

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 38—April, 1899.

I.

THE LITERARY HISTORY OF CALVIN'S "INSTITUTES."

THE *Institutes of the Christian Religion* by John Calvin might well claim attention, merely on the score of its position in the history of Christian thinking on the themes of the Gospel, even though it were as dull and as alien from our own modes of thought as the Zend-Avesta. It is, on the contrary, however, the fundamental treatise in the development of that evangelical theology to which the Reformed Churches are committed, and it is to it that they must look back as the first serious attempt to cast into a system the body of truth to which they adhere as taught in the Holy Scriptures. And from the point of view of mere literary standing, the *Institutes* of John Calvin holds a position so supreme in its class that every one who would profess to know the world's best literature must perforce make himself acquainted with it. It is saying too little to say that, in reading this work, we are brought into contact with a great book: would we justly express its eminence, we must say that it is one of the world's greatest books—absolutely the greatest book of its class. What Thucydides is among Greek, or Gibbon among eighteenth-century English historians, what Shakespeare is among dramatists, or the *Iliad* among epics, that Calvin's *Institutes* is among dogmatic treatises. "The *Institutio* of Calvin," says Dr. William Cunningham,* to whom will be conceded a right to an opinion in such a matter, "is the most important work in the history of theological science, that which is more than any other creditable

* *Reformers*, etc., p. 295.

In the Glasgow edition of 1714 (Hugh Brown), the pagination is also continuous throughout the volume. The title of the *Sum* is, "A Brief Sum of *Saving Doctrine*," and so on, as in the 1679 edition, and with the same error in punctuation.

In the London edition of 1717 (printed for Cruttenden and Cox), the pagination is also continuous, and the sub-title of the *Sum* is, "A Brief Sum of Christian Doctrine," etc., as in the 1679 edition, and with the same error in punctuation.

These are all the editions of the Confession, containing the Sum of Saving Knowledge, published before Dunlop's *Collection*, which for this enquiry I have examined personally or by proxy.* Not the least remarkable feature in these titles is the persistence of the full stop after the word *Catechisms*. In later editions, however, this is amended. In the Edinburgh edition of 1744 (Lumsden and Robertson) the full stop becomes a comma. In the Glasgow editions of 1749 (John Hall), and 1752 (James Knox), it becomes a colon; as it also does in the Edinburgh edition of 1756 (E. Robertson).

Nearly all the Scotch editions of the Confession, printed after Lithgow's 1650 edition, contain the *Sum*. There is, however, at least one notable exception, that printed at Glasgow by Robert Sanders in 1675. I do not remember any early edition of the *Sum* issued as a separate publication.

Though now ignored and neglected, the *Sum of Saving Knowledge* still exerts an influence for good even over those who may never have heard of it. Benefits which believers drew directly from it in past generations are now indirectly passed on to the present. For example, the saintly McChesney regarded it as the work which first of all wrought a saving change in him; and though he, too, is dead, by him it still speaketh.

ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.

D. HAY FLEMING.

FAMILY INFLUENCE IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

If my readers who have accustomed themselves to study the Scriptures with the eye of the Christian apologist would peruse thoughtfully the last chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, and attend to the first impression made upon their minds, I venture to think that most of them would find it to be one of surprise, if not of disappointment, at the evangelist's treatment of the resurrection of our Lord. With such a wealth of material on this great subject as we must suppose an apostle of Christ to have had at his disposal, it does seem astonishing that Matthew should have been satisfied with occupying only

* Mr. Carruthers, whose Confessional knowledge and bibliographical zeal are so well-known, kindly furnished me with elaborate notes concerning some of the rarer editions of the Confession and Catechisms in his own library and in the British Museum.

fifteen verses with the narrative of Christ's rising from the dead, and of His showing Himself alive to His friends, and of His final instructions to His disciples to engage in the grandest enterprise ever undertaken; not to speak of the evangelist's relating at some length in the same brief chapter the attempt of the Jewish high priests to explain away the evidence that Jesus must have risen from the dead. If we repress, as the prompting of unwarranted curiosity, the question why Matthew confines himself to the recording of only two out of many appearances of the risen Saviour, we cannot so easily refrain from asking ourselves why he should select the two particular appearances which he narrates—the one being to two women in or near Jerusalem, the other to the disciples in Galilee. To account for this very remarkable choice of matter in one of the most important portions of sacred history is a tempting problem in this age of critical investigation of the contents and sources of the Gospel. Such inquiries have been ardently pursued by unbelieving scholars. But they can legitimately and profitably occupy the reverent attention of Christian students who have full faith in the divine inspiration of Holy Scripture.

