

ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE,

BOTH
The Canonical and the Apocryphal,

DESIGNED TO SHOW

WHAT THE BIBLE IS NOT, WHAT IT IS, AND HOW TO USE IT.

BY PROF. C. E. STOWE, D. D.

(THE NEW TESTAMENT,
ILLUSTRATED.

PUBLISHED BY SUBSCRIPTION ONLY, BY
HARTFORD PUBLISHING COMPANY,
HARTFORD, CONN.

J. D. DENISON, NEW YORK.
ZEIGLER, McCURDY & CO., PHILADELPHIA, PA.; CINCINNATI, O.;
AND ST. LOUIS, MO. J. A. STODDARD, CHICAGO, ILL.

1868.

173473
29/8/22

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1867, by
CALVIN E. STOWE,
in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States, for
District of Connecticut.

Entered also at
STATIONERS' HALL, LONDON, ENGLAND.



Engraved by A. T. H. 1850

C. E. Stowe

TO THOSE WHO WITH ME

Believe and love and trust the Bible

THE FOLLOWING PAGES

ARE AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED

By the Author.

people, or even to the ministers of the church, except in very few cases, and therefore there is an absolute necessity for giving the extracts quite fully, if we would afford to our readers a fair opportunity of making up their own judgment on sufficient grounds. To scholars by profession I recommend the voluminous works of the Church Fathers themselves, and the very copious and judicious selections from them made in the large and elaborate treatises by Lardner and Kirchofer. I have faithfully endeavored to give a fair specimen of the testimony. To give the whole of it and the arguments arising from it, would be to make ten volumes like Lardner instead of one, and place the work entirely beyond the reach of those for whom I intend it. I have not given the strongest testimonies only, but fair specimens of both the strongest and the weakest; that the reader may see exactly how the matter lies in the original authorities to which I appeal.

The extracts from the apocryphal books are also full and copious; for these books for the most part are wholly inaccessible to the public generally, and without full extracts I should entirely fail of my object, which is to put into the hands of the common reader ample means of judging between the canonical and the apocryphal. Some of these books are exceedingly interesting. They are the honest endeavors of good Christian men, near the apostolic times; and the manifest difference between the apostolic writings and theirs, is just the difference between divine inspiration and the unassisted efforts of the human mind at that period and in that class of people. Others of these books are mere fictions, contrived by men more remote from the apostolic period, who had withdrawn into caves and deserts, and who thought that the way to serve God was to have nothing to do with men. Their dreams and sleepy imaginings are just what we might expect under such circumstances; but how different from the practical common sense and energetic worldly activity of the New Testament!

The style of my book is plain, simple and colloquial, as the purpose in writing it required. I hope it is neither barbarous nor ungrammatical; for though I make no claims to elegance, I have endeavored to be correct, concise and intelligible.

A similar volume, of about the same size, on the Old Testament, including discussions of some general topics, necessary to a complete view of the whole subject, such as Inspiration, Miracles, the Laws of Interpretation, etc., will be ready early next spring, if Providence permit.

C. E. STOWE.

APRIL 1, 1867.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE COMMON POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO THE BIBLE AT THE PRESENT DAY—WHAT THE BIBLE IS NOT, WHAT IT IS, AND HOW TO USE IT, - - - -	9-37
---	------

CHAPTER II.

THE KIND OF EVIDENCE ON WHICH WE RECEIVE THE SACRED BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, - -	39-56
--	-------

CHAPTER III.

EVIDENCE ON WHICH WE RECEIVE THE PRESENT TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS SUBSTANTIALLY CORRECT. DESCRIPTION OF THE ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WITH FAC-SIMILE ILLUSTRATIONS, -	57-100
---	--------

CHAPTER IV.

BRIEF BIOGRAPHIES OF ONE HUNDRED OF THE ANCIENT WITNESSES TO THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS, WHOSE TESTIMONY IS MOST IMPORTANT, AND MUCH OF IT CITED IN THIS WORK, - - - -	101-140
--	---------

CHAPTER V.

TESTIMONY FOR THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, - - - -	141-160
---	---------

CHAPTER VI.

THE FOUR GOSPELS SEPARATELY EXAMINED, MATTHEW, MARK, LUKE AND JOHN, - - - -	161-201
--	---------

CHAPTER VII.

THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS AND FRAGMENTS OF GOSPELS SUPPOSED TO BE LOST, - - -	203-252
--	---------

CHAPTER VIII.

MODERN SUBSTITUTES FOR THE GOSPEL HISTORY—EXAMINATION OF THE BIOGRAPHIES OF JESUS, BY STRAUSS, WEISSE, GFROERER, BRUNO BAUER, F. C. BAUR, RENAN AND SCHENKEL, - - -	253-312
---	---------

CHAPTER IX.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND THE APOCRYPHAL ACTS, - - -	313-334
---	---------

CHAPTER X.

THE FOURTEEN EPISTLES OF PAUL, - - -	335-389
--------------------------------------	---------

CHAPTER XI.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES AND THE APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES, - - -	391-467
--	---------

CHAPTER XII.

THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN AND THE APOCRYPHAL REVELATIONS, - - -	469-508
--	---------

CHAPTER XIII.

THE BIBLE PROPHETS AND THE CLASSICAL ORACLES CONTRASTED, - - -	509-540
--	---------

CHAPTER XIV.

THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE REASONS FOR THEIR EXCLUSION FROM THE CANON, 541-583	
---	--

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE COMMON POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO THE BIBLE AT THE PRESENT DAY. WHAT THE BIBLE IS NOT, WHAT IT IS, AND HOW TO USE IT.

JOHN, v. 39 ; xvii. 17,—Search the Scriptures. Thy Word is truth.

THE Lord Jesus, when talking with the unbelieving Jews, says to them, *Search the Scriptures*, and when praying to his Heavenly Father, in behalf of his disciples, he says, *Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth.*

According to these two statements, the Lord Jesus must have considered the Scriptures to be the very best book in the world, both for believers and unbelievers, both for the regenerate and the unregenerate; he must have regarded them as true; he must have looked upon the Bible as it then existed, and was afterwards to be enlarged, as the best means of making men good and noble and true; and he must have thought, that in order to derive benefit from it, men must search, examine, and study it.

Many persons in our day seem to have quite a different opinion of the Bible from that which the Lord Jesus here expresses. A respectable old book enough (they think) considering the times in which its different parts were written, but far behind the civilization of the present day, and it has, on the whole, about as

many bad things in it as good ones. Without showing any disrespect to these men we may be permitted to say, so far as personal character is concerned, intellectual or moral, or so far as opportunity of knowledge on this subject is concerned, their mere opinion in regard to the Bible can not be considered, to say the very least, any more worthy of our regard than that of the Lord Jesus.

Let us bring this matter to the test of fact and common sense. These men say, that the Bible is no more inspired than the writings of Homer and Shakespeare, and other great men, whom God has fitted to be the instructors of mankind. Well, then, let us try and see. Let us for a while use Homer and Shakespeare instead of the Bible, say night and morning, in our family prayers—when we meet in the house of God for his worship—in the hour of sickness and calamity and distress—at funerals, when all our earthly hopes are blighted, and we lay our dearest friends in the grave—let us then, instead of reading the Bible, take a few passages from Homer and Shakespeare. How long do you think this would last, before we should be glad to get back to our Bible again?

The old gross assaults on the Bible, of the Voltaire and Paine school have now generally passed by, the book is treated rather respectfully than otherwise by its opponents, and the objections to it are founded mainly on what it is *not* and what it does *not* profess to be, rather than on what it is and what it does profess to be. And these objections for the most part are entirely inappropriate, wholly aside from all the facts of the Bible, and from all the claims which it makes

for itself. They are just like objecting to a ship because it is not adapted to moving on a railway, or to a locomotive because it can not sail on the sea; like objecting to an iron foundry because it will not make cloth, or to a cotton factory because it can not manufacture iron. To meet such objections we must consider what the Bible is *not* as well as what it is, what it does *not* claim to be, as well as what it does claim to be.

I. The Bible is not an amulet, a charm, a fetish, a thing which by its mere presence without any voluntary agency exerted in connection with it, accomplishes its purpose; it is not to be used as the believers in witchcraft use a horse-shoe, or the American Indian his medicine-bag, or the superstitious Christian his relic or crucifix.

The Bible is not, neither does it claim to be, anything of this kind. It is the principles of the Bible which must be brought into contact with the soul, which must be interwoven with the very texture of our minds, which must be made a part of our moral nature. This is the way and the only way in which it promises to benefit us, in which it has done any good; and it does not operate by its mere presence like a charm or relic.

The thirsty man in the desert, when he comes to a spring, must drink of it as well as find it, or he perishes with thirst.

Yet men sometimes say, The Bible does no good; here it has been in the world thousands of years; and the world is still full of sin and misery, just as it always has been.

In the midst of Christian churches where the Bible

is read every day, there are the dishonest, the licentious, the blood-thirsty, and the villainous. True, but are these dishonest, licentious, blood-thirsty, villainous people, in Christian communities, the men who love and read the Bible—or the reverse? Which are the families generally that rear the industrious, frugal, intelligent, useful citizens; the families that despise and neglect the Bible, or the families that revere and study it? Are the men generally who neither believe nor love the Bible, who neither regard nor study it, better men than their neighbors, who believe, love and obey the Bible? Is the Bible generally a favorite book in grog-shops and gambling houses and brothels? Is it a book which cheats and swindlers and rogues especially love to study?

Let us look at this matter in the light of common honesty and common sense. A plague is raging in a city; and a benevolent physician discovers a remedy, which, if taken according to the prescription, infallibly cures; all who take it and follow the prescriptions escape death from the plague. But some refuse to take the medicine; others take it and do not follow the prescriptions, and these sicken and die. Now, says the objector, see, that medicine does no good—people die of the plague just as they did before! True, but who die? they who take the remedy, or they who refuse or neglect it? There is the test as you well know. Now try the Bible by that test and your objection is answered. Contrast any nation, any people, any community, that has and reverences and uses the Bible, with any nation, people or community that has it not, or refuses to put it to its proper use, and

see the difference. However prejudiced you may be, you can not shut your eyes to the plainest of facts.

II. The Bible is not one unbroken chain of books, chapters, and verses, representing one unbroken series of divine utterances from beginning to end.

Look for no such thing as this when reading the Bible, but rather the contrary. The Scriptures were given to men piecemeal, throughout many ages, as God saw the right opportunities—*at sundry times and in divers manners*—this is what the Bible says of itself; and not all at once, as if you must have bud, blossom and fruit, all in the same hour. The analogy here between nature and the word, as in everything else, holds perfectly. *First the blade, then the ear, and after that the full corn in the ear*; this is what the Bible says of itself, and this is just what we find it to be. There is but little of external unity in the Bible, it makes no pretensions to any such thing; you need not be at all shaken by the clamors of those who would make this obvious fact an objection to the authority of the Scriptures. As well might it be objected to the miracles of Christ that they are not given in philosophical order, beginning with the less and going on to the greater, with just so many and only so many of each kind.

The unity of Scripture is not an external, it is an internal, a spiritual unity, the unity of one grand idea running through the whole, the idea of reuniting the human soul to God, from whom it has been so sadly broken off by sin; and that too through a long continued process of sharp conflict and agonizing struggle.

Outside, the Bible is like some of those grand old rural dwellings in England, a congeries of different

buildings in every variety of style, the disconnected work of many successive generations; but within, a perfect harmony of utility and convenience, and all proceeding on one idea.

Warwick Castle, for example, viewed from the outside, is an immense pile, the disjointed work of four or five successive centuries, with every variety of architecture; but within, the apartments, though each is finished in the style appropriate to its own period, are most nicely adjusted to each other, so as to form suits of rooms perfectly harmonious, and make the whole edifice a convenient and delightful residence. So with the Scriptures, externally a miscellany, or if you please to call it so, a jumble, of different compositions, in different styles, by all sorts of authors, and separated by ages and centuries, yet internally, spiritually, a perfectly harmonious whole. So strong is this internal oneness, that it is even seen on the outside. 'In the first three chapters of Genesis we have creation, paradise, and the apostacy; then through all the succeeding books, conflict unspeakable, a protracted, dreadful struggle, till in the last three chapters of Revelations, we have the new creation, paradise regained, the final eternal victory over sin and Satan, and every form of evil.'*

It is no objection to the Bible, considering the uses it was designed to subserve, that it is made up, as the objectors say, of the fragments of Hebrew literature throughout many ages, or even that of some of the books the authors names are not certainly known;—any more than it is an objection to Warwick Castle,

* Archbishop Trench.

that it was not built at one time, by one architect, and in one uniform style of architecture; or that the names of the different architects of the different portions of it have not all been preserved. The very interest and beauty of the edifice is greatly heightened by this diversity, as every one sees and feels; and the name of an architect has no essential connection with the perfection of his work; that stands on its own foundation, name or no name. All this is literally true of the Bible; it is vastly more interesting, more beautiful, more adapted to the use of mankind, as it is, than it could be if it had been one compact, uniform treatise; and the book of Job is just as interesting a book as it would have been if it were certainly known whether the name of the author should be written with two or three syllables instead of one, whether we should call him Job, or Moses, or Elihu. When we have a statute book issued by the authority of our government, we do not need to have the name of each one of the original engrossing clerks signed to each individual enactment, to give it authority; enough that the whole book, as it stands before us, has been properly authenticated; and this we claim has been done in respect to the Bible.

III. The Bible is not given to us in any celestial or superhuman language. If it had been it would have been of no use to us, for every book intended for men must be given to them in the language of men. But every human language is of necessity, and from the very nature of the case, an imperfect language. No human language has exactly one word and only one for each distinct idea. In every known

language the same word is used to indicate different things, and different words are used to indicate the same thing. In every human language each word has more than one meaning, and each thing has generally more than one name.

The boy is learning his *letters*—the merchant is writing his *letters*—Dr. Johnson was a man of *letters*. In these three sentences the same word *letters* is used to designate three perfectly distinct and most widely divergent things—yet nobody mistakes, or nobody need mistake, for the connection in each case shows the meaning. How many different names there are to designate that one thing, a boat. In every known language words are sometimes used in a figurative sense and not always in their literal signification. In the first stanza of Grey's Ode on Spring, there are no less than eight words used in their figurative instead of their literal sense. Yet who mistakes?

“ Lo, where the *rosy-bosomed* Hours
Fair Venus' train appear,
Disclose the *long-expecting* flowers
And *wake* the *purple* year !
The Attic warbler *pours* her throat
Responsive to the cuckoo's note,
The untaught harmony of Spring :
While, *whispering* pleasure as they fly,
Cool zephyrs through the clear blue sky
Their gather'd fragrance *fling*.”

In all these cases men can mistake if they choose. They can make the metaphorical literal, and the literal metaphorical, they can confound the equivocal, and confuse the synonymous, if they will be perverse and unfair ; and they can understand aright if they desire

to. All this is as true of the Bible as of any other book, and no more so.

Moreover, human minds are unlike in the impressions which they receive from the same word; and it is certain that one man seldom gives to another, of different temperament, education, and habits of thought, by language, exactly the same idea, with the same shape and color, as that which lies in his own mind; yet, if men are honest and right-minded they can come near enough to each other's meaning for all purposes of practical utility.

Here comes in the objection that the Bible can be made to mean everything and anything, all sects build upon it, the most diverse doctrines are derived from it.

This infelicity it shares with everything else that has to be expressed in human language. This is owing to the imperfection, the necessary imperfection of human language, and to the infirmity and the perverse ingenuity also of the human mind. It is not anything peculiar to the Bible. Hear two opposing lawyers argue a point of statute law in its application to a particular case. Hear two opposing politicians make their diverse arguments in reference to the true intent and force of a particular clause in the United States Constitution. Is there not here as wide room for diversity of opinion and opposition of reasoning, as in regard to the meaning of any text of Scripture, or the correctness of any point of theology? Yet these laws and constitutions are made in our own language, and our own time, while the Bible comes to us from a remote age and in foreign tongues. Enough, that the Bible can be understood, if honestly studied, as well as any

constitution or any body of statutes can be understood. This much is sufficient for all practical purposes, and it is for practical purposes only that the Bible was given.

Yet prepossessions, prejudices and passions come in so plentifully to darken and confuse men's minds, when they are reading the Bible. *He opened their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures.* Men in these times need to have their understandings both opened and straightened out, that they may understand the Scriptures.

IV. The Bible is not a specimen of God's skill as a writer, showing us God's mode of thought, giving us God's logic, and God's rhetoric, and God's style of historic narration. How often do we see men seeking out isolated passages of Scripture, and triumphantly saying that such expressions are unworthy of God, and could not have proceeded from Him. They are unskillful, the mode of thought is faulty, they are illogical, in bad taste, the reasoning is not conclusive, the narrative is liable to exception. God has not put himself on trial before us in that way in the Bible, any more than He has in the creation—any more than He has promised that the Bible shall always be printed for us on the best of paper, with the best of type, and perfect freedom from typographical errors, and that after it is printed, it shall never be torn, nor soiled, nor any leaf lost: or that apostles and preachers shall be regularly handsome, men of fine forms and beautiful faces, and faultless elocution. It is always to be remembered that the writers of the Bible were 'God's penmen, and not God's pens.'*

* Reply to Essays and Reviews.

It is not the words of the Bible that were inspired, it is not the thoughts of the Bible that were inspired; it is the men who wrote the Bible that were inspired. Inspiration acts not on the man's words, not on the man's thoughts, but on the man himself; so that he, by his own spontaneity, under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, conceives certain thoughts and gives utterance to them in certain words, both the words and the thoughts receiving the peculiar impress of the mind which conceived and uttered them, and being in fact just as really his own, as they could have been if there had been no inspiration at all in the case. The birth and nature of Christ afford an exact illustration. The Holy Infant in the womb of the Virgin, though begotten of God directly without any human father, (as it was said, *the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee*), — this infant lived by his mother's life, and grew by the mother's growth, and partook of the mother's nature, and was just as much her child as he could have been if Joseph had been his father, the human and the divine in most intimate and inseparable conjunction. It is this very fact of the commingled and inseparable union of the human and divine, which constitutes the utility, which makes out the adaptedness to the wants of men, both of the incarnation of Christ and of the gift of the word. Inspiration generally is a purifying, and an elevation, and an intensification of the human intellect subjectively, rather than an objective suggestion and communication; though suggestion and communication are not excluded.

The Divine mind is, as it were, so diffused through

the human, and the human mind is so interpenetrated with the Divine, that for the time being the utterances of the man are the word of God.

Moreover, should we admit the facts in this objection to be just what the objector assumes them to be; even then they would only show the exact analogy between nature and the Bible, and thus prove, as far as analogy can prove anything, that they are both from the same author. Nature, as well as the Bible, has its useful things, and its good and beautiful things; and nature, as well as the Bible, and even to a much greater extent, has that which to our eyes may seem mean, ugly and useless. Why not apply to nature the same kind of criticism which you apply to the Bible, and say of some of the annoying creatures which you find on land, or of some of the queer looking animals which come out of the sea: "God never made such a looking thing as that—so odd, so out of all taste, so disagreeable, so useless." Why is not creation as well as the word fairly open to this kind of criticism? Certainly it is just as well grounded in the one case as in the other, and so far as facts go, the creation stands at quite a disadvantage in this particular by the side of the Bible. I see no way to avert the force of this consideration, unless we affirm with the Magi of old that God created the horses and the cows and the nightingales, and the Devil made the hyenas and the hornets and the canker-worms. Could not the old Magian press the believers in one only Creator with the same argument which unbelievers now urge against the Bible, and with a much fairer show of justice? God knows, if we do not, what He made every creature for, for every-

thing He has made He has a use; and so it is with every sentence in the Bible; every paragraph has its own appropriate use, and will at some time or other come into appropriate play—or at least, how can you prove that it is not so, so as to derive from this source an argument against the Bible? Example—the book of Jonah—Paul's cloak and parchment.

And here may properly be considered an objection derived from certain alleged wrongs and immoralities in some parts of Scripture.

1. Some of these are just such wrongs as we find in nature, such as the destruction of people by hostile armies instead of famine or pestilence, fire or storm—making the innocent suffer for the sins of the guilty;—visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, even to the third and fourth generation, etc. All this happens every day, both in nature and Providence.

2. Others are not immoralities at all: the manners and social condition of ancient times were quite diverse from ours, and the alleged difficulty arises wholly from bringing the unsuspecting innocence of childhood in collision with the fastidious depravity of maturer years.

3. A true account of the ancient misdeeds of men otherwise good and holy, is not necessarily immoral or of immoral tendency. This depends wholly on the spirit and purpose of the narrative. A divine revelation must be true to facts, and give a strictly accurate view of human nature, and not a false or even a flattering one.

4. A revelation is designedly progressive, and morally progressive, as well as intellectually and reli-

giously, socially and politically, as it must be in accountable men and not creatures merely passive, are to be trained, freely and not compulsively, from the infancy of the race to its maturity;—and we have not and do not pretend to have the perfection of morals till we have perfection of revelation in the New Testament. The New Testament itself says, *that the law made nothing perfect but the bringing in of a better hope did.*—Heb. vii. 19. And *there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.*

V. The Bible does not consist of systematic discourses, either on theology, or on morals, or on history, or on any other topic.

Do not expect the Bible to be like regularly planned and carefully written sermons; if you do you will never understand it or get much good from it. Take any of the finished sermons of Jeremy Taylor or H. Melville, of Dr. Dwight or Dr. Emmons, and lay them side by side with what you find in the Bible, and they are no more like it than the trimmed lawns, and regular paths and formal trees of a gentleman's grounds are like the luxuriant and untouched forests of nature. So far as the form of composition is concerned can you possibly conceive of a greater contrast? It may be said indeed of the discourses of these great and good men, that they were adapted to their times and to their congregations, and this no doubt is true; but a much better and grander thing can be said of the discourses in the Bible, to wit: that they are adapted to all times and to all congregations; and this universal adaptedness depends in no small degree on that very absence

of systematic and philosophical structure and arrangement, which is sometimes urged against them as an objection. All men are not philosophers, but all men have impulses; few men are trained to systematic thought, but all are capable of emotion.

It is only in certain states of society that men can appreciate the artificial plantation, or are capable of using it, but all men in all states of society can enjoy and use the natural forest.

It is with the Bible just as it is with nature, both coming from the same God. The truths of religion are found in the Bible, as plants and minerals are found in nature. The mineralogist and botanist must collect his minerals and plants one by one, as he finds them here and there scattered over the fields and by the hill side; and he must himself, in his cabinet, systematize and arrange them in their scientific order, for God never does that. In arranging his plants and minerals, and assigning them to their several places, in their several localities, God shows an utter disregard of scientific order.

So the theologian must pick out the truths of theology as he finds them here and there scattered about in the Bible; and if he wishes to arrange them in a scientific *hortus siccus*, he must make it himself, for God never makes any such things.

VI. The Bible is not conformed to the tastes or to the intellectual horizon, or to the social or ethical standpoint of any one age or nation or race.

Each age and each race is apt to think itself, if not the whole human race at least the most important part of it, and that the Bible ought to be specially adapted

to its own tastes and wants. But this can not be. It is intended for the whole race, and not for any one particular portion of it. Naturally each particular portion of the book must bear the impress of the particular age and nation in which that portion originated. The Bible in its origin is an Asiatic book, and therefore it bears distinctly, as it should do, the impress of Asiatic scenery and manners; and yet it is remarkable for rising above the local and the temporary, and seizing on those great principles which are common to human nature everywhere, and expressing itself in imagery universally understood. It describes the fertility of Palestine by the metaphor of a land flowing with milk and honey, a pleasing image and one easily apprehended throughout almost the entire world; yet the Greenlander and the Esquimaux would doubtless be better pleased and have a quicker appreciation of the metaphor if the image were of a coast abounding with whale oil and blubber, or walrus meat—but why should the Greenlander or Esquimaux, in this respect, be gratified at the expense of all the rest of the world? They have as much claim to a special gratification as the German or the Frenchman, the Englishman or the American, and no more. The *Song of Solomon*, indeed, is entirely an oriental book, adapted to oriental tastes; the oriental religious poetry is everywhere of the same sort—and why should not the orientals have a page or two of their own book specially adapted to themselves?

VII. The Bible is not a solution of the mysteries of existence, nor even of the perplexing problems which meet us in our own every day life.

The mystery of the actual condition of the human race, as it is now and as it always has been from the first dawning of history—the question, how can the existence of so much sin and misery so long continued be reconciled with the goodness, the wisdom and the power of God? this mystery finds no solution, this question finds no answer in the Bible. The Bible addresses itself to our faith and commands us to trust in God, of whose goodness, wisdom and power, it says, we have sufficient proof, even if by searching we can not find out the Almighty to perfection. The sovereignty of God, complete, unlimited, how is this reconcilable with the complete free agency of man? If Christ must be sacrificed, must there not also be a Judas, and a Caiaphas, and a Pilate; and how then are they entirely free? The Bible does not explain, it only asserts, the fact. The existence of God from all eternity, always, without beginning, what finite mind can form the conception of it? The Bible makes no explanations of these perplexing problems, nor could we understand them while in this world, even if it did, any more than the scholar can comprehend the differential calculus before he has studied algebra.

The events of our own daily life, how mysterious they often are to us; why was I thrown hither or thither? why did I suffer this or that? why are my circumstances thus and so?—the Bible gives us no information, but still tells us to trust in God and all will be well. We can have faith always, but knowledge is often beyond our reach. An old pilot, peering through a dense fog, once said in my hearing, "I know where we are now; I see the cape lights." None of

us could see a light house, nor anything else except impenetrable mist; but we could trust the practised eye and the tried fidelity of our pilot, and in this faith feel as safe as if we ourselves had the knowledge or sight.

Is not our blessed Saviour as trustworthy a pilot as man could ever sail with? May we not believe Him, even when we can not see? Let us first have the evidence that the Lord Jesus is what he claims to be, and then trust in Him.

What then is the Bible?

VIII. It is God's message to honest, intelligent, thoughtful men, sent to them by honest, intelligent, thoughtful men, and a message mainly on one particular subject, to wit, the way of escaping from the moral evils in which we are involved, and coming to the enjoyment of peace with God and in our own souls, for time and for eternity.

If we are lost in a forest, and a man is sent to help us, we want one that will lead us out of the forest, and not take up the time in giving us lectures on botany.

It is said that Solomon wrote a very large treatise on botany, and I dare say it was a very good one, but I never heard that it was ever received as a part of the Bible.

I was once in a large ship with some four hundred souls on board; and by heavy fogs and baffling winds and adverse currents, we were drifted on to the rocky shores of Nova Scotia, without any knowledge of our exact position. We could not see half the ship's length in any direction for the fog; but we could hear all around us the roar of distant breakers, and we

knew that we were in danger. What could we do? We lay as still as possible on the water, and tried not to move. We fired guns as signals of distress. After a while, by listening attentively between the booming of the guns, we could hear the plashing of oars in the distance. Then we fired the oftener that the oarsmen might be guided by the sound. Presently two boats filled with men came alongside. They were strong, healthy looking men, but they were not very handsome nor very well dressed. They did not seem to be learned men, and I suppose they had never studied geology, and had formed no theory in regard to the formation of the rocks along the shores of Nova Scotia. But they knew where the rocks were, and could tell us how to steer so as to avoid them; and we followed their directions and asked them no questions about geology, and got safe into Halifax, and lived to study geology afterwards in the books appropriate for that purpose. Now was not that the right way?

But are there not sometimes in the Bible mistakes and inconsistencies in numbers? and in the names of individuals and of nations?

Doubtless literal and numeral errors can be found in all copies of the Bible. There was never yet a book printed so carefully but there were some typographical errors in it, and the liability to such errors was much greater when books were perpetuated only in manuscript—and numbers and names are the very places where such errors most frequently occur. The Hebrews were sometimes under idolatrous kings, and sometimes in captivity to their enemies; and then they lost almost all the copies of their sacred books. In

the early part of the reign of Josiah, scarcely a single copy of the Pentateuch could be found in the whole city of Jerusalem. (II Kings, 22.) Their letters and numerals in many cases were very much alike and easily mistaken for each other. No wonder if in the long course of ages there should, under such circumstances, some errors in names and numbers of little importance to after ages creep in; but these no more impair the authority of the revelation than misprints destroy a statute book. Misprints may be so numerous and gross, and on points of such importance, as to destroy the usefulness and authority of a book—but this certainly is not the case with the Bible, nor with the statute book of any respectable human commonwealth.

Compare II Chronicles, 21: 20, 22: 2, with II Kings, 8: 26.

Are there not passages here and there which could not have been written at the time and by the authors supposed?

The art of bookmaking, like all other arts, was in its beginnings exceedingly rude and imperfect. In the times of the Bible writers there were no such things as title pages, chapters, headings, marginal notes, appendix or index. Books were written full on every page, with lines of single letters without any division of paragraphs, syllables, or even words—just line after line, continuous rows of letters, completely filling the page, without any divisions whatever. Of course what modern writers would put into a title or heading, a foot note, or an appendix, or index, in ancient writings comes right in as a part of the original page.

Here is all the ground there is for the objection stated. The passages objected to are just the foot notes of a subsequent editor, and not forgeries or fraudulent interpolations.

But does not the first chapter of Genesis come in direct collision with the well ascertained facts of geological science? No. Understand first the purpose of Moses and his mode of writing, and you will see that there neither is nor can be any collision between him and science of any kind. The Bible does not state, and never professes to state, scientific facts in scientific forms, but only phenomena, or appearances to the eye of a spectator. For example, that the earth revolves on its axis from west to east once in twenty-four hours, thus producing day and night, is a scientific fact; this the Bible never states, nor even alludes to. Indeed I do not suppose that the writers of the Bible knew anything about it, for "inspiration is not omniscience." That the sun rises in the east and passes along in the heavens till he sets in the west, is a phenomenon, an appearance to the human eye, and this and this only is what the Bible speaks of, just as in the language of common life and common sense everywhere, both among the learned and unlearned. While the statements of the Bible are true to the phenomena, the appearances, they are right, they have nothing to do with the scientific facts, and can not come in collision with them, any more than the decisions of a judge in the supreme court can come in collision with the governor's coach; for the two subjects are not of the same kind, they belong to two entirely different spheres of thought, they do not travel at all

on the same road; and how can they come in collision? A decision of a judge can come in collision with an act of the legislature; and a farmer's wagon may come in collision with the governor's coach; but there is and can be no collision crosswise from one sphere of objects to another.

To interpret the first chapter of Genesis, as a geological essay, and to attempt to remove from it, by scientific methods, geological difficulties, seems to me like interpreting the parable of the sower as an agricultural essay, and attempting to avoid the difficulty that fowls of the air devoured only the seed that fell by the way side, by learned inquiries as to whether birds in ancient times could fly over fences, and whether they were not obliged to keep the road, and solemnly imagining the sustaining of the latter supposition to be essential to the vindication of the truthfulness of Christ as a religious teacher. How much better to look at the simple fact just as it existed, to wit, that in the eastern countries, as now in Germany and France, the farms were seldom fenced, and the fields for the most part were guarded by old men, women and children, whose duty it was to keep away the birds as well as the cattle—and this practice very generally obtains in those countries at the present day, simply because that there old men, women and children are cheaper than fencing stuff. In the interpretation of so plain and homely a book as the Bible, a knowledge of the facts and good common sense are generally much better guides than scientific ingenuity or metaphysical subtilty. Everything to its appropriate use. I would not take a broad axe to mend a pen with, nor a pen-knife to hew ship timber.

The Bible was not written with reference to science or philosophy, but with reference to the feelings and impressions and needs of the great masses of mankind, and they are neither scientific men nor philosophers.

Moses in the six days work of the creation, gives an account of the fitting up of our planetary system for its present race of inhabitants; and intends to show in opposition to the pantheistic, polytheistic and atheistic cosmologies of ancient times, that all existing things are the work of one and the same self-existent, self-conscious and intelligent God. According to the analogy of all revelation, these transactions were not narrated to him in words for him to write them down as he heard them, but he saw the transactions all passing before his eyes in prophetic, or rather ecstatic, vision, and he wrote them down just as he saw them. Like all popular descriptions the language is phenomenal, the events are described as they would meet the eye of a spectator, and not at all in accordance with the scientific verities. Each day begins a process which goes on indefinitely, which is going on still; and no one day completes the process even of that day. It was not till the third day that the sun became the great luminary of the system. Light is not confined to the sun even now; it exists of itself, and entirely independent of the sun. And who knows, so as with authority to contradict Moses on this point, that the sun did become the luminary of the system before the third day, or that before the sun became the luminary of the system a day must be just twenty-four of our hours, neither more nor less; or that the order of the origin of things is not the order which

Moses has given ; or that if there had been a spectator of the scene, the successive appearances to his eye, would not have been in accordance with the Mosaic description? Many of the most eminent of scientific men have asserted that they must have been so—and what scientific man has yet demonstrated that they could not so have been?

