

Hebrew and from the LXX., and even from the same quotations as elsewhere occurring in the New Testament. And this is just what we might expect. A Hellenist, translating a Hebrew document into Greek (in times when reference to books was far more cumbersome, and trust to memory far more common, than with us) would be likely to be guided principally by his memory of the LXX., but partly by the Hebrew before him. Hence would result translations slightly varying both from the Hebrew and from the LXX., and from other translations made by contemporaneous writers. This argument is, of course, unaffected whether the translation was originally made in a document or as is more probable, in an oral tradition.

Some confirmation of this hypothesis is derived from the fact that, although the first book of Maccabees was without doubt originally written in Hebrew, yet the quotations in it from Scripture are not translations from the Hebrew version. On the contrary, if the quotation in 1 Mac. vii. 17 from Ps. lxxviii. (lxxix.) 2, 3, be compared with the latter passage in the LXX., it will be seen at once that the former, though not identical with the latter (nor with the Hebrew), could not have been written but by a writer familiar with the LXX. version; compare also 1 Mac. ix. 23 with the LXX. version of Ps. xci. (xcii.) 8. A similar inference would seem to be justified by the statement (De Wette, quoted by Roberts, *Discussions on the Gospels*, p. 50) that Josephus uses the LXX. more than the Hebrew text.

The hypothesis of translation.

Mistranslation of an Aramaic original may possibly explain in part some of the confusions in the common tradition noted above (p. 791). It cannot of course be denied that some of these confusions imply a confusion of Greek, not Hebrew, tradition (e.g., *ισάγγελοι*, Lu. xx. 36; *ὡς ἀγγέλοι*, Mat. xxii. 30; Mk. xii. 25); but some of the changes of construction (e.g., *πάσα ἡ περιχώρος ἐξεπορεύετο*, Mat. iii. 5 and Lu. iii. 3, *ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν περιχώρον*, Mk. i. 5) are more easily explicable on the hypothesis of translation. Some of the changes of words are also explicable thus, as may be illustrated by the Latin version. Commenting on the text, "Domine, ne in ira tua arguas me, nec in furore tuo corripas me," Augustine (Ziegler, p. 10) says that in some codices of the Latin translations "ira" stands first, and "furore" second, in others "furore" first and "ira" second. Compare with this Mat. v. 40, *τὸ θέλοντι λαβεῖν χιτῶνα ἄρα αὐτῷ τὸ ἰμάτιον*, and Lu. vi. 29, *τοῦ αἰροντός σου τὸ ἰμάτιον μὴ καλύπτει τὸν χιτῶνα*, where the phenomena are precisely the same; and note that Mat. (xxvii. 65) has *ἰμάτια*, where Mk. (xiv. 63) has *χιτῶνας*. Of somewhat the same type (perhaps are the passages Mat. vii. 16, *ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλήν*, and Lu. vi. 44, *ἐκ βάτου σταφυλήν*).

In the translations from Greek into the early Latin versions of the New Testament, one very common difference is (besides divergent rendering of single words) that one version uses participles where the other uses finite verbs, or relative pronouns where the other uses co-ordinate conjunctions.¹ These same slight differences are found in several sayings of our Lord where they happen to be twice recorded by the same evangelist. Compare (a) Lu. viii. 18, *ὅτι γὰρ ἂν ἔχη*, and Lu. xix. 26, *πάντι τῷ ἔχοντι* (see also Mat. xiii. 12; xxv. 29); (b) Lu. viii. 17, *οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν κρυπτὸν δὲ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται*, and Lu. xii. 2, *οὐδὲν δε συγκεκριμένον ἐστὶν δὲ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται* (see also Mat. x. 26); (c) Mat. x. 39, *ὁ ἐρῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν*, and Mat. xvi. 25, *ὅς γὰρ εἴαν θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, ὅς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν* (and cf. Lu. ix. 24; xvii. 25); (d) Mat. v. 32, *πᾶς ὁ ἀπολείων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, &c.*, and Mat. xix. 9, *ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ, &c.* (e) In the same two passages there appears to be a confusion between "causeth to commit adultery" and "committeth adultery,"—Mat. v. 32, *παρεκτός λόγον πορεύει, ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι*, and Mat. xix. 9, *μὴ ἐπι πορεύει . . . μοιχεύεται*; (f) Mat. v. 32, *ὅς εἴαν ἀπολεινῶν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, &c.*, and Mat. xix. 9, *ὁ ἀπολεινῶν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, &c.* These passages, so far as they go, would indicate that the compilers of the

¹ Compare the Codex Corbeiensis and Brixianus (Migne, *Patrologia Curs. Compl.*, vol. xii. p. 147); of which (1) the former has (Mat. ii. 7) "Tunc Herodes, clam vocatis Magis diligenter didicit ab eis tempus stellæ quæ apparuit eis; et mittens illos in Bethleem, dixit 'Ite et interrogate,'" &c.; while the latter has (2) "Tunc Herodes occulte vocans Magos diligenter exquisivit ab eis tempus quando apparuit eis stella, et misit illos in Bethleem, dicens 'Euntes requirite'" &c.

First and Third Gospels did not themselves translate from Aramaic originals; for if they had themselves been the translators, it would seem that they would have adopted a uniform rendering in translating the same or very similar words. Limited though the evidence is, it goes to prove that the compilers incorporated in their treatises Greek translations, not all made by themselves, from Aramaic originals.

The phenomena of the ante-Jerome versions of the New Testament deserve careful consideration in discussing the possible origin of our Greek synoptic tradition from an Aramaic original. In a well-known passage, Jerome (Ziegler, *Die Lateinischen Bibelübersetzungen vor Hieronymus*, p. 12) complains that there were as many texts as copies of the Latin versions ("tot sunt enim exemplaria pene quot codices"), and the occasionally great variety may be illustrated by comparing an extract from the Codex Bobbiensis (*Jahrbücher d. Literatur*, Vienna, 1847, ad fin.) with the Vulgate version of Acts xxvii. 20, 21:—

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>BOBBIENSIS. <i>Neque sole neque stellis apparentibus per multos dies et hieme et tempestate minima [sic] perseverante, iam amputabatur spes omnis liberandi nos. Et cum iam diu sine cibo essent, tunc dicens Paulus in medio eorum dixit: Oportebat quidem vos obediri credentes mihi non navigare de Creta et lucrari hanc iniuriam et detrimentum.</i></p> | <p>VULGATE. <i>Neque autem sole neque sideribus apparentibus per plures dies et tempestate non exigua imminente, iam ablata erat spes omnis salutis nostræ. Et cum multa jejuniis fulset, tunc dicens Paulus in medio eorum dixit: Oportebat quidem, o viri, audito me, non tollere a Creta, lucrifacere injuriam hanc et jacturam.</i></p> |
|---|--|

It will be seen at once that there is some similarity between the thread common to these two Latin versions and the thread common to many passages in Matthew, Mark, and Luke; though the resemblance between any two of the three synoptists would generally exceed the resemblance of the two passages quoted above. In most cases, however, the ante-Jerome versions (as represented by the Codex Corbeiensis, Brixianus, Vercellensis, and Veronensis) agree much more closely together, even more closely than any two of the synoptists agree together, and a portion more closely than the three synoptists agree. On the whole, taking into consideration the greater influence of differentiating causes in the earliest times of the church than in the times when the ante-Jerome versions were composed, we may fairly conclude that if in these later times so great a variety could occur in the process of translation from Greek, the greater variety found in the common tradition, as given by the three synoptists, might well be partly explained in the same way, as originating in part from varieties of translation from Hebrew. But then the questions arise—(a) Were the ante-Jerome versions independent translations from the Greek text? (b) Or were they divergent corruptions of one original Latin translation from the Greek text? (c) Or were they partly independent, but partly modified by some oral tradition or "ecclesiastical use," which diminished the divergence? On these questions there is not at present a complete agreement. Wiseman maintained that the second (b) answer was the right one; but in a recent work (quoted above) Ziegler (p. 123) maintains, with great probability, that the third (c) is correct—viz., that the oral catechizing and preaching in the Latin churches modified and assimilated translations otherwise independent. It is extremely probable that the same hypothesis of combined causes—(1) translations from Aramaic documents, (2) influence of oral Greek tradition—may explain much of the agreement and variation in the passages common to the three synoptists.