Our first business is to settle the family to which Matthew the apostle and evangelist belonged. The Hebrews had no family names as we have. What a source of perplexity this fact has proved to commentators is well known. Each Jew bore a single name, which, in ordinary circumstances, was accounted a sufficient designation. When it was judged necessary to distinguish him more particularly, the name of his father, or, occasionally, that of his mother was added to his own proper name. For the same purpose, his occupation, or some peculiarity attaching to him, might be specified. Thus Matthew designates himself "Matthew the publican" in his Gospel (Matt. x. 3). He thus identifies himself with the Matthew referred to in the preceding chapter (ver. 9), whom, while sitting as a publican at the place of toll, Jesus had summoned to be His follower. It does not admit of reasonable doubt that the publican called Matthew (Matt. ix. 9) is the same publican that is called Levi in Mark ii. 14 and in Luke v. 27. The identification of Matthew with Levi should not be called in question by any one who carefully compares these passages and their surroundings. Another identification which I have to propose may not be so readily accepted. Mark (ii. 14) calls Levi "the son of Alphæus." In the next chapter (iii. 18), in giving a list of the apostles, he appends to the name of the second James enrolled among them the same addition, "the son of Alphæus." I submit that in these circumstances the reader of Mark's Gospel ought to assume, in the absence of countervailing considerations, that the Alphæus of the third chapter is not a different person from the Alphæus of the second. The presumption is decidedly in favor of the view that one and the same Alphæus is mentioned in the two adjacent places. This point I do not claim to be a matter of certainty. But assuming it, as I may well do, as a working hypothesis, if I am able to show that I

can explain by it certain difficulties and peculiarities of Matthew's Gospel which cannot otherwise be satisfactorily accounted for, its truth will be experimentally verified.

We meet frequently in the Synoptic Gospels with a certain James, the son of Zebedee, who is always named there in conjunction with John his brother. Again, in Matt. xiii. 55 and Mark vi. 3, the people of our Lord's own country are introduced as saying of Him that He was the brother of James and of three others whose names are added. But this James is not one of the persons of whom the evangelists themselves profess to relate anything. They only give his name in quoting the language of astonishment indulged in by the people who were acquainted with the family relationship of Jesus. But all the Synoptists give James, the son of Alphæus, as one of the apostles. They have much to tell of the apostles in general, and when they speak of the apostles as a body they are, of course, to be understood as speaking inclusively of this James. Hence, when the evangelists, having given the name of James, the son of Alphæus, in their list of apostles, speak afterwards of one James as of a person presumably well known to their readers: and when it is certain that this James is not the apostle, the son of Zebedee; we are warranted to understand by this James none else than the other apostle, the son of Alphæus, of whom the evangelists might reasonably suppose their readers would readily think. When Luke, who does not, as Matthew and Mark do, quote the remark of Christ's countrymen about a certain James being His brother, tells us (xxiv. 10) that Mary, *the mother of James*, was, with Mary Magdalene, of the women who told the apostles what they had seen at the sepulchre, it may safely be assumed that this James is the apostle, the son of Alphæus. That he was not James, the son of Zebedee, is clear from the fact that Matthew (xxvii. 55) expressly distinguishes Mary his mother from the mother of the sons of Zebedee. Besides mentioning James, the son of Zebedee, and (vi. 16, R. V.) James, the father of an apostle Judas, Luke had not made the faintest allusion to any other James than the apostle, the son of Alphæus. This James then, to the mind of Luke, must have been the son of that Mary who was the companion of Mary Magdalene when she received the angelic message. Thus, it would seem pretty clearly made out that if Alphæus, the father of Matthew, was the same Alphæus who was the father of the apostle James, then that Mary, *the mother of James*, the woman who has so prominent a place in Matthew's narrative of the resurrection, must have been the evangelist Matthew's mother also. Matthew himself first describes her as the mother of James and Joses (xxvii. 56). Mark first speaks of her as the mother of James the little, and of Joses (xv. 40); Luke first introduces her to us simply as the mother of James (xxiv. 10). Thus if we consulted only the first three Gospels, it would appear highly probable that the "other Mary," who is associated with Mary Magdalene in the latter part of the Gospel of Matthew (xxvii. 56, 61, xxviii. 1-10), was one to whom this evangelist stood in the relation of son.