But after all, remember, and the idea can not be too strongly enforced, that *inspiration is not omniscience*. The apostle Paul could write the epistle to the Romans, but he never knew how to make a steam engine or run a locomotive. The apostle John, lovely as he appears in his gospel, and magnificent as he truly is in the apocalypse, never knew how to make a watch or construct a kaleidoscope. There are men now in every city of christendom, who, though very poorly qualified to be religious instructors and explain the ways of God to men, can make electrical machines and construct steam engines, and manage the magnetic telegraph better than all the twelve apostles put together; and I am quite ready to believe that Moses knew nothing at all of the science of geology.

Look not into the Bible for what God never put in it—look not there for mathematics or mechanics, for metaphysical distinctions or the abstruse sciences ; but look there simply for the way of spiritual life and salvation, and you will find enough, an abundance for all your spiritual needs.

I can select two chapters from the New Testament, and if all the Bible were lost except these two chapters, they alone, if we could be assured of their truth, would guide us safely through all the darkness and

sorrow of this life, and bring us to the haven of light and peace above. The two chapters to which I refer are the third chapter of the Gospel of John, and the eighth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

If of all the Bible we had only these two chapters left to us, and we could be assured that they are from God, and of divine authority, they alone would be sufficient to alleviate the sufferings of life, and cheer us with the most glowing and glorious hopes. The long continued, unalleviated distresses of mankind sometimes fill us with painful doubts as to the nature and purposes of our Creator; but here in the third chapter of John it is explicitly declared, "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." Whatever may be the difficulty, then, it is certainly no want of love on the part of our Heavenly Father.

When we look away from the world around us, and turn our thoughts within upon ourselves, we see that we are in ruins. We long for a virtue which we have not, and see no way of attaining. What, then, are we lost? No, for in this same chapter, we are told of an inward regeneration, a new birth, by the power of the Holy Spirit, which brings us into the kingdom of God, and at the same time, of an outward regeneration by water baptism, which brings us into God's visible church on earth, which establishes a covenant relation between Him and us, and gives us all the advantages of such a relation. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee,

Except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." But are these advantages reserved for a distant future, or can we have a present realization of them? The eighth of Romans tells us, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." But how far may these blessings be extended? Are they confined within narrow limits? Do they include only a few? Let us hear. "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; Because the creature itself also shall

be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Here then is enough for our salvation and our comfort, if we will but take it aright. How much more when we have all the riches of the whole Bible!

Yet there are men who would deprive us of our Bible. On the most frivolous pretexts, by the most groundless objections, they would rob us of the comforts of the divine word, and give us nothing in their place. As a recent writer has well remarked,*

"Weary human nature lays its head on the bosom of the Divine Word, or it has nowhere to lay its head. Tremblers on the verge of the dark and terrible valley, which parts the land of the living from the untried hereafter, take this hand of human tenderness yet of godlike strength, or they totter into the gloom without prop or stay. They who look their last upon the beloved dead, listen to this voice of soothing and peace, or else death is no uplifting of everlasting doors, and no enfolding in everlasting arms, but an ending as appalling to the reason as to the senses, the usher to a charnel house whose highest faculties and noblest feelings lie crushed with the animal wreck, an infinite tragedy, maddening and sickening, a blackness of darkness forever."

The Bible has various and infinite adaptations. Some portions are better understood in some parts of the world than in others. Some parts were better understood in the past than now—and other parts will be better understood in the future than ever before—while again there are other portions more closely

* Reply to Essays and Reviews, p. 340-41, English edition.

adapted to the present times than to any other portion of the world's history—for it was written not for any one age or nation, but equally for all ages and nations—and with a divine foreknowledge of all these needs and adaptations.

Says Lord Bacon :

“The Scriptures being written to the thoughts of men, and to the succession of all ages, with a foresight of heresies, contradictions, differing estates of the church, yea, and particularly of the elect, are not to be interpreted only according to the latitude of the proper sense of the place, and respectively toward that present occasion when the words were uttered, or in precise congruity or contexture with the words before or after, or in contemplation of the present scope of the place ; but have in themselves, not only totally or collectively, but distributively in clauses and words, infinite springs and streams of doctrine, to water the church in every part ; and therefore, as the literal sense is, as it were, the main stream or river, so the moral sense chiefly, and sometimes the allegorical or typical are those whereof the church hath most use ; not that I wish men to be bold in allegories, or indulge delight in allusions ; but that I much condemn that interpretation of Scripture which is *only* after the manner as men use to interpret a profane book.”

And again this same great philosopher speaks of “a latitude which is agreeable and familiar unto the divine prophecies, being of the nature of their author, with whom a thousand years are but as one day ; therefore they are not fulfilled punctually at once, but have *spring-*

ing and *germinant* accomplishment throughout many ages, though the height or fulness of them may refer to some one age." (Advancement of learning, B. ii.)

This book should be read daily and not too much at a time, with the expectation of finding in it that and that only which God has put in it. It should be read with thoughtfulness, with honesty, with reverence and with prayer. And it should always be borne in mind, that God saves us by His Word and by His Spirit, neither without the other, neither by the Word without the Spirit, nor ordinarily by the Spirit without the Word; but usually by both together in harmonious and inseparable co-operation.

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE KIND OF EVIDENCE ON WHICH WE RECEIVE THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

DOUBTLESS to the great body of Christian believers, the chief evidence for the truth of the New Testament is the moral evidence; that is, they feel within themselves urgent moral needs, irrepressible spiritual aspirations; these needs and aspirations are all supplied and satisfied by the teachings of the New Testament: these books they feel are just what the human soul wants, and He who made the soul and knows its wants would naturally afford the appropriate supply. While in the exercise of true devotional feeling, the devout Christian no more needs an external proof of the truth and divinity of the New Testament, than Elijah needed a metaphysical proof of the existence of God when he was ascending to heaven in his fiery chariot. This is as it should be, and this is the very highest kind of proof. All men need revealed religion, but very few indeed have the power or opportunity to make the external evidences of revealed religion a study.

Yet this moral proof is available only to the individual himself, and he can not make it evidence to another. And to the most devotional there come hours of mental darkness, when assaults seem formidable and faith is easily shaken from without and will

be likely to fail unless strongly fortified on external grounds. Hence discussions of the external evidences of revealed religion, adapted to the various shapes which objections assume in different ages and circumstances, will always be necessary. The old defences will not answer for the new assailants, either as regards the believers or the unbelievers, or those who are simply doubtful and inquiring.

The question which is now most perplexing to those who have time to read, but neither time nor means for thorough study, is this: How is it that there are such diversities of opinion as to the genuineness of the books of the New Testament? So many different hypotheses as to the authors of the sacred books, and all maintained by arguments more or less plausible? The very fact that the books of the New Testament can be subjected to such treatment seems of itself, to some minds, to throw a shade of doubt over the evidence of their genuineness and authority. A well-known school of German writers began more than half a century since by denying the authenticity of the book of Revelation, and now, after having gone through with the whole of the New Testament, and placed all the other books a century or two later than the authors to whom, by Christian antiquity, they have been ascribed, they have at length come round to the conclusion, I believe with entire unanimity, that the book of Revelation is a genuine relic, and possibly the only genuine relic of the very first age of the Christian church.

How is it that the books of the New Testament can be subjected to such treatment? The answer is very

simple. It is done by ignoring or rejecting all external testimony in regard to these books, and judging of them by the critic's own subjective views of the internal evidence only. Any modern works, subjected to the same kind of criticism, would be lost in the same diversity and uncertainty. For example, the letters of Junius are deficient in external testimony as to their authorship. The consequence has been an endless diversity of opinion on this subject, innumerable hypotheses, all sustained with more or less of acuteness and plausibility from internal evidence, and to this day there is an entire uncertainty.

Sir Walter Scott's novels were at first published anonymously, there was no external testimony as to their authorship; the public was left to internal evidence only; the consequence was an endless diversity of opinion, different hypotheses sustained by argument of equal degrees of plausibility, and an entire uncertainty; until Sir Walter himself avowed the authorship, his publishers confirmed it, and thus the requisite external testimony was supplied; and since then there has been no doubt. And if such be the case where we are well acquainted with the writers, and with the history and literature of the period, how much more emphatically must it be true where we know almost nothing of the literature of the period and place except by the books themselves which are in question. It is as easy by such a method to call in question, to assign to various authors, to maintain by plausible arguments discordant hypotheses in regard to the products of modern literature as in regard to the books of the New Testament. In respect

to Robertson's History of Charles V., or Milton's Paradise Lost, how do we know that these works belong to the authors named? By external testimony and by external testimony only. Reject this or discredit it, put no faith in it, and we are all at sea in regard to every literary production of every period of the world.

Combined with external testimony internal evidence has an important place and use; but as to that alone, it is like a sail without mast or cordage, it can indeed be blown away by the wind, but it can never move or stay a ship. How much more is all this true of the books ascribed to the apostles and evangelists, to Matthew and Mark, to Luke and John, to Paul and Peter, or any other of the writers of the New Testament! Who knows enough of the literature or of the persons of that period and class of writers to decide, for example, that a certain book ascribed to Paul was written by Apollos? Who knows anything, indeed, except from the books themselves, of the mental characteristics of Paul or Apollos? It is often impossible, by internal evidence alone, to assign even the age of a book, much less its author. We may sometimes prove by internal evidence only, that a certain book does not belong to a particular period, if, for example, positive anachronisms are woven into the structure of the work, allusions to things which did not then exist, or to events which had not then occurred, (except where we admit the prophetic gift, or can show that the allusions are by a later hand,) but it is not so easy to decide by internal evidence alone to what period exactly a particular work does belong. Many examples are on record of gross mistakes in this regard.

About forty years since Dr. Wilhelm Meinhold of the island of Rugen, published his celebrated novel of the Amber Witch. It purported to be the copy of an old manuscript found in a church there, and written by a clergyman of the time of Gustavus Adolphus. Critics who could decide from internal evidence alone that the books of the New Testament could not have been written earlier than the second or third centuries of the christian era, were very easily deceived by the Amber Witch, and pronounced it a genuine production of the period of the Thirty Years' War, being two centuries out of the way in both cases.

But is there not a lack of external testimony in regard to the books of the New Testament, so that we are obliged to rely on internal evidence alone, vague as it is, for want of something better? No, there is no deficiency of this kind; the external testimony is abundant, more than we have for any other ancient book whatever, more than we have for most modern books. The English writer, Dr. Nathaniel Lardner, and the German, John Kirchhofer, have in their works drawn out this testimony with great minuteness of detail, and full quotations of passages; and a very good outline, exhibiting the nature and quality of this testimony, is given by Dr. Paley in his *Evidences*, chapter IX. Many of the early Christian writings which contained the external testimony to the genuineness of our sacred books, are now lost; but many of them are also preserved: and of those which are lost, we have passages which we need on this subject quoted in full by Eusebius.

Eusebius is a very important witness in the whole matter of Christian evidence, and therefore he is gen-

erally the first object of attack among unbelievers and skeptics.

With others also he fares hard, and can hardly expect exact justice, for the ultra orthodox dislike him on account of his mildness and aversion to severe treatment of theological opponents, and the ultra protestants on account of his willing acceptance of the ecclesiastical organization that had begun to prevail before his birth, and was fully established by Constantine.

It is necessary then that we should give some information in regard to this man and his opportunities of knowledge, and his credibility as a witness, which has been so bitterly impugned. He was the bishop of the church at Caesarea, in Palestine, at the close of the third and beginning of the fourth century of the Christian era, and he became the personal friend and ecclesiastical adviser of Constantine, after that emperor had embraced Christianity. In that church at Caesarea before A. D. 300, there was a remarkable man who seemed raised up by Providence to do just the work in regard to the Christian books which was needed for that and all subsequent time. This was Pamphilus.

If there ever was a special providence here was one, for if the work had not then been done it never could have been done afterwards. Pamphilus was the intimate bosom friend of his pastor, Eusebius, so that it was said by their contemporaries that there seemed to be but one soul between them both, and Eusebius gave to himself the surname of Pamphilus, after the name of this friend. This Pamphilus had a great passion for collecting books, the books written by Christians; and every scrap of Christian literature down to his

own time, which he could find, he laid hold of and stored it away in his library. He was to the Christians of that age very much what the late Thomas Dowse was to his literary neighbors in Cambridge. When there was a Christian book which he could neither purchase nor beg for his library, he would laboriously copy it entire with his own hand. In this way, by copying them himself, he became possessed of all the folios of the works of Origen, which were then very difficult to be obtained. He died early the death of a martyr, and bequeathed his entire library to the church at Caesarea, (as Mr. Dowse did his to the Massachusetts Historical Society;) and Eusebius, his pastor, all his life long had the use of it. Eusebius was a voracious reader and voluminous writer, as hungry to read and write books as Pamphilus had been to purchase and own them. Thus Eusebius became intimately acquainted with everything pertaining to the Christian literature of the first three centuries, and was well qualified to give testimony in regard to all the Christian books of that period. This testimony is given very copiously in his historical writings, which are still extant and tolerably complete. He was not a bigoted churchman, he was not rigidly orthodox, he rather leaned towards Arianism, and on all theological and ecclesiastical questions he was inclined to take the liberal side; and he shows no disposition to exaggerate the number or the value of the Christian sacred books, but quite the contrary. His testimony, therefore, especially where it is in favor of a book, is clearly unexceptionable; and the many literal quotations which he makes on this topic from early Christian writings,

now lost, are altogether invaluable. But it is said that Eusebius, though a man of great learning and industry, and on the whole reasonably honest, was credulous, vain and weak, a flatterer of Constantine, and therefore not a reliable witness. Granting that these were the faults of Eusebius, it would not materially affect his testimony on the particular points for which we here use it. The genuineness of this or that sacred book was not generally a question on which he had any prejudices or interests to subserve, as is perfectly evident from his writings; and it was not a matter which could usually affect the accuracy of his quotations from preceding authors. Allowing that he was very much such a kind of man as Cotton Mather (and I am inclined to think that in many respects he was), yet Mather is a very important authority in the early history of New England, and though a very poor witness on some subjects, is a perfectly reliable one on others. Mather, on account of his credulity and his prejudice in respect to those particular subjects, is a poor witness in regard to papists, and heretics, and witches, and wonderful providences, and the like; but who can impeach his testimony or dispense with it on such topics as the pastors and members of the early churches in Boston, the books which they wrote and approved, the meeting of the synod at Cambridge, and the articles and platform there adopted, the founders and first graduates of Harvard College, etc.? And who will dispute the general accuracy of the numerous quotations from other authors which are found in his writings? On all such points Mather is a reliable witness, and it is on such points as these that we use

his authority in the early New England history, and our early history would be meagre and bare indeed without him. It is precisely on points like these that we use the authority of Eusebius in early church history, and especially in regard to the Christian sacred books; on such points he is a reliable witness; and if we throw him out, we must, like the Tuebingen critics, rely on our imagination for many of our most important facts. Reject Eusebius, and what have we for a history of the Christian churches of the first three centuries, or of the books used as Scripture in those churches? Eusebius is in the main a reliable witness, as much so certainly as the great body of historians, ancient or modern; where other testimony is accessible his historical statements are generally borne out by it, and where we have opportunity to compare his quotations with the authors themselves we generally find them correct. I know of but one exception. It is alleged that in one passage he wilfully misquotes Josephus. Let us examine this allegation. Josephus, giving an account of the death of Herod, says he saw just before he expired an owl sitting on a rope above him a messenger (*αγγελος*, *angel*,) of evil tidings to him as it had before, when he was a prisoner at Rome, been a messenger of good. Eusebius, in quoting the passage, omits the word *ουβοννα*, *owl*, and retains only *αγγελος*, *angel* or *messenger*, and for this he is accused of falsehood, and his credibility throughout hotly assailed. But Eusebius, certainly, and Josephus, probably, regarded the appearance not as the natural bird, but as a supernatural messenger or angel in the form of the bird, as the Holy Spirit assumed the form of a dove:

and if so, he gives the exact sense of Josephus if not all his words. Moreover if he has misquoted by the omission of a word, willingly or unwillingly, what other historian, ancient or modern, as voluminous as he, has not been many times guilty of errors even graver than this? Very few of our popular historians, if subjected to so severe a test, would escape so well as Eusebius; and are they to be set down as utterly unworthy of credit on all topics on account of these occasional errors? Is Macaulay to be wholly discredited on account of his blunders, obstinate and wilful as they would seem to be, in regard to William Penn, or his scarcely less inexcusable misrepresentations of Lord Bacon and the Duke of Marlborough? Is Hume to be regarded as utterly untruthful, and rejected as false on all subjects, on account of his inexcusably mendacious statements in respect to Cromwell? Read, especially in the Greek, the passages referred to, in Eusebius' *Eccl. Hist.*, II. 10, and Josephus' *Antiq.*, XVIII. 6: 7, and XIX. 8: 2; and compare with them the one-sided, and unreasonable criticisms of Alford in his *Com. on Acts XII, 2*.

Dr. Schaff, in his truly learned *History of the Apostolic Church* (p. 52) bears the following noble and truthful testimony to Eusebius as a historian. "The title father of church history belongs undoubtedly to the learned, candid and moderate Eusebius,—in the same sense in which Herodotus is called the father of profane history."

"His mild disposition, love of peace, and aversion to doctrinal controversies and exclusive formulas of orthodoxy, have brought upon him the suspicion of

having favored the Arian or Semi-Arian heresy ; but without sufficient foundation. It is certain that he signed the symbol of Nice, and at least substantially agreed to it ; though for himself he preferred the lower terminology of his favorite Origen concerning the divinity of Christ."

Such is the deliberate judgment of a Protestant of well known candor and erudition ; but many so-called Protestants are in the habit of treating the testimony not only of Eusebius but of all the early Christians, subsequent to the apostolic age, as if it were utterly worthless, and not at all to be relied upon in making up a judgment on any subject. This is doubtless a reaction from the half deification of the primitive church fathers by the Catholics ; but it is no less false and no less misleading than that opposite extreme. If the men who successfully achieved such a revolution as was the triumph of the Christian religion against such odds as the entire force of the Greek and Latin literature, and the whole power, civil and military, of the Roman empire, at the cost of peace, prosperity, reputation, even of life itself, in the face of every possible danger, deprivation, distress and torture—a moral revolution by purely moral means, of the most thorough and tremendous character that the world has ever witnessed—if, I say, the men who did all this were triflers and liars, and unworthy of belief, incompetent to give testimony on the plainest matters of fact, then surely this must have been the strangest, the most unaccountable of all the chapters in the history of the world. To say the very least of it, the testimony of the early Christians, in regard to their own affairs, is as good and as worthy of belief as any human testimony whatever.

But it is sometimes sneeringly said, that it was the divine power and not the human which established Christianity in the world. True, but when God has a great and good work to be done in His church He does not select fools and knaves to do it. He selects men to do His work who have the natural capacities and the acquired abilities to do exactly the work which is to be done. It was so in the great German reformation, it was so in the great Puritan revolution in England, it was so in the great Wesleyan movement, it is always so. The great struggle which eventuated in the establishment of Christianity in the world formed no exception to this general rule. The Christians of the first three centuries were men naturally and morally fitted for the huge task which was laid upon them, and which they successfully finished. They, like all other men, had their faults, and some faults peculiar to their age and circumstances; but they were among the strongest and noblest men which the world has ever seen, and fully competent to give reliable testimony as to all the facts of their own history and literature. To suppose, as some seem to do, that Christianity all suddenly died out at the close of the apostolic period, and lay dead for twelve or fourteen centuries more, and never breathed again; and then suddenly started forth full grown in the persons of the Protestant reformers, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, is to think and reason in a most childish and frivolous way.

But, it is objected, that on a subject so momentous as that of religion, ought we not to have something better than mere human testimony to rely upon? There is the divine testimony within, to all who desire it and

rightly seek for it. The really good man hath the witness in himself—he knoweth the doctrine whether it is of God. And as to the external word, if there were as great moral risk in believing it as there is in rejecting it, the question above stated might have some significance. But notoriously all the risk is in rejecting, there is none at all in believing. On the principles of the unbelievers themselves, no one is made the worse in time, no one can be made the worse in eternity, by a rational, considerate, consistent belief in the Christian sacred books. It is the order of providence, that for our important practical knowledge on all subjects, we must depend to a great extent on human testimony. We are made to depend on each other. It is so in medicine, in law, in politics, in all the ordinary business relations of life; men of good moral principles and sound common sense, get on without essential inconvenience from this cause; and so it is and so it must be, creation being as it is, in regard to the evidence, the external evidence, on which we receive the sacred books which contain the divine revelations to us.

In regard to direct testimony, each separate book of the Bible must stand in a great measure by itself, and the witnesses can be most advantageously examined when we come to treat of the individual books each by itself. This will be the subject of subsequent chapters. There are general testimonies to the whole, which will not be overlooked in our discussions. Some of the most satisfactory testimonies are those which are merely incidental, where there is no intention of testifying, but the witness is intent on another topic.

Such kind of testimony is in all cases particularly valuable. I will here give an example or two to illustrate my meaning.

Polycarp, the disciple of John the apostle, and who was appointed by the apostles bishop of Smyrna, and was well acquainted with several of them, (Irenaeus, III. 3: 4,) in fragments of his writings, which have come down to us, has incidental notices of this kind: "Matthew testifies that the Lord said that Moses wrote of Adam's speaking in this manner, *this now is bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh, for this cause shall a man leave father and mother,*" etc. (Matt. xix. 5.)

"Mark begins with the ancient prophetic announcement of the advent of Christ; Luke begins from the priesthood of Zacharia; John takes his exordium from the author of our redemption." These extracts are neither full nor literal; the sense of Polycarp is given in an abridged form to show the kind of incidental testimony to our sacred books from the ancient fathers who had been in immediate communication with the apostles themselves, and so onward. But as some, though without sufficient reason, doubt the genuineness of these fragments of Polycarp, we will add a passage or two from his epistle to the Philipians, in regard to which there has never been reasonable question. "Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world as Paul teaches?" (I Cor. vi. 2.) "I trust ye are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures." "As in these Scriptures it is said, Be ye angry and sin not: and Let not the sun go down upon your wrath:" (Eph. iv. 26.) Remember what the Lord said, teaching: Judge not that ye be not judged; with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." (Matt.

vii. 1, 2.) “Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of hell:” (Acts, ii. 24.) In this one short epistle of about five or six common duodecimo pages, Polycarp has incidental allusions to, and express quotations from, no less than sixteen of the books of our present New Testament; and in all fairness we might extend the number to twenty, for the four called *doubtful* are scarcely to be justly doubted.

Origen lived in the latter part of the second and the early part of the third century. He was one of the most learned, indefatigable, sincere and honest men that ever lived. In his seventh sermon on the book of Joshua, allegorizing, after his manner, the account of the taking of Jericho, he thus speaks: “But when our Lord Jesus Christ came, of whom Joshua, the son of Nun, was but a type, he sent forth the priests, his apostles, bearing well-beaten trumpets, sounding the glorious heavenly doctrine. Matthew sounds first with the priestly trumpet in his gospel; Mark, also, and Luke and John, sounded with their priestly trumpets. Peter, likewise, sounds aloud with the two trumpets of his epistles; James, also, and Jude; John sounds again with his trumpet in his epistles and revelation. Last of all sounds he who said (I Cor., iv. 9) *For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last*, and sounding with the trumpet of his fourteen epistles, he threw down to the foundations the walls of Jericho, and all the engines of idolatry, and the schemes of the philosophers.”

Another brief extract of the same kind from the same author. It is in his homily on Genesis, xxvi. 18–22. “Thus Isaac digged again the wells of water which

the servants of his father had digged. One servant of his father was Moses, who dug the well of the law; other servants of his father were David and Solomon, and the prophets, and all they who wrote the books of the Old Testament. Isaac, therefore, again digged new wells; yea the servants of Isaac digged. The servants of Isaac are Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; his servants, also, are Peter, James, and Jude; and likewise the apostle Paul; who all dig the wells of the New Testament."

It is in this incidental way that the ancients make us acquainted with the books of the New Testament as they had them; and to quote all that they say, even in the small portion of their writings which has come down to us, would make a book larger than the New Testament itself.

Origen, then, and Polycarp, the one a cotemporary with the first publishers of the New Testament, and the other about a century later, had the same New Testament books which we now have; and we have an unbroken series of the same kind of testimony from the apostle John to the great theologian of the western church, St Augustin. It will be found exhibited in full in the English works of Dr. Nathaniel Lardner, and in the German work of Kirchhofer, alluded to above. These works contain not only the copious extracts from the genuine writings of the fathers, by Lardner translated into English, and by Kirchhofer in the original languages, but also the most exact references to book and paragraph, giving the reader the amplest opportunity for verification.

We have thus set forth the kind of evidence on


which we receive the Christian sacred books; we have shown it to be the same kind of evidence which is universally admitted to be satisfactory, and is found to be satisfactory, in all the most important transactions of our daily lives; and it is obvious that we have no claim on God for any other or any different kind of evidence. The particular testimonies will be given when we come to treat of the individual books of the New Testament.

The next object will be to show that we have the text of the New Testament substantially incorrupt, that is, that we not only have the same books of the New Testament which the first Christians had, but that we read in these books the same things, and only the same things which they read in them.

We close this chapter with an interesting fact or two in respect to the emperor Constantine, having an important bearing on this whole subject. Constantine, although he did not offer himself for baptism till quite at the close of life, had always been, from his first acquaintance with Christianity, an earnest and delighted reader of the New Testament. It had been his custom for years in his palace to read every day to his household a portion of Scripture, and then himself offer prayer, like the good Christian house-fathers of the Puritan stock. After the affairs of his empire had been established on a sure basis, he wrote to Eusebius of Caesarea, to have prepared for him, by the best workmen and of the best material, fifty copies of the entire Greek Scriptures; and ordered two of the government wagons, under the special charge of a deacon of the Caesarean church, to transport these copies, when completed, to Constantinople for his own inspection.

This commission Eusebius promptly and joyfully fulfilled; and to this fact undoubtedly, in a great degree, we are indebted for the remarkable accuracy of the text of the Greek Testament, so much superior in this respect to the text of any Greek or Latin classic, or even of our own Shakespeare and Milton. These manuscripts the emperor gave to the principal churches to be read in the public worship; and they were transcribed for the use of other churches. To this source we probably owe all our best ancient manuscripts of the Greek Testament; the Alexandrian, the Vatican, the Ephraim, the Sinai; which all give evidence of Egyptian origin, and of being originally from the great book market of Alexandria. See Life of Constantine by Eusebius, IV. 17, 34-37.

JERUSALEM FROM THE MOUNT OF OLIVES.





CHAPTER THIRD.

EVIDENCE ON WHICH WE RECEIVE THE PRESENT TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS SUBSTANTIALLY CORRECT.

To ascertain the substantial correctness of our present text of the New Testament, we must compare the readings of our modern printed editions of the Greek with the earliest manuscript authorities, and as nearly as possible with the very autographs of the original authors. It is not necessary that we should have these autographs, because it is not necessary to prove a minute, unchangeable accuracy of every word and every letter, but only to show that there has been no change which essentially affects the meaning of the New Testament, or hinders the attainment of the purpose for which it was given to mankind.

In the age of the New Testament writers, the most common and convenient material of writing was papyrus—a sort of paper formed of the inner bark of a reed which abounds in Egypt, and flourishes also on the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates. Of this there were three kinds, the sacred, the common, and the epistolary. The first was very expensive, and its use limited principally to the pagan priesthood in Egypt. The epistolary was thin and perishable; but the common papyrus was more firm and durable, and this probably was the kind used mainly by the writers of

the New Testament. Paul in one passage speaks of parchment, and in a manner which indicates that he set a high value upon it (II Tim. iv. 13).

Authors, at that period, seldom committed their own compositions to writing, and never for the use of the public. The preparation of manuscripts was then a trade, as much as printing and bookbinding are now. Paul usually did not write even his own epistles (Rom. xvi. 22 ; Gal. vi. 11) ; but to prevent forgery he wrote his own name with the concluding salutation (I Cor. xvi. 21 ; II Thess. iii. 17 ; Col. iv. 18). He urges it as a strong proof of his tender and deep interest in the Galatians, that he had written to them so *large an epistle* with his own hand, though the epistle itself is much shorter than that to the Romans, which was written by Tertius ; and to the Thessalonians he writes, "the salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle ; so I write."

The author dictated to one whose business it was to write rapidly, and who was denominated by the Greeks *tachugraphos*, *swift writer*, and by the Latins *notarius* or *amanuensis*. This was copied in a fair character by the *kalligraphos*, *fine writer*, called also *bibliographos*, and by the Latins, *librarius*. The manuscript was then submitted to one, the *dokimazon*, whose business it was to see whether the whole was accurately written, and to correct any errors which might have occurred.

The work thus prepared was dedicated to some patron of learning or of the author, as Josephus directed his writings to Epaphroditus, and Luke his to Theophilus ; or to some association, as the epistles of Paul were generally directed to a church ; or to some friend,

as Paul wrote to Timothy, to Titus, and to Philemon; and through these channels they were made known to the public (Compare Hug's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. I. p. 106 ff. in German).

All the ancient manuscripts of the New Testament of any value, which we now possess, are written on parchment or vellum.

For evidence that we have the text of the New Testament as it was originally given, we must first apply to the most ancient manuscripts of those books which are still accessible. Of these the number, antiquity and variety is most surprising, considering the circumstances, and especially when we compare them with the paucity and comparative recentness of those on which we must rely for the text of the most celebrated and most useful writers of classic antiquity.

Herodotus is the most ancient, and in many respects the most important of the classic historians. Of his great work there are known to critics in all about fifteen manuscript copies, but most of these are of more recent date than A. D. 1450. One of the best, in the imperial library at Paris, belongs to the twelfth century, another in the library at Florence, is as early as the tenth, and one in the library of Emmanuel College, at Cambridge, in England, may be as early as the ninth century. Of the ethical writers among the classics, Plato is the most celebrated and the most popular. The number of the ancient manuscript copies of his writings is even fewer than of those of Herodotus, and one of the earliest, which is in the Bodleian library at Oxford, is as recent as the ninth century. This manuscript bears the date of A. D. 895, and was obtained

in the year 1801, by the traveller E. D. Clarke, from the Convent of St. John, in the Isle of Patmos. In 1847 Mr. Coxe, the librarian of the Bodleian, visited this convent for the purpose of making manuscript purchases; but found the monks there still very sore on account of the loss of their Plato, which they knew very well had gone to Oxford; and he had very little success among them. Now let us compare with this statement the antiquity, number and variety of the manuscript copies which we have of the historical and ethical writers of the New Testament. Of the manuscript copies of the Greek Testament, from 700 to 1000 of all kinds have been examined already by critics, and of these at least 50 are more than 1000 years old, and some are known to be at least 1500 years old; while the oldest of the Greek classics scarcely reach the antiquity of 900 years, and of these the number is very small indeed, compared with those of the Greek Testament. We have manuscripts of the Greek Testament that could have been read by men who had opportunity to read the autographs of the apostles themselves; manuscripts as near to the life time of the apostles as we ourselves are to the life time of the pilgrim fathers who landed at Plymouth; and the writers of which might have themselves seen the autograph books in the churches as we now may see the original records of the old colony in the Plymouth court-house.

When I was in England, in 1836, I saw Dr. Routh, the President of Magdalen College, Oxford, who had seen and conversed with men who had seen and conversed with James II. king of England. James died

in 1701, Routh was born in 1746; forty-five years between them. I was then only one link distant, in the chain of tradition, from the hiding of the Connecticut charter in the Wyllys oak in Hartford.

Any person who saw Josiah Quincy, in Boston, just before he died, in 1865, was only two links in the chain of tradition from the very first settlement of Massachusetts. S. Bradstreet, governor, was born 1603, died 1697. J. Quincy was born 1772; seventy-five years between them.

It is about 200 years from the death of the apostle John to the first full manuscript we have of the whole New Testament, though we have fragments and quotations from the very earliest periods, from the time of the apostle John himself.

The age of manuscripts to which no date is affixed is decided by various circumstances, such as the appearance of the parchment, the fashion of the book, and particularly the form of the letters used, which varied at different periods, as has been the case with the types which are used in printed books. Compare the books which were printed in London in the time of Elizabeth, with those which are printed there now; and remember that in manuscript letters the difference is still wider at the different periods, as great indeed as the difference between German text and the common Roman letter; or, to make a comparison that is still more exact, like the difference between the capital and the small letters of our common alphabets. In respect to antiquity the manuscripts of the Greek Testament are of two kinds, designated by the shape of the letters in which they are written. The most ancient are written in large, square capital letters,

without any division into sentence, or even words, consisting simply of continuous rows of letters across the page in parallel lines from the top to the bottom. There are, however, certain breaks in the continuity of the writing, corresponding in some degree to the breaks in the sense, in most if not all the manuscripts; but of these each manuscript, as a general fact, has a series peculiar to itself, and none of them have the regularity or uniformity of our present arrangement into paragraphs and sentences. There are also, common to many ancient manuscripts, two sets of divisions, the one called the Ammonian sections, introduced by Ammonius of Alexandria, in the third century, and the other the Eusebian canons, introduced by the ever active and indefatigable Eusebius of Caesarea, a century later. These are generally found together; and in manuscripts, too, which have another and more ancient division like that which we mentioned first. These latter sections and canons, however, are usually indicated by Greek numerals, rather than by breaks in the writing; having been often affixed by later hands, long after the manuscript had been originally written.