The difference between the Triple Tradition of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke will, at this stage, occur to us as an important feature in our evidence. The widely different phenomena of the Double and the Triple Traditions suggest different origins for the two traditions. Many of the passages common to Matthew and Luke agree together far more closely than even the Latin versions of the Greek Gospels. It would seem to follow that in such cases Matthew and Luke used one and the same Greek document—a translation of some Aramaic original—which document had not undergone much modification by oral tradition before passing into the several treatises of Matthew and Luke. On the other hand, the more varying language of the Triple Tradition, together with the additions and omissions of the three writers, suggests (a) independent translations of an Aramaic original; (b) occasional resemblances suggested by the general "usus ecclesiasticus"; (c) divergences created by the local "usus ecclesiasticus," or by the individual style of the editor or editors.

Date of the Synoptic Writers.—The composite nature of

the synoptic Gospels makes it necessary to distinguish carefully between the date of the compilation of each collective treatise and the date of the composition of the several parts of which that treatise may be composed. The original tradition has been shown to have existed before any of the three synoptics; some common document of the words of the Lord has been shown to have probably existed before Matthew's or Luke's narrative; other documents or traditions might also possibly be shown to exist embedded in each of the synoptists, and the date of each of these parts would be earlier than the date of the whole. Therefore, even if the date of Matthew, or Mark, or Luke could be exactly determined, it would by no means determine the date of the traditions which they contain. It is even possible that a later Gospel may retain in some cases an earlier version of the common tradition of the words of the Lord, as we have seen in the case of Luke's version of the Lord's Prayer (see p. 798 above).

There is no internal evidence for exactly determining the date of any one of the synoptics. The supposed references in Mark to the death of James, the capture of Jerusalem, or any special earthquakes which might determine the date (Renan's *Évangiles*, p. 123), are so shadowy as scarcely to deserve consideration. The reference to the death of Zachariah the son of Baruch, shortly before the capture of Jerusalem (Joseph., *B. J.*, iv. 5, 4), supposed to be found in Mat. xxiii. 35, is still more improbable. Still the marked difference between the detailed prediction (in Lu. xxi. 18-25) of the fall of the city and the scattering of the people, and the more general predictions in corresponding passages in Matthew and Mark, indicates that Luke's description is modified by reminiscences of the siege of Jerusalem; while Matthew's and Mark's accounts are not thus, or at all events not equally, modified. It is an almost certain inference that Luke compiled after 70 A.D. As regards Matthew and Mark inferences cannot be drawn with equal certainty; for of course a compiler may compile at a late date, and yet preserve traditions in their earliest shape; but it is at least a reasonable inference that the compilers of the First and Second Gospels wrote before Luke; and there is a balance of probability in favour of the supposition that they wrote before the fall of Jerusalem.

Coming to more general evidence, we find (see p. 791) that (1) Mark, at least in many passages, includes the original tradition from which both Matthew and Luke borrowed; (2) his language, less polished than that of Matthew and Luke, appears more natural for an earlier Gospel in the first and rudest age of the church; (3) Mark's version of the tradition contains many expressions which might naturally be considered "stumbling-blocks," and which, in fact, were rejected or not inserted in the other Gospels; (4) the omission of all account of the manifestations of Jesus after the resurrection indicates a very early date; and though it may be said that this omission arises from the fact that the Second Gospel was accidentally left incomplete, yet this answer will not account for the omission of the genealogies, and of all account of the birth and infancy of Jesus; (5) the interpolated appendix describing the resurrection of Jesus, quoted as it is by Irenæus, shows that even in the time of Irenæus (170 A.D.) the Gospel had been long enough in use to admit of widespread interpolations. All these facts lead to the inference that Mark was compiled earlier than any of the other Gospels, and probably some time before 70 A.D. It is almost impossible to fix any date (worth stating) after which the compilation must have taken place. Those who accept as literally true Mark's accounts of the feeding of the four thousand and five thousand, the walking on the waves, and the exorcism of the Gadarene,

may naturally carry back his history to the first years of the Galilean church; and even those who interpret these accounts symbolically are ready to admit that a very short space of time is often quite sufficient, by misunderstanding and accretion, to erect supernatural narratives on a basis of natural and symbolic story. But any approximation to a date after which the Gospel was compiled must be deferred till we consider the external evidence.

The narrative of Matthew does not leave us quite so uncertain. The mention of "the Jews," which is so frequent in the Fourth Gospel, is justly regarded as a proof that the author was writing in times when the Christian church was regarded as definitely and antagonistically separated from the Jewish nation. In the synoptists it is the "Pharisees," not the "Jews," who are in conflict with Jesus. But in his account of the resurrection Matthew (xxviii. 15) uses the word in this antagonistic sense. Further, he twice (xxvii. 8; xxviii. 15) uses the expression "even to this day," of events occurring shortly before or after the death of Jesus,—thereby showing that a long interval had occurred between the death of Jesus and the compilation of the narrative. The tone of the Gospel, as compared with Luke, indicates a period when the Jews still existed as a nation, and when the abrogation of the law and the destruction of the temple were not yet accepted as recognized facts; but the number of parables upon the end of the world and the judgment, the tendency to dwell on exclusion rather than inclusion, on the "many" that are shut out rather than on the "few" that are chosen, and the atmosphere of gloom generally characterizing the Gospel, point perhaps to the crisis immediately preceding the siege of Jerusalem. The additions concerning the birth and incarnation may seem to imply a later date; but when we reflect how natural it was that in very early times the church should attach importance to these subjects, the wonder will be, not that these narratives were written so soon, but that they were deferred to so late a period as forty years after our Lord's death. It is also extremely remarkable—and a mark of early date as compared with Luke—that even in this developed form of the Gospel the accounts of manifestation of our Lord after His resurrection should be so scanty, doubtful, and vague.

In Luke the signs of later date abound:—(1) the pre-existence and implied failure of many "attempts" to set forth continuous narratives of the things "surely believed;" (2) the mention of the "tradition" of the eye-witnesses and ministers of the word as past, not as present (*παρέδοσαν*) (i. 2); (3) the dedication of the Gospel to a man of rank (fictitious or otherwise), who is supposed to have been "catechized" in Christian truth; (4) the attempt at literary style and at improvement of the "usus ecclesiasticus" of the common tradition; (5) the composition of something like the commencement of a Christian hymnology; (6) the development of the genealogy and the higher tone of the narrative of the incarnation; (7) the insertion of many passages mentioning our Lord as *ὁ κύριος*, not in address, but in narrative; (8) the distinction, more sharply drawn, between the fall of Jerusalem and the final coming; (9) the detailed prediction of the fall of Jerusalem, implying reminiscences of its fulfilment; (10) the very great development of the manifestations of Jesus after the resurrection. The inference from all this evidence would be that Luke was not written till about 80 A.D. at earliest. If it could be further demonstrated that Luke used any Greek Apocryphal book (Judith, for example), and if it could be shown that the book in question was written after a certain date (Renan suggests 80 A.D. for the date of the book of Judith), it might be necessary to place Luke much later; but no such demonstration has been hitherto produced.

External Evidence.

The composite nature of the synoptic Gospels will affect the inferences we shall draw from early quotations of passages found in them, where the authors of the Gospels are not expressly mentioned. If, for example, we find in Justin a passage (quoted as a saying of the Lord) which is found both in Matthew and Luke, Justin may indeed have quoted it from Matthew or from Luke; but it is also possible that he may have quoted it neither from Matthew nor from Luke, but either (a) from the common source whence Matthew and Luke derived the passage, or (b) from some other book or tradition, which, like Matthew and Luke, included the passage in its collection or compilation. The same applies to a quotation from the Triple Tradition. It may be quoted from Matthew or from Mark or from Luke; but it is also possible that it may be drawn from none of these, but from the common tradition itself, or from some other treatise based on the Triple Tradition.