But we turn now to the Gospel of John, xix. 25. There we read : " But there were standing by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene" (R.V.) We confine ourselves here to the question, Is this Mary, the wife of Clopas, to be identified with the mother of James, the son of Alphæus, and so the woman who is represented by Matthew and Mark as a witness with Mary Magdalene of our Lord's crucifixion? In other words, are Alphæus and Clopas only varying forms of the same Hebrew name? To the mere English or Greek scholar this would seem most unlikely, but they who are familiar with the modifications which Hebrew proper names have undergone in passing into Greek find it possible to see in *Ἀλφαῖος* and *Κλωπας* Greek representations of the one Hebrew name *לֵפְתִּי*, a name known to the Talmudists. After comparing at considerable pains proper names as they appear in the Hebrew text of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, with their Greek representatives in the Septuagint Version, I am prepared to recognize in Alphæus and Klopas forms of the one Hebrew name. The Hebrew letter Cheth is often altogether omitted in the Greek substitute for a Hebrew proper name. The same Greek letter Chi stands frequently for both Cheth and Caph. In Nehemiah iii. 6, the Hebrew Cheth is represented by the Greek Kappa. Even the softer aspirate He is represented by Kappa in 1 Chron. i. 21. Gesenius sees no insuperable philological objection to regarding *לֵפְתִּי* as appearing in *Καρραι*, Carræ, and *Κληψ* as appearing in *Καλαχηνή*. There is an Aramaic word *Kulba*, meaning an axe, from which Holtzmann would derive Klopas. The same Aramaic word means also a fool. I do not think Holtzmann's view likely to be largely followed. I greatly prefer the view maintained by such scholars of the seventeenth century as Cappel and Lightfoot and Spanheim—the view which I have set forth. The judgment of St. Jerome, who was a good Hebraist, is not to be despised; and he made Alphæus and Clopas variant names of the same person. Clopas is not to be confounded with Cleopas. The latter is a contraction of Cleopatros, as Antipas is of Antipatros. Instead of Cleophas of the A.V. in John xix. 25, Clopas is the reading on which critical editors are now agreed.

We can draw, then, from the Gospel of John a confirmation of the result reached by a study of the Synoptic Gospels, viz., that James the apostle, the son of Alphæus, had for his mother that Mary, the mother of James and Joses, whom Matthew makes an equally conspicuous figure with Mary Magdalene in connection with our Lord's death and resurrection. Mary the wife of Clopas was Mary the mother of James, who, with Matthew, had Alphæus for father.

When I conceive of the evangelist Matthew as the son of that Mary who, with Mary Magdalene, bore so prominent a part in the events related by him as following the death and resurrection of the Lord, then his selection of material in his last chapter, which was before so strange and perplexing to me, appears beautifully natural and appro-

priate. He could, doubtless, have told much of what he had himself witnessed relating to the risen Redeemer. But, humble man that he was, he keeps himself in the background, and gives the narrative which he had often heard his mother tell in the family circle. Mary Magdalene and she came to the sepulchre. The stone is rolled away and an angel is seated on it. His glorious appearance is described in words which, we may well believe, Matthew had heard from the lips of Mary his mother. The women of the Bible under strong emotion express themselves in elevated language, partaking of the parallelism that characterizes Hebrew poetry. "His appearance was as lightning, and his raiment white as snow; and for fear of him the keepers did quake, and become as dead men." Take these words as a quotation of his mother's own tale, and the objection which critics make to the style of them, as unlike that of Matthew, falls away. Then how vivid and graphic is the report of what the angel said to the two women! How fitting, if conceived as coming from the mouth of "the other Mary." "Fear not ye, for I know that ye seek Jesus, which hath been crucified. He is not here; for he is risen, even as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples, He is risen from the dead; and lo, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him; lo I have told you." The evangelist does not say that the two women delivered to the disciples this message of the angel, but the carrying out of their commission is understood as a matter of course. Unfortunately the ninth verse, as it stands in our Authorized Version, would make it appear that the intervention of Jesus Himself prevented the women from doing as the angel had so urgently charged them. "And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail." But the Revised Version, following the correct text, here reads simply, "And behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail." And this amended version leaves us at liberty to think that it was after the women had brought the disciples word that Jesus himself met them. "Then saith Jesus unto them, Fear not; go, tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me." The fact that Jesus uses the words, "My brethren," where the angel had said "His disciples," shows how accurately the language of each is here reported.