The letters in which these most ancient manuscripts are written, are called *uncial* letters, from the Latin word meaning *inch*, as if the letters were originally an inch long. This letter fell into disuse before the tenth century, and manuscripts written in it are older than that date. The other kind of letter is called the *cursive*, or running hand, which is a small letter in distinction from the capital, and resembles the type in which Greek books have generally been printed. We may therefore say, as a general classification sufficiently

accurate for our present purpose, that *uncial* manuscripts of the Greek Testament are more than one thousand years old, and the *cursive* less than a thousand years.

The manuscripts of the Greek Testament which we have, are all in the book form, none of them in the ancient oriental form of rolls. Very few manuscripts contain the whole of the New Testament; for an ancient manuscript book being necessarily much larger than a printed one, for convenience sake, the Testament was generally arranged in four or five different volumes. Of the volume containing the Gospels we have at least 426 different manuscripts of which 27 are uncials, or more than one thousand years old; of the volume containing Paul's Epistles, 255 manuscripts, of which 9 are uncial; of the volume of Acts and the Catholic Epistles, 200, of which 8 are uncial; and of the Apocalypse or Revelation, 91, of which 3 are uncial. Here then we have 972 entire manuscripts of the different volumes of the Greek Testament, of which 47 are more than 1000 years old. This enumeration does not include all the known manuscripts, nor are all the volumes arranged precisely like these—but I give these facts simply as a general illustration of the topic under discussion.

Compare with this what has already been said of the number and antiquity of the manuscripts of Herodotus and Plato, which are fair specimens of the classics generally in regard to this point. Of these two most important of the classical writers we have less than 30 manuscripts, and not one of these 1000 years old; while of the New Testament we have in round num-

bers 1000 manuscripts, and 50 of them more than 1000 years old.

Different books of the New Testament are often in manuscripts entirely independent of the other books; and some books were much more frequently copied and more generally used than others. There are more manuscripts of the Gospels than of any other part of the New Testament, and Revelation has by far the smallest number.

A few of the more important of these manuscripts will now be described, that the reader may have the means of forming a judgment for himself as to their condition and value. We will select mainly from those which originally contained the whole of the New Testament, which are very few in comparison with the whole number. When critics first began to use manuscripts for the correction of the printed text, there were scarcely a half dozen valuable ones known to exist in the libraries of Europe, and for convenience they were designated by the capital letters of the Roman alphabet, A, B, C, &c., the manuscript first used being designated by the first letter, without reference to its age or value, and so of the rest in succession. The number of manuscripts discovered is now so great that all the capitals of both the Roman and Greek alphabets have been exhausted in the designation of the uncial manuscripts only, and a beginning has been made on the Hebrew. As a single manuscript seldom contains the whole of the New Testament, but only a certain portion of it, it often happens that the same letter designates two or three different manuscripts when applied to different parts of the Testament. For

example, the letter E may designate a particular manuscript of the Gospels, also a manuscript of Paul's Epistles, which has no connection with that of the Gospels, and so of the rest. This must always be borne in mind when examining the references to manuscripts. Whenever a manuscript contains the whole of the New Testament, the particular letter applied to that is never appropriated to any other. The term generally used to designate a manuscript book is the Latin word *codex*.

A. CODEX ALEXANDRINUS. The Alexandrian manuscript is so called from the place of its origin, the city of Alexandria in Egypt. In the year 1628 Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, who formerly held the same office at Alexandria in Egypt, and who was so much inclined towards protestantism that he made an abortive attempt to reform the Greek church on the model of Calvinism at Geneva, sent to England by Sir Thomas Roe, the English ambassador in Turkey, a magnificent Greek manuscript of the whole Bible as a present to King Charles I. This was kept in the king's library till 1753, when on the formation of the British Museum, it was transferred to that institution, in the archives of which it is still most carefully preserved. It has on the back of the first leaf, after the table of contents, a statement in Arabic, of a very ancient date, that the whole book was written by a noble Egyptian lady, and martyr, by the name of Thecla, about the time of the council of Nice, which was held A. D. 325. The patriarch Cyril, in the same volume, under his own hand, certifies to the same fact. There is no evidence of a date much later than this. Whether we admit the accuracy of the tradition or not, we may

not safely place the date of the book far on either side of A. D. 350. It was probably manufactured at Alexandria in Egypt, the great book mart of that period. The manuscript is on parchment, in quarto form, about thirteen inches high and ten broad, each page being divided into two columns of fifty lines each, and about twenty letters in a line, the lines being simply straight rows of uncial (capital) letters, and generally without any divisions whatever, even so much as to separate the words. Some sections are designated by large ornamented letters, not at the beginning of the section, unless the section itself begins with the line, which is seldom the case, but at the beginning of the next line below. Whenever the section begins after the beginning of a line, the first letter of the next line, even though it may be in the middle of a word, is a large ornamented capital standing out in the margin. The whole is written in a plain, square and firm hand, and looks as if it were the work of one person throughout. If so it must have been a prodigious labor. It is now put up in four volumes, three for the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, and one for the New, with the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. Several leaves have been lost, but the most serious defect is in the first twenty-four chapters of Matthew, which are gone beyond recovery. There are not a few literal and verbal errors in it, very obvious to any intelligent reader, but no more than what we might expect in any manuscript of that extent, even the most carefully written. It has no punctuation or accents, though in some cases the end of a word is designated by a small mark. It has brief titles and subscriptions to the several books.

In the Gospels it arranges Matthew in 68 sections or chapters, Mark 48, Luke 83, and John 18; and it has also the Eusebian canons, which with the Ammonian sections, are intended to make out a harmony of the Gospel history. It is one of the most valuable, though probably not the oldest, of the existing manuscripts of the Greek Testament, and from its history and its present location we may properly designate it as the Greek text of the Protestant church. There was a reprint of the New Testament portion published by Dr. Woide, in 1786, in large square capitals, intended to answer the purpose of a *fac simile*; and another one in common Greek type by Mr. Cowper, in 1860, either of them sufficiently accurate for common critical examination. It is difficult and expensive for most readers to get access to these very old manuscripts, and when access is attained they are so tender and mouldering by reason of age, that they must be handled with great caution. An accurate reprint, to the reader, after he has once seen the manuscript, is more convenient for his purposes, on his own study table, than the manuscript itself in its sacred shrine.

B. CODEX VATICANUS, the Vatican manuscript, so called from the library in which it is kept, the Vatican at Rome. This library was established by pope Nicholas V., about A. D. 1450, and this celebrated manuscript has from the first been one of its most valued deposits. Little is known of its previous history, though it is supposed that it was brought to Italy by the learned Greek Cardinal Bessarion in the early part of the fifteenth century. It is perhaps a quarter or a half century older than the Alexandrian; and like that

it originally contained the whole of the Greek Bible; and like that, too, several of its leaves have been lost. The Epistles to Philemon, Titus, and the two to Timothy, called the pastoral epistles, the latter part of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse, are all wanting. The New Testament is now a quarto volume, bound in red morocco, ten and a half inches high, ten inches broad, and four and a half thick, and contains 146 leaves. It is written on very fine vellum, in a small, elegant square letter, three columns on a page, so that on opening the volume anywhere in the New Testament, six columns of well formed letters are presented to the eye. Each column for the most part contains forty-two lines, and each line sixteen or eighteen letters. The letters are very much like those in the manuscript rolls discovered in the ruins of Herculaneum, one of the evidences of its great antiquity. As originally written it had neither ornamented capital letters, punctuation, accents, or anything of the kind, though some have been added by later hands, the earliest perhaps dating from the eighth century. The dates of such additions to, or modifications of, ancient manuscripts, are ascertained by the color of the ink, the forms of the letters, the difference in the handwriting, and other circumstances of the like nature. Like all ancient manuscripts, it has no divisions into words, though some of the books have divisions into sections, marked by blank spaces, Matthew having of these sections 170, Mark 72, Luke 152, John 80. It has also brief titles and subscriptions to most of the books.

Its value as an authority is very high, and before

the beginning of the present century it had been three times collated, though imperfectly, for printed editions of the Greek Testament. The unreasoning jealousy of the Papal Court has never allowed to scholars the free use of it. In 1810 Napoleon took it to Paris with other Italian treasures, and while there it was easily accessible to those who wished to examine it. After the battle of Waterloo the spoils were restored to their original places; but Mr. Baber, the librarian of the British Museum, besought the Duke of Wellington that for the sake of Biblical science this invaluable manuscript might be deposited where it would be accessible to scholars. "No (says Wellington) I shall not detain it; it is stolen property, and must go back to its owners." So it went back to the Vatican, where it has been guarded with a jealousy so puerile and senseless as to deprive the world of the benefits it might confer. In 1843, Tischendorf, the best and most careful scholar, in this department, of the present generation, went to Rome for the purpose of examining it. It was locked up in a drawer of the library, and it was some months before he could obtain even a sight of it; and then with two *prelati* to watch him, he was allowed to look at it on two separate days, three hours each day; but he was previously searched and deprived of pen, ink and paper, to preclude the possibility of making a note, and if he even looked at a text with special care, the attendants would snatch the book from his hand. In 1844 Edward de Muralt was allowed to examine it on three different days, three hours each day, but under the same jealous watchfulness. In 1855 Dr. Tregelles went from England to Rome, armed with a letter of

recommendation from Cardinal Wiseman, for the express purpose of examining the manuscript; but though he was allowed to see it, he was effectually hindered from transcribing a syllable. If the Papal scholars themselves would make any effective use of this treasure committed to their keeping, their exclusion of all Protestant scholars from it would not appear so disgustingly illiberal; but their conduct in this respect is a repetition of the old fable of the dog in the manger. For more than a quarter of a century, Cardinal Angelo Mai, a really amiable and learned man, kept promising a reprint of this work in such a form as would meet the demands of Biblical inquiry. In 1858, the work was published, three years after the Cardinal's death; but so slovenly and unscholar-like was the whole performance, that even the Papists were ashamed of it, and in 1859 Charles Vercellone, a monk of St. Barnabas, and a friend of the Cardinal, published a revised edition, a little better than the first one, but still glaringly insufficient, and altogether below the scholarship of the age. Instead of an exact reprint of the Vatican manuscript, word for word and letter for letter, which is the thing and the only thing that is wanted, and one would think the simplest and easiest thing to be done, we have an ordinary Greek text on the basis of the Vatican, containing in their regular order all the parts which the manuscript omits as well as those which it has, and the deviations pointed out in marginal notes, which are none of the clearest, and all done in such a way as very much to diminish our confidence in the accuracy of the whole performance. This is the more remarkable, inasmuch

as both the cardinal, and his friend the monk, by their prefaces and dissertations, show clearly that they knew how the work ought to be done, and that they were themselves capable of doing it. We still wait for a proper examination and reprint of the Vatican manuscript; and till we can get it, must content ourselves with the Greek Testament edited by P. Buttmann, on the basis of the Vatican, so far as known, and published at Berlin in 1862.

The following announcement in the "Nation" newspaper, which has been made since the above was written, indicates a most gratifying change of the papal policy in regard to the custody of this most precious manuscript:

"Messrs. Williams & Norgate announce a new edition—or rather the first genuine edition, for that of Cardinal Mai was inaccurate and doctored—of the Greek text of the New Testament from the Codex Vaticanus. It is edited by Prof. Tischendorf, who spent last spring in Rome to examine the manuscript, and will be a companion volume to the quarto edition of the Codex Sinaiticus. It will give the true text of the manuscript, indicating throughout the pages and columns of the original, and in some parts the single lines. The later alterations, which have been so often confounded with the original text, will be for the first time distinguished not only from the text but from a third writing, later by several centuries. The book will also contain valuable prolegomena: on the history of the Codex, on its paleographic and other peculiarities, on the corrections, on the date of its execution, and on the character of the text. Prof. Tischendorf

makes an extended and careful comparison of the Codex Vaticanus with the Codex Sinaiticus, with very remarkable results as to the relation of these two important manuscripts. A companion volume is also announced, under the title of an 'Appendix,' which will contain two more leaves of the Codex Sinaiticus, in fac-simile, being fragments of the Pentateuch found in the covers of old bindings in the monastery of Mt. Sinai; nineteen three column pages of the Codex Vaticanus, taken from fifteen books of the New Testament, and a double column of the poetical books of the Old Testament, in fac-simile; and the complete text of the letters of Clemens Romanus, from the Codex Alexandrinus in the British Museum, which has never been accurately edited. The two volumes will appear early in 1867."

CODEx SINAITICUS, the Sinai manuscript, so called from the place where it was discovered. In 1844 Dr. Tischendorf, while traveling under the patronage of the king of Saxony, for research in Biblical science, was at the convent of St. Catharine on Mount Sinai. From a basket of rubbish intended to kindle his fire he picked out forty-three beautiful parchment leaves belonging to a manuscript of the Septuagint hitherto unknown. These, on his return to Europe, he published. On the 4th of February, 1859, he was at the same convent for the third time, and one of the monks brought to him the other leaves of that same manuscript loosely tied in a napkin. To his inexpressible delight he found here not only the remaining portions of the Septuagint, but also the entire New Testament with the Epistle of Barnabas, and portions



CONVENT OF ST. CATHARINE, MOUNT SINAI

of the Shepherd of Hermas; the most complete, the most ancient, the best manuscript copy of the entire New Testament that had as yet been known. There was no sleep for him that night. Till morning dawn he was busy in transcribing, and he persuaded the monks to allow him to take the manuscript with him to Cairo in Egypt, and finally to St. Petersburg in Europe, as a present to the Russian emperor Alexander II., the great patron of the Greek church throughout the world.

The New Testament part of this manuscript, with Barnabas and Hermas, consists of one hundred and forty-seven and a half leaves of excellent parchment, written four columns on a page, forty-eight lines in each column, and on an average fifteen letters in a line, in a large, plain, square letter, clearly and symmetrically formed. There are revisions and would-be corrections of the manuscript by later hands, beginning as early as the sixth century; but as it came from the hand of the first writer, there was no punctuation, no division of sentences or words, no accents, no ornamented capitals; everything plain about it, indicating great carefulness and the highest antiquity. There is nothing improbable in the supposition that it may be one of the very manuscripts which Eusebius, by the order of Constantine, had prepared at Alexandria for the use of the metropolitan churches. It is the only ancient manuscript yet known which contains the Greek text entire without the loss of a leaf. The emperor Alexander had two hundred copies of an exact fac-simile prepared, which he presented to different learned institutions throughout Christendom, and Tisch-

endorf has published a beautiful and accurate reprint in common Greek type (Leipsic, 1863), which is a perfect model for a publication of this kind. When shall we have such a reprint of the Vatican manuscript? Even in this most precious Sinai document there are just such verbal and literal errors as we might naturally expect in such a work; but most of them are very easily detected. The Greek and Roman capital letters having been exhausted in designating manuscripts before Tischendorf discovered this one, he refers to it by the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, *aleph*.

I have called these three important manuscripts, to wit, the Alexandrian, the Vatican and the Sinai, respectively the Greek Testament of the Protestant, the Roman, and the Greek churches, merely on account of their history and location; and not because any one of these three great divisions of Christendom finds special help in regard to their peculiarities, from any of these manuscripts. These three great original sources of New Testament teaching, with the utmost impartiality treat all these divisions exactly alike, so far as their denominational character is concerned, that is, they say nothing about them whatever; and they all three are decidedly and equally the upholders of Protestantism, just so far as Protestantism, in fidelity to its original principles, rejects the mere human traditions, which encumber and overlie the Greek and Roman confessions, and adheres simply to the teachings of Christ and the apostles as expressed in the written word.

To give the reader an idea of the different kinds of uncial manuscripts of the Greek Testament it will be necessary to present a brief description of two

others, differing from the three just described in important points, to wit, those referred to by critics by the letters C and D.

C. CODEX EPHRAEMI, the Ephraim manuscript, so called from Ephraim the Syrian, a Mesopotamian saint of the age of Constantine. This is a very valuable manuscript of the same class with the Alexandrian as to age, form of letters, etc. It originally contained the whole of the Greek Bible, written in a single column to a page, with from forty to forty-five lines in a column, and from forty to forty-five letters to a line. Somewhere in the twelfth century this manuscript was taken to pieces, the letters as far as possible obliterated, and the leaves used for a copy of the Greek sermons of St. Ephraim. For this purpose the leaves were taken promiscuously without any regard to their proper original order and sewed together at hap-hazard, sometimes top end down, and front side behind, just as if they had been mere blanks, the sermons of Ephraim being the only matter regarded in the book. These sermons formed a thin quarto volume, morocco bound, and the parchment on which they were written contained sixty-four leaves of the Greek Old Testament, and one hundred and forty-five of the New; of entire books of the New Testament, only John II. and Thess. II. are wholly missing, and there are also wanting in the four Gospels about thirty-seven chapters, in the Acts ten, in the Epistles forty-two, and in the Revelation eight.

The volume was brought to France from Italy by Catharine de Medicis as the sermons of Ephraim, it not having been at that time discovered that the parch-

ment originally was used for a copy of the Scriptures. This was first satisfactorily ascertained by Peter Allix about 1650 ; and in 1834, at the instance of the scholar Fleck, a chemical wash was applied to the pages, which, without putting Ephraim into the dark, made the evangelists and apostles somewhat visible. The precious remains were published in an accurate reprint by Tischendorf, A. D. 1843. It is probably somewhat later than the Alexandrian, but of great critical value. There are in it some breaks for sections, but no division of words, no traces of chapters except in the Gospels, where we have the Ammonian divisions marked by large letters ; and the titles and subscriptions to the books are very brief and simple. The leaves have been much discolored by the wash applied to them, and they are so tender and mouldering by reason of age that the scholar will find Tischendorf's reprint much more convenient for use than the manuscript itself. Manuscripts of this kind, where one writing has been erased to make room for another, are called palimpsests, from two Greek words which signify to *wipe again*. This manuscript, like the others, has been subjected to the revisions of correcters, the earliest of whom seems to be of about the sixth century. This most interesting relic of antiquity, was, after some hesitation, put into my hands by the very gentlemanly and accommodating librarian of the Imperial Library at Paris, with the remark that it was so old and fragile, and so much injured by the chemical wash, as to require the most delicate handling, and that the last person who had been permitted to examine it was the eminent German scholar Dr. Tischendorf, the discoverer of the Sinai manuscript.

D. CODEX BEZAE, the Beza manuscript, presented to the library of the University of Cambridge in England, by Theodore Beza, A. D. 1581. This is a handsome quarto manuscript on parchment of a good quality, carefully written in *stichoi*, that is, lines not filling the page, but as we print poetry, in a single column, the Greek on the left hand page and a very ancient Latin translation on the right, corresponding line for line and almost word for word with the Greek; and the uncial letter of both languages so much alike that on first opening the volume both pages present themselves to the eye as Greek. The book is ten inches high by eight broad, and consists of four hundred and fourteen leaves, eleven of which are mutilated, and nine, additions by later hands. . Beza obtained it in 1552 from the monastery of St. Irenaeus, in Lyons, where it had long lain buried in dust; and the heads of the Cambridge University, in acknowledging the present, assure the donor that next to the Sacred Scriptures themselves there are no books which they prefer to the writings of the famous John Calvin and his friend Theodore Beza. It contains only the historical books of the New Testament; and in a text that is very peculiar, more divergent from the common text than any other ancient manuscript, and it belongs probably to the latter part of the fifth century, A. D. 490, or thereabouts, being the most modern of the five which we have described. A good reprint of it was published by Dr. Kipling, two vols. folio in 1793, which is nearly a *fac-simile*.

Nothing is known of its early history, but probably it was copied from some old Alexandrian manuscript,

and the Latin translation inserted for the benefit of the western churches.

In the summer of 1836 I had the free use of this beautiful and interesting book through the politeness of Rev. Dr. Lamb, a younger brother of the Prime Minister Lord Melbourne, and then master of Corpus Christi College. Dr. Lamb was an eminent scholar in manuscript and antiquarian lore, as is fully shown by his splendid work on the Thirty-nine Articles.

These five will give the reader a very good idea of the general character, condition, and variety of our most ancient manuscript copies of the Greek Testament.

Here then we have accessible to us five manuscript copies of the Greek Testament, the most recent more than 1200 years old, and the most ancient reaching to an age of fifteen centuries. The proudest and most costly architectural structures of men have within that period either crumbled and mouldered away, or become obsolete and unfit for their original use, though built of the most solid materials and put together with the utmost care; while we of this age can read the same fragile page of books which were in the hands of men forty-five and fifty generations before us.

These all give substantially the same text that we now have. There are diversities among them, and divergencies from our common text; and these are to be frankly acknowledged and their real importance fully indicated, without any attempt at concealment or palliation or apology. No ancient Greek manuscript hitherto discovered contains I John v. 7, *There are three that bear record in heaven*, etc.; in our common

text the verse John i. 18, reads, *The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him*, but the old Greek manuscripts read, *The only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him*; in Colossians ii. 2, our common text reads, *To the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ*, but the old Greek manuscripts read, *To the acknowledgment of the mystery of the God Christ*; and so there are other diversities between the old text and the present one; but these I think are the most striking examples that can be found. Do they in the least degree necessarily change or even modify our ideas respecting any Scriptural fact, doctrine, or precept? They somewhat disturb those who hold to the notion of a strictly verbal inspiration, and exact *verbum verbo* dictation by the Holy Spirit in the composition of the Scriptures; but these I suppose are very few in number and not the most thoughtful or intelligent.

Besides these divergencies between the older manuscripts and the modern text, there are also divergencies among the older manuscripts themselves. The best illustration of this can be found by comparing the Vatican with the Beza, the most ancient perhaps, certainly with only one exception, with the most modern of the five which we have described. As compared with the common text the Vatican is remarkable for its condensations, the Beza for its amplifications. For example if the common text should say, *Then Jesus again went up to Jerusalem*, it would be characteristic for the Vatican to express itself thus: *Jesus went to Jerusalem*. As already shown the Vatican has not yet

been examined with sufficient minuteness to speak with strict accuracy on this subject; but critics affirm that from examinations already made, more than one thousand instances in all the New Testament of such condensations are found in the Vatican as compared with other texts. Of the Beza manuscript there has been the fullest opportunity for examination, and therefore we can be quite explicit in our designation of the amplifications to be found in it. In Acts xi. 25, the common text says of Barnabas, *He went to Tarsus to seek Saul, and finding him brought him to Antioch.* The Beza gives it thus: *And hearing that Saul was at Tarsus, he went there to seek him; and when he happened to meet him, he entreated him to come to Antioch.* In the narrative of Peter's visit to Cornelius, Acts x. after verse 24, the Beza manuscript thus particularizes: *And Peter, drawing near to Caesarea, one of the servants running before announced him, and Cornelius running out and meeting him, etc.*

Such amplifications, as is readily seen, no more change the sense or import of the New Testament, than do the condensations of the Vatican. But sometimes the Beza makes a veritable addition to the common text, a new statement, but always in the same line of thought and to the same purport. For example, at Luke vi. 5, after the conversation in regard to working on the Sabbath, the Beza adds: *And on the same day, seeing a man at work on the Sabbath, he said to him, man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, blessed art thou; but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law.*

We must here remark that the Beza is the least reli-

able of the five ancient manuscripts we have selected for description, and that being written at a later period and for the use of the western churches, it probably incorporated into the text circumstances the memory of which had been perpetuated in the East simply by tradition. Doubtless the Vatican is much nearer to the autographs of the original writers than the Beza.

VARIOUS READINGS. From the thousand manuscripts (more or less) of the Greek Testament, or parts of the Greek Testament, which have already been examined, critics have selected about 50,000 various readings. But most of them are simple differences of orthography, as if the word *labor* were spelled in one manuscript with the u, and in another without it. Very many are simple diversities in the collocation of the words—as if one should say, *Jesus went to Jerusalem*, and another, *To Jerusalem Jesus went*. Not 50 of the 50,000 make any change in the meaning whatever; and among these fifty the most important changes are such as those which have already been noticed in the comparisons made on a preceding page. The uniformity and purity of the text of the Greek Testament, when we consider how old a book it is, and for how many ages it was propagated only in manuscript before the art of printing was known, and when we call to mind the vicissitudes of persecution and corruption and superstition and unbelief and bigotry and dogmatism and latitudinarianism, through which the Christian churches have passed in that time,—is perfectly amazing, and beyond that of any other book in the world of frequent publication and wide extent. Milton and Bunyan and Shakespeare, though scarcely more

than two centuries old, and always having the advantages of type and printing, open a much wider field for various readings than any part of the Greek Testament, the latest book of which has been in existence more than seventeen centuries. On this subject I can not do better than quote the following from the North American Review in an article on Prof. Norton's work on the New Testament.

“It seems strange that the text of Shakespeare, which has been in existence less than two hundred and fifty years, should be far more uncertain and corrupt than that of the New Testament, now over eighteen centuries old, during nearly fifteen of which it existed only in manuscript. The industry of collators and commentators indeed has collected a formidably array of ‘various readings’ in the Greek text of the Scriptures, but the number of those which have any good claim to be received, and which also seriously affect the sense, is so small that they may almost be counted upon the fingers. With perhaps a dozen or twenty exceptions, the text of every verse in the New Testament may be said to be so far settled by the general consent of scholars, that any dispute as to its meaning must relate rather to the interpretation of the words, than to any doubts respecting the words themselves. But in every one of Shakespeares thirty-seven plays, there are probably a hundred readings still in dispute, a large proportion of which materially affect the meaning of the passages in which they occur.” It may be added that it is perfectly understood among scholars, that no one doctrine of Scripture of any importance and no practical duty, are at all impugned or materially

affected by these "various readings." Nineteen-twentieths of them are of no more importance than the question, whether the words *labor*, *honor*, &c., should be written with or without the additional vowel.

A stronger case even than that of Shakespeare has lately come to the notice of the writer. From a comparison of the manuscript of Edwards' Work on the Will, published within the last century under the superintendence of his own descendants, it may be made apparent that the text is more at variance with the original and more open to objections of this character than our authorized version itself.

The first printed edition of the Greek Testament that was ever published, was issued from the press of John Frobenius in Basel, in March 1516. It contained both the Greek and Latin text, together with annotations, and was hastily and rather carelessly prepared by Erasmus. In subsequent editions it was greatly improved. The Greek manuscripts which he used are still to be seen in the university library at Basel. They are of comparatively recent date, and of inferior authority. In his Greek manuscript of the Revelation the last six verses were missing, and he supplied the defect as well as he could by himself translating these verses from the Vulgate Latin into Greek. Cardinal Ximenes had already prepared a better edition in Spain from better manuscripts; but this was not published till the year 1522, when it came out as a part of the famous Complutensian Polyglott Bible, the greatest work of that great statesman and ecclesiastic. Since then, the printed editions of the Greek Testament have been almost innumerable; and by the labors of

such scholars as Wetstein, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf, the text has been brought to a degree of accuracy and perfection such as belongs to no other ancient book that was ever printed. Any objection to the New Testament on the ground that its present text is uncertain must proceed either from the most deplorable ignorance in regard to such matters, or from a spirit of the most hopeless cavilling.

Our present division into chapters and verses is comparatively modern, the chapters going no farther back than the thirteenth century, and the verses being as recent as the sixteenth. Neither do we claim any divine authority for the punctuation or the division into words; but among intelligent readers of the original there will be found very little occasion for difference of opinion on either of these points.

ILLUSTRATIONS TO CHAPTER THIRD.

For the following fac-similes I am indebted principally to the published writings of Prof. Tischendorf, Dr. Hartwell Horne, Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, and the Rev. Frederick Henry Scrivener.

ILLUSTRATION A.

No. 1 is the English of John i. 1-7, printed in square Roman capitals without any division of words, just like the old Greek manuscripts represented in the following illustrations. It will be found on trial that such writings are not so difficult to be read as might at first be supposed.

No. 2 is John xiv. 6, represented in the same way with the Greek in a parallel column for the purpose of comparison.

No. 3. is Matt. i. 18, 19, with the parallel column of Greek.

ILLUSTRATION A.

1

IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE WORD AND THE WORD WAS
 WITH GD · AND GD WAS THE WORD ·
 HE WAS IN THE BEGINNING WITH GD
 ALL WERE MADE BY HIM AND WITH
 OUT HIM WAS MADE NOT ONE *THING*
 THAT WAS MADE IN HIM LIFE WAS
 AND THE LIFE WAS THE LIGHT OF MN
 AND THE LIGHT IN DARKNESS SHIN
 ETH AND THE DARKNESS DID NOT IT COMPRE
 HEND · THERE WAS A MNSE

N T FROM GOD WHOSE NAME WAS
 IOHN · THIS CAME
 ASA WITNESS THAT THE MIGHT TESTI
 FY CONCERNING THE LIGHT THAT A
 LL MIGHT BELIEVE THROUGH HIM ·

2.

*ΔΕΓΕΛΑΥΤΩΟΙΣ
 ΓΩΕΙΜΕΙΗΘ
 ΟΣΚΑΙΗΛΑΗ
 ΙΑΚΑΙΗΖΩΗ
 ΥΔΙΣΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ
 ΡΟΣΤΟΝΗΤΡΑ
 ΙΜΗΔΙΕΜΟΥ*

SAITH UNTO HIM J^s
 I AM THE W
 AY AND THE TRU
 TH AND THE LIFE
 NO MAN COME TH
 UNTO THE Fth R
 BUT BY ME

3.

*ΤΟΥ ΔΕ ΙΙΧΥ Η ΓΕΝΕΣΙΣ ΟΥ
 ΤΩ ΣΗΝ· ΜΝΗΣΤΕΥΘΕΙ
 ΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΜΗΤΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟ...
 ΜΑΡΙΑΣ ΤΩ ΙΩΣΗΦ ΠΡΙΝ
 ΣΥΝΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΣΕΥ
 ΡΗΘΗ ΕΝ ΓΑΣΤΡΙ ΕΧΟΥΣΑ·
 ΕΚ ΠΝΣΑΓΙΟΥ
 ΙΩΣΗΦ ΔΕ Ο ΑΝΗΡ ΑΥΤΗΣ
 ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΜΗΘΕΛ...
 ΑΥΤΗΝ ΔΕ ΕΓΜΑΤΕΙΣ ΑΙ
 ΕΒΟΥΛΗΘΗ ΔΑΘΡΑ ΑΠΟΛΥ
 ΣΑΙ ΑΥΤΗΝ.*

NOW THE BIRTH OF J^s CHth
 US WAS · BEING ESPOU
 SED HIS MOTHER
 MARY TO JOSEPH BEFORE
 THEY CAME TOGETHER SHE WAS
 FOUND WITH CHILD
 BY THE HOLY SPT ·
 JOSEPH THEN HER HUSBAND
 BEING A JUST MAN AND NOT WILL...
 TO MAKE HER A PUBLIC EXAMPLE
 WAS MINDED PRIVILY TO PUT
 HER AWAY.

ILLUSTRATION B.

This is Luke xxiv. 49-53, in exact fac-simile from the Sinaï manuscript. The last two lines are the words *euangelion kata loukan*, the title of the book, as in most of these manuscripts the title is at the end instead of the beginning.

The line at the top of the page is the clause at the close of the 53d verse, *and was carried up into heaven*, which was not in the manuscript as originally written, but was added by a later hand. The difference in the hand-writing is perfectly obvious. A mark between the lines, a little more than half way down the column, shows where the correction is to come in. It is to be read in the line below the mark.

✓ ἸΣΑΝΕΦΕΡΕΤΟ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΝΟΥΝΟΝ

ΛΩΤΗΝ ΕΠΑΓΓΕΛΙ
ΑΝ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΜΟΥ
ΕΦΥΜΑΣ ΥΜΕΙΣ
ΔΕ ΚΑΘΙΣΑΤΕ ΕΝ ΤΗ
ΠΟΛΕΙ ΕΩΣ ΟΥ ΕΝ
ΔΥΣΗ ΘΕΕΣ ΥΨΟΥ
ΔΥΝΑΜΙΝ
ΕΞΗΓΑΓΕΝ ΔΕ ΑΥΤΟΥ
ΕΩΣ ΠΡΟΣ ΒΗΘΑ
ΝΙΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΑΡΑΞ
ΤΑΣ ΧΙΡΑΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ Η
ΥΛΟΤΗΣ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ
ΚΑΙ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΕΝ
ΤΩ ΕΥΛΟΓΙΝΑΥΤΟΥ
ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΔΙΕΣΤΗ
ΑΠ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΥ
ΤΟΙ ΠΡΟΣΚΥΝΗΣΑ
ΤΕΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΥΠΕΣ
ΤΡΕΨΑΝ ΕΙΣ ΙΕΡΟΥ
ΣΑΛΗ Μ' ΜΕΤΑ ΧΑ
ΡΑΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΗΣ ΚΑΙ
ΗΣΑΝ ΔΙΑΠΑΝΤΟΥ
ΕΝ ΤΩ ΙΕΡΩ ΕΥΛΟ
ΓΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΤΟΝ ΘΝ

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

ILLUSTRATION C.