Taking the evidence chronologically, we come first to the testimony of Paul, who, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, says (1 Cor. xi. 23), "I received from the Lord that which also I delivered to you;" and then follows a description of the institution of the Lord's Supper, differing materially from Matthew and Mark, and agreeing in the main with Luke, except that Paul repeats twice the command, "Do this in remembrance of Me." It would seem unreasonable and scarcely reverent to suppose that a special revelation revealed to Paul the exact words of the institution; but comparing the passage with Gal. i. 9, 12, we see that Paul merely says here about this part of his teaching what in Gal. i. 9, 12 he says about the whole of it, viz., that he received it from the Lord and not from man. From Ananias, or from other elders of the church, he may have received the words of oral tradition of the church; but for the meaning and spiritual force of it, and the application of each part of it to the work of redemption, he was indebted, not to the elders of the church in Damascus, but to the revelations given to him in the solitude of Arabia. The words of Paul, therefore, do not exclude (and the facts render probable) the use of oral tradition in this passage. This being so, it may seem remarkable that Paul follows the tradition contained in the latest of the three Gospels. It can hardly be that Luke has here preserved the earliest tradition. The insertion of "new" before "testament" (not inserted in the correct text of Matthew and Mark), and the ampler narrative of Luke indicate a later, not an earlier, shape of the tradition. The word "testament" appears to have been used by our Lord in the ordinary sense of "will" and "testament," indicating that in that funeral feast He was designating Himself to His disciples for ever.¹ The insertion of "new," by a sort of play upon the double meaning of the word "testament," introduces the sense of "covenant," and therewith a contrast between the old and the new covenants. But this suggestive thought (highly characteristic of Paul) seems more likely to have been added to the original in process of explanation, than to have been dropped by Matthew and Mark through neglect, or discarded owing to difficulty. The probable solution therefore would seem to be that Luke has embodied, not the earliest tradition, but the later Pauline shape of the tradition. We have here therefore not Paul supporting the tradition of Luke, but Luke (in all probability) borrowing from Paul.² The only other passage in which Paul (in the Acts) quotes a saying of Jesus contains (Acts xx. 35) words not found in any of our Gospels, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

The Second Epistle of Peter (2 Pet. i. 17) contains a reference (apparently) to the transfiguration, of which the writer speaks as an eye-witness. But this testimony, most important if genuine, is almost certainly spurious. The mention of the mount of transfiguration as "the Holy Mount," and of Paul's epistles as "scriptures," would in itself suggest a late date; and Canon Westcott (*Gospels*, p. 175) justly says that "the comparative elaborateness

¹ Similarly it is used in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 17), διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία· ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει ὅτι ἐξ ὧν διαθέμενος. This use of the word is also found in the title of the early apocryphal work, *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. It is said by Mr. Sinker, in his edition of that work (p. 32), that probably, by the time of the composition of the *Testaments* (i.e., before 135 A.D.), "the word διαθήκη itself [Ἰσραηλῆ] had been taken into Hebrew in the sense of "will" (Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabd.* s.v.). It would seem to follow that long before that date, the word διαθήκη was in regular use, in Hebrew Greek, to render the meaning "will" or "testament," although of course it also represents (and very much more frequently, owing to the more frequent repetition of the thought in the New Testament) the meaning "covenant."

² If the similarity between Luke xxii. 20 and 1 Cor. xi. 25 arises from an interpolation in the former, in that case the negative conclusion remains the same, that we have not here Paul supporting the tradition of Luke.

of the description (of the transfiguration) seems to offer an instructive contrast to the simplicity of the earlier Gospel." External evidence is also against the genuineness of this epistle. Up to the times of Clement of Alexandria "no trace has been found" of its existence (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 349); and neither Origen nor Eusebius accepts it as canonical. To obtain a complete idea of the judgment of the church upon the canon, we must combine (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 264) the two canons of the East and West; by doing this "we obtain, with one exception, a perfect New Testament without the admixture of any foreign element." That "exception" is the Second Epistle of Peter. The only importance to be attached therefore to the testimony of an epistle thus rejected by the general consent of the early church is that which attaches itself to an early literary fabrication composed so early as to have found a place in our canon. Such a composition (mentioning Paul's letters as "scriptures") cannot have been written before the beginning of the second century; yet we find that, even at that date, the common tradition is quoted most inexactly. The voice from heaven, as given by the author of the spurious epistle, is, "Ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα." But in Matthew (xvii. 5) it is οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. Mark and Luke differ still more from the Epistle, for they both omit εὐδόκησα. The inaccuracy is the more serious because, in describing the baptism of Jesus, Matthew (iii. 17) speaks of a voice from heaven which almost exactly agrees with the words in the Epistle, omitting the words ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. In these circumstances it is impossible to say that the author of this spurious Epistle had Matthew before him. Much more probably he was quoting from memory, or from some document differing from any of our synoptic Gospels.

The next witness is Clement of Rome, whose Epistle to the Corinthians, probably written in or soon after 95 A.D. (Lightfoot's *Clement of Rome*, Appendix, p. 267), contains three passages which may indicate a use of our Gospels. (1) In chap. xiii. he blends together (Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 921) passages common to Matthew (v. 7; vi. 14; vii. 12; viii. 2), Mark (iv. 24; xi. 25), and Luke (vi. 36, 37, 31, 38, 37) in a terse, antithetical, and uniform style, inserting the words, ὡς χρηστὴν οὖρανὸν χρηστὴν θύραν ἡμῶν. Dr. Lightfoot has pointed out that the looseness of this quotation does not exceed the looseness with which (chap. 12) the same author quotes the narrative of Rahab, and therefore it is quite possible that here, as there, Clement may be simply quoting from memory with no other documents than Matthew and Luke in his mind; but to many the "roundness, compactness, and balance of style" which Dr. Sanday notices in the quotation will make it probable that Clement was quoting, not perhaps from any other document (for else how is it that no trace remains of a documentary version of the word of the Lord so "rounded and compact" in style, and used 95 A.D. by so eminent a man as Clement of Rome in writing to the church of Corinth?), but with some tradition in his memory (which had perhaps served the purpose of preachers, teachers, and catechists in the Roman Church), blending and condensing the versions of Matthew and Luke into a form adapted for the oral instruction of converts. (2) In another passage (chap. xxvi.) Clement combines Mat. xviii. 6 (Mk. ix. 42; Lu. xvii. 1, 2) and Matt. xxvi. 24 (Mk. xiv. 21; Lu. xxii. 22) in a manner which suggests quoting from memory. (3) A third passage (Sanday, p. 70) contains a quotation from Isaiah (xxix. 13) differing from the Hebrew and from the similar LXX, (which is, ἐγγίσει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσιν με, ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πρόβω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ), and substituting a condensed and antithetical form, οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσιν με τιμᾷ, ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πρόβω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, which is also found in Matt. xv. 8 and Mk. vii. 6 (except that they read ἀπέχει for ἀπίστῳ). The inference has been drawn that Clement is quoting from our Gospels. But this is not the only passage where quotations from the Old Testament in the New appear to have been influenced by an "ecclesiastical use," arising in some cases from a desire to make the application closer (compare Jo. xix. 37 with the LXX version of Zech. xii. 10, and note that this version is exactly quoted by Justin, and allusively by the author of the Apocalypse, i. 7), in part from abridgment or other causes (compare Mat. iii. 3; Mk. i. 3; Lu. iii. 4 with Isa. xl. 3). Therefore, even though the citation in Clement exactly coincided with the citation in Mark and Matthew, it would not follow that Clement cited it from them; and as the quotation is not identical, the probability is that it is quoted by Clement, with a slight alteration, from memory of "ecclesiastical use." There is also in chap. ii. ("more gladly giving than receiving") an allusion to the saying of Jesus mentioned in Acts xx. 35. Our conclusion is—(a) that Clement of Rome, about 95 A.D., is proved to have a knowledge of the several scattered sentences in our common tradition which he quotes as "words of the Lord," but very loosely and freely; (b) that his quotation of the Old Testament appears on one occasion to be influenced by Christian "ecclesiastical use"; (c) that he uses (but whether as a quotation or not we have no means of determining) some words not found in our Gospels, which words are attributed to Jesus by the author of the Acts of the Apostles.

Early in the second century we for the first time meet with a quotation from the addition to the common tradition which are peculiar to Matthew. The Curetonian or shorter version of the epistles of Ignatius (107 or 115 A.D.) uses Matt. x. 16 almost *verbatim*, and possibly refers (Sanday, p. 79) to the star of Matthew (chap. ii.). The Vossian or longer version of the Ignatian epistles (which may be accepted as testimony for about 150 A.D.) contains, besides an ample and somewhat exaggerated reference to the star in Matt. ii., three or four (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 60) short but striking phrases peculiar to Matthew. But none of these passages have marks of quotation, the words of Matthew being in each case embedded in the writer's own words. It is remarkable that the only words of the Lord expressly quoted by Ignatius are words not found in any of our synoptic writers: "And when He came to those about (περὶ) Peter, He said to them, Take, handle Me, and see that I am not a bodiless demon." These words, although they have some likeness (the word ἠψηλάφησατε is in both) to Lu. xxiv. 39, are expressly said by Eusebius to be derived from some source unknown to him, and by Jerome to be derived from a Gospel which he had translated (from Hebrew), and which was read in his time by the Nazarenes (Kirchhofer, p. 449); and, according to Origen, the passage occurred in the teaching of Peter. It is, of course, impossible for us, upon this evidence, to determine whether Ignatius quoted from the Nazarene gospel, or from the teaching of Peter, or from some other document or tradition embodied before or after in both those documents. Our conclusion is that, by the middle of the second century, the writer of the Vossian version of the Ignatian epistles was familiar with the Gospel of Matthew, but that he also used other sources (not known to us) when quoting the words of the Lord in support of the material resurrection of Jesus.