Thus one-half of Matt. xxviii (vers. 1-10) is taken up with relating matters which, to our mind, formed part of the personal experience of her whom we have supposed to be the mother of the evangelist. She and the other women were the only human beings who could have furnished the information at first hand. *She was his source.*

We have seen that Matthew in the first half of his last chapter speaks of a double solemn advertisement of a meeting with the disciples in Galilee, coming first from an angel and afterwards from Jesus Himself. He had previously stated how the Lord, before His death, promised that He would, after He should rise again, go before the disciples into Galilee (xxvi. 32). The evangelist's narrative, then, of

this thrice-promised meeting in Galilee, we might reasonably expect to find in his Gospel, and we are not disappointed. Other appearances of Christ might be omitted, but not this one.

We may, indeed, deem it passing strange that Matthew should not speak also of other manifestations of the risen Lord to the disciples; but this one, after all the notice of it that had been given, could hardly be left unrecorded by him. So after narrating the report of the guard set to watch the sepulchre, and the arrangement made with them by the high priests (vers. 11-15), the next thing related by Matthew is (ver. 16), "But the eleven disciples went into Galilee unto the mountain where Christ had appointed them."

Those who remember how Matthew begins his third chapter with the words, "And in those days cometh John the Baptist preaching," etc., after the statement in the preceding verse that Joseph "came (with the young child) and dwelt in a city called Nazareth," will not be embarrassed by this sudden transition to Galilee, and the passing over of a number of intervening days in which important events occurred. It is an unwarranted conclusion of certain critics that the message of the angel to the disciples that Christ should be seen by them in Galilee excludes the supposition that He could have appeared to them in or near Jerusalem, as is stated in the other Gospels. This consideration, if it had the force assigned to it by some commentators, would prove too much. It would equally exclude the appearing of Jesus to Mary Magdalene and the other Mary which Matthew himself relates in ver. 9. That meeting announced to take place in Galilee was evidently of a very solemn and public character, for which Galilee would be much more suitable than Jerusalem or its neighborhood.

It is a very erroneous notion that the evangelists must have related all they knew on subjects which we rightly esteem very important, or that they always give a complete exhibition of the evidence of every grand fact they would have men believe. What is written in John xx. 30, xxi. 25, ought to correct this opinion. I will give only a single example to show its misleading character. Mark (xvi. 7) describes Galilee as appointed to be the place where the disciples should see Jesus, but he does not say a word about their actually meeting Him there. Yet surely if he had not known that the appointed rendezvous in Galilee did take place, he would have suppressed the angelic notice of it.

I might enlarge on what I might call "family influence traced in the composition of the Gospel of Matthew," but I must be very brief. Who, when his attention is directed to it, is not struck with the singular expression which Matthew twice employs in his Gospel; "The mother of the sons of Zebedee"? (xx. 20, xxvii. 56). I have never met with a parallel to it, nor have I ever seen an attempt to account for its remarkable peculiarity. May not this be the explanation? Matthew, knowing that James was the elder of the sons of Zebedee,

would naturally mention his name before that of his brother John; but as he would begin to write or speak, "the mother of James and John," he would feel that the first words of the description, "the mother of James," would naturally suggest his own mother; and, therefore, instead of saying, "the mother of James and John," he resorted to the uncouth way of designating this woman, "the mother of the sons of Zebedee."

Where Matthew writes (xxvii. 56), "Mary the mother of James and Joses," Mark has (xv. 40) "Mary the mother of James the little (*τὸν μικρὸν*) and of Joses." It is of no consequence to the question before us whether we understand the specification "the little" to refer to the stature of James or to his age, or to his standing in the church. It is in any case a characterizing addition to his name which would be used only by one outside the family to which he belonged. Therefore, it is employed by Mark and not by Matthew. To give a homely illustration: I knew several brothers, one of whom was much smaller in size than the others. His name was very commonly augmented by an epithet equivalent to that one which Mark attaches to the name of James, but this epithet was not used by any member of the household. So Mark, an outsider, might speak of James "the little," but Matthew would not find it natural to make this distinguishing addition to the name of his brother James.

PITTSBURG, PA.

DUNLOP MOORE.