No. 1, John i. 1-7, in exact fac-simile of the Alexandrian manuscript. In this extract there is no defect in the writing.

No. 2, is Rev. i. 1-4, from the same manuscript ; but the first letters of most of the lines, as shown by the dots, have become obliterated by the ravages of time. It will be seen, on trial, that such slight imperfections do not at all obscure the sense in reading.

7

ΕΝΑΡΧΗΗΝΘΛΟΓΟΣΚΑΙΟΛΟΓΟΣΗ
ΠΡΟΣΤΟΝΘΝ·ΚΑΙΘΕΗΝΟΛΟΓΟΣ
ΟΥΤΟΣΗΝΕΝΑΡΧΗΤΠΡΟΣΤΟΝΘΝ
ΠΑΝΤΑΔΙΑΥΤΟΥΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ·ΚΑΙΧΘ
ΡΕΙΣΑΥΤΟΥΕΓΕΝΕΤΟΟΥΔΕΕΝ·
ΟΓΕΓΟΝΕΝΕΝΑΥΤΩΖΩΗΗΝ·
ΚΑΙΗΖΩΗΗΝΤΟΦΩΣΤΩΗΑΝΩΝ·
ΚΑΙΤΟΦΩΣΕΝΤΗΣΚΟΤΙΑΦΑΙ
ΝΕΙΚΑΙΗΣΚΟΤΙΑΑΥΤΟΥΚΑΤΕ
ΛΑΒΕΝ· ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟΑΝΘΟΣΑΠΕ

7

ΣΤΑΛΜΕΝΟΣΤΑΡΑΘΥΟΝΟΜΑΥ
ΤΩΪΩΑΝΝΗΝ·ΟΥΤΟΣΗΛΘΕΝ
ΕΙΣΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΑΝΙΝΑΜΑΡΤΥΡΗ
ΣΗΤΠΕΡΙΤΟΥΦΩΤΟΣ·ΙΝΑΤΤΑΝ
ΤΕΣΤΙΣΤΕΥΣΩΣΙΝΔΙΑΥΤΟΥ·

ΚΑΧΥ·ΙΣΙΥΧΥ·ΗΝΕΔΩΚΕΝΑΥΤΩ
ΔΕΙΖΑΙΤΟΙΣΔΟΥΛΟΙΣΑΥΤΟΥΑΔΕΙΓΕ
ΣΘΑΙΕΝΤΑΧΕΙ·ΚΑΙΕΣΗΜΑΝΕΝΑΤΤΟ
ΕΙΛΑΣΔΙΑΤΟΥΑΓΓΕΛΟΥΑΥΤΟΥΤΟΥΔΟΥΛΟΥ
ΤΟΥΪΩΑΝΝΗ·ΟΣΕΜΑΡΤΥΡΗΣΕΝΤΟΝ
ΓΟΝΤΟΥΘΥ·ΚΑΙΤΗΝΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΑΝΙΥΧΥ·
ΣΑΙΔΕΝ·ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣΟΑΝΑΓΙΝΩΣΚΩΝ·
ΔΙΟΙΔΙΚΟΥΟΝΤΕΣΤΟΥΣΛΟΓΟΥΣΤΗΣ
ΡΟΦΗΤΕΙΑΣ·ΚΑΙΤΗΡΟΥΝΤΕΣΤΑΕΝΔΥ
ΤΗΓΕΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΑ·ΟΓΑΡΙΚΑΙΡΟΣΕΓΓΥΣ·
ΩΑΝΝΗΝΗΣΤΑΙΣΕΤΤΑΕΚΙΚΛΗΣΙΑΙΣΤΑΙΣ
ΕΝΤΗΑΣΙΑ·ΧΑΡΙΣΥΜΙΝΚΑΙΕΙΡΗΝΗ

ILLUSTRATION D.

No. 1, is Psalm i. 1, 2, and the first line of verse 3, in exact facsimile of the Vatican manuscript, exhibiting the mode in which the poetical books are there written, *in stichois* as it is called.

No. 2, is Ezekiel i. 1-3, from the same manuscript. We are obliged here to give our illustration from the Old Testament instead of the New, because the stupid jealousy of the Papal court has never yet allowed a fac-simile of any part of the New Testament to be taken.* The writing however is the same in both parts, and the illustrations above from Psalms and Ezekiel give a very sufficient idea of the whole manuscript.

* By the exertions of Prof. Tischendorf, we have now reason to hope that a different policy will hereafter be pursued.

α

+ ψαλμοι +



M

ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC ΑΝΗΡ ΟC ΟΥΚ ΕΠΟΡΕΥΘΗ ΕΝ
ΒΟΥΛΗC ΕCΕΒΩΝ

ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΟΔΩ ΧΜΑΡΤΩΛΩΝ ΟΥΚ ΕCΤΗ
ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΚΑΘΕΔΡΑΝ ΟΙΜΩΝ ΟΥΚ ΕΚΧΕΙCΕ
ΑΛΛΗ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΝΟΜΩ ΚΥΤΟΕC ΔΗΜΑΥΤΥ
ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΝΟΜΩ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΜΕΛΕΤΗΣΕ
Η ΜΕΡΑ CΚΑΙΝΥΚΤΟC
ΚΑ ΕCΤΑΙ ΩCΤΟC ΎΛΟΝ ΤΟ ΠΕΦΥΤΕΥ

+ ²ΙΕΖΕΧΙΗΛ

K

ΚΑΙ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΤΡΙΔ
ΚΟCΤΩ ΕΓΕΙΤΕ ΤΑΡΤΩ
ΜΗΝΙ ΠΕΜΠΤΗ ΤΟΥ ΜΗΝΟC
ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ ΗΜΗΝ ΕΝ ΜΕCΩ
ΤΗC ΔΙΧΜΑΩCΙΑC ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ
ΠΟΤΑΜΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΧΟΒΑΡ ΚΑΙ
ΗΝ ΟΙ ΧΘΗCΑΝ ΟΙ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΙ
ΚΑΙ ΕΙΔΟΝ ΟΡΑCΕΙC ΘΥΜΕC
ΠΤΗ ΤΟΥ ΜΗΝΟC ΤΟΥΤC
ΤΟ ΕCΤΟC ΤΟ ΠΕΜΠΤΟΝ ΤΗC
ΔΙΧΜΑΩCΙΑC ΤΟΥ ΒΑCΙ
ΛΕΩC ΙΩΔΑΚΕΙΜ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΕ
ΝΕΤΟ ΛΟΓΟC ΚΥΜΡΟCΙΕ
ΖΕΚΙΗΛ ΥΙΟΝ ΒΟΥΖΕΙΤΟΝ
ΙΕΡΕΔ ΕΝ ΓΗ ΧΑΛΔΑΙΩΝ Ε
ΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΟΤΑΜΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΧΟ
ΒΑΡ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΕΠΕΜΕ
ΧΕΙΡ ΚΥΚΑΙ ΙΔΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΙΔΟΥ
ΠΝΔΕΞΑΙΡΟΝ ΗΡΧΕΤΟ ΑΠΟ
ΒΟΡΡΑ ΚΑΙ ΝΕΦΕΑ ΗΜΕΡΑ
ΔΗ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ

ILLUSTRATION E.

This is the famous text, 1 Tim. iii. 9-15, in exact fac simile of the Ephraem manuscript *palimpsest*. The pale writing is the New Testament passage in Greek, and the bright black lines are a part of one of St. Ephraem's sermons in Greek, to provide material for which, on account of the dearness of parchment, the New Testament itself had been obliterated. It will be seen that there is very little difficulty in reading the original Greek.

ἔπειτα τὴν χεὶρ φοῖτηται ἐλπιωσάτο· κύνων
αὐτοῦ ποσὸν ὄσσομαι· ταῖς χερσίν αὐτὸς τέτονε·
πείθομαι ὅτι δυνάται ἀλλήλοισι γένησθαι
καὶ οὐ βλάψατο ἐδύ· ἰαθεὶς βατὰ τὴν σπυρ-
εῖ μαιτὸν σπείδω· οἱ φοβί κισθὲν· ἀπ' ὧν
δοῶ ὅτι καὶ πᾶσι θ'· θύρως λείπει· ἀλλ' ἐ-
πὶ οἱ ὅτι ἐμὸν αὐτὸς ἀνθελὸν καὶ δεισθῆναι

ILLUSTRATION F.

This illustration is designed to exhibit the differences of hand-writing in which the various corrections are made from time to time in ancient manuscripts ; and how we are able to detect, by the style of the penmanship, the comparative age of each of the corrections. The specimens are all from the Sinai manuscript.

No. 1, is John v. 6-9.

No. 2, is John vi. 14, 15.

No. 3, is a correction in Matt. v. 45.

No. 4, is a correction in Matt. x. 39.

No. 5, is a correction in 2 Cor. x. 12.

No. 6, is a correction in Matt. ix. 10.

No. 7, is a correction in Matt. iii. 13, 14.

No. 8, is a correction in Luke xxiv. 51.

No. 9, is a correction in Matt. xxiii. 35.

ΤΩ ΥΔΑΤΙ ΜΟΝΟΝ
 ΑΛΛ' ΕΝ ΤΩ ΥΔΑΤΙ
 ΚΑΙ ΤΩ ΑΙΜΑΤΙ ΚΑΙ
 ΤΟ ΠΝΑΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ
 ΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΥΝ ΟΤΙ
 ΠΝΑΕΣΤΙΝ Η ΑΛΗ
 ΘΕΙΑ ΟΤΙ ΟΙ ΤΡΕΙΣ ΕΙ
 ΣΙΝ ΟΙ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΙ
 ΤΕΣΤΟ ΠΝΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ
 ΔΩΡ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ
 ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΤΡΕΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ
 ΕΝ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΕΙΤΗΝ ΜΑΡ
 ΤΥΡΙΑΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΟΥΛΑΜ^{ΩΝΑΝΩΝ}

ΗΣ ΕΝ ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ ΕΞ
 ΓΟΝΟΥ ΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ
 ΑΛΗΘΩΣ Ο ΠΡΟΦΗ
 ΤΗΣ Ο ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ Κ^Ο Δ^Ο
 ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ
 ΙΣΟΥΝ ΓΝΟΥΣΟΤΙ
 ΜΕΛΛΟΥΣΙΝ ΕΡΧΕ
 ΣΘΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΡΠΑΞΕΙΝ
 ΑΥΤΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΝ Α^{ΝΑ} ΠΟΙΗ
 ΚΝΥΝ ΑΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ^{ΕΩΣΙΝ}
 Δ^{ΑΝΕΧΩΡΗ} ΦΕΥΓΕΙ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΕΙΣ
 ΟΡΟΣ ΜΟΝΟΣ ΑΥΤ^{ΟΣ}

ILLUSTRATION F—Continued.

No. 10, is a caligraphic flourish.

No. 11, is a correction in Rev. xi. 1.

No. 12, is a correction in Isaiah viii. 22.

No. 13, is a correction in 1 Tim. iii. 16.

No. 14, is a correction in Matt. xix. 3.

No. 15, is a sentence by a certain monk who had been employed on the manuscript, or had the use of it, nearly as late as the twelfth century. The meaning is this: *Remember, Lord, the soul of the sinner Dionysius the monk, when thou comest into thy kingdom.* Such sentences are not uncommon in the ancient Bible manuscripts. They form no part of the text, and are simply pious ejaculations of the writers or readers. In this instance the ugly, awkward, cramped, barbarous hand shows plainly enough a later and barbarous period, and contrasts very strongly with the neat, plain and not inelegant hand of the original writer of the manuscript. The difference in the writing, in each instance, is well worthy of study, and of great interest to the investigator.

3
ΘΟΥΣΚΑΙΒΡΕΧΙΕΠΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΤΕ
ΔΙΚΑΙΟΤΕ

4
ΥΠΕΡΩΝΤΗΝΥΓΧΗΝΑΥΤΟΓΑΠΟΛΕΙΛΑΥΤΗΝ
5

ΔΛΛΑΥΤΟΙΕΝΕΑΥ
ΕΛΥΤΟΥΣ
ΤΟΙΣΜΕΤΡΟΥΝΤΕΣ

6
ΚΑΙ ΑΜΑΡΤΩΛΟΙ ΕΛΘΟΝΤΕΣ

7
ΜΑΛΗΝΗ ΤΟΥ ΟΔΕΔΙΕ

8
✓ ΚΑΝΕΦΕΡΕΤΟ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΟΥΝΟΝ
9

ΑΙΜΑΤΟΣ ΖΑΧΑΡΙΟΥ ΥΪΟΥ ΒΑΡΑΧΙΟΥ

11
cf) ΖΙΞΘΗΚΕΙ Ο ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ

12
ΕΚΑΤΩ ΕΜΒΛΕΨΟΝΤΑΙ
13

ΤΟΤΗΣ ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΑΣ
ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΕΩΣΕ

14
ΓΟΝΤΕΣ ΕΙΣ ΕΣΤΙ ΑΝΩ

15
ΘΥΣΙΟΝ Χ' ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΝ ΑΝΩ

ILLUSTRATION G.

This is a fac simile of Acts vii. 2, from the Codex Laudianus, a very valuable manuscript of the sixth century, now in the Bodleian library at Oxford. The right hand column is the original Greek, and the left hand a Latin translation. It will be seen how closely, at that period, the Latin and Greek alphabets resembled each other, and how very short the lines in which the ancient manuscripts were often written.

Αἰλλεαῖτ

υῖρι

ἑκᾶτρες

ἐτ πατρες

⁵
αυδίτε

θευς

γλорιαε

υῖς υῖς ἐστ

πατρι

νοστρο

Οαεεφν

ανδρες

αδελφοί

καμπατρες

ακούσατε

οε̄ς

της δοξης

υῖς φων

τα πρι

ιμων

ILLUSTRATION H

This illustration is intended to indicate the transition from the square capitals, in which the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament were written previous to the tenth century, to the cursive or running hand which came into use subsequent to that period, and gave form to the Greek type used when printing was introduced.

No. 1, is the beginning of John's Gospel, i. 1-10, as presented in an elegant manuscript of the latter part of the fourteenth century. It is called the *Codex Ebnerianus*, and belongs to the University of Oxford.

No. 2, is Matt. xv. 1, 2, in exact fac simile from an elegant manuscript of the Gospels in the city of Basle, as early as the tenth century, and probably among the earliest that were written in the cursive character.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

BRIEF BIOGRAPHIES OF ONE HUNDRED OF THE ANCIENT WITNESSES TO THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS, WHOSE TESTIMONY IS MOST IMPORTANT AND MUCH OF IT CITED IN THE FOLLOWING PAGES.

THIS list includes not only orthodox Christians, but also Jews, heretics, pagans, and infidels. Where testimony from such varied and even opposing sources is really coincident and self-consistent, it must be substantially correct.

As we have affirmed in chapter second that the testimony on which the genuineness of the sacred books of the New Testament rests, is as good as any human testimony whatever on any subject, we proceed now to submit to the reader a brief account of the principal witnesses.

Agrippa Castor, lived under the emperor Hadrian, about A. D. 120. He wrote a work in 29 books against Basilides of Alexandria, the Egyptian Gnostic. This work was read by Eusebius, and is referred to by him in very high terms in E. H. iv. 9. Agrippa was highly distinguished as a man of extensive learning, and he was confided in as a man of integrity and truthfulness. Jerome, Catal Script. c. 20.

Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria from A. D. 312 to 326. He took an active part in the controversy against Arius and was a member of the Council of

Nice, A. D. 325. He wrote letters to various bishops respecting the Arian controversy. Of these there are now extant, one to Alexander, bishop of Byzantium, in Theodoret i. 1; another to the Catholic bishops generally throughout the world, in Socrates i. 6; some fragments of a letter against the Arians, and a short epistle to the elders and deacons of Alexandria in Cotelerius.

Amelius, named also *Gentilianus*, born in Tuscany in the third century. He was a Platonic philosopher, a disciple of Plotinus, and wrote in defence of his master.

Ambrose was born in 333, the son of a Roman proconsul in Gaul. He held an office in Milan, and in the midst of a fierce controversy for the vacant bishopric there, he, though a mere civilian, was suddenly chosen to the dignity by popular acclamation. He accepted the appointment with reluctance, but held it with great activity and conscientiousness till his death in 397. Of his courage and decision in the discharge of his official duties he gave a brilliant proof in his treatment of the emperor Theodosius, whom he withstood at the door of his church and compelled him to submit to the regular church discipline, on account of some cruelties of which he had been guilty. The feeble attempt of Gibbon to deprive Ambrose of all the credit of this daring act of official duty, only shows the shallowness of the claims of the infidel historian to freedom from partizan bias, on which he so much values himself. Ambrose was eminent for his services as a writer of hymns and promoter of church music. His writings, still extant, are numerous and easily acces-

sible. He was a man of great native nobleness of character as well as of Christian conscientiousness and unshaken intrepidity in the discharge of his Christian obligations.

Ammonius. There are two witnesses of this name. One is the celebrated Ammonius Saccas, who gave a more definite form to the eclecticism of the new Platonists, and was the philosophical teacher of Origen about 250. He remained all his life a pagan.

Cotemporary with him there was also a Christian Ammonius, whose writings, some of which are still extant, are quoted by both Eusebius and Jerome. Among these are a treatise on the agreement of Moses and Jesus, and a harmony of the Gospels.

Amphilochius of Cappadocia, at first a monk and afterwards bishop of Iconium in Lycaonia. He was a strenuous opponent of the Arians, and influenced the emperor Theodosius to issue an edict against them. He was present at the synod of Constantinople in 394. He was highly esteemed by Basil the great. Most of his writings, which consisted mainly of sermons and biographies, are lost; but one of his poetical works, still extant, contains a complete catalogue of the Christian writings as they were received in his time. This however is by some ascribed to Gregory of Nazianzen.

Andreas, once bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, about the year 500, wrote a commentary on the Revelation which is still extant, and is in many respects a work of great interest and importance.

Appelles, about the year 188, was a disciple of Marcion, and a fellow student of Lucian. After having been excommunicated by Marcion for the alleged crime

of unchastity, he founded a Gnostic sect of his own. He is quoted by Ambrose, and notwithstanding his rather doubtful moral character, there is no ground for the impeachment of his testimony in regard to the Sacred Books in use among the Christians of his time. He had neither interests nor prejudices, which, so far as we can judge, would induce him to give false testimony on such a subject as this.

Apollonius. In the first century after Christ, there was a pagan of this name, from Tyana in Cappadocia. He was said to be a worker of miracles; he traveled extensively as a teacher of morals and religion, and his miracles were often claimed to be on a level with those of the Lord Jesus. A few of his letters are still extant; and a biography of him principally from the writings of Philostratus, was published by the English deist Blount, in 1680.

The Christian Apollonius was a presbyter at Ephesus, and an active opponent of Montanus. He lived late in the third century, and is quoted by Eusebius.

Archelaus, a bishop in Mesopotamia, about the year 277, and one of the first opponents of the sect of the Manicheans.

Aretas, archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, about 540, the author of a commentary on Revelation which is still extant.

Arius, the much celebrated founder of the sect of Arians, was the son of Ammonius, from Lybia or Alexandria, and a contemporary of Constantine. He was presbyter at Alexandria, under the bishop Alexander, when he first propounded his doctrine that the Son is created and not from eternity. Condemned by the

Council of Nice in 325 he was banished. He made his submissions in a creed artfully worded, and returned to Alexandria, whence he was expelled by Athanasius his chief opponent. Repairing to Constantinople, the emperor, much against the wishes of the patriarch Alexander, peremptorily required that he should be again received into the communion of the Alexandrian church ; but before this requisition could be formally carried out, he died very suddenly, not without suspicion of poison, in the year 336. Some of his writings, consisting principally of poems and letters, are still extant, and contain a variety of important testimony which there is no reason to impeach.

Arnobius, a teacher of rhetoric at Sicca in Africa, near the close of the third century, was at first an open opponent of Christianity. By a remarkable dream he was brought to acknowledge Christ, and requested baptism of the bishop of Sicca, who required, as a proof of the sincerity and genuineness of his conversion, that he should write a book in defence of the Christian faith. This gave occasion to his celebrated work, entitled *Disputations against the Gentiles*, now indeed far more valuable for its testimony to facts than for its logical arguments.

Athanasius succeeded Alexander in the episcopal dignity at Alexandria in 326, and died in 373. His whole official life was spent in heated and violent controversy with Arius and the Arians, sometimes triumphant and sometimes conquered, so that, of the forty-six years of his bishopric, twenty were spent in exile. It was not till after the death of the emperor Valens, that his triumph became complete and permanent.

The creed which bears his name was not his composition, but a large number of his writings are extant, easily accessible and of great value.

Athenagoras was a philosopher of Athens about the year 160. After his conversion to Christianity he wrote an apology for the Christians, directed to the emperor Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus, and a treatise on the resurrection of the dead, a subject of great interest at Athens, as we learn from the apostle Paul, Acts. xvii. These writings are both still accessible.

Aurelius Augustin, the son of Patricius and Monica, was born at Tagaste in Africa, in the year 359. In early life, through the influence of bad associates, he was much given to dissipation, and was for a considerable time partial to the doctrines of the Manichaeans. He lived at Rome and later at Milan as a teacher of rhetoric. By the influence of Ambrose especially he was led to the study of the Scriptures and particularly the Epistles of Paul. After a long and severe inward struggle, he became a convert to Christianity, and returned to Africa first as a priest and afterwards as bishop of Hippo, in which last position he remained during his life. He was the most powerful and influential of all the teachers of the Latin church. Particularly by his conflict with the Pelagians he came to precise statements respecting the doctrines of sin and grace, and thus became the most celebrated theologian of the Christian world. His writings are voluminous and of easy access.

Bardesanes was a native of Mesopotamia and lived at Edessa about 170. He at first belonged to the

orthodox church, then became a convert to Valentinus, then became the founder of a Gnostic system of his own, but in the latter part of his life returned to sounder views. He was a man of candor, acuteness and learning. He wrote much in the Syrian language, and his works were so highly esteemed that they were translated into Greek and widely read. He published refutations of Marcion and almost all the heretics of his time ; he composed a dialogue on fate dedicated to Antoninus, a work on the persecutions to which the Christians were subjected, etc. Eusebius gives him a high character. E. H. xx. 30.

Barnabas, a Levite of Cyprus, according to Clement of Alexandria one of the seventy disciples. He was the companion of Paul at Antioch and also on his first missionary journey ; and after his separation from Paul he went with Mark to Cyprus, and probably to other places, preaching the gospel. There is an interesting epistle which the ancients universally ascribe to him, though it has been doubted by some of the moderns. It is contained entire in the original Greek in the famous Sinai manuscript discovered by Tischendorf. It has been often published, was highly esteemed in the ancient church, and though in its present form it may contain some interpolations, there is no good reason for rejecting it as a whole.

Basilides, the most celebrated of the Egyptian Gnostics, lived at the close of the first and the beginning of the second century. He propagated his sentiments with great activity, zeal and power, in Africa and Asia, assigning great prominence to the doctrines of *emanation* and *dualism*. He wrote a commentary

on the Gospels in 24 books, which was refuted by Agrippa Castor, and from which subsequent Christian writers have made many extracts. An apocryphal gospel is also ascribed to him. His testimony is very valuable as to the Gospels and other New Testament books received in his time. Eusebius, H. E. iv. 7.

Basil the Great, the brother of Gregory of Nyssa, was born at Caesarea in Cappadocia near the beginning of the fourth century. He studied at Antioch, Constantinople and Athens, became a monk and a founder of monasteries in Pontus; he was afterwards a presbyter in Caesarea, his native place, under Eusebius, but disagreeing with his bishop, he returned to his monkish life in Pontus; and again becoming reconciled to Eusebius, he succeeded him as bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. He was one of the most distinguished men of his time and a zealous helper of Athanasius in his conflict with the Arians. His works still extant are very numerous and have often been republished. Among them we have 428 letters, 9 homilies in verse, monastic rules, liturgies, etc.

Beryllus was bishop of Bostra in Arabia, about the year 290. He held some notions respecting the person of Christ, which Origen so effectually refuted that he renounced them entirely, and became in consequence one of Origen's firmest and most devoted friends.

Caius, a presbyter at Rome about the year 200. He was the author of three works of which there are fragments preserved by Eusebius; and the Italian Muratori, not without good reason, ascribes to him a fragment containing one of the most ancient and interesting catalogues in existence of the writings of the New

Testament at that time received. He is very often quoted by the church historian Eusebius, who sets great value on his testimony. The important fragment referred to was discovered in the Ambrosian library at Milan by the librarian Muratori, about the year 1720.

Carpocrates lived at Alexandria in Egypt early in the second century, and was the founder of an anti-nomian system of Gnosticism, which was further developed and propagated by his son Epiphanius. He is largely quoted by Irenaeus, Epiphanius and others.

Cassianus (Julius), a Valentinian Gnostic of the second century, whose writings are quoted by Clement of Alexandria.

Cassiodorus (Magnus Aurelius) was born at Calabria about the year 470. He was prime minister of Theodoric, and was engaged in political life with great distinction and success till he was seventy years old. He then retired to a monastery founded by himself in Calabria, and became a very voluminous writer on religious subjects, living to be more than ninety years old.

Celsus was a heathen, an Epicurean philosopher, and a violent enemy of the Christians. He lived in the latter part of the first and the beginning of the second century, very near the time when the books of the New Testament were first collected into a volume. He wrote a very elaborate book which he entitled the *True Word* (or Logos), in which he undertakes to refute the Christians out of their own writings. He introduces a Jew who quotes very largely from the Christian Scriptures. The very object and plan of the work, as well as the zeal and ability of the author,

make it an invaluable witness to the Christian books as then received. Though we have not the book of Celsus entire, yet in the refutation of it by Origen, there are very large and literal quotations from it, in which the views of this zealous pagan in regard to the Christian books, as he read them at that early period, are very fully developed. There is nowhere to be found a more important witness to the integrity and genuineness of the books of the New Testament than this very zealous and able enemy of Christianity.

Chrysostom (John) was born at Antioch about the year 354. He was one of the most effective preachers of the Christian church, and it was on account of his eloquence that he received the surname of Chrysostom or *Golden Mouth*. He was patriarch of Constantinople, but had a very bitter enemy in the empress Eudoxia, by whose influence he was twice banished, and he finally died in exile at Comane in Pontus in the year 407. His writings are very numerous, consisting of treatises, sermons and letters; they have been collected with great care, and frequently published in very handsome volumes. He is the prince of the Greek Church Fathers.

Claudius Apollinaris was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia about the year 173, and an able and zealous defender of the Christian truth. The ancients, particularly Eusebius and Jerome, were acquainted with many of his writings, as for example, an apology to the emperor Marcus Aurelius, five books against the pagans, two respecting the truth, two against the Jews, letters against the Montanists; but none of these are now extant.

Clement of Rome, the same spoken of by Paul in his Epistle to the Phil. iv. 3, was a Roman by birth, a disciple of the apostles, and bishop of Rome at the close of the first century. Under his name we have two epistles to the church at Corinth, the first genuine and entire, but the second a mere fragment and of doubtful authority. The book ascribed to him, under the title of *Recognitions*, is a religious romance in ten books which we have only in the Latin translation of Rufinus. The *Clementina*, 19 homilies, appear to be a reproduction of the *Recognitions* in a modified form. These works are very important as contributions to the history of the Ebionites; they belong to the earliest period of Christian literature after the New Testament, and probably may be the genuine works of Clement the friend of Paul. The Canons of the Apostles, and the Apostolic Constitutions are more doubtful as to their authorship; and the same may be said of the five letters, one of which is directed to the apostle James. All these books have been many times published, and are very valuable as witnesses to the opinions and the literature of the first age of the Christian church; and they all tend to confirm the genuineness of the New Testament books, as we now have them.

Clement (Titus Flavius) of Alexandria, was by birth a pagan and well instructed in all the branches of Greek literature. He received his Christian instruction from the celebrated Alexandrian teacher Pantaeus, in the year 187 became his successor in the presidency of the catechetical school, and in the course of time had the world famed Origen as one of his scholars. His

Institutes, in which he gave a concise view of the contents of the Old and New Testament, are lost, except a few fragments preserved by later writers. But we have five entire works by him which are of great value and which in their day laid the foundation of Christian theology as a science. We see in all his writings that he used the same Bible, especially the same New Testament, which we now have.

Cyprian (Thascius Caecilius) was born in Carthage, of pagan parents, about the year 200. He was at first a teacher of rhetoric, a heathen, a man of genius, and rather dissipated. In 245 he was converted to Christianity by means of Caecilius, a presbyter of Carthage, and immediately entered the service of the church; and though he lived but twelve years after this, by his incessant activity and great strength of character he rendered services which have placed his name among the highest of all Christian antiquity. He became bishop of Carthage in 248; during the Decian persecution he fled, while others apostatised; and the question of their subsequent restoration gave rise to a violent controversy, which he with great difficulty suppressed. He took part with the Roman bishop Cornelius against his rival Novatian, in order to restore the unity of the church. When another bishop of Rome, Stephen, undertook to impose the traditions of Rome on other churches as if they were of universal obligation, Cyprian was his most energetic and determined opponent. In the persecution under Valerian he was at first exiled and then beheaded in the year 256. His works, consisting of short treatises, called forth by the exigencies of his times, and familiar

letters, have been preserved with great care and often republished. Of his letters there are more than eighty, and they give a most striking and truthful picture of all that pertains to the organization and discipline, the spirit and the life of the church at that early period. He had high ideas of the episcopal authority, and was most distinguished as an organizer and disciplinarian.

Cyrill, bishop of Jerusalem, in the middle of the fourth century. At first he was a moderate semi-Arian, but subsequently adopted the Nicene creed, and for this was by the Arian party expelled from his see. His writings that remain to us consist of catechetical instructions for youth and recent converts, with fragments of sermons, etc.

Cyrill, bishop of Alexandria, belongs to the fifth century, and was a leading man of his time. He was the chief opponent of Nestorius, and summoned against him the council of Ephesus in 431. Besides his controversial works against Nestorius and others, we have from him commentaries on John's Gospel, the twelve minor prophets, Isaiah, and select portions of the Pentateuch.

Dionysius, bishop of Rome in 252, has left three letters, one particularly against the Sabellians. The works published in the name of Dionysius the Areopagite at Athens, a convert of Paul the apostle (Acts. xvii) are undoubtedly spurious and belong to the fourth or fifth century.

Dionysius, bishop of Corinth in 170. Ancient writers, particularly Eusebius and Jerome, have frequent references to his letters, but we have none of them entire. He was a man of great authority among

the churches of his day. He died the death of a martyr in 173.

Dionysius of Alexandria, surnamed *the great*, was a scholar of Origen, was by him converted to Christianity from paganism, and became bishop in 247. His official life was a very disturbed one. In the Decian persecution he suffered a long imprisonment, with the bishop Nepos he had a controversy in regard to the millennium in which he had the pleasure of bringing over that bishop to his own anti-millenarian views; he affirmed the validity of heretic baptism, and met with severe opposition on this account; he wrote against Sabellius and also against Paul of Samosata; during the Valerian persecution he was driven into exile; and after a most unquiet life he died in 269. Of his numerous writings we have only fragments remaining, which have been collected and published.

Ephraem the Syrian was born at Nisibis in Mesopotamia, became abbot of the cloister in Edessa, and died in 378. He was a voluminous writer in the Syrian language; his works were highly esteemed; they were translated into Greek and read in many churches. As we have already observed, the text of the New Testament itself was in one instance at least obliterated to furnish parchment for a copy of Ephraem's Sermons; a symbol of what has often happened in the Christian church since his time. His works have been frequently and very handsomely published.

Epiphanius was of Jewish origin, and born in a village near Jerusalem about the year 310. After his conversion to Christianity he became a Monk in Palestine and was afterwards made bishop of Salamis in



CAESAREA.

the island of Cyprus. He was full of zeal against heretics, and among his other writings is a ponderous work against 80 heresies. He assailed with great energy John, bishop of Jerusalem, on account of his supposed attachment to the principles of Origen, and endeavored, though in vain, to enlist Chrysostom in his crusade against Origenism. He did not begin to be an author till after he was sixty, and pursued the calling with characteristic zeal and industry till he was past ninety. He died while returning from a long journey which he had made in his zeal against Origenism. His works are hasty, fiery, and full of mistakes, but valuable on account of the many quotations which he makes from ancient writings now lost. For his time he was a remarkable linguist, being acquainted with Hebrew, Syrian, Egyptian, Greek and Latin. His works are to this day easily accessible. He is a remarkable example of zeal, industry and sincerity in heresy hunting. His quotations from other authors are generally faithful and reliable.