In the Epistles of Barnabas (100-125 A.D.) is found (chap. iv.) the first apparent reference (if we except the reference in 2 Pet. iii. 16) to any passage of the New Testament as "written": "Let us beware lest we be found, as it is written, many called, but few chosen," words almost exactly found in Matt. xxii. 14 alone (probably interpolated in Matt. xx. 16). There is also an allusive quotation of the words in Matt. ix. 13; Mk. ii. 17; Lu. v. 32: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." The only words expressly assigned to Jesus (chap. vii.) are not found in our Gospels: "Even so, saith He, they that would see Me and touch My kingdom, must take Me, through persecution and suffering." It is most unfortunate that the inexactness of the verifiable quotations in this epistle prevents us from laying much stress upon the author's statement as to the source of those which are unverifiable. For example, in chap. xvi., the author has, "The scripture saith, And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the Lord will deliver up the sheep of His pasture, and their sheepfold and tower to destruction. And it so happened as the Lord had spoken." But we know of no "scripture" containing these words; and the probability is that the author was quoting from memory and erroneously, as when (chap. v.) he combines Isa. iii. 9 and Wisdom ii. 12, as follows: "The prophet speaks against Israel, Woe to their soul because they have counselled an evil counsel against themselves, saying, Let us bind the Just One, because He is displeasing to us." Our conclusion is that, if Barnabas is deceived by his memory in attributing one passage to "writing" or "scripture," he may be deceived about another, and that we consequently cannot feel sure that he is quoting Matt. xxii. 14 from a document and not from memory of oral tradition. But (a) that the author was acquainted with passages found in Matthew is certain; and (b) it is also certain and noteworthy that the only words of the Lord quoted by him are quoted from sources not known to us.

Poly carp (born about 69 A.D., died 155 or 156) quotes (chap. ii.) sentences from the Sermon on the Mount, similar to those quoted by Clement above, with the preface, "remembering those things which the Lord said (while) teaching, Judge not," &c. The quotation, like Clement's, is antithetical and compressed, but neither in order nor in words agrees so far with Clement's as to make it in the least degree probable that Poly carp and Clement are quoting from a written version differing from our synoptics. There is also a quotation from Mat. xxvi. 41 and Mk. xiv. 38, and a reference to Mat. vi. 13, "Asking the all-beholding God not to lead us into temptation; even as the Lord said, The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." Two other coincidences (chap. v. and vi.) seem to refer to Mat. xx. 28; Mat. ix. 35; Mat. vi. 12, 14; Lu. xi. 4. There are no supposed allusions to apocryphal writings in Poly carp (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 61). It will be seen from what has been said above that there is nothing remarkable in the great variations with which the "Sermon on the Mount" was taught and quoted among the Christians in the first century. Like the "Lord's Prayer," it has not a literary but a practical interest; and being much used in many different churches from the earliest times, it may naturally have assumed many different shapes serviceable for catechists and preachers. This consideration (and the possibilities of variation arising from translation) may easily account for the variation between Clement and Poly carp, without necessitating or justifying, even as a working hypothesis, the supposition that

Clement or Poly carp, in quoting the "Sermon on the Mount," quoted from other documents than our existing Gospels.

The "Shepherd" of Hermas, written about 135-40 A.D., "contains no distinct traces of any writing of Old or New Testament" (Sanday, *Gospels*). This is worth bearing in mind, as a warning that the nature of the subject will greatly affect the number of quotations from the scriptures in any early books. The allegorical nature of the "Shepherd," intended more as a stimulating tale than as a polemical or hortatory discourse, dispenses with scriptural illustrations; and in the same way Justin, in his *Second Apology*, refrains from quoting the scriptures, while in his other works he multiplies quotations or references. In appealing to the heathen, Justin "quotes the scriptures only when he must speak of things beyond the range of common history, preferring elsewhere to appeal to external documents such as the enrolment of Quirinus and the Acts of Pilate" (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 110).

Papias, who wrote about 130-140 A.D., composed five books, entitled "Exposition (ἐξηγήσεις) of the Oracles" of the Lord. It is (apparently) in an introduction to this work that he speaks (Euseb., iii. 39) of traditions gathered from different sources: "But I will not shrink from placing along with my interpretations (ἐρμηνείας) as many (traditions) as at any time I learned well, and well stored up in memory from the elders." The noun "interpretations" (ἐρμηνείας) may receive some light from Papias's own use of the words ἐρμηνευτής and ἐρμηνεία, as quoted in the same chapter of Eusebius. "Mark," he says, "was the interpreter of Peter (ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος);" again, "Matthew wrote his scriptures (λόγια) in Hebrew, and each man interpreted them (ἑρμηνεύοντες) as he best could." So Eusebius himself in the preceding chapter tells us that some believe Clement to have "interpreted" (ἐρμηνεύοντα) Paul's (Hebrew) Epistle to the Hebrews into Greek. Our conclusion would be that the word ἐρμηνεία may here mean something more than mere "commentary"; it may imply that he, as others had done, wrote an interpretation of the "Logia," accompanied by comments and by supplementary traditions. At all events he does not speak of any one Greek "interpretation" of Matthew as being as yet paramount and authoritative, so as to exclude the necessity of further "interpretations." Of Mark he speaks (in the person of "the elder") almost apologetically, implying that his narrative had been censured for its incompleteness and unpolished style; and he defends it by quoting a tradition from "the elder" (apparently, John the elder) thus:—"Mark, having become Peter's interpreter, wrote down accurately all that he remembered—not, however, in order—both the words and deeds of Christ. For he neither heard the Lord, nor attached himself to Him, but later on, as I said, attached himself to Peter; who used to adapt his lessons to the needs of the occasion, but not as though he were composing a connected treatise of the discourses (λόγων, v. γ. λογίων) of the Lord: so that Mark committed no error in writing down some matters just as he remembered them (ἀεμνημόνευσε). For one object was in his thoughts (ἐὸς γὰρ ἑστίασε πρόνοιαν)—to make no omissions and no false statements in what he heard."

Much of this exactly applies to our Mark. If we desire to know what is meant by Mark's not writing "in order," we have only to turn to Luke, who made it his object to write "in order," and whose arrangement, chronologically as well as artistically, differs from Mark. It is true that we may be disposed to think Mark's "order" not inferior to Luke's; but the fact is indisputable that Luke attempted to write "in order," and that his "order" differs considerably from that of Mark, who manifests no purpose except the desire to put down what he knew as he remembered it. It has been shown above (see p. 802) that Mark's Gospel is rather a collection of anecdotes than a connected narrative; and of such a collection it would be natural to say that it was not written as an orderly narrative. To the single evidence of Papias, derived from an unknown elder, not much importance can be attached; and it is very doubtful whether the most searching investigations will ever determine with certainty the name of the author or authors of any one of the synoptic Gospels. But at all events, it is only reasonable to admit that the hypothesis of "notes" taken from oral discourses, and serving as the groundwork for the Second Gospel, would explain many of its phenomena. If these oral discourses embodied the early common Greek tradition, it would be easy to see how the First and Third Gospels came to resemble the Second Gospel, although all three Gospels are mutually independent. As regards the First Gospel, it has been shown above that internal evidence is against the theory of a very early authorship; and we

¹ No one word in English will exactly express the word λόγια, which was used both before and after Papias, to mean not merely "sayings" but "Scriptures."—Lightfoot, *Contemporary Review*, Oct. 1875.