Eusebius, surnamed *Pamphilus*, from his friend the martyr, was born in Palestine in the year 264 and died in 340. He is the most valuable of all the early church historians, and has been perhaps sufficiently characterized in the second chapter of this work. He was bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, an amazingly diligent reader and writer, amiable, unprejudiced and candid. He endeavored to protect Arius against Alexander the bishop of Alexandria, and thus incurred for himself the suspicion of Arianism, though he subscribed the Nicene creed; and he was sent on an embassy to Constantine in regard to Athanasius. He became an iati-

mate personal friend of that celebrated emperor, and had a most favorable opinion of him, which is not at all surprising considering the circumstances. His numerous historical writings are still held in great esteem, and there is nothing that can supply their place. Notwithstanding all that partizan zeal has from time to time alleged against him, there is no historian equally voluminous on whom fewer errors can be proved.

There were other distinguished churchmen of the same name, during that age, as a bishop of Emessa in 359, who published homilies, and a bishop of Vercelli in 371.

Evagrius Scholasticus was born at Epiphania in Coelesyria in the year 536, and was a lawyer at Antioch. We have from him an ecclesiastical history in 6 books including the period between the years 431 and 594; a valuable work, though somewhat marred by the credulity of the author and his faith in monkish legends.

Firmilianus, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, was a great admirer of Origen, and he took an active part in all the church questions of his time. We have from him an able letter to Cyprian, in which he takes part with that prelate against the assumptions of Stephen, the bishop of Rome. He is referred to by Eusebius, E. H. vi. 26, 29, 46; vii. 5, 29.

Gregory, surnamed *Thaumaturgus* or *Wonder Worker*, on account of the wonderful works which he is said to have wrought, was born of wealthy and respectable heathen parents at New Caesarea in Pontus about the year 210. In 231 he was on his way to Berytus intending to study law at the famous school in that

place ; but meeting with Origen he was converted to Christianity, and the whole purpose of his life was changed. He studied with Origen eight years. He was made bishop of his native city about the year 243 or 4. At that time there were said to be only seventeen Christians in the whole city ; but such was the energy and success of his labors there, that when he died in 270, there were scarcely so many pagans left in the place, though a very populous one. In the Decian persecution he was obliged to flee. Afterwards he took part against Paul of Samosata in 269 at the Council of Antioch. He was a diligent student of Scripture, and a most laborious and faithful pastor. His fame filled the North and the East, and even the pagans called him the second Moses.

Gregory of Nazianzen, was born in the year 300 at Nazianzen in Cappadocia, where his father was bishop. He was the confidential friend of Basil the great, was sometime bishop of Constantinople, but finally retired to private life and died in 391. When Julian the apostate prohibited the Christians the use of the Greek and Roman classics, Gregory and some others endeavored to fill the gap by writings of their own. In the Arian controversy he kept the congregations at Constantinople warmly engaged against the heretics. On account of his great attainments in divinity he was surnamed the *Theologian*. He published discourses, of which there are two against Julian written with great severity ; we have of his nearly 250 letters ; and more than 150 poetical pieces in different kinds of verse. His works were highly esteemed, carefully preserved, and are still accessible in good editions.

Gregory of Nyssa, brother of Basil the great, was born at Pontus in Macedonia, was at first a rhetorician, then a monk, and finally bishop of Nyssa. He was exiled from his see for eight years by the Arians, and attended both the councils of Constantinople in 381 and 394. He was highly celebrated for his eloquence as a preacher. The time of his death is uncertain. His writings, treatises, orations, poems, etc., are well preserved.

Hegesippus was a Jew by birth and a member of the Christian congregation at Jerusalem. He composed at Romè, about the year 176, a historical work under the title of *Memoirs*, which described, in 5 books, the vicissitudes of the church of Christ from its origin to his own time. Nothing remains of this work but the fragments preserved by Eusebius. He died in 180. A history of the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem, which are ascribed to him, are not his. Eusebius, E. H. iii. 19, 20, 32; iv. 8, 22.

Heracleon, of whom but little is known, was a disciple of Valentine, about the year 126. He wrote largely on the New Testament books, but though we have none of his works entire, yet copious extracts are made from them by Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Being a Gnostic, and of that very early period, his testimony is particularly valuable.

Heraclitus, in the latter part of the second century, is mentioned by Jerome and Eusebius as an able commentator on the Epistles of Paul.

Hermas. Under this name there was in the most ancient church, and held in the highest esteem, a book entitled the *Pastor* or *Shepherd*. The ancients sup-

posed the author to be the Hermas mentioned by Paul in Rom. xvi. 14. Others would ascribe it to Hermas, a brother of Pius, bishop of Rome, about the year 156. But the great authority of the book as early as the time of Irenaeus (from 140 to 200) would certainly indicate the correctness of the first opinion rather than the second. In the work, which consists of three books, an angel in the guise of a shepherd gives instructions to Hermas on the various duties of the Christian life, in the form of visions, commands and similitudes. It was for many ages extant in a Latin translation only, with the exception of a few sentences; but in the famous Sinai manuscript discovered by Tischendorf we have the original Greek of a considerable portion of it. It is a most precious relic of the very highest Christian antiquity.

Hermias, who lived towards the close of the second century, while paganism was still in the ascendant and all powerful, wrote a sharp polemic work in opposition to it, entitled *Irrisio Gentilium Philosophorum*, Ridicule of the Gentile Philosophers, which is interesting as a specimen of the very earliest Christian polemics. It is still accessible in good editions.

Hieronymus (*Sophronius Eusebius*) was born in the year 330 at Strido in Dalmatia. He was one of the most learned of all the church fathers, particularly in everything pertaining to the literature of the Bible. In English we generally write his name *Jerome*. He received at Rome his first instruction in the sciences, traveled extensively, and finally withdrew to a solitude near Bethlehem in Palestine, where he spent his life in the study of the Scriptures and the composition of

various learned works in the several departments of Christian literature. He employed a Jew to teach him Hebrew, and was a most diligent and faithful student. His greatest work was the revising of the common Latin translation of the Bible called the Vulgate, and writing for the several books of Scripture erudite prefaces containing all that could be ascertained respecting the authors, times and occasions of writing, etc. Even the most laborious investigations of modern times have in many instances scarcely advanced beyond the results of Jerome. Of most of the sacred books he made new translations very much superior to any that had preceded. His writings are among the richest of the ancient sources of critical investigation, there are passages in them of surpassing eloquence, he was altogether sincere and earnest; but he always wrote hastily, and was often passionate and prejudiced. He had several fierce controversies with Rufinus, Augustin and others; and when excited, as he always was almost in controversy, he did not hesitate to call his opponents by the roughest kind of names. His writings were numerous, mainly on exegetical and historical subjects; they have been carefully preserved, and are accessible in many good editions. He died in 420 at the age of 90.

Hilary, called by many the *Western Athanasius*, was born in Poitiers in Aquitania, educated in paganism; but converted to Christianity by the reading of the Bible, he became bishop of his native city in 355. For his opposition to Arianism he was banished to Phrygia; but after his return, he sought with redoubled zeal to purify France from this heresy. He died in

368. He wrote on the trinity, commentaries, hymns, etc. His works are preserved with a good degree of completeness, and have often been published in handsome and readable editions.

Hippolytus (Eusebius, H. E. vi. 20, 22) belongs to the close of the second century, and was one of the most active and influential churchmen of his day. He was a scholar of Irenaeus and a friend of Origen. He was bishop of Ostia at the mouth of the Tiber, and died a martyr's death. His writings consist of commentaries on the Old and New Testaments, sermons, dogmatic and polemic treatises, historical disquisitions, etc. His personal history was very little known even to Eusebius and others of the earliest writers. But it has been gradually coming to light even in modern times. In 1551 a statue of him with an inscription giving some account of him and his writings was disinterred near Rome; in 1661 a polemic work of his was discovered; and in 1842, there were found in Greece seven books, that is from the 4th to the 10th, of his great work on all the heresies, of which only the first book had before been known. This discovery produced a wide-spread excitement in the learned world, and gave rise to numerous publications illustrating, from Hippolytus, the doctrines, rites and ethics of the ancient church.

Ignatius, surnamed *Theophorus*, was a pupil of the apostle John, and by him ordained bishop of Antioch, which office he held forty years. He lived through the persecution of Domitian, but in the reign of Trajan he was condemned to death, and after a most remarkable conversation with the emperor, an account

of which is still extant; he was taken to Rome and there suffered martyrdom by being thrown to wild beasts about the year 109 (Eusebius, E. H. iii. 36). An account of his martyrdom, written by the friends who attended him on his journey, is still preserved. While at Smyrna, and at Troas, on his way to Rome, he wrote letters to several of the Christian churches, and one to his friend Polycarp. These seven epistles have been known and read in the Christian churches from the very earliest period. There is an edition of them of about the sixth century, which undoubtedly contains many interpolations; but the earlier and briefer recensions, of which archbishop Usher had a Latin translation and I. Voss, the Greek original, may safely be received as genuine throughout. Besides these seven there are others ascribed to Ignatius which may be rejected as spurious. The genuine epistles of Ignatius are among the most interesting of all the relics of Christian antiquity; they have often been published and are easily accessible.

Irenaeus was born at Smyrna probably about the year 120. He studied with Polycarp and Papias. He was a missionary to the pagans in France under Pothinus, from whom he received ordination; and after the death of his master by martyrdom, he succeeded him as bishop of Lyons in the year 178. He was a faithful pastor of his flock, had great influence throughout the Christian world, and successfully withstood Victor, bishop of Rome, in his endeavors to impose the Romish Easter on other churches. He suffered martyrdom under Septimius Severus in the year 202. Eusebius, E. H. v. 15, 20, 24, 26. He was probably the

author of the letter, still extant, which gives so graphic and terrible a description of the persecutions suffered by the churches of Vienne and Lyons in France in the year 177. His great work is his five books against heresies, which is still extant, partly in the original Greek, but mostly in a very ancient and rather barbarous Latin translation. The work contains a great amount of information as to the origin, doctrines and character of the ancient heretics; as well as of the theological tenets of the orthodox churches of that age, and the most approved mode of stating and defending them. The book is a very common one.

Isidorus, the son of the Gnostic Basilides, wrote works both of an exegetical and ethical character, of which fragments are preserved by Clement of Alexandria and Epiphanius.

Isidorus of Alexandria, surnamed *Pelusiota*, a monk of Pelusium, was distinguished for his abstemious and severe life. He belongs to the latter part of the fourth century, and has left over two thousand letters arranged in five books.

Jerome, see *Hieronymus*.

Jornandes or *Jordanes*, a Goth, was before his conversion a notary, then a monk, and finally a bishop about the year 550. His works are historical, and contain important testimonies.

Josephus (*Flavius*), the great historian of the Jews, born at Jerusalem in the year 37, son of a priest, and of the sect of the Pharisees. In the Roman war he held with great distinction the Jewish military command in Galilee; but being defeated and made a prisoner by Vespasian, he became an intimate friend of

the emperor and his son, and was employed by Titus as a negotiator with the Jews in the siege of Jerusalem. His last years were spent at Rome. His works are well known. His testimonies to Christ and the early history of Christianity have by some been rejected as spurious, but without sufficient reason.

Julius Africanus (Eusebius, E. H. i. 7; vi. 31) was by birth a Lybian, and dwelt at Emmaus in Palestine, and he is by some called bishop of Emmaus, which is the same as Nicopolis. When the city was destroyed by fire about the year 220, Julius was sent on an embassy to the emperor Heliogobalus to have it rebuilt. He was a man of great learning and influence, and has left some important writings, though now mostly in fragments. His letter to Aristides on the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, and a letter to Origen on the genuineness of the story of Susanna in the Greek Daniel, we have entire; but of his great historical summary from the creation to A. D. 221, and an elaborate treatise on natural science and medicine, only fragments remain.

Justin (Flavius, the Martyr) was born at Neapolis, the ancient Shechem, in the beginning of the 2d century. From his early youth he had an intense longing to acquire a knowledge of divine things. He gave himself to the study of philosophy, and attended the instructions of a Stoic, a Peripatetic, and Pythagorean, but without obtaining satisfaction. With a Platonist he succeeded better; but once as he was taking a solitary walk, absorbed in meditation, he was met by a venerable old man who referred him to the writings of the prophets and apostles and the instructions of Christ. A dili-

gent study of the Bible, and a witnessing of the steadfastness of the Christians under the most severe persecutions, brought him over to Christianity. He thenceforward devoted himself to a defence of the Christian faith, and especially to a vindication of it to the men of learning among the pagans. For this purpose he always retained the philosopher's mantle, and went to Rome and founded a school there. Through the malice of a certain Cynic by the name of Crescens he suffered a martyr's death at Rome in the year 167. Justin is the first of the church fathers, whose writings have come down to us, that brings Christianity into connection with philosophy; and he was followed as a model by subsequent defenders of the faith. His larger apology was addressed to the emperor Antoninus Pius about the year 139, and the smaller to Marcus Aurelius in 163 or thereabouts. In both these works the argument is addressed mainly to the pagans. For the Jews he wrote a dialogue which he professes to have held with Trypho, a Jew, while walking in the gymnasium or *Xystus* at Ephesus. As to the genuineness of these works there can be no reasonable doubt.

There is a very ancient letter to Diognetus, giving an account, minute and interesting, of the opinions and practices of the Christians of the earlier period, that has sometimes been ascribed to Justin the Martyr, but without sufficient grounds. It is a genuine and most valuable relic of the earliest Christian age, and its statements are authentic and of the deepest interest, but the author is unknown.

Lactantius (Caecilius Firmianus), an Italian or Afri-

can, a pupil of Arnobius in eloquence; but he so far surpassed his teacher that he gained for himself the title of the Christian Cicero. He devoted himself to the instruction of youth, and was appointed by Constantine the Great the tutor of his son Crispus in the year 317. He died about 325. His principal work is his *Institutes* in seven books. His works have been highly esteemed, and frequently and handsomely published. The language, generally, is more noticeable than the thought.

Lucian, of Samosata in Syria, an Epicurean philosopher and distinguished orator of the second half of the second century. He traveled extensively and learned much of the follies of mankind. In his dialogues, which have had a great run, he ridiculed with much sharpness and wit the sacred things of the pagans, and did not spare the Christians. Much can be learned from this merciless satirist, whose works are too congenial to the ill nature of mankind ever to be lost or become obsolete.

Manes or *Mani*, the founder of the Manichaeans, was born in the early part of the third century. He was a Persian, educated among the Magi, and on becoming acquainted with the Christian books, combined the Christian doctrines with the Magian, gave himself out for the Paraclete or Comforter promised by Christ, and founded a new system of religion, which embraced some of the ideas of Christ, but was characterized by the old Zoroastrian dogma of dualism, or two original principles of light and darkness, of good and evil, in perpetual and everlasting conflict. Being an artist as well as a philosopher he composed a work illustrative

of his system, which he adorned with splendid pictures, and it was called by the Persians *Ertenki-Mani*, or the Gospel of Manes. He traveled extensively, wrote other works, and had numerous followers. Hormisdas, king of Persia, was among his converts. But the next king, Varanes I. put him to a most cruel death as a perverter of religion in the year 277; but for many generations afterwards his followers were numerous and influential, among whom was the great Augustin in the early part of his life. Extracts from the writings of this most remarkable and erratic genius are preserved by Epiphanius.

Marcion was born at Sinope, where his father was bishop, early in the second century. He visited Rome and was there acquainted with Justin Martyr and Valentinus the Gnostic. He became the founder of an anti-Jewish Gnostic sect, which as late as the fourth century had its own churches and bishops. He rejected the Old Testament and compiled, mainly from Luke, a gospel of his own, which is still extant. He received as divinely inspired ten of the epistles of Paul, and is a good witness for all the New Testament books as they were received by the Orthodox churches of his time. He regarded Matthew, Mark and John as Judaizers, who failed to comprehend the doctrine of the good God as expounded by Jesus of Nazareth; but recognized as genuine the Gospels ascribed to them. He was himself a believer in the dualism of the Persians, as was Manes also a century afterward. Considering the history and condition of the world from the beginning to the present time, it is rather surprising that this solution of the great problem of the existence

of moral and physical evil, has not been more popular among theologians of modern times. It held great sway over the minds of many of the profoundest thinkers of the old Oriental world, and was extensively received for many ages after Christ.

Marcus, a native of Palestine and a disciple of Valentinus, belongs to the second half of the second century. He set forth his Gnostic doctrines in a poem, a liturgy, and symbols. Irenaeus, in his first book against heretics, gives an account of him and his writings, from which it appears that he is a good witness for the books of the New Testament, especially for the first three Gospels.

Maximus, a writer against the Gnostics, was cotemporary with Marcus above mentioned, and probably the bishop of Jerusalem. He is mentioned by Eusebius, E. H. v. 27, and quoted by him in his other works as a witness to the four Gospels. John and Matthew, Mark and Luke, four evangelists (he says) but one Gospel.

Melito, bishop of Sardis, about 160, was one of the most active and influential of the church fathers of his time. A good account of him and his writings is given by Eusebius, E. H. iv. 26. He traveled to Palestine for the purpose of ascertaining exactly the Hebrew canon of Scripture, and to him we are indebted for the earliest Christian catalogue of the books of the Old Testament.

Methodius, bishop of Tyre in Phoenicia, or Patara in Lycia, probably was martyred in the Diocletian persecution about the year 311. Several of his writings are preserved; and we have extracts in Epipha-

nus and Photius and John of Damascus. He was a zealous opponent of Origen.

Minucius Felix, a lawyer and advocate at Rome, probably of African origin, and converted to Christianity about 225. His writings are important as witnessing to our sacred books, and have been often published.

Montanus, a native of Mysia on the borders of Phrygia, in the second half of the second century, was the founder of the sect of Montanists, in connection with the two female preachers Priscilla and Maximilla. He was a Millenarian of the most advanced type, and exceedingly severe and ascetic in his rules of life. Epiphanius gives us extracts from his writings.

Nepos was bishop of Arsinoe in Egypt about the year 244. He at first wrote in defence of the most literal conception of the millennium, but being convinced of his error by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, he frankly and fully retracted. Besides his works on the millennium he was the author of psalms and hymns for the use of the churches.

Nilus, a praelect in Constantinople, was afterwards with his son Theodulus a monk on Mount Sinai, where he died in the year 450. He gave a narrative of the slaughter of the monks on Mount Sinai and the captivity of Theodulus, and wrote treatises of general interest.

Oecumenius, was a Greek writer, who compiled commentaries on the greater part of the New Testament, collected out of the writings of the ancients, and therefore valuable to us. He probably lived in the tenth century; and we still have quite complete his works on the Acts and the Epistles.

Origen, surnamed *Adamantius*, son of Leonides the martyr, was born at Alexandria in Egypt in the year 135. He was educated at the catechetical school in his native city, under Clement, and received instruction also from the philosopher Ammonius Saccus. After the death of his father he supported his mother and her family by teaching; and at the age of eighteen became master of the celebrated Alexandrian catechetical school in which he had himself been instructed. At this time, from misunderstanding the passage in Matthew xix. 12, he did violence to his own person. Subsequently he made a journey to Rome; in his twenty-fifth year he made himself master of the Hebrew language, and was sent to Arabia to instruct an emir in the Christian faith. After his return, the rage of Caracalla against the Alexandrians compelled him to flee to Palestine, and he publicly expounded the Scriptures in Caesarea. Recalled by Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, he in Antioch became the teacher of Mam-maea, the mother of Alexander Severus; again he spent a few years in Alexandria; on a journey to Greece was ordained presbyter; on which account his bishop Demetrius was enraged against him, accused him of heretical opinions, and summoned church councils which condemned and banished him. Origen then opened a school at Caesarea; in the Severian persecution he fled to Cappadocia; and when quiet was again restored, he visited Athens, Palestine and Bostra, where he found Beryll and converted him from his errors. In the Decian persecution he was imprisoned and put to the torture, and soon after his release he died at Tyre in the year 254 at the age of sixty-nine. Origen was one

of the most wonderful men that any age or country has ever produced. Sincere, earnest, indefatigable, prolific, his numerous writings are among the richest treasures which Christian antiquity has left to us; and no witness to the sacred books is more trustworthy, copious, and important than he.

Pamphilus, a presbyter, was born at Berytus (Beirut) in Phoenecia, devoted himself to the study of theology, and made his home at Cæsarea in Palestine in the latter part of the third century. Here he employed his large fortune in the collecting of a Christian library, and copied many books, which it was impossible otherwise to procure, with his own hand, as for example the voluminous writings of Origen. This library was of invaluable benefit to Eusebius and Jerome, and other Christian writers. He also founded a Christian school in the same city, of which he was himself the teacher. Under the emperor Maximin, in the year 307, he was thrown into prison, and two years after put to death. His life was written by Eusebius. He published an edition of the Septuagint according to the revision of Origen, which was much used in Palestine and Syria, and an apology for Origen in six books, in conjunction with Eusebius. The Euthalian sections or chapters in the book of Acts are probably from him.

Pantaenus of Sicily, of the second century, was at first a Stoic, and was converted to Christianity by a disciple of the apostles. He became master of the catechetical school at Alexandria, where he acquired a great reputation, and had some very distinguished scholars, as for example the Alexandrian Clement. He had been for a considerable time before this a preacher

of the Gospel in India, and died at Alexandria in the year 212. He was the author of commentaries on the Scripture. He found in India certain Jewish Christians who had the Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew, which had been left them by their teacher, the apostle Bartholomew. See Eusebius, E. H. v. 10.

Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia about the year 100, according to Irenaeus and other ancients, a student of both the apostle John and of Polycarp, was a zealous millenarian, learning his doctrine, as he says, from the apostle John himself. Eusebius, E. H. iii. 39. He wrote five books containing traditional accounts of Christ, the apostles, and others of the primitive times. Fragments only of his works remain. Though a man of moderate intellectual capacity, he was evidently entirely honest and sincere, and a good witness in regard to the sacred books of his time.

Philastrius, a native of Spain or Italy, at first a presbyter, in which capacity he traveled through the whole Roman empire, laboring for the conversion of heretics and pagans, and finally became bishop of Brescia in the time of Ambrose. He died in 389. He was a zealous defender of the Nicene creed, and wrote a book concerning heretics, which is still extant, in character much like that of Epiphanius, already noticed.

Photius was at first chief secretary to the emperor at Constantinople, and then, in the year 850, was raised by Bardas, the uncle of the emperor Michael I., to the metropolitan see of Constantinople, in which office he made open schism with the church of Rome. He was twice deposed and as often reinstated. He died in

891. He was the most learned of the Greek ecclesiastics of his time, and his writings numerous and valuable are still preserved. Especially worthy of notice is his *Μυριβιβλιον* or Bibliotheca, containing extracts from 280 ancient works read by him, most of which are now lost. It is quite common with a certain class of Protestant writers to date the papal anti-Christ from the schism with Photius.

Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, and by him ordained bishop of Smyrna. Of his family and native country nothing is known. He held his office for a long period, living on the most intimate terms with Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, visited on business of the church the bishop Anicetus at Rome, where he gave a sharp reproof to Marcion. He took Irenaeus under his instruction; and in the reign of Marcus Aurelius was condemned to death, between the years 164 and 168. The church at Smyrna gave a most affecting account of his death and his beautiful confession at the stake in a letter to the churches of Pontus, which is preserved by Eusebius (E. H. iv. 15), and has been published in full by archbishop Usher. He wrote a letter to the Philippians, which is for the most part still extant. Some answers to Biblical questions are ascribed to him, in regard to the genuineness of which serious doubts have been raised.

Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus about the year 196, wrote a synodical letter in the name of the bishop of his province to Victor of Rome, in which he resisted the assumptions of the Roman bishop, and affirmed that Easter ought to be celebrated on the 14th day of the month Nisan. Fragments of this letter are pre-

served by Eusebius, E. H. iii. 31, v. 24, which gave important testimony to the Gospels.

Polycarp, the celebrated philosopher of the new Platonic school, was born at Batanea in Syria, in the year 233. He was at first, it is said, a Christian, but afterwards apostatized and wrote an elaborate work in fifteen books against Christianity. The book itself is now lost, but copious extracts from it are given by Eusebius and Jerome. He quotes in these fragments, from Matthew, Mark, and John, also from the Acts or the Galatians. He assails the contents of the New Testament books, but never their genuineness. See Eusebius, E. H. vi. 19.

Ptolomy was a Gnostic, a disciple of Valentinus, about the year 150, of whom we have several fragments preserved by Epiphanius, giving important testimony to the New Testament books.

Rufinus Tyrannius, from Concordia in Italy, was a fellow student with Jerome in the monastery at Aquileia, where he was baptized. He lived for a long time in the East, principally in Egypt, and was a presbyter in the church at Jerusalem. He was an admirer of Origen, and on this account had a quarrel with Jerome, which, after a brief reconciliation, broke out anew after Rufinus had returned to Rome and translated some of the writings of Origen, and became excessively bitter. When Rome was conquered by Alaric the Goth, he fled to Messina, where he died in the year 410. Besides his translations from Origen, he gave a Latin translation of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius and a continuation of it, translations from several of the Greek fathers, apologies for Origen, and other

original works. His translations are very free and not altogether trustworthy, but his writings are valuable as testimonies.

Serapion was the successor of Theophilus in the bishopric of Antioch in the year 190. By an extract from one of his letters preserved by Eusebius (E. H. vi. 12), we see how careful the primitive churches were in respect to receiving books which claimed to be of apostolic origin, and how watchful they were to preserve the purity of the New Testament canon.

Socrates, a lawyer of Constantinople, was born in the year 380. He wrote in seven books an ecclesiastical history from the time of Constantine to the year 439. It is the best of the historical writings of that period. He and also Sozomen bore the surname of *Scholasticus*, an honorary title indicating the esteem in which they were held.

Sozomen Salamanes Hermias, was also a lawyer of Constantinople, and was living in the year 446. He also wrote in nine books a church history from 324 to 439; a more vivacious work than that of Socrates, but hardly so reliable.

Tatian was by birth a Syrian, but well instructed in the sciences of the Greeks. At Rome he became acquainted with the abominations of the secret doctrines of the heathen; and after studying the Scriptures in company with Justin Martyr, with whose school he was for a long time connected, he made open profession of the Christian faith. He as well as Justin was persecuted by Crescens. Tatian withdrew to the East, and there fell into certain Gnostic and especially Valentinian errors, taught *dualism* and *dôceticism*, be-

came excessively austere, and was the founder of the Encratites, who rejected even marriage as unchaste. He died about the year 190. We have from him an oration against the Greeks, written before he left the orthodox church. He here attacks the Greek philosophers, and asserts that they had learned all their wisdom from the barbarians, and that the doctrine transmitted from the Hebrews to the Christians was the only true philosophy. He even in this treatise shows a strong tendency towards the Gnosticism which he subsequently advocated openly. His Harmony of the Gospels is lost, though some account of it is given by Eusebius, E. H. iv. 29, and also by Theodoret and Clement of Alexandria, and he is alluded to also by Irenaeus. His testimony to the Gospels, as given by his Harmony, is of great value, as is abundantly seen from the statements of those who had read it. A writer of the twelfth century, Dionysius Bar Salibi, testifies that the Harmony of Tatian began with the first words of John's Gospel, *In the beginning was the Word*.

Tertullian (Quintus Septimius Florens) was born at Carthage about the year 160, and is the oldest of the Latin church fathers whose writings have reached us. He devoted himself at first to the study of the Roman law, but after his conversion to Christianity he was ordained presbyter, but whether at Carthage or Rome is uncertain. From this time with much learning and a fiery zeal he assailed Jews, heathens and heretics, in a series of energetic treatises. His own severe and fiery nature, and perhaps also the many annoyances which he suffered from the Roman presby-

ters, induced him, about the year 203, to join the Montanists; but he held their principles with moderation, and from this time onward he directed many sharp and energetic writings against the Romish church. He died, as some say, about the year 220, or, according to others, as late as 240. He writes in a peculiar and very difficult Latin style, but with rhetorical skill and great force and fire. His writings are numerous and have been well preserved and published very often. They are apologetic, polemic and practical. Being so numerous and diversified and written so near the apostolic age, by one who had been educated a Roman lawyer, and who was the son of a Roman soldier of proconsular rank, their testimony to the New Testament books is exceedingly interesting and important. His chief book, his *Apology* against the Gentiles, was addressed to the Roman governors in Africa; in his book on the testimony of the soul his object is to show that Christianity is founded in the nature of man. He wrote two books on marriage addressed to his own wife, in which he sets forth the principles that should govern Christian men and women in their domestic relations; also a work to show that Christians ought not to attend the games and spectacles of the pagans; another in defence of a Christian soldier who refused to wear the military garland; one to show that Christians should take no part in the construction of images or other implements of idolatry; an exhortation to chastity to a widow against a second marriage; a book to show that both married women and virgins should remain veiled in church; one against female extravagance in dress; one in defense of himself for putting

off the Roman toga and assuming the philosopher's mantle ; and on various other topics.

Theodoret, the only son of pious parents, was born at Antioch about the year 390. He was educated at a neighboring monastery, where he was associated with Chrysostom and Nestorius. In 420 he was ordained bishop of Cyrus in Syria, and is said to have had the superintendence of 800 churches. The country was overrun with Marcionites and anti-trinitarian sects ; but such was his zeal and tact that he brought almost all of them into the communion of the orthodox church, having himself, as he says, baptized not less than ten thousand Marcionites. In 431 he took the part of Nestorius, his early friend, against Cyrill, and for this he was excommunicated in 449, but was restored to the communion of the church by Leo, bishop of Rome ; and after he had at Chalcedon, in 451, publicly recanted and given his vote against Nestorius, he was reinstated in his bishopric. From this time he devoted himself to writing till his death in 457. He left a commentary on most of the books of the Old Testament, and on all the Epistles of Paul, and a church history in continuation of Eusebius to the year 427, besides several other works and nearly two hundred letters. His writings are among the best which that age produced ; they have been well preserved and handsomely published in good and readable editions.

Theodotus, a learned tanner of Byzantium, about the year 192, fled from persecution there and took refuge at Rome. Since he had denied Christ in that persecution for the sake of saving his own life, he was excommunicated by Victor, bishop of Rome. He

then taught that Christ was a mere man, and this led him of course to reject the Gospel of John. He was welcomed among the Montanists. A considerable portion of one of his works, containing important testimonies to the books of the New Testament, is still in good preservation among the writings of Clement of Alexandria.

Theophilus was the sixth bishop of Antioch, about the year 168. He was heathen or Saducee, but by the reading of the Scriptures, was brought to acknowledge the truth of Christianity and devote himself to the Christian ministry. Some account is given of him by Eusebius, E. H. iv. 20, 24. He wrote against Hermogenes, against Marcion, and a commentary on the four Gospels. These writings are lost. But we have from him three books in vindication of Christianity, addressed to his pagan friend Autolycus. He takes much the same views as Justin Martyr. The three days of creation preceding the appearance of the sun and moon he regards as typical of the trinity (τριάδος) of God, the earliest mention which we have of the word *trinity*. The account of vegetables springing up from the seeds he considers typical of the resurrection of our bodies, an idea which he might have borrowed from St. Paul.

Titus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, suffered persecution under Julian the apostate, and in the reign of Jovian attended the Synod of Antioch, in the year 363. His three books against the Manichaeans are still extant.

Valentinus, the celebrated Gnostic, was by birth an Egyptian, probably of Jewish origin, and educated at Alexandria, about the year 120. Tertullian says he

forsook the Christian church because he was not made a bishop. He formed a Gnostic system of his own, which he zealously propagated in the city of Rome, where he lived till the bishopric of Anicetus. His most celebrated disciples were Heracleon, Ptolemy, Mark, and Bardesanes. A gospel of his own, which he and his followers used, they called the *gospel of truth*. Several quotations from him, containing important testimonies to our sacred books, are made by the church fathers, especially by Irenaeus. Some account of him is given by Eusebius, E. H. iv. 11. He cites all the Gospels, but gives the preference to John, and was familiar also with the writings of Paul.

Victorinus, bishop of Pettau in Steiermark, towards the end of the third century, suffered martyrdom under Diocletian, in the year 303. He wrote commentaries on almost all the books of Scripture, of which only fragments remain. There is still extant a commentary on the Apocalypse ascribed to him.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

TESTIMONY FOR THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

EACH book of the New Testament is a distinct work by itself; as to the examination of its claims each must stand independent of all the rest, and the evidence of each must be separately investigated. Before proceeding, however, to this individual examination, there are some general considerations which should be continually kept in mind.

Those books, and those only, were regarded by the primitive Christians as a part of their New Testament canon which were written either by an apostle or by an associate of an apostle with apostolic superintendence and sanction. The authority of an inspired apostle was the only authority for a sacred book.