² Cf. also Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, vii. 17, 106, where certain heretics appeal to Glaucias τὸν Πέτρον ἐρμηνεία; and Jerome suggests as an explanation of the difference in style between the First and Second Epistle of Peter that the apostle used different interpreters (Kirchhofer, p. 276). The point for consideration is, not whether the statements of Papias are correct, but what Papias meant when he spoke of Mark as ἐρμηνευτής, and of himself as writing ἐρμηνεία.

must add that it exhibits no signs that the portion before the call of Matthew was written from hearsay, and that after the call of Matthew by an eye-witness. But there seems the following strong argument in favour of the tradition of Papias as to the authorship of Matthew: if there was no basis for it, if it was a mere fiction or guess, why not select, as the author, some more distinguished apostle, Peter, John, or James? This argument is neutralized by the following consideration. The apostles (Acts iv. 13) were known in the earliest days to have been unlearned and ignorant men; and although the Holy Spirit gave them power to speak and teach, it was less natural that they should be inspired with power to write and to compose connected treatises. But Matthew being a publican, and necessarily ready with his pen, might naturally be supposed in the post-apostolic generation to be a skilful writer; so that if an early tradition with general apostolic authority was committed to writing, the church would naturally select Matthew the publican and ready writer as the special author of it. Nevertheless, the testimony of Papias is important as attesting the belief (1) in a Hebrew origin for the Logia or the Gospel scriptures, and (2) in an early multiplicity of "interpretations."

The apologetic tone in which Papias introduces the traditions, which he "will not shrink from placing along with the interpretations" of the scriptures, indicates that the written scriptures were gradually subordinating tradition. He nowhere expresses an opinion that the Logia are unauthorized, but he implies that they require "interpretation," and adds (almost as though it were an idiosyncrasy) that he set a great store on supplementary tradition from the sources nearest to the truth,—not only taking pleasure in those who taught the commandments that came from the Lord (who was) the very truth (i.e., the disciples of the Lord), but also questioning any who had "attached themselves to the elders," whom he used to examine closely on the utterances of Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord, and on the sayings of Aristion and the elder John, the disciples of the Lord.¹

¹ Eus. H. E. iii. 39: Οὐκ ὀκνήσω δὲ σοὶ καὶ ὅσα ποτὲ πᾶρα τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον καὶ καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα, συντάξαι ταῖς ἐπιμνήμασι, διαβεβαιούμενος περὶ αὐτῶν ἀληθεῖαν· οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαρον, ὡς περὶ οἱ πολλοὶ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀληθῆ διδασκασιν, οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίων ἐπιμνήμασι μνημονεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς πᾶρα τοῦ κυρίου τῆ πίστεως δεδομέναις καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινόμεναις τῆς ἀληθείας. εἰ δὲ πού τις παρρηκολούθησεν τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀκούων λέγοντος· τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ τί Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τίς ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἔτι Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσι. It is maintained by able scholars (from whom dissent can be expressed only with great diffidence) that the λέγουσι indicates that Aristion and John the elder were living, while the εἶπεν indicates that Andrew, Peter, John the apostle, Matthew, and all the rest of the apostles were dead at the time "when Papias began his investigations" (Westcott, Canon, p. 69). Now, John the apostle is supposed to have died at a very advanced age, about 38 A.D., and Papias (Lightfoot, Contemporary Review, May 1875) to have been born about 60-70 A.D., and to have written (Westcott, *et sup.*) about 140-150 A.D. We have therefore to suppose on this hypothesis (a) that Papias did not "begin his investigations" till he was twenty-eight or thirty-eight years old (i.e., not till seven or seventeen years after he had attained to manhood), although the apostle John was living all that time in his immediate neighbourhood; (b) that two personal disciples of Jesus outlived the aged apostle John for a period long enough to enable Papias to conduct a systematic investigation into their traditions during their lifetime. "Improbable" is too mild a word for such a hypothesis. It seems very much more probable that λέγουσιν is simply the graphic present used for variety. Papias desires to make a distinction between the *dicta* of the apostles and the less authoritative utterances of Aristion and John the elder, who were not apostles. For this purpose he not only (1) mentions them separately, but also (2) varies the construction, changing *τί* into *ἄτε*, and (3) *εἶπε* into *λέγει*. A hundred instances might be given from the Gospel of St John alone, where *εἶπε* and *λέγει* are used indifferently and alternately for the mere purpose of variety; see John iv. 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17 (*bis*), and the whole of the gospel *passim*. And for the use of *λέγει* in a dependent sentence following an imperf. indic. compare Plato, *Apol.* 21 B, ἠπόρουν τί ποτε λέγει, "I was in doubt as to what (the oracle) meant." It is true that Eusebius, though he denies Irenæus's assertion that Papias was a hearer of John the apostle, maintained that Papias heard John the elder. But he appears to have no evidence for this statement except the sentence just quoted, and the fact that Papias set down certain traditions of John the elder, mentioning him by name. His words are: "Ἀριστίωνος δὲ καὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου ἀνήκουον ἐαυτῶν ὄντι γενέσθαι. Ὀνομαστὶ γοῦν πολλοὶ αὐτῶν μνημονεύσας ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ συγγράμμασι τίθειν αὐτῶν παραδόσεις. This is quite insufficient in face of the great difficulties in such a supposition. The only tradition of an elder quoted by Eusebius from Papias with any words of preface begins thus: "The elder said this also." Such a preface is quite consistent with the supposition that Papias had heard the tradition, not from the elder himself, but from one who had attached himself to the elder (*παρρηκολούθησεν τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ*); and the above-quoted sentence of Papias itself better suits such a supposition, for the "cross-examining of those who had attached themselves to the elders" naturally applies to all the names that follow, and more especially to John, since he is expressly included in the class of "elders." "I used to cross-examine any that came in my way who had attached themselves to the elders (asking them), what said Andrew, . . . and about the sayings of Aristion and John the elder;" surely the natural inference is that Aristion and

It must be added that Papias, besides recording the raising of a dead man by Philip, and the drinking of poison without injury by Justus surnamed Barsabas, is said by Eusebius to have narrated several "strange parables and teachings of the Saviour," and other fabulous matters, originating from a literal understanding of figurative expressions. He also published "a story about a woman accused in the presence of the Lord for many sins, which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews" (Euseb., *ib.*) It has been demonstrated by Dr Lightfoot that Eusebius, in treating of the disputed and undisputed writings of the earliest times, adopted one course for the former and another for the latter. (1) As to the disputed books, the *antilegomena*, he pledged himself to "record when any ancient writer employs any book belonging to their class;" but (2) as regards the undisputed canonical books, he only professes to mention them, "when such a writer has something to tell about them" (*τίνα περὶ τῶν ἐνδιαθήκων εἴρηται*) *Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1875. We are not therefore to infer from the silence of Eusebius that Papias did not know or quote the Gospels of Luke and John, but only that he said nothing about them; which of course might arise from either of two causes, either because he did not know of their existence, or because, knowing their existence, he "had nothing to say about them." What bearing this may have on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel we shall see hereafter. But, so far, we see written scriptures still (1) supplanted by oral tradition; (2) freely criticized as inadequate; and (3) accompanied by memoirs of various interpretations from some Hebrew original; though rapidly emerging, if they have not already emerged, to authoritative definiteness.

One fact is of the highest importance. We have seen that Papias was of a curious disposition, discontented with the written records before him, and anxious to supplement them by traditions. He was also, according to Eusebius, a man of no great judgment, fond of recording wonders, and, by his own account, fond of recording novelties. If therefore there had been any other non-canonical Gospel at that time, rivaling our present Gospels, and known to Papias, it seems probable, if not certain, that he would have used such a book; and, if he had done so, Eusebius could not (in the execution of his plan) have failed to mention such a use; but Eusebius makes no mention of the use of any non-canonical gospel by Papias. Even in the narrative of the sinful woman mentioned above, which was found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, Eusebius expressly avoids saying that he derived the narrative from that Gospel. He merely says that Papias "has published a narrative which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews" (it is probably the narrative interpolated in Jo. viii. 1-11); whereas, almost in the same sentence, he says that Papias "has used testimonies from the First Epistle of John." This negative evidence from the silence of Papias is strongly in favour of our Gospels.

In the works of Justin Martyr (who is supposed to have written his *Apologies* and *Dialogue with Trypho*, 145-147 A.D.; so Hort, quoted by Westcott, *Canon*, p. 98) we find definite and abundant mention of written documents containing the facts of the Gospel narratives, but no assigned names of authors. The Gospel is by him considered as a whole, sometimes called *εὐαγγέλιον*, sometimes *εὐαγγέλιον*, but frequently τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἐποστόλων, and once (when he is referring to Mark's Gospel) τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρον. Bearing in mind Xenophon's well-known *ἀπομνημονεύματα Σωκράτους*, from which title "the word had already been borrowed by several writers" (Westcott, *Canon*, 108), we might naturally infer that the memoirs were not written by the apostles, but about the apostles or rather about their teaching; and this view is confirmed by what Papias says (above) about Mark, that he *ἀπεμνημόνευσε*, "recorded from memory," the teaching of Peter.² This probably was originally the meaning of the title as applied to our Gospels; but it seems to have been understood differently by Justin, as though it meant "written by the apostles." For in describing the descent of the Holy Spirit on Jesus at His baptism he uses the words, "The apostles wrote." It might indeed be said that he has in his mind Matthew and John, for John also records

John are included in the "elders." If this be so, every difficulty vanishes: Papias, though placed before Polycarp by Eusebius, may have been naturally so placed because he died before the aged Polycarp, so that his work fell in a period preceding Polycarp; but he may have been born about the same time or later, say 80 A.D. In that case the last of the apostles would have passed away before Papias was thirteen; and when Papias began his investigations he would necessarily have to rely on the pupils of the elders, since the elders themselves, whether apostles, as Andrew and Peter, or mere elders, as Aristion and John, had all passed away. If, however, it should appear after all that Papias did hear John the elder, it follows that, when Irenæus described Papias as "the hearer of John," he either (1) meant John the elder, or (2) confused John the elder with John the apostle. In either case most important consequences might follow, bearing upon the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. For it follows that, if here, then on other occasions, when speaking of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, Irenæus either (1) may have meant John the elder where we at present suppose him to mean John the apostle, or (2) may have confused John the elder with John the apostle.

² Clement of Alexandria (Eus., H. E., vi. 14) expressly says that Peter had no part in the composition, and did not even encourage it. There seems to have been an early and not unnatural tendency to depreciate the Second Gospel.

this; but St John's Gospel is not once quoted in the whole of his works, and it is inconceivable that, in this latent fashion, he should have referred once to a writing as apostolic, which elsewhere he never quotes. It seems more likely that Justin considered that the ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρον were written by Peter, so that the first two Gospels at all events were written by apostles; or else that he considered the First Gospel not to have been written by one apostle, but to have been a joint apostolic production. Elsewhere, in describing the agony of the Lord (Lu. xxii. 44), a passage peculiar to Luke, he seems to have been struck with the inapplicability of his favourite title to a work written by one who was only a follower of the apostles; and instead of his usual formula, he here substitutes "The memoirs which I assert to have been written by the apostles, and by those who attached themselves to them;" but even this more precise description would only hold good of the three Gospels used by Justin, on the supposition that the "Memoirs of Peter" were written not by Mark but by Peter. The subject is important, as showing by what easy stages a work written by a pupil might be supposed (even in the face of direct evidence to the contrary) to be written by the teacher.

For a full discussion of Justin's quotations from the Gospels the reader is referred to Westcott, *On the Canon of the New Testament*, pp. 95-175, and Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, pp. 88-137. Here it must suffice to state a few general conclusions deduced from an examination of his use of the Old and New Testament.

We must bear in mind then (1) that Justin is writing polemically, and that (especially in his dialogue with the Jew Trypho) a main object with him is to show that "the prophets are fulfilled in Jesus;" to the proof from prophecy he attaches more importance than to any other. (2) He is a most inexact quoter; and though he quotes long passages from the Old Testament accurately, shorter passages are quoted from memory inexactly, while Messianic passages, even when long, are modified (sometimes with a closer return to the Hebrew original) by Christian use and adaptation to Christ. (3) He often inserts words and notions of his own in the passages quoted from the Old Testament: for example, he says that Moses, in order to heal the children of Israel from the plague of serpents, "took brass and made an image of a cross, and set this in the holy tabernacle, and said to the people, Should you look on this image and believe on it, ye shall be saved" (*Canon*, p. 124). (4) He ascribes texts to wrong authors, and quotes the same text in various shapes, not only in different books, but even in the same book and at short intervals (*ib.* 127). This being the case, we shall naturally be prepared, in approaching the New Testament quotations of Justin, to find many inaccuracies, and some alterations of fact; especially where a slight alteration can render some Old Testament prophecy more applicable to the New Testament narrative.

Reviewing the quotations from the apostolic fathers given above, we shall expect to find in Justin also a great number of the words of the Lord and incidents in the life of Jesus quoted from tradition, which are not found in our Gospels. Clement, we find, has two passages roughly quoted from our Gospels; and one traditional saying quoted in Acts xx. 35. Ignatius (Vossian) uses phrases or sentences from Matthew four times allusively, but quotes a "word of the Lord" found in no Gospel. The author of the Epistle of Barnabas quotes Matthew once, and a non-canonical word of the Lord once. Polycarp is the first apostolic father who, while four or five times quoting or alluding to sayings in our Gospels, quotes no non-canonical passages, Papias "published" a narrative contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. If then, in the small modicum of quotation hitherto given, so large a proportion (say a fourth) is non-canonical, how much more non-canonical matter might we naturally expect to find in Justin, who in two works quotes our Gospels 67 times (Sanday, p. 116), and occasionally in long continuous passages? We shall also expect to find in Justin many misquotations of our Gospels, arising from interpolations and corruptions of the text, for "the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected originated within a hundred years after it was composed" (Scrivener, quoted by Sanday, p. 135). A generation after Justin, Irenæus will be found quoting the interpolated appendix of Mark, which the general consent of scholars now recognizes to be spurious; and it has been pointed out that the differences of Justin from the ordinary text are little more than the differences of Codex D from the same text.

Bearing these considerations in mind, we ought to be surprised, not at the large, but at the small amount of extraneous matter which Justin has introduced into the Gospel narrative, and at the comparative accuracy with which he has quoted the Gospels. Treating of the variations of quotation, Dr Westcott has shown that, even where Justin's misquotations are found in other authors, the resemblances are of such a kind as to be easily derivable from some common tradition, or from some early but now obsolete text (*Canon*, pp. 148-156). The extraneous matter may readily be explained as arising either from sense of an omission or from the

morbid desire to find in each incident of the life of Christ the fulfilment of some prophecy in the Old Testament. If, for example, (1) he speaks of the voice from heaven at the baptism as being, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee;" this is explained (apart from the various reading in D, which no doubt arose from the same motive) by a desire to see in the voice a repetition of Ps. ii. 7. (2) If a fire is said to have been kindled in the Jordan at the Lord's baptism, was it not natural that He who came to baptize others with the higher baptism of fire, as well as that of water, should Himself receive the highest baptism; or that the act which was already technically known as *φωτισμός*, "enlightenment," should be accompanied (in the case of the Lord of Light) by that symbol which was specially characteristic of the divine presence? (3) If Mark recorded that Jesus was a "carpenter" (a fact not then suppressed by the various reading in Mk. vi. 3, owing to such sneers as those of Celsus, Origen, *Cont. Cels.*, v. 34), was it not fitting that the Carpenter, who bade men lay hand on the plough, and take His yoke on them, should have "wrought, when among men, ploughs and yokes"? (4) If he speaks of the Magi as having come "from Arabia," had it not been prophesied, Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 10, that "the kings of the Arabians shall bring gifts"? (5) If the foal of the ass on which our Lord entered Jerusalem was said by Justin to have been "bound to a vine," must it not needs have been so, seeing that it was said of Judah (Gen. xlix. 11) that "he bound his foal unto the vine"? (6) Lastly, since Isaiah predicted (xxiii. 16 in LXX.) that "he shall dwell in a high cave of a strong rock," was it not necessary that the Messiah should not only be born in Bethlehem, but also "in a cave"?

In all these additions there is absolutely nothing to make probable, or even suggest (even though the "fire" at the baptism of Jesus is mentioned in an apocryphal Gospel) that Justin used any other written Gospel than those known to us. These thoughts and others like them were floating in the atmosphere of every Christian church in those days. They were the results naturally developed from that habit of appeal to prophecy which has produced, even in our own canonical Gospels, not inconsiderable effects; and there is nothing in Justin's additions that is not capable of being explained from the same method (developed a little further) as that by which we may explain Matthew's addition about the potter's field, and possibly some of the other passages peculiar to the First and Third Gospels. Nor does the omission of the names Matthew, Mark, and Luke, by Justin, throw any doubt upon the supposition that he used the Gospels called by those names. It is quite possible that the names were given to these Gospels long after their composition. The very title, "The Gospel according to Matthew," &c. (not of, or by, Matthew), indicates that, even at the time when the titles were assigned, the compilers were regarded rather as editors of an old and received tradition than as authors of a new book. It is therefore quite possible that Justin (who mentions John by name as the author of the Apocalypse) may have used the first three Gospels, and yet have been ignorant of the names under which they are now current.