The four Gospels which we have, and these only, have always been acknowledged and quoted by Christians and heretics, Jews and pagans, as the authoritative books of the Christian church. Other gospels have existed, and heretics have claimed for them equal or superior authority to those which we regard as authentic; but it has never been pretended that the *Christian church* has acknowledged any other gospels as canonical.

Very generally the Gospels have been arranged in the order in which we now have them, which is prob-

ably the order of time in which they were written ; but many ancient authorities put John immediately after Matthew, thus placing the two apostolic Gospels together.

The origin of the Gospels, according to the best circumstantial evidence that we can obtain, seems to have been this: The apostles *preached Christ*, that is, they told their hearers who Christ was, what he had done, and taught, and suffered ; and explained the connection between the life and death of Jesus and the religious welfare of mankind. As was customary in ancient times, when books were rare and sold at an exorbitant price, many of their hearers took notes of their discourses, and sent copies of them to their friends. These notes, necessarily imperfect, without authority, and sometimes perhaps contradictory, were widely circulated. To prevent confusion and mistake the evangelists were divinely directed to write and publish authentic narratives, for the instruction of their contemporaries and posterity.

Luke refers to these prior accounts, which had been written and circulated, in chapter i. v. 1, of his Gospel : "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order," etc. "Many" can not refer to Matthew and Mark, who had written before him ; for two could hardly be styled "many ;" and in verse 4, Luke says he wrote, that the "certainty," respecting the Saviour, might be known. Now if Matthew and Mark had been referred to in the word "many," there would have been no need of writing another account, as they were credible and inspired writers as well as Luke, and the "certainty" could have been learned from them as well as from him.

The first three are called the *Synoptic Gospels*, because on account of their similarity, they can be taken together in one view and thus afford a sort of harmonized narrative of the life of Christ.

Those books and those only were regarded by the primitive Christians as of canonical authority, which were written by apostles, or by the companions of the apostles under apostolic superintendence.

The question in regard to the canonical authority of any book, therefore, was a question of simple fact, in respect to which the churches at that time had every opportunity of forming a correct judgment. Most of the churches were personally acquainted with several of the apostles; and every one of the writers of the New Testament was personally known to many of the churches.

The churches from which the books of the New Testament proceeded, were situated around the shores of the Mediterranean sea, from Egypt, through Palestine, Asia Minor and Greece, to Italy; and through these countries, in consequence of the extensive military operations of the Roman empire and the roads established for the convenience of the soldiery, and the glory of Rome and the preservation of her power, communication was then easy and frequent. These churches were engaged in a great and common cause, in the prosecution of which they were obliged to encounter obloquy and persecution of the severest kind; and naturally they became strongly attached to each other, and the more intimately connected the more they were separated from the rest of the world. Thus we find them relieving each other's necessities by char-

itable contributions (Acts xi. 29; 1 Cor. xvi. 1-3; 2 Cor. viii. 1; Gal. ii. 10). Ministers and church members traveling, were recommended by one church to another: (Acts xviii. 27; Rom. xvi. 1, 2; 2 Cor. iii. 1; Col. iv. 10). Churches sent friendly salutations to one another (2 Cor. xiii. 1; Phil. iv. 22). Apostolic writings were sent from one church to another (Col. iv. 16).

The churches so intimately connected, so frequently visited by different apostles, and teachers, and church members, and continually sending their sacred writings from one to another, could not be deceived as to what were apostolic books, and what were not. It would be perfectly easy to ascertain, in respect to any production, whether an apostle composed it or superintended its composition. If this were the case, the book was received as of canonical authority; if not, its claims to such authority were rejected.

It would have been impossible to impose upon these churches spurious books, as the writings of the apostles or apostolic men, during their lifetime, or the lifetime of the members of the churches who had been acquainted with them. Such deception, every one knows, would be impossible now. No one could write a letter to the churches of the United States or Great Britain, or any of the countries of Europe, and affix to it the name of any well known living preacher, as Spurgeon, or of one recently deceased, as bishop Whately, without exposing himself to immediate detection. Deception would have been equally impossible then; for communication was then equally easy and frequent between the several places where churches were situated, and the connection between the churches was still more intimate then than it is now.

The canonical books were kept in a sacred depository in the churches, as the manuscript rolls of the Old Testament are still kept by the Jews in their synagogues; and they were read in course every Lord's day as a part of the regular religious service. Books written by those who were not apostles or apostolic deputies, as Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp, and others, were also occasionally read in public on the Lord's day, for the instruction of the congregation; as ministers now sometimes read occasional communications from the pulpit. But the reading of these books did not make a part of the regular religious service, and they were not taken up till after the customary reading of the canonical Scriptures had closed.*

The internal and circumstantial evidence confirms the judgment of the ancient churches respecting the canonical authority of these books.

1. The contents of the books agree in every respect with what we know from other sources concerning the history of those times; and nothing can be detected in them inconsistent with their claims to authenticity. They exhibit no marks of a later composition; and the characteristic peculiarities of style by which the several books are distinguished from each other, give evidence of their genuineness.

2. The dialect in which these books are written, is a convincing proof of their genuineness. They are written in a Hebraistic Greek, which was used chiefly by Jews of the first century, and went into very general disuse before the close of the third century. These books, then, if they are forgeries, must have been

*Cave's Primitive Christianity, Part I. Chap. 9.

forged during the lives of the men to whom they are ascribed, or very soon after their death; and it is utterly incredible that such forgeries should ever have gained general credit.

These books, if written by the apostles, or with apostolic superintendence and sanction, are worthy of belief, simply as books written by capable and honest men, setting aside all questions in regard to divine inspiration and authority.

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPELS.

I do not here touch the question of the inspiration or divine authority of the Gospels; but simply the credibility of the writers as men—as men capable and honest, or incapable and dishonest. Their claims to inspiration will be considered in another place. As evidence of their credibility we observe,

1. They were well qualified to give testimony respecting all the facts which they relate; for three of them, Matthew, Mark, and John, were eyewitnesses of the transactions which they record, and Luke made himself acquainted with the facts by a diligent investigation of the whole subject. Their manner of writing, and all that we know respecting them, proves that they were men of capacity and discernment sufficient to make them competent judges of all the circumstances which they relate.

2. They give every proof of the most perfect simplicity and honesty. They impartially narrate their own faults and the faults of their brethren; when, persecuted and defamed as they were, it would have been very natural for men in their situation to endeavor to palli-

ate each other's failings. They expose all their own weaknesses; when, if they had been impostors, it would have been greatly for their interest to have concealed them. They record with singular fidelity the severe rebukes which they received from their master for their timidity, forgetfulness, thoughtlessness and unbelief (compare Matt. xxvi. 69; Mark vi. 49-52; viii. 14-21; Luke xxiv. 25, and many other passages). What stronger proof of honesty is it possible to require?

3. They changed their whole mode of life in consequence of their belief of the facts which they stated, and endured all manner of suffering in attestation of their truth. They themselves certainly believed that the things of which they testified, had actually occurred; and these facts were of such a nature, and such were the circumstances of the case, that the witnesses could not have believed them, unless they had actually taken place.

4. If their statements had not been true, the falsehood could have been easily detected;—for they were continually surrounded by bitter enemies who were ceaselessly watchful to seize upon every advantage to hinder their progress. The Jews from all parts of the world were continually coming to Judea, with full opportunity to learn everything that occurred there, and to report it when they returned to their homes. But the principal facts of the gospel history, instead of being denied, were admitted by its enemies; and Judas himself, who had been intimate with the disciples, enjoyed their confidence, and partaken in all their counsels, and who had every inducement to excuse his own

baseness by alleging crime against him whom he had betrayed, offered no such vindication of himself, but acknowledged that he had sinned and betrayed the innocent, and gave proof of the reality of his remorse and the depth of his wretchedness by violently destroying his own life. What stronger testimony can we have to the innocency of Jesus and the integrity of the gospel history?

5. It is impossible that the character of Jesus should be a fiction, invented by such men as the writers of the New Testament. Their education, character, circumstances, everything precludes the idea of their possessing the ability or the inclination to conceive and delineate such a character, unless they had actually seen it exhibited before their eyes. Where in that corrupt age, where in all the history of the world, could they have found a model on which to form so grand, so perfect an idea? And if a model, or even the nucleus of such a character, had existed, how were poor, unlettered publicans and fishermen to learn the skill to fashion and exhibit it with such beauty and effect?

A character possessing every virtue, without any of the corresponding failings, towards which, in imperfect human nature, each virtue leans—courage without rashness, humility without meanness, dignity without arrogance, perseverance without obstinacy, affection without weakness—always acting in exact consistency, and never ruffled by anger or depressed by despair, in all the severe and aggravating trials through which he passed. How could they draw such a character except from the living person? And who could this

person have been, if not he who came down from heaven? How short was his stay upon earth! scarcely three years of public life, and yet how glorious, how permanent the results! A world disenthralled, corrupting and debasing superstitions overthrown, men placed in circumstances of improvement by which they are continually advancing their social and public welfare; and now, nearly two thousand years after his death, while other founders of religious systems of more recent origin have already lost their hold on the human mind, the influence of Jesus of Nazareth is yet young and fresh, and more extensive and powerful than it has ever been before; still increasing and strengthening and brightening, evidently to go on till the affections of every human heart shall be gained, and every tongue shall confess him Lord! Has all this grown out of a fiction contrived by the poor fishermen of Galilee?

Another consideration of great importance, to be taken in connection with the exalted moral perfection of Jesus, and the wonderful good sense which characterizes his teachings, is the coolness and calmness and quiet assurance with which he makes the most astounding claims, which, if made by any human being would be absurd, revolting and preposterous in the extreme. For example, his discourse at Capernaum, John vi. 32-65, and also many other passages of similar import, necessarily imply that if Jesus were not the Divine Person he claimed to be, he was the most raving of fanatics, a supposition entirely inconsistent with the whole course of his life and every trait of his personal character.

It is true that these expressions are metaphorical; but let us look at them closely.

“Whoso *eateth my flesh* and *drinketh my blood*, hath eternal life.

For *my flesh is meat indeed* and *my blood is drink indeed*. He that EATETH ME, even he SHALL LIVE BY ME.”

These metaphors are so strange, so uncouth, and so intensely abhorrent, especially to all Hebrew conceptions and ideas, that when used before a Jewish assembly by a teacher so sober, so clear-headed, so full of practical common sense as the Lord Jesus, and repeated over and over again in continuous sentences, notwithstanding the offence which they very naturally gave, they certainly must indicate an idea utterly remote from the common range of human thought, unparalleled, and hitherto in human language unexpressed,—and all this occurs in the assertion of a claim peculiar to himself, a property which no other being in the universe, except himself, has or can have.

CHARACTER OF THE GOSPELS.—GENERAL REMARKS.

One of the first remarks we make on examining the Four Gospels is, that while the first three have a striking general resemblance to each other, the fourth is altogether peculiar, frequently in the substance of the narrative itself and always in the mode of narrating. So marked is this peculiarity of John, that the simple enunciation of a single sentence from his gospel strikes the ear in a way that precludes the possibility of referring it to either of the other evangelists.

Another thing which we notice is, that the several

evangelists, in narrating the same circumstance or reporting the same discourse, seldom or never employ exactly the same words; but rather give the sense in forms of expression slightly varied. To illustrate this fact by a single example, take the sentence which was pronounced from heaven at the time of our Saviour's baptism. Matthew (iii. 17) gives it, "*This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased;*" Mark (i. 11) "*Thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased;*" and Luke (iii. 22) "*Thou art my beloved son, in thee I am well pleased.*" A like variation is often observable in the quotation of the same passage of the Old Testament by the different writers of the New. For example, compare Deut. viii. 3, and vi. 13, as quoted by Matthew (iv. 4, 10) and by Luke (iv. 4, 8). In all these cases the sense is faithfully preserved, but the phraseology is varied. The writers of the New Testament, indeed, never appear to aim at exact quotations of language, and provided the meaning is given, the mode of expression is regarded as of comparatively little importance.

Two of the evangelists only, Matthew and Luke, give an account of the birth and childhood of Christ; but all the four are very particular in their details respecting his death and resurrection; for these were the great events on which the most important consequences depended.

The most important fact, however, to be borne in mind in reading the Gospels, is, that they are neither histories nor full biographies, but simply scattered notices of transactions and discourses intended to illustrate particular points in the character of Christ, and

so arranged as to secure this purpose, but with little regard to the order of time. The evangelists disclaim all intention of writing complete and consecutive narratives, and declare that their whole design is, by relating a few facts, to give such an impression respecting the character, teachings and works of Christ, as might induce men to receive him as the promised Messiah, the Saviour of the world (John xx. 30, 31; xxi. 25). The evangelist here says, expressly, that he had taken but few facts from the whole number which had fallen under his notice, and that these had been selected with exclusive reference to the object above stated. We are not to look, therefore, for complete biography or chronological arrangement in the Gospels, but only for detached examples of the teachings and doings of Christ, suited to illustrate his character.

The character of the Gospels in this respect can be easily illustrated by analogous examples from classical literature. After the death of Socrates, his disciples, Plato and Xenophon, undertook by their literary efforts to vindicate the character of their master from the aspersions cast upon it by his enemies. The work of Xenophon is divided into four books and subdivided into distinct topics. The topics of the first book are the following :

I. Socrates did not condemn the gods of his country, nor introduce new objects of worship.

II. Socrates was not a corrupter of young men.

III. What sort of man Socrates was, both in words and deeds, during his whole life.

IV. How Socrates demonstrated the existence of God.

V. How Socrates discoursed on temperance.

VI. Disputation of Socrates with Antiphon the sophist.

VII. How Socrates dissuaded men from arrogance.

Each of these topics is illustrated by anecdotes respecting Socrates, and by reports of conversations which he had with different persons, bearing on the several points; and these are thrown together in the manner best suited to illustrate the different topics, without regard to the order of time in which the transactions or conversations actually took place, and without any endeavor to preserve the appearance of continuity of narrative. Accordingly, this work is never regarded as a biography of Socrates, and is always referred to under the appellation of *memoirs* or *memorabilia*. Its Greek title *απομνημονευματα* (*apomnemoneumata*) is applied by Justin Martyr to the Gospels, and with great propriety, for they are works of precisely the same kind.

An examination of the Gospel of Matthew will show that it is constructed on a plan very similar to that of Xenophon's *Memorabilia* of Socrates. After a brief notice of the birth and childhood of Jesus (i. ii.) and his entrance on his public ministry (iii. iv.), Matthew proceeds to show what Christ was as a public teacher of religion, and gives an adequate example of the nature of his instructions and his mode of communicating them, by reporting at considerable length the substance of his sermon on the mount (v.—vii.). I say the *substance* of the sermon, for it is evident that Matthew does not give the whole discourse word for word as it was uttered, from the fact that Luke, who

in a briefer abstract of the same sermon (vi. 20–49), has yet inserted some things omitted by Matthew, as for example the three woes corresponding to the beatitudes (Luke vi. 25).

Matthew next exhibits Christ as a worker of miracles, and collects into one connected view several miracles of different kinds, wrought in various places and at different times, for the purpose of showing what Christ was in reference to the exercise of miraculous powers (viii. ix.).

He afterwards exhibits Christ in another view, as a teacher by parables, and collects together several different parables as a specimen of this most interesting mode of teaching (xiii.).

Thus throughout his Gospel, Matthew does not follow any chronological series of events or instructions, but groups together things of the same kind, and shows by a series of living pictures, what Christ was in all the various circumstances through which he passed. This mode of writing was chosen by him for the same reason that it had been before by Xenophon, because it was the best adapted to the particular purpose he had in view, which was to vindicate the character of Christ before his countrymen, and set it in its true light.

Christ had been the great moral teacher and benefactor of his nation. He had been undervalued, slandered, and persecuted all his life, and was at last unjustly doomed to a cruel death, attended with all the circumstances of indignity and shame, which could be brought together to blast his reputation and throw a shade over the splendor of his exalted virtues. Mat-

thew, his disciple, like Xenophon, the disciple of Socrates, knew and could appreciate his master's worth; and by a simple detail of what he did and said in various circumstances and on different topics, sought to disarm the prejudices of his countrymen, and bring them to see what sort of a man he was, whom their rulers *with wicked hands had crucified and slain*.

After these general remarks we shall now turn our attention to the particular circumstances of each one of the evangelists, the special object each had in view while writing, the distinguishing peculiarities of each one of the several Gospels, and especially the precise grounds of evidence on which each of these books stands before us in the Bible.

For a knowledge of these particulars we must rely mainly on incidental and brief hints scattered through the New Testament; for the evangelists never make themselves prominent in their narratives, nor give any details respecting their personal history and circumstances. *They preach not themselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord.*

The genuineness of the books of the New Testament is a question simply of historical fact, nothing more nor less, and like every other question of fact, is to be ascertained and determined by testimony, by the testimony of independent and credible witnesses, and this testimony not contradicted, but confirmed and sustained by the internal evidence. We have already shown in a preceding chapter, that the testimony of the early Christians, to their own sacred books, is at least as good and worthy of belief as any human testimony; and that if the facts in regard to

their books can not be established by their testimony, no facts of secular history can ever be established by any human testimony whatever. Before proceeding to the examination of each one of the historical books of the New Testament, we wish to give some general idea of the state of the testimony in regard to them during the first four centuries. We must remember that the great majority of the writers of this early period have gone into oblivion, their writings have perished, and the witnesses whom we can call are but the few survivors of an immense shipwreck. We will cite the principal witnesses by name; and refer the reader to the preceding chapter for a brief biography of the witnesses cited, which will show their value as witnesses by a statement in regard to their character and their qualifications to give testimony on this particular point.

For the first three, or the synoptical Gospels in connection, we call as witnesses, three of the personal friends and associates of the apostle Paul—to wit, Barnabas, Clement of Rome (Phil. iv. 3), Hermas (Rom. xvi. 14), and also Ignatius and Polycarp, the friends and associates of the apostle John, five good witnesses.

For the four Gospels in connection, the witnesses are Polycarp, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tatian, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome—thirteen witnesses, ten of them not cited before.

To the Gospel of Matthew individually, Papias, Justin Martyr, Hegesippus, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Pantaenus, Clement of Alexandria, Ter-

tullian, Julius Africanus, Origen, Eusebius, Cyrill of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Jerome—seventeen witnesses, five of them not cited before.

To the Gospel of Mark individually, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome—ten witnesses.

To the Gospel of Luke individually, Justin Martyr, the Church of Vienne and Lyons in France, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Julius Africanus, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome—thirteen witnesses, one not cited before.

To the Gospel of John individually, Barnabas, Hermas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Church of Vienne and Lyons, Irenaeus, Polycrates, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, Eusebius, Dorotheus, Victorinus, Epiphanius, Jerome—twenty witnesses, four not previously cited.

Witnesses to the book of Acts, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Dionysius of Corinth, Justin Martyr, Church of Vienne and Lyons, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome—fifteen witnesses, and one which has not been cited before.

Beside these witnesses, who all belonged to the Christian church, we have some valuable testimony which is anonymous, as that of the Epistle to Diognetus; and also other very important testimony, all corroborating the witnesses belonging to the church, from heretics and pagans and Jews.

Before proceeding any further, let the reader now turn to the biographical chapter (chapter fourth) and judge for himself whether any ancient books whatever have anything like the amount of unexceptionable testimony in their favor which we here adduce in favor of the historical books of the New Testament; and the other books will be found equally well sustained when we come to discuss them.

It is sometimes objected that these witnesses simply copy from one another, and that accordingly the testimony of ten or a dozen is no more than the testimony of one or two. To this we answer, first, that the statement is a mere assumption of the objector without any positive evidence in its favor whatever. The objection, as used in this discussion, is wholly the offspring of the imagination and has no historical basis to rest upon. Moreover, the objection is in itself altogether improbable. But very few out of hundreds and thousands of witnesses have come down to our time. The others have been buried under the ruins of past ages. To assume, then, that the witnesses which still survive of the second and third, and subsequent ages of the church, were taught exclusively by those few who still survive to our time of the first age of the church, and not by any of those who have now passed into oblivion, is to assume that which is on the very face of it an entire absurdity. The witnesses which we cite from each of the primitive ages of the church had the use of all the witnesses who had preceded them, and who are now unknown.

That we do not overstate the number of witnesses is evident from the pagan writers themselves. Tacitus

(Annal. xv. 44) says that the Christians in Rome, during the reign of Nero, and the life time of the apostles, A. D. 64, were already a "vast multitude"; Pliny, of the next generation, A. D. 112, in his letter to Trajan, gives a similar account of their great numbers in the remote province of Bithynia; while the Christian writers Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. i. 10) and Tertullian (Adv. Jud. c. 7) from A. D. 150 to 180 represent their believing brethren as thickly scattered over the whole known world, both civilized and barbarian. At the very time of the composition of the Christian Scriptures, or within one generation thereafter, there were Christian churches in every part of the world; and every church had its elders, (Titus i. 5) educated for their work, and fully competent to form a correct judgment in regard to their sacred books.

The witnesses of each of the primitive ages took the best matured results of their own time, and their matured results were drawn from hundreds of original and credible witnesses then well known, but since lost, as well as from the very few who yet survive. None of them depended exclusively on the dozen or twenty which we have, and who have outlived the ruins of the past.

All human testimony, even the best, is liable to error, and some witnesses are much more worthy of credit than others. We do not require that the testimony of every or any witness be received as infallible, nor that there should be no discrimination among the witnesses. We ask only that this testimony be treated just like all other human testimony; and be received as substantially correct, unless there be sufficient cir-

cumstantial or other evidence to contradict it, or unless the character of the witness himself be proved to be justly liable to suspicion. Let it be fully understood that we do not profess in any case to cite all the witnesses who are still extant; but only those whose testimony is the most full and the most easily accessible. With these preliminary remarks on the nature and extent of the evidence given, we proceed to the discussion of each one of the individual books of the New Testament, beginning, as a matter of course, with the historical books in their usual order.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

THE FOUR GOSPELS SEPARATELY EXAMINED.

MATTHEW.

MATTHEW was a Galilean Jew, and held the office of a receiver of customs under the Roman government, at the sea of Tiberias, near Capernaum (Matt. ix. 9). By Mark he is called Levi, son of Alpheus (Mark ii. 14). When a Jew became a Roman citizen he generally assumed a Roman name; and it is probable that Levi was the original Hebrew, and Matthew the assumed Roman name of this evangelist. He left his business at the call of Christ, and became his permanent attendant and one of the twelve apostles a short time before the delivery of the sermon on the mount (Luke v. 27). In enumerating the apostles he calls himself Matthew the publican (Matt. x. 9) or customhouse officer, a name exceedingly odious to the oppressed Jews.

The nature of the publican's office, and the injustice and oppression which these officers generally practised, were enough to excite odium in a nation less sensitive than the Jewish. When the Romans subjugated the Jews, they treated them as they did other conquered nations, that is, they required of every man, in addition to various taxes, the payment of an annual tribute, as a token of his subjection and for the support

of the dignity of the Roman empire. This tribute was extremely hateful to the Jews, who boasted that they had no sovereign but God, that they were Abraham's seed, and were not in bondage to any man. But oppressive as this tax was in itself, it often became still more so by the manner in which it was collected. It was customary for the government to expose the taxes of a province to sale, and he who would offer the most for them had the privilege of collecting; and all that he could obtain above the amount paid to the government, went to enrich himself. Those who had thus taken the taxes of a whole province, would divide the province into districts, and expose them to sale in the same manner; and often the district would be subdivided and sold again; so that sometimes three or four different sets of extortioners were to be enriched out of the surplus tribute money of the people, above that which went into the public treasury. As the right of collecting was frequently sold from one to another at an increasing price, it was for the interest of the publican to extort as much as possible; and as the general government participated with the publicans in their plunder, it was for their interest to listen to no complaint against the collectors of their revenue. There was scarcely a possibility of redress in case of wrong; and if one refused to submit to injustice, frequently by false accusation he was robbed of his whole property (compare Luke iii. 12-14; xix. 1-10). It is no wonder then, that the very name of publican became odious, and synonymous with that of sinner; though doubtless there were some who performed the duties of this office in an honorable and conscientious manner.

It is the unanimous testimony of the ancients, that Matthew wrote his Gospel for the use of the Jewish Christians of Palestine; and this testimony is confirmed by internal evidence. The writer everywhere takes it for granted, that his readers are well acquainted with the geography of Palestine; and he does not consider it necessary to explain any of the Jewish customs to which he alludes. The considerations, which he adduces to prove the Messiahship of Jesus, are such as would have most weight with Jews. He traces the genealogy of Christ from his reputed father through David to Abraham; and takes particular pains to show how the prophecies of the Old Testament were fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth. Compare i. 23; ii. 6, 15, 18; iii. 3; iv. 14; viii. 17; xii. 17; xiii. 35; xxi. 4; xxvi. 56; xxvii. 9. Indeed it is the leading object of his Gospel to prove that Jesus is the Messiah spoken of by the prophets, an argument which at that time Jews only could appreciate.

The testimony is just as unanimous and unequivocal that Matthew originally wrote his Gospel in Hebrew as it is that he wrote a Gospel at all. This will be seen in the citations of witnesses which we shall soon give. And if he wrote for the use of the Hebrews in Palestine previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, as all agree, there was an absolute necessity that he should write in Hebrew. By Hebrew is here meant the Syro-Chaldaic or Aramaen dialect spoken at that time by the Jews in their own land. This in the New Testament is called Hebrew (Acts xxi. 40; xxii. 2), and though not the pure ancient Hebrew, it is as much like it as the English of the present day is like the English

of the Reformation period. It is the language in which Christ usually conversed while on earth, as is seen from such passages as Mark v. 41; vii. 34; xv. 24; Matt. xxvii. 46. The Jews tenaciously held on to this their national tongue, using Greek only from absolute necessity; and Paul greatly conciliated a Jerusalem mob simply by addressing them in their native Hebrew (Acts xxi. 40; xxii. 2). When Paul on this occasion asked permission of the chief captain to address the multitude, that officer expressed his surprise that he found the apostle so well acquainted with the Greek language (Acts xxi. 37, 38). Josephus was a Jew of high rank, born about the time when Matthew first wrote his Gospel, and received the best education which Palestine could then give to her most favored sons, and he gives the following most explicit testimony on this point. *Antiq.* XX. xi. 2. "I have taken great pains to acquire the Greek learning, and to understand the elements of the Greek language, though I have so long accustomed myself to speak our own tongue, that I can not pronounce Greek with sufficient exactness; for our nation does not encourage those that learn the languages of many nations." Again in his preface to the same work, sec. 2, he says "it is a difficult thing to translate our history (the Jewish) into a foreign and to us unaccustomed language" (the Greek).

This being the case, (and who can contradict the testimony of Josephus on such a point?) if Matthew cherished any expectation of being read by his own countrymen, he must have addressed them in their own language.

How happens it then that there has been preserved

in the church a Greek Gospel of Matthew and no Hebrew one? The ancients assign two dates to the composition of Matthew's Gospel, one from A. D. 40 to 45, the other from the year 60 to 65. The inference is quite obvious that he wrote his Gospel twice, and the reason for this is very plain. After the overthrow of Jerusalem the Jews were dispersed and ceased to speak their own language, and the Greek became their usual tongue, as Hebrew had been before. Matthew, then, foreseeing this exigency, as the time drew near, prepared for them his Greek Gospel, and there being no further use for the Hebrew one it gradually disappeared; though Jerome affirms that he had not only seen it, in the famous library of Pamphilus at Cæsarea, but actually himself translated it into Greek and Latin.

Among the manuscripts brought to the British Museum in 1842, there is a very ancient Syrian Matthew, which Dr. Cureton has published, and which he supposes, not without some reason, to be the original Hebrew Matthew. It differs from our Greek Matthew only in phraseology here and there. The following is a specimen of the variations;

<i>Greek.</i>	<i>Syrian.</i>
i. 20, He shall save his people from their sins.	He shall save the world from its sins.
i. 23, God with us.	Our God with us.
i. 25, knew her not.	dwelt with her in purity.
vii. 5, hypocrite.	accepter of persons.
xv. 22, grievously demonized.	badly conducted by a devil's hand.
xvi. 19, the keys of the kingdom.	the keys of the gates of the kingdom.

Our present Greek is no translation, but an original from Matthew's own hand; and we have the evidence entirely satisfactory of a Hebrew Gospel of his, written some twenty years earlier, and indispensable to Matthew's purpose of introducing the life of Christ to his own countrymen. The Hebrew Gospel, as we are informed by Eusebius (E. H. v. 10), was found among the Christians in India in the latter part of the second century, by Pantaenus, the missionary and philosopher, who afterwards with so much celebrity presided over the catechetic school at Alexandria. He testifies that the book was carried thither by the apostle Bartholomew, who first preached the Gospel in those regions. According to the testimony of antiquity, which there is no ground for contradicting, the Hebrew Matthew was the first of the four Gospels that was written. Eusebius says that after our Lord's ascension Matthew preached in Judea, (for fifteen years, adds Clement of Alexandria,) and then went to foreign nations. He is said to have visited Ethiopia, Persia and Parthia, and to have died a martyr's death.

Matthew may be styled a plain, matter of fact writer; and the habits of his mind are evidently those of a man of business rather than study. He exhibits Christ mostly in his earthly character and relations; as a law-giver, promulgating the new dispensation from the mount, as Moses did the old from Sinai; as a worker of miracles and a teacher. Because he thus treated of Christ in his earthly employments and human character, his Gospel was by the ancients called *σωματικόν* (*somatikon*) or the *bodily* Gospel.

He is very brief in narrative, disregarding almost

entirely the order of time, but particular in his reports of the discourses and parables of our Lord, and generally he gives only just enough of the narrative to introduce the discourse. In this respect, as well as in some others, his Gospel bears a striking resemblance to the work of Xenophon alluded to above.

Indeed, there is the same sort of difference between the accounts of Jesus Christ as given by Matthew and John, that we find between the accounts of Socrates as given by Xenophon and Plato.

TESTIMONIES TO MATTHEW.

In all cases, in examining the testimonies cited, the reader is requested to turn to the name of each witness, in chap. fourth, and ascertain his qualifications to give testimony, as there stated. It is also to be noted that much of this testimony is given incidentally, and is all the more valuable on that account; that is, it is not expressly stated always that such an author wrote such a book, but there is a quotation from the book, or an allusion to some statement in it, which shows that the witness read the same book in the same way that we now read it, and assigned it to the same author. It is further to be observed that the ancients quote the New Testament very much as the New Testament writers quote the Old Testament, seldom with literal exactness, quite freely, often giving the sense only without regard to the exact words, as though they quoted from memory simply, as doubtless they often did.

The most important witnesses for Matthew are Papias, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Hegesippus, Letter to Diognetus, Irenaeus, Tatian, Pantaenus, Clement of

Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Cyrill of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Jerome, Julius Africanus.

As introductory to the quotations which will be made from the ancient witnesses in behalf of the Gospels, we commend to the reader's attention the following paragraphs from Dean Stanley :

“Irenaeus and Tertullian were two writers in the last quarter of the second century ; the former had spent his youth among the churches of Asia Minor, and had migrated among the Christians of Gaul ; the latter was a presbyter in the Latin church of North Africa. Both were strong traditionists ; and both distinctly appeal to the four canonical Gospels by name. But would churches so widely remote as those of Smyrna, Carthage, and Lyons, with one accord receive as Scripture four books which were only a few years old ? And besides, Irenaeus had been in his youth a companion of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John. Is it credible that St. John's Gospel could have been received by him if it had been never heard of till A. D. 150 ? Moreover, about A. D. 150, Celsus quotes both the synoptical Gospels and St. John, and says, ‘all this I have taken out of your own Scriptures.’ About the same date, Theophilus and Tatian both constructed a Harmony of the Four Gospels ; and ten years earlier still, Justin Martyr speaks of Gospels written by the apostles and their companions ; meaning, there can surely be little question, the four as we now have them. Twenty years before that, Polycarp uses St. Matthew, and quotes the first Epistle of St. John, which is allowed on all hands to be (under any supposition) by the same author as the Gospel. And about the same period,

Papias, a bishop in Asia Minor, who tells us he took particular pains to collect oral information from survivors who had known the apostles, describes how Matthew wrote originally in Hebrew, and how Mark drew his materials from St. Peter. The passage is but a fragment preserved in Eusebius, so that no sound argument against St. John can be drawn *e silentio*, any more than against St. Paul or St. Luke. Thus we are brought down to about A. D. 100, without a trace of any conciliar action, or of any controversy on the subject which can not easily be explained. The church emerges from the first century with the sacred book of the four Gospels in her hand. The very earliest apocryphal Gospels only attempt to fill up the blanks in their narrative, and never give a competing account. The most ancient of all was held by Jerome, who translated it, to be the Hebrew original of St. Matthew. The Montanists, in their wildest hatred of St. John's Gospel, could only attribute it to his contemporary Cerinthus. And every recent discovery, such as the missing end of the Clementine Homilies (containing a quotation from St. John), and the original Greek of Barnabas (giving St. Matthew's Gospel the honorable title of 'Scripture'), only tends to corroborate the proof, that we have in the four Gospels the primitive records of Christianity, and a trustworthy means for understanding what the mind and the preaching of the apostles really were."*

We subjoin a specimen of the kind of testimony which the ancient witnesses give in respect to Matthew :

*This argument is well drawn out in Tischendorf's pamphlet, "Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?"