Three most important facts remain to be mentioned. (a) Justin tells us that in his days the memoirs of the apostles were read with the books of the prophets in the service of the church. This public reading of the memoirs must have given, if not a complete security, at least a considerable guarantee, against material alterations. The fact that the new traditions were now placed on a level with the ancient and venerable writings or scriptures of the Old Testament was a still more effectual barrier against change. (b) Although Justin mentions sayings of our Lord and events in His life not found in our Gospels, yet "he never does so when he proposes to quote the apostolic memoirs" (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 157). (c) In describing the fire kindled in the Jordan and the voice from heaven, he not only does not quote the memoirs, but, by implication, distinguishes these statements from other statements immediately following, which are quoted from the memoirs (*Canon*, pp. 153-159).¹

To conclude, we find that, although Justin knew and used traditions, yet (1) he set a special value on certain writings, which were publicly read in the churches; (2) he believed these to have been written by apostles, or the immediate disciples of apostles, and he repeatedly quotes them under this title; (3) though he does not lay stress on miracles (for miracles would be assumed by the Jew Trypho, accustomed to the miracles of Moses and Elisha, and they would be rather harmful than helpful to his cause in the eyes of educated Greeks and Romans), nor on the longer lessons involved in Christ's parables, yet he covers the greater part of our Gospel history, and much of our Lord's teaching through maxims; this he does to such an extent that it is possible (Sanday, pp. 91-98) to reconstruct from his quotations a fairly connected narrative of the incarnation, birth, teaching, crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord; (4) the whole of this narrative (with the exception of the few unimportant incidents mentioned above, and one or two

¹ Perhaps we may also lay some stress on the fact that, in the seven passages in which Justin uses the phrase, "it is written," as applied to the memoirs, he almost always agrees *verbatim* with Matthew or with Luke (*Canon*, p. 150).

traditional sayings of Jesus) is found in Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, or in all three; and there is also a reference to an incident recorded by Mark alone; (5) he never, as from these memoirs, quotes any words, or alleges any incidents not found in our Matthew, Mark, or Luke; (6) he never quotes any rival Gospel, nor alleges any words or facts which make it probable he used a rival Gospel; (7) such non-canonical sayings and facts as he mentions are readily explicable as the results of lapse of memory, general looseness and inaccuracy, extending to the use of the Old as well as the New Testament, and the desire to adapt the facts of the new scriptures to the prophecies of the old. Our conclusion is that the memoirs of the apostles which include so much that is contained in our first three Gospels, and which were continuously read in the services of the church from the time of Justin downwards, cannot have passed into oblivion a few years afterwards, so as to have given place to rival Gospels not known to Justin. They must be identical with the Gospels, to some or all of which testimony is successively borne by Marcion (140 A.D.) in spite of his arbitrary and entirely uncritical excisions; by the heretical Clementine Homilies (160 A.D.) in spite of occasional use of apocryphal sources; by the Muratorian fragment (170 A.D.); by Athenagoras and Ptolemaeus, and the churches of Vienna and Lyons (177 A.D.); till the century closes with the affirmation of Irenæus, who not only uses three synoptical Gospels with the Fourth so fully as to leave no doubt of the identity of his Gospels with ours, but also is so convinced of the essential necessity that there should be four and only four Gospels, that he discerns in the quadriform nature of the cherubim a type of the pre-ordained quadriform nature of the records of the life of Christ.¹

In the foregoing remarks attention has been mainly directed to definite evidence, whether external or internal. Limits of space, as well as other considerations, prevent the discussion of that more indefinite evidence which might perhaps be called indirect external evidence, and which would treat of the influences amid which the Gospels grew up and by which they were likely to be moulded. For such a discussion it would be necessary that we should place ourselves in the position of a disciple in some early congregation of Jewish or Gentile Christians, and endeavour to realize the influence exerted upon the Christian records—(1) by prophecy; (2) by heathen religions; (3) by Eastern metaphor acting upon Western literalism; (4)

The Gospel of the Hebrews.

¹ As a good deal of stress has been laid upon the apocryphal Gospel of the Hebrews, from which (according to the testimony of Jerome, Kirchhofer, p. 449) Ignatius quoted, it may be well to show that this was later than our Gospels. (1) We have seen above (p. 807) that in the common tradition Ἰησοῦς is habitually employed, and that the use of ὁ Κύριος, "the Lord," in narrative is a sure sign of later origin; but "the Lord" is habitually used in the narrative of the Gospel of the Hebrews (see Kirchhofer, pp. 450, 453, 454). (2) It softens several difficulties: (a) in the story of the rich young man, the Lord says to him, "Behold, many of the brethren, sons of Abraham, are covered with dung and dying for hunger, and thy house is full with many good things, and ought goeth forth at all from thee to them," thereby blunting the point of the young man's rejection; (b) after the words "If thy brother shall sin against thee" (cf. Matt. xviii. 22), Jesus adds, in the Gospel of the Hebrews, "in word, and if he shall make thee amend" (Jb. p. 454) (*in verbo et satis tibi fecerit*); (c) the error in Matt. xxiii. 35, "son of Barachiah," is corrected into "filium Jôjadæ" (Jerome (Jb. p. 455)). (3) It increases the marvellous element: (a) at the baptism of Jesus, "It came to pass when the Lord was come up from the water, the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit came down and rested upon Him, and said to Him, O My Son, in all the prophets I was awaiting Thee, that Thou mightest come, and that I might find rest in Thee; for Thou art My rest, Thou art My first-born Son, who reignest for ever" (Jb. p. 454). (b) hence the Holy Spirit is called the Mother of the Lord, and it is said by the Lord, "But now My Mother, the Holy Spirit, took Me by one of My hairs, and carried Me away to the Mount Tabor" (Jb. p. 451); (c) after His resurrection, it is added that the Lord ordered a table and bread to be brought, and caused His brother James to break his fast, when James had sworn not to eat bread till he had seen the Lord; in this story James is called "James the Just," a title which in itself is a mark of late composition.

To this note we may add that Celsus, towards the end of the second century, speaks of "the writings of the disciples of Jesus" (Jb. p. 330) as the source of his information, and mentions nothing (so far as we know) of any importance that is not found in our Gospels. It is true that Origen (*Cont. Cels.*, ii. 74), in answer to Celsus's boast that he had crushed the Christians with facts taken from their own writings, replies, "But we showed (above) that there has been a great deal of nonsensical blundering, contrary (*παρά*) to the writings of our Gospels," &c.; but if we refer to what has gone before, we find that Origen is referring (1) to Celsus's unfair inaccuracy, e.g., in saying that Jesus was betrayed, not by one disciple, but by His disciples; (2) to such blunders as the confusion of "Chaldeans" with "Magi"; (3) to his ignorance of the number of the disciples, &c. There is therefore every reason to believe—for if Celsus had attacked any apocryphal narratives as representing the faith of Christ, Origen could not have failed to take advantage of the triumphant rejoinder which such a mistake would have afforded him—that an assailant of Christianity, writing before the end of the second century, knew of no writings of the disciples of Christ upon which he could base any effective attacks against their religion, except our four Gospels.

by the ritual and language of the Lord's Supper; (5) by the universal predilection for the marvellous; (6) by the fall of Jerusalem. The results thus obtained would be in a great measure conjectural; but, compared step by step with the results deduced above, they would enable the reader to feel additional confidence in conclusions supported by the double confirmation of indirect as well as direct evidence. The best work in English bearing on this subject is probably the translation of Keim's *Jesus of Nazara* (London, 1876-79); and there is also much valuable information in the Appendices to Canon Farrar's *Life of Christ*.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Authorship.

Evidence from earliest Tradition.—Before considering the subject matter of this Gospel, it will be well to consider the evidence, direct and indirect, bearing on the authorship. The author is not mentioned in the Gospel by name, but only as "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (xxi. 24, 20), "which also leaned on His breast," and to whom Jesus commended His mother from the cross (xix. 26; xiii. 23). The first writer who mentions John as the author in connexion with a passage quoted from our Fourth Gospel is said to be Theophilus, who wrote towards the close of the second century (170-180 A.D.). The Muratorian fragment (170 A.D.) speaks of the apostle as the author of a Gospel, but does not quote from it. But Theophilus quotes Jo. i. 1, as written by John, one of those "inspired by the Spirit" (*πνευματοφύρων*).² It is a natural inference that Theophilus (at so late a date), using the name thus without further definition, meant by "John," the "John" best known to his readers, i.e., John, the son of Zebedee, the apostle. But there is unusually strong evidence to show that John the apostle wrote the Apocalypse, so strong that we may assume the apostolic authorship of that book with more confidence than the authorship of any other book in the New Testament, except some of Paul's epistles. The question therefore arises, how far does the style of the Gospel, which was said by Theophilus (170-180 A.D.) to have been written by John (presumably the apostle), agree with the style of the Apocalypse, which we have so good reason for believing to have been written by the apostle John? If we assume John to have been four or five years younger than his Master, he would be, according to the commonly received date (68 A.D.) of the Apocalypse, about sixty-seven or sixty-eight years of age when he wrote that work. By that age (one would suppose) an author's style would, if ever, have reached its maturity. Even if he were ten years younger than Jesus, so that he was only a little over sixty years of age, yet his style would not be capable of a complete transformation. But when the Gospel is compared with the Apocalypse, instead of similarity, we find an almost complete contrast.³ The vocabulary, the forms, the idioms, the rhythm, the thought—all is different. That the Apocalypse and the

² Such at least is the statement of Kirchhofer (p. 153), and it has been reproduced in modern books. But part of the period of Irenæus might precede part of the period of Theophilus; and Irenæus quotes John's Gospel (xx. 31) as from "John the disciple of the Lord," in a passage of his work *Against Heresies* (III. xvi. 5, or ed. Grabe, iii. 18), a passage omitted by Kirchhofer.

³ It is not necessary, however, to deny that the Gospel exhibits traces of the Apocalyptic doctrine and thought. On the contrary, the impression left by a comparison of the two is, that the Gospel exhibits an attempt to refine and spiritualize some of the more material and concrete expressions of the Apocalypse. From this point of view, we may say that "the Gospel is the spiritual interpretation of the Apocalypse. . . . The active and manifold religious thought of Ephesus furnished the intellectual assistance which was needed to exhibit Christianity as the absolute and historical religion in contrast with Judaism and heathenism" (Westcott, *Introd. to St. John*).

Fourth Gospel should have been written by the same author would be, we will not say impossible, but one of the most marvellous literary phenomena ever authenticated. The change in Shakespeare's style, or in the style of Burke, cannot be compared with this; for those changes can be in part explained by the transition from youth to maturity or old age. Here we have to explain how a writer could completely change language, style, and thought, after the age of sixty or sixty-seven years. It is possible, but *a priori* highly improbable.

It has indeed been suggested that this change of language may be explained by the lapse of more than thirty years, during which the author was living in the midst of a Gentile population. This assumes that the Apocalypse was written in 68 A.D., before John had resided in Ephesus, and that he wrote the Gospel at the age of ninety-eight. But (1) the minute knowledge of the Seven Churches (Rev. i. ii. iii.) makes it probable that the writer had resided for some time in their neighbourhood; (2) the composition of such a work as the Fourth Gospel at the age of ninety-eight is in itself unlikely; (3) it is by no means certain that the Apocalypse was written in 68 A.D., and not rather in 78 A.D., simultaneously with the fourth Sibylline Book (and the later the date of the Apocalypse the shorter the interval between it and the Fourth Gospel, and the more improbable becomes the theory of the change of style). An hypothesis based upon three hypotheses, themselves not proved or improbable, requires much evidence before it can be accepted.

There is yet another difficulty in the way of believing that John the apostle is the author: the words of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel (1) differ altogether in style and rhythm from the synoptic tradition of the words of the Lord, and (2) do not differ at all from the author's own remarks and observations. So great is the similarity between the words of the writer and the words which are assigned by him either to our Lord or to John the Baptist that Dr Westcott, commenting on Jo. iii. 10-21, 27-36, says (*Introduction to the Gospels*, p. 292), "It is impossible not to feel that the evangelist is in fact commenting on and explaining the testimony which he records. The comments seem to begin respectively at verses 16 and 31." The words italicized (not by Dr Westcott) require little comment. It is obvious that a biographer, who so mixes the words of his characters with observations of his own that a most careful and scholarlike commentator is unable to feel sure where the words of the characters end and the observations of the author "seem to begin," cannot be supposed to be exactly recording, scarcely even to be attempting to record with exactness, the words of the characters themselves. Yet it seems impossible that the "disciple whom Jesus loved" should either remember his Master's words so ill, or else deliberately transmute them into entirely different language of his own. A work of this kind, notwithstanding the presence of historical elements, seems rather to deserve to be called a poem, or a drama, than a biography; and accordingly the same careful commentator who is quoted above declares that "the spirit of parallelism, the instinctive perception of symmetry in thought and expression, which is the essential and informing spirit of Hebrew poetry, runs through the whole record" (*Introd. to the Gospel of St. John*). Such a work does not seem likely to have proceeded from one of the sons of Zebedee, a fisherman of the lake district of Galilee, not indeed a poor man, but still not a man of letters nor of any great literary culture.

"The earliest account of the origins of the Gospel is already legendary" (Westcott, *Introduction to the Gospels*, p. 255), as given in the fragment of Muratori (A.D. 170). It is there said that, being requested by his fellow-disciples and bishops to write, John desired them to fast for three

days, and then to relate to one another what revelation each had received either for or against the project. The same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that "while all called (the past) to mind (or while all revised,—*cunctis recognoscentibus*), John should write everything in his own name." Legendary though this account may be, it curiously agrees with a passage in the Gospel itself which implies that others besides the author were "revising," or otherwise assisting in, the work: "This is the disciple which testified of these things and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true" (xxi. 24). Yet immediately afterwards—in a sentence which, though omitted by Tischendorf, is supported by the MSS. almost without exception—the singular number is resumed: "I suppose that the world could not contain the books that should be written." This passage certainly seems to indicate some kind of joint authorship or revision, or at all events a desire to convey the impression of joint authorship or revision, such as the Muratorian fragment describes. The theory of joint authorship or revision is confirmed by evidence derivable from the 1st Epistle of John, which is justly regarded (Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, 1875) as a kind of postscript to the Gospel. It begins (like the Gospel, and unlike the Apocalypse, as also unlike the 2d and 3d Epistles of John) without mention of the author's name, and in the plural number: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us." Yet at the conclusion of the first chapter, as though it were to be understood that the whole was written "in the name of John" ("suo nomine," as the Muratorian fragment has it), the singular number is used, "these things write I unto you" (1 Jo. ii. 1, 7, 12, 13, 14, 21; v. 16).¹ So far therefore as we have gone, the evidence is very decidedly against the supposition that John the apostle was the sole author of the Fourth Gospel. He may have written it (1) through an amanuensis or disciple, who translated his language (and possibly his thoughts also) in the process of expressing them (just as Paul is said by some to have written the Epistle to the Hebrews in Hebrew, and to have had it freely rendered by one of his followers);² or (2) it may have been an attempt on the part of a leading teacher of the Johannine school at Ephesus to reproduce the spirit of their Master's teaching after He had been taken from them by death, an attempt of one of the Ephesian elders to reproduce John once again in their church, surrounded by Andrew and Philip and Aristion and the rest of the disciples of the Lord, the former proclaiming and all the rest assenting to "that which they had heard, and that which they had seen with their eyes."³ If during the latter years of his life John was infirm and bedridden, obliged to preach and teach by deputy,⁴ it is obvious that the "teaching of John" during the last eight years of his life, when the old man was now past ninety years of age, might be

¹ Of course the "we," whereby the writer identifies himself with his readers (ii. 8 and *passim*), is quite different from the "we" mentioned above.

² The statement that Papias "wrote out the Gospel at the dictation of John," quoted by Westcott (*Canon*, p. 76) from an argument prefixed to an MS. of the 9th century, is probably worthless, except as indicating an opinion much earlier than the MS., that John did not himself write the Gospel.

³ That a similar attempt was made to reproduce, as it were, the authority of Peter by a writer in the 2d century, we have seen above (p. 814) in the account of the Second Epistle of Peter. But the circumstances and prolonged infirmities of the apostle John might make such an attempt far more successful and a far more accurate representation of spiritual truth.

⁴ Jerome, *Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.*, vi. 10, quoted in Westcott's *Introd. to St. John*.