Papias: "Matthew set forth his oracles in the Hebrew dialect, which every one interpreted as he was able." Euseb. Hist. Ecc. iii. 39.

Irenaeus: "Matthew put forth the writing of the Gospel among the Hebrews in their dialect." Adv. Haer. iii. ; Euseb. Hist. Ecc. v. 8.

Jerome: "Matthew, first in Judea, on account of those from the circumcision who believed, composed the Gospel of Christ in Hebrew letters and words." Catal. c. 4. "Matthew published a Gospel in Judea in the Hebrew language." Proleg. in Matth.

Eusebius: "Matthew, having first proclaimed his Gospel to the Hebrews . . . committed it to writing in his native tongue." Ecc. Hist. iii. 23.

Epiphanius: "They indeed (the Ebionites) receive the Gospel according to Matthew; for this both they use and also the Cerinthians. They call it indeed *the Gospel according to the Hebrews*; as it is true to say, that Matthew alone in the New Testament made the declaration and preaching of the Gospel in Hebrew and with Hebrew letters." Haeres. xxx. 3.

Clement of Alexandria: "Matthew having first proclaimed the Gospel in Hebrew, when on the point of going also to other nations, committed it to writing in his native tongue." Euseb. E. H. iii. 24.

Origen: "The first (Gospel) is written according to Matthew, the same that was once a publican but afterwards an apostle of Christ, who having published it for the Jewish converts, wrote it in the Hebrew." Euseb. E. H. vi. 25.

Ignatius: "How then was he manifested to the ages? A star shone in heaven, in splendor excelling

all the other stars, and its brightness was ineffable, and the strangeness of it inspired terror." Matth. ii.; Ephes. xix.

Barnabas already in his time quotes Matthew as Scripture, Epist. chap. iv. "As it is written many are called but few chosen." Matth. xx. 16; xxii. 14. Again, chap. v. "He did not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." Matth. ix. 13.

Justin Martyr: "The discourses of Christ were brief and compendious, for he was no sophist, but his word was the power of God. Concerning chastity he said this: Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart before God. Also, If thy right eye offend thee, cut it out, for it is profitable for thee with one eye to enter into the kingdom of God, rather than with two eyes to be sent into eternal fire. Also, He who marries a woman repudiated by another man commits adultery. Also, There are some who are made eunuchs by man, and there are some who are born eunuchs, and some who make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heavens's sake; but not all receive this." See Matth. v. 28, 29, 32; xviii. 9; xix. 11, 12. Apol. i. p. 21.

"Christ called not the just and the chaste to repentance, but the impious, the incontinent and the unjust, for thus he said, I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Matth. ix. 13. Apol. i. p. 22.

"He cured all sickness and all disease." Matth. iv. 23. Apol. i. p. 50.

"At that time some coming to him asked him if it were proper to pay tribute to Cæsar, and he answered,

Tell me, whose image hath the coin? and they say Cæsar's; and again he answered them, render therefore to Cæsar the things that be Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." Matth. xxii. 15-21. Apol. i. p. 26.

"He (John) seated by the river Jordan cried, I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but there will come one mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire, whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and his wheat he will gather into his garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Matth. iii. 11, 12. Dialogue with Trypho p. 268-9.

In the few works of Justin which remain to us there are from 50 to 75 quotations of this kind from the Gospel of Matthew.

Epistle to Diognetus: "Christ taught that we should not be anxious (*take no thought*) about food and raiment." Matth. vi. 25.

Tatian: "The Saviour said it is not proper to lay up treasure on earth where moth and rust corrupteth." Matth. vi. 19. Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. p. 463.

Athenagoras: "I say to you love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that persecute you, that you may be the children of your Father who is in heaven, who causeth his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." Matth. v. 44, 45. Legat. p. 11.

Theophilus: "Thus he teaches those that do good not to boast, that they be not pleasers of men. Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." Matth. vi. 4. Autol. p. 126.

Pantaenus: "To whom (the inhabitants of India) Bartholomew, one of the twelve apostles, preached, and left them the writings of Matthew in Hebrew letters, which is preserved to this day." Euseb. E. H. v. 10.

Clement of Alexandria: "But in the Gospel according to Matthew the genealogy which begins with Abraham terminates with Mary the mother of the Lord, For there are, he says, from Abraham to David, fourteen generations, and from David to the carrying away into Babylon, fourteen generations, and from the carrying away into Babylon until Christ, there are likewise fourteen other generations." Matth. i. 17 Strom. i. p. 341.

Tertullian: "In the outset Matthew himself, that most faithful reporter of the Gospel, as companion of the Lord, for no other reason than that he might make us acquainted with the carnal origin of Christ, thus begins, The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. De Carne Christi, c. 22.

"Matthew, bringing the origin of the Lord from Abraham to Mary, says, Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, from whom Christ was born." id. c. 20.

The genuineness of the first two chapters of Matthew has by some been called in question, but undoubtedly on doctrinal grounds, solely for the sake of getting rid of the narrative of the miraculous birth of Christ, and not for any historical reason whatever. The earliest testimony, as given above, is just as clear and positive to these two chapters as to any other part of the book, and the most critical examination of the

language and style has failed to produce any result unfavorable to the authorship of Matthew. See above, Ignatius, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Epiphanius, Julius Africanus, and others.

Irenaeus: "But again Matthew speaking concerning the angel, says, The angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream. Of what Lord he himself interprets: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, Out of Egypt have I called my son. Therefore a virgin shall conceive in the womb and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name Jesus, which is interpreted, God with us." Adv. Haer. iii. 9.

Cyril of Jerusalem: "Matthew writing a Gospel wrote it in the Hebrew tongue." Catech. xiv.

Epiphanius: "Wherefore indeed this Matthew also writes the Gospel in Hebrew letters and preaches, and begins not at the beginning, but derives the genealogy indeed from Abraham." Matth. i. 1, 2. Haeres. li.

Jerome: "Concerning the New Testament I now speak, that doubtless it is Greek, the apostle Matthew being excepted, who first in Judea gave out the Gospel of Christ in Hebrew letters." Praefat in iv. Evang. ad Dam.

Julius Africanus. This writer gives an elaborate statement of the different genealogies of Christ as they stand in Matthew and Luke, and proposes an ingenious method of reconciling them. It is perfectly certain that he used the same first chapter of Matthew which is found in our own Greek Testaments.

Here are a very few of the testimonies which we have in the earliest ages to the existence of Matthew's

Gospel, and as we now have it. We give less than a tithe of what might be adduced even from the scanty remains, which have escaped the ravages of time, of the primitive Christian literature. But the evidence, even from this source, that there was from the first a Gospel of Matthew, and that this Gospel, whether Hebrew or Greek, in fact both, was the same Gospel which we now have under Matthew's name, is beyond controversy.

GOSPEL OF MARK.

Mark was the son of a pious woman in Jerusalem, and the intimate friend of the apostle Peter (Acts xii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 13). He was also the friend and companion of Paul (Acts xii. 25; xiii. 5), till some neglect of his, which occasioned a misunderstanding between Paul and Barnabas respecting him, produced a separation (Acts. xv. 36–41). Paul afterwards became reconciled to him, perhaps when he met him at Rome in company with Peter, and speaks of him in several of his epistles with great confidence and affection (Col. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Philemon 24).

According to the almost unanimous testimony of antiquity, his Gospel was written at Rome, under the superintendence of the apostle Peter, a little after that of Matthew, and it was intended for the instruction of the Roman converts from paganism. To this, internal evidence corresponds.

He has many pure Latin words written in Greek letters, where the other evangelists use the appropriate Greek words.

For example *κεντυριον* (*kenturion*) the Latin *centurio* instead of the Greek *ἑκατονταρχης* (*hekatontarches*) *centurion*, xv. 39, 45, 35. Compare also xii. 42.

Again, σπεκουλάτωρ the Latin *speculator, executioner*, vi. 27.

The Latin phrases εσχάτως ἐχέει (*eschatos echei*) and το ικανόν ποιῆσαι *to ikanon poiesai*, v. 23; xv. 15.

The above purely Latin words and phrases, instead of the corresponding Greek, are used by Mark and Mark only of all the writers of the New Testament.

But why if he wrote for the Romans, did he not write in Latin instead of Greek?

It is evident from the statements of Tacitus, Martial, Juvenal, and the very inscriptions on the Roman tombstones, that Greek was generally understood and used at Rome during this period, and probably the children universally, when taught to read at all, were taught to read Greek. The emperors themselves, as Marcus Antoninus, when they became authors, wrote in Greek. Classic authors residing at Rome, and writing to Romans, as Epictetus, Plutarch, Polybius, Josephus, wrote in Greek. Justin Martyr, residing at Rome and addressing his two apologies to the Roman emperors, wrote them both in Greek. So of the Christian writers generally. Irenaeus, Clement of Rome, Hermas, and others, living in the Latin empire and writing for Latins as well as Greeks, used the Greek tongue as the dialect most generally accessible as the language of books. It is no wonder, then, that Mark, residing at Rome and writing for Romans, should write in Greek, nor that his composition should be characterized by Latin words and idioms.

He carefully explains allusions to Jewish customs, as if writing for those who were unacquainted with them (Mark vii. 2-4; xv. 6). He is much more brief than

the other evangelists, and has but twenty-four verses the substance of which is not found in Matthew and Luke. Unlike Matthew he is very particular in narrative, and very much condenses the conversations and discourses of Jesus.

There is no proof that he had ever seen the Gospel of Matthew before writing his own; much less that his own is an abridgment of Matthew's, as some have supposed. The contrary is shown from the fact, that he is in not a few instances much more particular in his narrative than Matthew. (Compare Mark v. 1 with Matt. viii. 28; Mark ix. 14 with Matt. xvii. 12-14; and Mark xiv. 66, 67 with Matt. xxvi. 69).

It is the uncontradicted testimony of antiquity, which there is no reason to doubt, that Mark spent the latter part of his life at Alexandria in Egypt, as pastor of the churches there; and it is evident from 1 Peter v. 13, that he had been with the apostle Peter in Babylon. Eusebius, E. H. ii. 15.

The witnesses for Mark especially, are Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome.

A specimen of their testimony we subjoin.

TESTIMONIES TO MARK.

Papias: "And John the Presbyter said this: Mark being the interpreter of Peter, whatsoever he recorded he wrote with great accuracy, but not however in the order in which it was done or spoken by our Lord, for he neither heard nor followed our Lord, but as before said, he was in company with Peter, who gave him such information as was necessary wherefore Mark has not erred in anything but was care-

fully attentive to one thing, not to pass by anything that he heard, or to state anything falsely in these accounts." Euseb. E. H. iii. 39.

Irenaeus not only directly quotes the Gospel of Mark; but the last verses of this Gospel, which have been rejected by many writers, he especially ascribes to the evangelist Mark. Adv. Haer. iii. 10, 6. "Mark says in the end of his Gospel (Mark xvi. 19), And indeed the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God."

Again, "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, transmitted to us in writing what had been preached by him." Euseb. E. H. v. 8.

Origen: "The second (Gospel) is according to Mark, who composed it as Peter explained it to him, whom he also acknowledges as his son in his general epistle." etc. (1 Pet. v. 13.) Euseb. E. H. vi. 25.

Justin Martyr: "In what suffering and torture the wicked will be, hear the words spoken in like manner on this point, for they are these (Mark ix. 44, 46, 48), their worm shall not cease and their fire shall not be quenched. Apol. ii. p. 87.

"And as also it is requisite to worship God only, he thus declared, saying (Mark xii. 30), the greatest commandment of the law is, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, with all thy heart and with all thy might, the Lord who created thee." Apol. ii. p. 63.

It is to be remembered, both here and elsewhere, that Justin does not quote book, chapter and verse, but only the sense of each passage, and for the convenience of the reader, I insert in parenthesis the

reference to the text quoted. This is to be noticed in every instance of quotations from the fathers, for they indeed, as has already been shown, had no chapters and verses to refer to.

Athenagoras: Mark x. 11, "For whosoever shall put away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery."

Tertullian: "The Gospel which Mark published, is affirmed as Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was." Adv. Marcion iv. 5.

Epiphanius: "And immediately after Matthew, Mark, the companion of St. Peter at Rome, is directed to put forth a Gospel; which having written, he is sent by St. Peter into the country of the Egyptians." Haeres. 51.

Jerome: "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, being asked by the brethren at Rome, wrote a Gospel in brief, according to what he had heard Peter relating; and when Peter had heard it, he approved of it, and gave it forth to be read in the churches by his authority, as Clement also writes in the sixth book of the Hypotuposeis." Catal. Script. c. 8.

Hippolytus: "Jesus says to all at the same time, concerning the gifts which shall be given by him through the Holy Spirit (Mark xvi. 27), And these signs shall follow them that believe, in my name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them, and they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." Concerning Spiritual Gifts, Opp. p. 545.

As observed before, and the reader must remember,

the author quoted, Hippolytus, does not give the name of the book, nor the chapter and verse.

Clement of Alexandria: "So greatly did the splendor of piety enlighten the minds of Peter's hearers, (at Rome) that it was not sufficient to hear but once, nor to receive the unwritten doctrine of the Gospel of God; but they persevered with various entreaties to solicit Mark, as the companion of Peter, and whose Gospel we have, that he should leave them a monument of the doctrine thus orally communicated, in writing. Nor did they cease their solicitations until they had prevailed with the man, and thus became the means of that writing which is called the Gospel according to Mark. They say also that the apostle Peter having ascertained what was done by the revelation of the Spirit, was delighted with the zealous ardor expressed by these men, and that the history obtained his authority for the purpose of being read in the churches." Euseb. E. H. ii. 15.

"When Peter had proclaimed the word publicly at Rome, and declared the Gospel under the influence of the Spirit; as there was a great number present, they requested Mark, who had followed him from afar, and remembered well what he had said, to reduce the things to writing, and that after composing his Gospel, he gave it to them who had requested it of him." Euseb. E. H. vi. 14.

GOSPEL OF LUKE.

Luke was a gentile by birth, and a physician (Col. iv. 11, 14), and according to the prevailing testimony of the ancients, a citizen of Antioch, where the follow-

ers of Christ were first called Christians. He was familiar with Greek literature, as is evident from the style and structure of his two works, the Gospel and book of Acts, and his method of addressing them to Theophilus. The introductory verses of his Gospel are pure and even elegant Greek, and the same may be said of his introduction to the Acts; and indeed wherever he writes independently in his own person, and does not quote from or relate the discourses of others.

He became a zealous Christian and made himself familiarly acquainted by personal investigation (Luke i. 1-4) with all the circumstances attending the origin of Christianity, diligently studied the Hebrew Scriptures, and was the constant companion of the apostle Paul.

Of Theophilus, the friend to whom he ascribes his two works, nothing is known with certainty. He was probably a Greek who lived out of Palestine, and perhaps at Antioch, the native city of Luke.

The Gospel of Luke was written at about the same time with that of Mark; and as the latter appears to have been designed particularly for the Romans, so the former seems especially adapted to the Greeks. Luke represents Christ as the Saviour of the world, without distinction of nations, and traces his genealogy through his mother Mary to Adam, the progenitor of the whole human family; in this particular affording a contrast to the obviously Jewish complexion of the first chapter of Matthew. He is circumstantial in narrative, gives the dialogues of Christ with particularity, and is careful to insert geographical notices of the places in Palestine which he mentions (Luke i. 26; iv. 31; viii. 26; Acts i. 12).

Of all the evangelists he is the only one who gives a detailed account of the circumstances which preceded and attended the births of John Baptist and Jesus; and in this part of his Gospel the style is more strongly Hebraistic than in any other part of the New Testament, if we except the Apocalypse. Luke probably copied this narrative and the genealogy just as he found them in the family of Elizabeth and Mary.

Luke was the companion of Paul in many of his missionary journeys, as we see by the book of Acts; and it is said that after Paul's martyrdom he preached in Italy, Dalmatia, Macedonia, Bithynia, and finally suffered martyrdom at a very advanced age.

The witnesses to Luke's Gospel are Justin Martyr, the Letter of the church of Vienne and Lyons, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Julius Africanus, Jerome.

A specimen of the testimony we subjoin.

TESTIMONIES TO LUKE.

Church of Vienne and Lyons. Of one of their brethren they say; "That though young, he equalled the character of old Zacharias (Luke i. 6); for he walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." Lardner ii. 162. Euseb. E. H. v. 1.

Tatian (Luke vi. 25): "You may laugh, but you will weep." Oration against the Gentiles, Lardner ii. 150.

Tatian composed a harmony of the four Gospels, of course including Luke. Euseb. E. H. iv. 29.

Athenagoras (Luke xvi. 18): For whosoever, says he, shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." Legat. Lardner ii. 196.

Theophilus (Luke xviii. 27): "For the things which with men are impossible are possible with God." Ad. Autol. Lardner ii. 205.

Irenaeus: "Luke, the companion of Paul, committed to writing the Gospel preached by him." Euseb. E. H. v. 8.

"Luke, also, the follower and disciple of the apostles, referring to Zachariah and Elizabeth, of whom according to the promise of God, John was born, says they were both righteous before God," etc. (Luke i. 6.) Adv. Haer. iii. 10.

Clement of Alexandria: "But Luke also in the commencement of his narrative, premises the cause which led him to write, showing that many others, having rashly undertaken to compose a narration of matters that he had already completely ascertained, in order to free us from the uncertain suppositions of others, in his own Gospel, he delivered the certain account of those things, that he himself had fully received from his intimacy and stay with Paul, and also, his intercourse with the other apostles." Euseb. E. H. iii. 2, 4.

Origen: "The third (Gospel) is according to Luke, the Gospel commended by Paul, which was written for the converts from the Gentiles. Euseb. E. H. vi. 25.

"But Lucius some suppose to be Luke who wrote the Gospel." Comment. ad Rom. xvi. 2

Justin Martyr: "As Christ indicated saying, To whom God hath given the more, he will also require the more of him." (Luke xii. 48.) Apol. i. 28.

"The power of God coming down upon the virgin overshadowed her. And at that time an angel being

sent to the virgin herself brought joyful tidings to her." (Luke i. 35.) Apol. i. 54.

"As also you can learn from the census that took place under Cyrenius, your first procurator in Judea." (Luke ii. 2.) Apol. i. 55.

"Therefore moved by fear, he did not put her away, but when the first census was taken in Judea under Cyrenius, he went from Nazareth where he dwelt to Bethlehem where he originated, that he might be enrolled" (taxed). Luke ii. 1-5.) Apol. i. 303.

"For that is what our Lord said, they shall neither marry nor be given in marriage, but shall be equal to the angels, being children of God, and of the resurrection." (Luke xx. 35, 36.) Apol. i. 308.

"In the memoirs which I say were composed by the apostles and those who followed them, we find that his sweat was as great drops of blood, while he prayed saying, if it be possible let this cup pass from me." (Luke xxii. 41.) Apol. i. 331.

"Yielding up his spirit upon the cross he said, Father into thy hands I commit my spirit, as I have learned this also from those memoirs." (Luke xxiii. 46.) Apol. i. 333.

Tertullian: "For from those commentaries which we have, Marcion seems to have selected Luke, whom he mutilated. Moreover Luke was not an apostle but an apostolic man, not a master but a disciple, as it were less than a master, and so much the later certainly as he was the companion of the later apostle Paul doubtless." Adv. Marcion iv. 2.

Julius Africanus. This writer compares the genealogy of Luke with that of Matthew.

Eusebius: "But Luke, who was born at Antioch and

by profession a physician, being for the most part connected with Paul, and familiarly acquainted with the rest of the apostles, has left us in two inspired books, the institutes of that spiritual healing art which he obtained from them. One of these is his Gospel, in which he testifies that he has recorded as those who were from the beginning eye witnesses and ministers of the word, delivered to him, whom also he says he 'has in all things followed.' Ecc. Hist. iii. 4.

GOSPEL OF JOHN.

John, the son of Zebedee and Salome, and the brother of James, was born in Bethsaida of Galilee, the native city of Andrew and Peter (John i. 40; Matt. iv. 18, 21). From the circumstances, that the father of John owned vessels on the sea of Galilee, and had hired servants in his employ; and that his mother was one of those who provided for the support of Jesus and purchased costly spices for his embalming; and that he had a house in Jerusalem, and was personally known to the high priest; it is inferred that his family were in possession of property, and of respectable rank. (Compare Mark i. 20; Matt. xxvii. 56; Luke xxiii. 56; John xix. 27; xviii. 15.) These circumstances of superiority might possibly have emboldened the mother of James and John to make for them the obnoxious request for precedence over the other disciples (Matt. xx. 20-24; Mark. x. 35). His mother was a devoted follower of Christ, but nothing is said respecting the religious character of his father.

He was originally a disciple of John Baptist, and was among the first to follow Christ (John i. 35). Having afterwards returned to his business, he was one

of the first whom Jesus called to the apostleship (Matt. iv. 18, 21). Andrew and Peter, James and John were the first chosen of the apostles; three of them, Peter, James and John, were selected by Jesus to witness the glories of his transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1; Mark v. 37), and the agonies of his humiliation in the garden; two, Peter and John, remained with him when all the others forsook him and fled (John xviii. 15); and one only stood by him to the last and witnessed his death (John xix. 26), and this one was John; and to him the expiring Jesus affectionately committed the care of his mother, requesting him to discharge towards her the duties of a son.

“Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother and his mother’s sister, Mary the wife of Cleopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus, therefore, saw his mother, and the disciple standing by, whom he loved, he said unto his mother, Woman, behold thy son! Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own house.”

Peter and John were first at the tomb of Christ, after the news of his resurrection (John xx. 2-8).

According to ancient testimony, John was the youngest of the apostles, and some four or five years younger than Jesus, and the Gospel designates him as the disciple whom Jesus loved.

He remained at Jerusalem, as Eusebius informs us, till after the death of Jesus’ mother and the imprisonment of Paul; when he went to Ephesus, about A. D. 65, to take charge of the important church which Paul had established there (Acts xix. 1-20). Soon after he

was banished to Patmos by Nero* (Rev. i. 9), where he wrote the Apocalypse. After a time he was restored to Ephesus, where he established a theological school, for the purpose of supplying the numerous churches with competent pastors, as they could no longer expect the continuance of miraculous qualifications. Hence he received the appellation of the *theologian* or *divine*. While engaged in this employment, he wrote his Gospel and Epistles; and in the reign of Trajan, he died a natural death at a very advanced age. (Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. iii. 18, 23, 31, 39.)

From several instances recorded of him in the Gospels, he seems to have been originally of an impetuous and fiery temper, which by the influence of the Christian religion became entirely subdued, and produced that warmth of affection, that soul stirring energy of love, the softness, mildness, and richness of feeling, which we so much admire in this beloved apostle. (Luke ix. 49, 54, 55; Mark iii. 17; ix. 38, 39.)

His Gospel probably was especially written for the use of his theological students, and it is equally distinguished for the childlike simplicity of its language and the depth and pathos of its sentiment. It is supplementary to the others, and consists principally of the

* Nero was of the Domitian family, and his full family designation was Nero Claudius *Domitius*, or in the adjective form, DOMITIANUS. This led to the misapprehension among some of the ancients that John suffered punishment under DOMITIAN and not under *Nero*, but this was by no means the case with all. The subject is very thoroughly and satisfactorily discussed by Guericke in his *Einführung in das Neue Testament*, p. 59-65, and 522-530, and also by Prof. Stuart in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, vol. i. p. 263-282. The discussion is too wide and involved to be entered into here.

discourses of Jesus, which are characterized by so great freshness and naturalness, and so strong an excitement of the most inward emotions, that we are inclined to believe that they must be given nearly word for word as they were uttered. The ancients, on account of these peculiarities, called this the *spiritual* gospel; and by a distinguished modern, Ernesti, it has been styled the *heart of Jesus*. Though the most simple in its language, it is the most difficult of all to be fully comprehended. There is great peculiarity in the use of words, such as *light, life, word, &c.*, and a depth of meaning which has not often been fully explored. It is always a favorite book among those who have full sympathy with the spirituality of the Christian religion, but very mystical and obscure to such as know Christianity only in its outward forms and precepts.

Chrysostom, in speaking of this Gospel, expresses himself in terms like the following: "If the spectators of orators, musicians, and athletes, sit with so great willingness to see and hear, how great readiness and zeal should we manifest when, not a musician, not a sophist, enters the scene, but a man speaking from the heavens and uttering a voice more majestic than thunder! For he seizes and holds the world, and fills it with his tones, not by a loud cry, but by moving his tongue with divine grace: and what is wonderful, this voice, though so great, is neither harsh nor unpleasant, but sweeter, more persuasive, more enchanting than all the harmony of music; and besides all this, most holy and most exciting, full of unspeakable glories, and conveying so great blessings, that those who with readiness

and diligence receive and retain them, are no longer like mortal men, nor do they abide upon earth, but rise above all transitory things, and being transferred to the angelic inheritance, so inhabit earth as if it were heaven." (Preface to Homilies on John).

Augustin speaks with equal enthusiasm. "In the four Gospels, or rather in the four books of the one Gospel, John has not unaptly been compared to the eagle on account of his etherial intelligence; for he carries his preaching to a much higher and more sublime elevation than the other three, and in his elevation wills our hearts also to be raised. The other three evangelists walked with the Lord as with a man on earth, and said but little concerning his divinity; but John, as if it were irksome to him to remain on earth, thunders, as it were, in the very beginning of his Gospel, rises not only above the earth and above the whole circuit of the atmosphere and heavens, but even above all the hosts of angels, and the whole order of the invisible powers, and makes his way directly to him by whom all things are done, saying: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' The rest of the Gospel corresponds to this great sublimity of its commencement. He freely gave what he had freely received. For it is not without reason, that it is said of him in this very Gospel, that he leaned on the breast of the Lord at the last supper. From that breast he imbibed in secret, and what he had imbibed in secret he gave out openly." (Tract. in Johan. 36.)

Origen also says, "It is not too much to affirm, that as the Gospels are the chief of all writings, so the Gos-

pel of John is the chief of the Gospels; but no one can understand it except by reclining on the bosom of Jesus; and so far, indeed, he must become another John, as John by sympathy becomes another Jesus." (Com. in Johan.)

But the most characteristic description of the peculiar style of John is by Matthias Claudius, an eccentric German writer. He says, "It delights me most of all to read in St. John. There is in him something so entirely wonderful, twilight and night, and through it the swiftly darting lightning—a soft evening cloud, and behind the cloud the broad full moon bodily; something so deeply, sadly pensive, so high, so full of anticipation, that one can not have enough of it. In reading John, it is with me always as though I saw him before me, lying on the bosom of his Master, at the last supper; as though his angel were holding the light for me, and in certain passages would fall upon my neck, and whisper something in my ear.

"I am far from understanding everything which I read, but it often seems to me as if what John meant, were floating before me in the distance; and even where I look into a passage altogether dark, I have a foretaste of some great, glorious meaning, which I shall one day understand, and for this reason I grasp so eagerly after every new interpretation of the Gospel of John. Indeed the most of them only crisp*

* See Goethe's Faust. Scene first, "Your speeches I say, which are so highly polished, in which ye *crisp* the shreds of humanity, are unrefreshing as the mist-wind which whistles through the withered leaves in autumn."

the evening cloud, and the moon behind has quiet rest." (Claudius's Works, vol. i. p. 9.)

The witnesses to John's Gospel are Barnabas, Pastor Hermas, Clement of Rome, Papias, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, the Letter to Diognetus, the Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, Irenaeus, Polycrates, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Caius of Rome, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, Eusebius, Dorotheus of Tyre, Victorinus of Pettau, Epiphanius, Jerome.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, who lived in the latter part of the fourth century, preserves the following curious tradition respecting John's Gospel, which is well worthy of regard. Towards the close of the apostle's long life, the first three Gospels were laid before him by his neighboring ministers, to which he gave his sanction, but said that important particulars had been omitted, and at their earnest request, he supplied those omissions in the Gospel which he then wrote. (Wordsworth on Canon, p. 136-7.)

We now give a specimen of the testimony above referred to.

Ignatius: "He also is the gate of the Father, by whom enter in Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the prophets and the apostles and the church. (John x. 9.) Ad Philadelph. c. 9.

"Wherefore as the Lord without the Father doeth nothing." (John viii. 28.) Ad Magn. c. 7.

"But living water, also speaking in me says within me, come to the Father; I rejoice not in corruptible food, nor in the pleasures of this life; I desire the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life,

which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, afterward born of the seed of David, and I desire the drink which is the blood, which is love incorruptible and life eternal." (John vi. 32, 33, 45; xlv. 51-58.) Ad Rom. c. 7.

Justin Martyr: "For Christ himself says, except ye be born again ye can not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (John iii. 4. 5.) Apol. i. 89.

"And Jesus Christ was begotten, the only genuine Son of God, being His Word." (John i. 1, 19.) Apol. ii. 68.

"But the Word of God is His Son." Apol. ii. 95.

"By the Word of God Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh." (John i. 14.) Apol. ii. 98.

"But the men supposed him (John Baptist) to be Christ, among whom he cried, I am not the Christ, but the voice of one crying, etc." (John i. 20, 23.) Dial p. 316.

"And he gave himself to be touched by them, and he showed the prints of the nails in his hands. (John xx. 27.) De Resurrect.

Epistle to Diognetus: "This (the Word) is the same who was from the beginning." (John i. 1.)

Epistle of the Churches at Vienne and Lyons: "And that was fulfilled which was predicted by our Lord in these words, The time will come when whosoever killeth you will think he doeth God service." (John xvi. 2.) Euseb. E. H. v. 1.

Barnabas, xii.: "And again Moses makes a type of Jesus, to show that he was to die, and then that he, whom they thought to be dead, was to give life to others; in the type of those that fell in Israel. For

God caused all sorts of serpents to bite them, and they died; forasmuch as by a serpent, transgression began in Eve; that so he might convince them that for their transgressions they shall be delivered into the pain of death. Moses then himself, who had commanded them, saying, Ye shall not make to yourselves any graven or molten image, to be your god, yet now did so himself, that he might represent to them the figure of the Lord Jesus. For he made a brazen serpent, and set it up on high, and called the people together by a proclamation; where being come, they entreated Moses that he would make an atonement for them, and pray that they might be healed." (John iii. 14.)

Pastor Hermas: "But the door is the Son of God, who is the only access to God. No one therefore will enter in to God otherwise than by his Son." (John x. 7-9.) *Simil.* ix. 12.

Clement of Rome: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, being beaten by the servants of the high priest, answered, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil, but if well, why smitest thou me." Kirchhofer, p. 144.

Irenaeus: "Afterwards John, the disciple of our Lord, the same that lay upon his bosom, also published the Gospel, while he was yet at Ephesus in Asia." Euseb. E. H. v. 8.

"All the elders testify, who were conversant with John the disciple of our Lord in Asia, that John delivered these things." Adv. Haer. ii. 22.

"John, the disciple of our Lord, announcing this faith thus began, in the doctrine which is according to the Gospel, In the beginning was the Word." (John i. 1.) Adv. Haer. iii. 11.

Polycrates: "Moreover John, who rested on the bosom of our Lord, who was a friend that bore the sacerdotal plate, and a teacher and witness, lies buried at Ephesus." (John xiii. 23.) Euseb. E. H. iii. 31.

Tatian: "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made." (John i. 3.) Orat. cont. Graec. 158.

"And this also is said, The darkness did not comprehend the light. The word indeed is the light of God." (John i. 5.) Orat. 132.

"God is a spirit." (John iv. 24.) Orat. p. 144.

Athenagoras: "But the Son of God is the Word of the Father, in idea and in work; for by him and through him were all things made, the Father and the Son being one; the Son being in the Father and the Father in the Son by the union and power of the Spirit, for the Son of God is both the mind and the Word of the Father." (John i. 3; x. 30, 38.) Legat. 10.

"For God was from the beginning, being eternal mind; and He himself had the word in himself being eternally endowed with the Word. (John i. 1, 2.) Legat. 10.

Theophilus: "As the Holy Scriptures and all who have the Spirit teach us, among whom John says, In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God; signifying that God alone was in the beginning and that the Word was in Him. And then he says, The Word was God, and all things were made by Him, and without Him there was not anything made." (John i. 1-3.) Ad. Autol. ii.

Clement of Alexandria: "John, last of all, perceiving that what had reference to the body in the Gospel

of our Saviour was sufficiently detailed, and being encouraged by his particular friends and urged by the Spirit, he wrote a spiritual Gospel." Euseb. E. H. vi. 14, compare iii. 24.

Tertullian: "Of the apostles, John and Matthew publish the faith to us." Ad. Marc. iv. 2.

Origen: "What shall we say of him who reclined on the breast of Jesus, I mean John? who has left one Gospel, in which he confesses that he could write so many that the whole world could not contain them." Euseb. E. H. vi. 25.

Dionysius of Alexandria: "The Gospel and Epistle (of John) mutually agree; for the one says, In the beginning was the Word, and the other, That which was from the beginning; the one says, The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we saw his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father; the other says the same things a little altered, That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, and which our hands have handled of the Word of life, and the life was manifested." Euseb. E. H. vii. 25.

Victorinus of Pettau: "For he (John) afterwards wrote the Gospel." Lardner iv. 211.

Dorotheus of Tyre: "John, the brother of James, who was made the evangelist of the Lord, whom also the Lord loved, proclaimed in Asia the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ." De Vit. et mort. proph.

Eusebius: "The Gospel of John comprehends the first events of Christ, but the others the history that took place at the latter part of the time. It is probable therefore that for these reasons John has passed by in silence the genealogy of our Lord, because it

was written by Matthew and Luke; but that he commenced with the doctrine of the divinity, as a part reserved for him by the divine Spirit, as if for a superior. Let this suffice to be said respecting the Gospel of John." Eccl. Hist. iii. 24.

Epiphanius: "Wherefore also the blessed John coming, and seeing men busying themselves with the lower coming of Christ, and the Ebionites deducing the bodily genealogy of Christ from Abraham said not that the Word of God, whom the Father begat from eternity was from Mary alone, nor from Joseph the husband of the virgin, but, In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Haer. lxix. 23.

Jerome: "The apostle John, whom Jesus especially loved, the son of Zebedee and the brother of the apostle James, whom Herod beheaded after the passion of our Lord, wrote the Gospel last of all, being called thereto by the bishops of Asia, against Cerinthus and other heretics, and especially the dogmas of the Ebionites, who assert that Christ did not exist before Mary." Catal. Scrip. Eccl. c. 9.

"He wrote this Gospel in Asia, after he had written the Apocalypse in the island of Patmos—the last of the Gospels." Praef. in Cod. Antiq.

RELATION OF THE GOSPELS TO EACH OTHER.

In the four evangelists, we have a fourfold picture of the Saviour; the same perfect character as it impressed its image on four minds of different structure and habits; and the picture in each instance receives

a different shade of coloring in consequence of the particular purpose and genius of each writer.

Matthew developes the character of Christ in the way best adapted to take hold of the devout Jews, looking for the hope of their fathers as promised in the Old Testament. Mark writes for the grave, severe, matter of fact Roman; Luke, for the versatile and learned Greek, whose eager curiosity could never sleep—and John, for the deeply reflecting, philosophical spirit, which feels keenly the want of that which earth cannot afford, and whose intense desires remain unsatisfied amid all the physical and intellectual luxuries that satiate the rest of mankind. Matthew exhibited the human and subordinate; John, the spiritual and divine of the Redeemer; Mark, his official character; and Luke, his personal history.

In the four we have Jesus represented to us as the Messiah, the Teacher, the Pattern, and the God. (Compare Olshausen's Introduction to his Commentary on the New Testament.)

Throughout the Bible, God recognizes the principle of approaching different minds by different means, and has so arranged his word that no constitutional peculiarity remains untouched. Whatever may be your peculiar temperament or habits of mind, in the Bible you will find a Redeemer adapted to your wants, and a Gospel suited to your condition. Try the character and claims of Jesus by the various and pressing spiritual necessities of men, and see how exactly he answers to them all; with what certainty he leads every variety of character submitted to his direction towards its own proper perfection; by what appropriate methods he

corrects every evil disposition and soothes every sorrow; how equally he reveals himself to the most enlightened and the least instructed of those who make him their Saviour; how uniformly all his precepts are fitted to the nature and condition of men and tend to promote their highest happiness; how strong a hold he has on the warmest and most devoted affections of all who choose him for their friend; with what undeviating confidence they trust him, and with what unshaken faith they preserve the consciousness of his presence and love; and how this confidence and faith, when regulated by his instructions, never fails to impart unalloyed improvement to the intellect and the affections; how hope by his influence continues steady through every kind of worldly trial, and brightens to rapturous vision when man is called to nature's last struggle—consider, also, that all this influence has been steadily increasing from its first commencement, and that the number, the zeal, the intelligence, and the power of those who act under it, was never so great as at the present time, and never so rapidly increasing—contemplate all this, as it actually occurs in this cold, sensual world; and awed by a miracle really more stupendous than the darkness and the earthquake, the rending rocks and the opening graves of the crucifixion-day, will you not exclaim with the Roman soldier, *Truly this man was the Son of God!* (Mark xv. 39.)

I ask the reader's careful attention to the following extracts from Augustin, as admirably translated by Dr. Wordsworth, in the introduction to his Commentary on the New Testament. I insert them here be-

cause the fathers had ways of looking at the books of the Bible, which in our day have nearly become obsolete, and which ought in some measure at least to be revived. The incredulity of our own times in regard to the Bible is due, not so much to the want of evidence as to the want of that reverence and affection and admiration of the Scriptures, which so distinguished the Christians of the early ages.

"We concur with those," says *St. Augustin*, "who, in interpreting the Vision of the Four Living Creatures in the Apocalypse, which represent the Four Gospels, assign the *Lion*, the King of all Beasts, to *St. Matthew*; and the *Ox*, the Sacrificial Victim, to *St. Luke*. The Apocalypse itself says, '*The Lion* of the Tribe of *Judah* prevailed to open the book;' and thus it designates the Lion as symbolical of Christ our King.

"St. Mark follows St. Matthew, and relates what Christ did in His *Human* Nature, without special reference to His functions as King or Priest, and is therefore fitly symbolized in the Apocalyptic vision as the *Man*.

"These three Living Creatures—the Lion, the Ox, the Man—walk on the *earth*. The first three Evangelists describe especially those things which Christ did in our flesh, and relate the precepts which He delivered on the duties to be performed by us while we walk on earth and dwell in the flesh. But St. John soars to *heaven* as an Eagle, above the clouds of human infirmity, and reveals to us the mysteries of Christ's Godhead, and of the Trinity in Unity, and the felicities of Life Eternal; and gazes on the Light of Immutable Truth with a keen and steady ken.

“The first three Evangelists inculcate the practical duties of Active Life; St. John dwells on the ineffable mysteries of the Contemplative: the former speak of Labour, the last speaks of Rest: the former lead the Way, the last shows our Home. In the former we are cleansed from sin, in the last we enjoy the beatific Vision promised to the pure in heart who will see God.

“He, who is the last in order, declares more fully the Divine Nature of Christ, by which he is Equal to and One with the Father, and in which He made the World; as if this Evangelist, who reclined on the bosom of Christ at Supper, had imbibed in a larger stream the mystery of His Divinity from His lips.

“This Evangelic Quaternion is the fourfold Car of the Lord, upon which He rides throughout the world, and subdues the Nations to His easy yoke. The Mystery of His Royalty and Priesthood, which was foretold by Prophecy, is proclaimed in the Gospel. The same Lord Christ, Who sent the Prophets before His descent from heaven into this world, has now sent His Apostles after His Ascension. He is the Head of all His Disciples; and since His Disciples have written those things which He did and said, we are not to affirm with some, that Christ wrote nothing. They wrote, as His members, what they knew from the dictation of Him who is their Head. Whatsoever He willed that we should know of His own Words and Deeds, this he commanded them to write, as it were, by His own hand. Whoever, therefore, rightly comprehends the fellowship of Unity, and the Ministry of His Members acting harmoniously in different functions under their Divine Head, will receive what he

reads in the Gospel from the narration of the Evangelists, with no other feeling than if he saw the very hand of Christ Himself, which He has in His own body, performing the act of writing.

In the first three Evangelists, the gifts of active virtue,—in the last, St. John, those of contemplative, shine forth. *To one man is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit.* One drinks wisdom from the bosom of Christ; another man is raised to the *third heaven*, and hears unutterable words. But as long as they are in the body, all are *absent from the Lord*. And all who believe with good hope, and are written in the Book of Life, have this promise reserved to them,—*I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him.* In proportion as we make greater progress in knowledge and intelligence in this mortal pilgrimage of life, let us be more and more on our guard against two devilish sins, Pride and Envy. Let us remember, that as St. John elevates us more and more to the contemplation of the Truth, so much the more does he instruct us in the sweetness of Love. That precept is most healthful and true,—*The greater thou art, the more humble thyself, and thou shalt find favour before the Lord.* The Evangelist who reveals to us Christ more sublimely than the rest, he also shows us the humility of Christ washing His Disciples' feet."

Another remark of St. Augustin's has in it so much of good sense, and is so far in advance of the opinions of many even at the present day, that I am happy to make place for it here :

"There are varieties, but not contrarieties, in the Gospels; and by means of these varieties we may learn some very useful and necessary truths. We are thus reminded that the main thing for us, is to ascertain the *meaning* to which the *words* are ministerial; and we are not to imagine that the Sacred Writers deceive us because they do not give us the precise words of Him whose meaning they desire to express. Otherwise we shall be like mere miserable caterers at syllables, (*miseri aucupes vocum*,) who imagine that the truth is to be tied to the points of letters; whereas, not in words only, but also in all other symbols of the mind, it is the mind itself which is to be sought for."

Wordsworth on the Gospels, p. xlvii.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

COMPARISON OF THE CANONICAL GOSPELS WITH THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS STILL EXTANT.

THE impugnors of the New Testament Gospels appeal to the fact, that there are gospels acknowledged to be apocryphal, as a proof of their theory that our recognized Gospels are also myths or forgeries. Any one who candidly examines these spurious gospels, and compares them with the New Testament, will find in them, not a refutation of our sacred writers, but a most convincing testimony to their intelligence, honesty and supernatural inspiration. So totally diverse are they from the genuine Gospels in conception, in spirit, in execution, in their whole impression, in all respects so entirely unlike, so immeasurably inferior, that the New Testament only shines the brighter by the contrast. They have scarcely so much resemblance to the genuine Gospels as the monkey has to a man.

The inspiration of the canonical books is proved quite as strongly by what they omit as by what they insert; and this ray of evidence shines out very clearly on a comparison of the apocryphal gospels with the Gospels of the New Testament.

An elaborate history and collection of these writings was first published by Fabricius near the beginning of the last century. The first volume of a new and critical edition was issued at Halle by Thilo in 1832. Prof. Norton has given an account of them in the third volume of his work on the Genuineness of the Gospels, but with an incredulity in regard to the testimony of the ancients which amounts almost to credulousness; yet it is very useful to be studied in connection with other and more credulous authorities. Ullmann gives a very good abstract of them in his treatise entitled *Historisch oder Mythisch*, and Guericke in his Introduction to the New Testament makes a brief and intelligible catalogue of them. Quite recently Dr. Hoffmann of Leipzig has compiled a life of Jesus according to the Apocrypha, accompanied with learned annotations. English translations of the principal apocryphal writings of the New Testament have been collected and published both in England and the United States. If this has been done with any purpose of bringing discredit on our genuine New Testament, the design has most signally failed, for on every fair minded and intelligent reader, they must produce directly the opposite effect.

Fabricius gave the titles of about fifty of such spurious writings, and the industry of subsequent investigations has added to the number; but scarcely one-tenth part of these are now extant, and probably there were never more than ten or a dozen distinct works of the kind, the others being different recensions of the same narrative, or different titles of the same work, or mere repetitions of each other. The best editions of

the apocryphal gospels are the two following, to wit, that by Thilo, published at Halle in 1832, who gives twelve ; and that by Tischendorf, published at Leipsic in 1854, who gives twenty-two. Not all of them, however, can with propriety be called gospels. Mahomet derives his idea of Christ almost entirely from the apocryphal gospels, not at all from the genuine.

THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

Not more than seven of these now remain, which are worthy of notice, three of them in the Greek language, two in the Latin, and two in the Arabic. They are the following :

1. *The Protevangelium of James the brother of the Lord*, of which the full original title is this: *Declaration and history how the most holy mother of God was born for our salvation*. This seems to be the most ancient and valuable of these books ; it was first made known in Europe by W. Postel, about the middle of the sixteenth century, and was published by Fabricius in his *Codex Apoc. Nov. Test.* The principal part of it is occupied (cap. 1–20) with the history of the birth and childhood of Mary, and the circumstances attending the birth of Christ. Then follows briefly and much in the manner of our Gospels (cap. 21, 22) the visit of the Magi and the flight into Egypt ; and it concludes (cap. 23, 24) with an extended description of the murder of Zachariah, the father of John the Baptist. The style of this gospel is far more simple and pure than that of any other of these apocryphal narratives, though in this respect, as in all others, it is immeasurably below the canonical books. Some things

mentioned in it are alluded to by Justin Martyr and Clemens Alexandrinus, and the book is expressly quoted by Origen. It was in existence, at least a part of it, as early as the third century, though it was much later than that, before it was ascribed to the *brother of our Lord*, or took the title of *Protevangelium*. It was for a long time held in high estimation by the Greek church, and publicly read at their festivals, especially those which pertained to Mary. Very probably many of the early church traditions respecting Mary are preserved in it; and in this respect it may gratify a curiosity for which the canonical Gospels make very little provision.

2. *The Greek Gospel of Thomas*. This is one of the most extravagant of the apocryphal books, and professes to give a minute account of Jesus from the fifth to the twelfth year of his age. It is filled with miracles which are wholly ridiculous, and some of them decidedly immoral and malevolent. The beginning and close of the book are very fragmentary. Irenaeus (adv. Haer. i. 17) refers to some things contained in the book, and Origen (Hom. in Luc. i.) expressly mentions it. There is not a shadow of probability that it was written by Thomas the apostle. It is evidently of heretical origin, and was highly esteemed and in great use among the Manichaeans. It is probably of considerably later date than the preceding one, and its Greek style is very impure.

3. *The Greek Gospel of Nicodemus*. This, next to the *Protevangelium*, is the most important and respectable, as well as the most widely circulated of the apocryphal gospels. It is divided into two unequal parts,

which seem originally to have been separate works. The first part (cap. 1–16) contains a minute description of the examination of Jesus before Pilate, and of his crucifixion and resurrection, and appears to be a remodelling and amplification of certain *epistles and acts of Pilate*, which are very early mentioned, but have not come down to us in a reliable shape. (See Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 76, 84; Tertull. Apol. 21; Oros. Hist. vii. 4; Euseb. H. E. ii. 2.) It is probably of Jewish-Christian origin, and written for the purpose of affecting unbelieving Jews by the example of Annas and Caiaphas, who, it alleges, were converted by the testimony of Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea.

The second part (cap. 19–27) describes Christ's descent into Hades and the wonderful things he accomplished there. This is apparently more modern than the first part. Some Latin manuscripts have an additional chapter, in which Annas and Caiaphas make oath before Pilate that they are convinced, from all the testimony, that the Jesus, condemned and executed at their instigation, is truly the Son of God. There are also printed with it, by Thilo, letters of Pilate to the emperors Claudius and Tiberius.

The book, in its present form, can not have been earlier than the fifth century, and was probably much later. It is not expressly mentioned until the thirteenth century. The prologue, which states that it was written in the Hebrew language by Nicodemus in the time of Christ, and translated into Greek by a Jewish Christian, named Ananias, during the reign of the emperor Theodosius, is evidently a mere fiction. The book was held in high esteem during the middle ages,

and before the invention of the art of printing it had been translated into Latin, Gaelic, Anglo-Saxon, German and French.

4. *The Latin Gospel of the Nativity of Mary.* This probably belongs to the sixth century. The prologue, which states that it was written by Matthew, and translated into Latin by Jerome, deserves no regard. It goes over the same ground as the *Protevangelium*; but is more minute as to the birth of Mary, and more condensed on the other points.

5. *The Latin History of the Nativity of Mary and of the Infancy of the Saviour.* The first part (cap. 1–17) from the annunciation of Mary to the Bethlehem massacre, follows mainly the *Protevangelium*, though with considerable variations and amplifications; while the latter part, the childhood of the Saviour, is more like the apocryphal books which we find in the Arabic language.

6. *The Arabic History of Joseph the Carpenter.* In this book, Christ is introduced as discoursing with his disciples, and gives them a long and marvelous account of the life, death and burial of Joseph. Its Arabic style has an air of antiquity about it, though it is somewhat bombastic. It seems to be the product of a Jewish Christian, and a translation from the Hebrew. It may possibly, in its present form, be as early as the third or fourth century.

7. *The Arabic Gospel of the Childhood of the Redeemer.* This book was in high esteem among the Nestorians, and may have been the product of some Nestorian Christian of the fifth or sixth century, and originally written in Syriac. Cap. 1–9 relates minutely



MOUNT OF OLIVES.

the birth of Christ; 10-26 the flight into Egypt, and the wonderful miracles wrought by his presence, his clothes, the water in which he had been washed, etc.; 27-35 another course of miracles through the instigation of Mary; 36-49 miracles wrought by the boy of his own accord, all of them childish, some of them obscene; and cap. 50 relates a visit made to the temple at Jerusalem.

ABSTRACT OF THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

Having thus given an account of these books, it remains that we present an outline of their contents, in order to afford opportunity for a comparison between them and the genuine. To avoid repetition, it will be most convenient to do this in the form which Ullmann has adopted in the work above referred to, namely, by grouping into one view what is said in the different books respecting the same person or subject. Each subject, however, has some one book particularly devoted to it, so that an analysis of a subject is generally the analysis of a book. We begin with

JOSEPH. According to the Arabic *History of Joseph* (No. 6), Christ, seated in the midst of his disciples on the mount of Olives, relates for substance the following story: "Joseph, well acquainted with the arts and sciences, was a priest in the temple of the Lord; but he pursued his carpenter's trade, and lived, even in Egypt, by the labor of his hands, that, according to the law, he might not, for his support, be chargeable to any one. He was highly distinguished, not only by his intellectual qualities, but also by the physical; he never suffered from weakness, his sight never

failed, he never lost a tooth nor had the toothache, he never lost his presence of mind, he always walked erect, he never had a pain in his limbs, and was always fresh and cheerful for labor. He lived to be a hundred and twelve years old, and it was not till near the close of his life that he felt any diminution of the liveliness and vigor of his mind or body, or lost in any degree his interest in his handicraft. An angel announced to him his approaching death. He prayed God not to permit frightful-looking demons to come in his way, nor the gate-keepers of paradise to obstruct the entering in of his soul, nor the lions to rush upon him, nor the waves of the fiery sea, through which his soul must pass, to overwhelm him, before he had seen the glory of God. In the anguish of death Joseph cursed himself, his life, the day of his birth, the breasts he had sucked; he heaped up all kinds of accusations against himself, besides original sin, all kinds of actual sin, untruthfulness, hypocrisy, reproachfulness, fraud, and many others. In this distress he calls upon Jesus, the Nazarene, as his Saviour and deliverer, his Lord and God, begs his pardon that he, through ignorance, had sinned against the mystery of his miraculous birth by an unworthy suspicion, and then concludes, 'O my Lord and God, be not angry, and condemn me not on account of that hour; I am thy servant, and the son of thy handmaid, and thou art my Lord, my God and Saviour, the Son of God in truth.' This earnest prayer of Joseph not to be forsaken, being satisfactory, Jesus laid his hand upon the bosom of the dying man, and perceived that his soul was about to flee out of his mouth; and from the south he sees

death and hell approaching with their fiery troop ; and then, at his prayer, the archangels Michael and Gabriel appear, receive the soul of Joseph, enfold it in a lustrous garment, and protect it from the demons of darkness, which are found on the way. At the lamentations of the family, Nazareth and Galilee come together and take part in the mourning. Jesus utters a prayer which he had composed before he was born of Mary, and as soon as he says 'Amen,' a multitude of the heavenly host draws near ; he commands one of them to spread out a resplendent shroud, and therein enwrap the body of Joseph. Then he blessed the dead ; no smell of death should proceed from him, no worm should touch him, no limb should be decomposed, no hair should fall from his head ; but he should remain entire and uninjured till the millennial feast. Afterwards the most distinguished men in the city come to array Joseph in his grave-clothes, but they can not remove from him the linen garment ; so closely and immovably does it adhere to his body, that they can not find a single fold by which they can seize hold of it."

The apostles, to whom Jesus relates all this, only wonder that Joseph, the just one, whom Jesus calls his father, whose festival by the command of Jesus all the world must annually celebrate, was not, by the miraculous power of Jesus, made immortal, like Enoch and Elijah. To this Jesus replies, that by Adam all men without exception, who descended from him, are made mortal—that this is the fate which even Enoch and Elijah, who as yet retain their bodies, will experience at the final consummation, when four will be slain

by Anti-Christ, namely, Enoch and Elijah, Shilo and Tabitha.

Towards the close of the book the celebration of Joseph's festival is most earnestly enjoined, as also the copying and circulating of this history of Joseph. Whoever, on the festival of Joseph, distributes alms, or offers gifts and prayers, shall be rewarded thirty, sixty, and a hundred fold; whoever copies the history of his life, him will Christ commend to the special protection of God for perfect absolution; the poor, who have nothing to give, must at least give the name of Joseph to a new born son, and thus protect him from poverty and sudden death; and finally, as Christ in the canonical Gospels says, "Go and teach all nations," so here he says, "Proclaim to them the death of my father Joseph, celebrate his birth with a yearly festival; and he who adds to this word or takes from it, is guilty of sin."

In reading such a gospel as this, what a totally different atmosphere we breathe from that of the canonical Gospels! We are transported at once to another age, to a different planet, to a totally diverse world of ideas. It is as different from the New Testament Gospels as Jack the Giant-killer is from Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. Yet it was written in or near the same country as the canonical Gospels, and probably not many generations later.

MARY. Here we derive our information mainly from the book already quoted (No. 6), from the *Protevangelium* (No. 1), from the *Gospel of the Nativity of Mary* (No. 4), and from the *History of the Nativity of Mary* (No. 5). In the *History of Joseph* (No. 6),

Jesus makes the following statements respecting his mother, namely, that when she was three years old she was brought into the temple and remained there nine years, till she was twelve. At the close of this period, on consultation with the priests, that the change of constitution might not occur to her in the temple, and thereby God be incensed, it was resolved to give her to a just and pious man. Twelve venerable men from the tribe of Judah were called together, and the lot cast, by which she was given to Joseph, who took her away. With Joseph Mary found children of a former marriage, among them James, whom she brought up, and thence she was called the mother of James. In the fourteenth year of Mary's age, Christ, with the approbation of the Father, and the concurrence of the Holy Ghost, accomplished through her his incarnation, being born in a mysterious way which no created being can understand. The birth, on account of which Joseph went with Mary to Bethlehem, occurred in that prophetic city in a cave near the grave of Rachel. Satan informed Herod of it, and this occasioned the persecution and flight into Egypt. Says Jesus: "Then Joseph arose and took my mother, and I rested in her bosom, and Salome accompanied us on our journey to Egypt." The family remained in Egypt a year, and Jesus relates all the circumstances, as if he had the most perfect recollection of them.

The account of Mary in the *Protevangelium* is far more minute and circumstantial. In this narrative she is in a miraculous manner promised to her parents, Joachim and Anna, who had long been childless, and mourned and suffered much on that account. When

Mary was six months old, her mother put her on the floor to see whether she could stand, and she walked seven steps and then came back to the arms of her mother. In her third year she was brought into the temple attended by a company of pure virgins, and was received by the high priest with the eulogistic words: "Mary, the Lord hath exalted thy name among all generations, and in the last days God will reveal to thee the treasures of his redemption for the sons of Israel." Then the high priest placed her on the third step of the altar, and she sprang upon her feet and the whole house of Israel loved her. Mary was now brought up like a dove in the temple of the Lord, and received her food from the hand of an angel. By a revelation made to the high priest, at twelve years of age she must be betrothed to an Israelite for her protection, and this her protector must be pointed out by a divine token. All the widowers of the people were to come together with their staves; and he on whose staff the sign appeared, was to take her away. A dove flew out from the staff of Joseph, the last one, and rested upon his head; and then, notwithstanding his reluctance, Mary was given to him.

When Mary first went out to draw water, she heard a voice: "Hail, thou favored one, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women." She looked about her to the right and left to see whence the voice proceeded; and when she returned to the house, the angel of the Lord met her, and announced to her that she would be the mother of the Son of God. Joseph, when he sometime after returned from his work, was exceedingly shocked at the appearance of



BETHLEHEM.



Mary, and broke out into the most bitter complaints against her, both on her account and on his own. She resolutely asserted her purity. The affair came to the ears of the high priest, who called them before him and loaded them with reproaches. Mary affirmed that she was pure, and Joseph that he was innocent; and they both passed the ordeal by drinking the water of proof, and with a result so clear that the high priest acquitted them. Soon after, on account of the enrollment, they took their journey to Bethlehem; and on the way Joseph, perceiving that Mary is sometimes sad and sometimes laughing, inquires of her the cause. She answers: "I see two nations before mine eyes, the one sighing and weeping, the other exulting and laughing." When the time of her delivery drew near, Joseph placed her in a cave and went out to seek a nurse. And here for a few sentences we will give the narrative literally as it is contained in the gospel.

"As I was going (said Joseph) I looked up into the air and I saw the clouds astonished, and the fowls of the air stopping in the midst of their flight. And I looked down towards the earth, and I saw a table spread, and working people sitting around it, but their hands were upon the table and they did not move to eat. They who had meat in their mouths did not eat, they who lifted their hands to the table did not draw them back, and they who lifted them up to their mouths, did not put anything in, but all their faces were fixed upwards. And I beheld there sheep dispersed, and yet the sheep stood still, and the shepherd lifted up his hand to smite them, and his hand continued up. And I looked into the river, and saw the

kids with their mouths close to the water, and touching it, but they did not drink. Then I beheld a woman coming down from the mountains, and she said to me, 'Whither art thou going, O man?' And I said to her, 'I go to inquire for a Hebrew midwife.' She replied to me, 'Where is the woman that is to be delivered?' And I answered, 'In the cave, and she is betrothed to me.' Then said the midwife, 'Is she not thy wife?' Joseph answered, 'It is Mary, who was educated in the holy of holies, in the house of the Lord, and she fell to me by lot, and is not my wife, but hath conceived by the Holy Ghost.' The midwife said, 'Is this true?' He answered, 'Come and see.' And the midwife went along with him and stood in the cave. Then a bright cloud overshadowed the cave, and the midwife said, 'This day my soul is magnified, for mine eyes have seen surprising things, and salvation is brought forth to Israel.' But on a sudden the cloud became a great light in the cave, so that their eyes could not bear it. But the light gradually decreased, until the infant appeared and sucked the breast of his mother Mary. Then the midwife cried out and said, 'How glorious a day is this, wherein mine eyes have seen this extraordinary sight!' And the midwife went out of the cave, and Salome met her. And the midwife said to her, 'Salome, Salome, I will tell you a most surprising thing which I saw. A virgin hath brought forth, which is a thing contrary to nature.' To which Salome replied, 'As the Lord my God liveth, unless I receive particular proof of this matter I will not believe that a virgin hath brought forth.' "

The narrative goes on to inform us that Salome entered the cave, and proceeded to examine that she might have demonstration of this wonderful fact, when her hand was seized with a blazing fire and excruciating pain; and it was only by earnest prayer and the interposition of a miracle, an angel directing her to take the child in her arms, that she was rescued.

The Latin *Gospel of the Birth of Mary* (No. 4) is similar to the preceding, but has some things peculiar to itself. According to this, as many of the greatest and most holy persons were born of mothers before unfruitful, such was the case also with Mary. She was promised to her mother Anna as a special gift of God, by an angel, who also predicted her course of life. In her third year, having been taken by her parents to the temple, without a leader she walked up the steps like an adult; and hereby the Lord indicated her future destination. During her residence in the temple, she was daily visited by angels and enjoyed the visions of God, whereby she was protected from all evil and filled with all good. In her fourteenth year, by the direction of the priest, she with her companions were to be betrothed. They consented, but Mary resisted because she had vowed perpetual virginity. The priest in perplexity asked for a divine oracle, and was pointed to Isaiah xi. 1. In order now to espouse her to some one, he called together all the unmarried men of the house of David. They were to appear with their staves; and he whose staff should blossom, or upon which the Spirit of the Lord should rest in the form of a dove, should be affianced to the virgin and take her under his protection. The decision was in favor

of Joseph, for a dove came from heaven and seated itself upon his staff. During her residence in the house of Joseph, the angel of the annunciation appeared to her and she at once recognized him as a heavenly messenger, for she had already become familiar with such appearances. The angel promised to her a son, whom she would conceive and bring into the world without sin and with virginity intact. Mary wished to know how this were possible; and the angel informed her that it would be without the aid of man, solely by the Holy Ghost and the power of the Most High.

The same general features pervade the other *History of the Nativity of Mary* (No. 5), though with enlargements and additions, and still greater extravagances. According to this, Mary, when three years old, was like an adult; her face glistened like the snow, so that one could scarcely look at it; she busied herself with all the labors appropriate to woman, but especially with prayer, in which she continued from early dawn till the third hour of the day, and then again from the ninth hour onward, till there appeared to her the angel of the Lord, from whose hand she received her food, in order that she might daily grow in the love of God. Never was virgin more pious, more pure, more virtuous, more lovely, better instructed in the wisdom of the divine law; she was firm, always equable, immovable, constantly increasing in goodness. She took care for her companions, that none of them should fail in word, or laugh aloud, or do anything wrong. She lived only on angelic food; the provisions which she received from the priests in the temple she

distributed among the poor. When a sick person touched her, he returned well to his house. Frequently angels were seen waiting upon her and talking with her.


In the choice of a husband for her, three thousand men came together and deposited their staves with the high priest. Joseph, who was highly esteemed as an elder, would not take his staff again; but the high priest Abiathar called after him with a loud voice, and when he received his staff, out of the top of it there came a dove, whiter than snow, and of great beauty, which flew a long time about the pinnacles of the temple, and then soared away to heaven. Joseph took Mary, and also five other virgins to whom the high priest had assigned work, namely, Rebecca, Scephiphora, Susanna, Abigail, and Zabel. Mary obtained by lot the most honorable work, namely, the sewing of purple for curtains of the temple; and on this account, the other virgins called her the queen. On the third day, while about her usual employment, an angel of wonderful beauty appeared to her, and made to her the annunciation, etc., etc.

Contrast all this fanfaronade of childishness, superstition and foolery, with the few brief, simple, and rigidly common-sense notices of Mary, which we find in the four canonical Gospels. Can any two kinds of writing be more utterly unlike?

CHRIST. We next turn our attention to the account which these books give of Christ himself. Here the contrast between them and the canonical Gospels appears, if possible, in still stronger colors. There is nothing of the Christ whom we find in the New Testa-

ment. All is puerile, bizarre, extravagant. The real dignity, the steady benevolence, the unvarying good sense of the New Testament Christ, are wholly unknown. The periods of life selected, and the topics treated, are wholly different from those of the New Testament.

Infancy and Childhood of Christ. These topics occur in but two of the canonical Gospels, and are there treated very briefly; but they make the great staple of the apocryphal gospels, and are drawn out to a most wearisome length. The most minute and characteristic of these narratives is the *Arabic Gospel of the Childhood of the Redeemer*. According to this book, while the child Jesus was lying in his cradle he said to his mother, "I, whom thou hast brought forth, am Jesus, the Son of God, the Logos, as the angel Gabriel announced to thee; and I am sent by my Father for the salvation of the world." At his birth his parents are in a cave, amid the splendor of lights which shine more brightly than the light of the sun. The woman called in by Joseph, as soon as she saw that Mary was the mother, exclaimed, "Thou art not like the daughters of Eve;" to which Mary replied: "As none among the children is like my child, so his mother has not her like among women." Mary allows the nurse to lay her hands on the child, and thus are they made clean. The child is circumcised in the cave, and the Hebrew woman preserves the foreskin in a vessel of spikenard, the same vessel from which afterwards Mary the sinner anointed the head and feet of the Lord. To the Magi, who came in consequence of a prophesy of Zoroaster, Mary gave one of the swad-



CAVE OF THE NATIVITY.

dling cloths in which the child had been wrapped, and they received it as the choicest treasure. On their return home, they held a festival, and, according to their custom in religious worship, kindled a fire, and into it they threw the bandage, which, however, remained unscorched, as if the fire had not touched it. They kissed it, spread it over their heads and eyes, and said, "This is an undoubted truth, verily it is a great thing that the fire can not destroy it." And they took the bandage, and with great reverence preserved it in their treasury.

Next comes the narrative of the journey into Egypt, and a loose, disconnected story of the strangest and most trivial miracles. The holy family come to a city which is the abode of the most distinguished god in the land; and the moment they take lodgings in a public house, there is great excitement among the citizens, and they flock to their god to learn the cause. He replies, "An unknown God has arrived here, and he is God in truth; and besides him there is no one worthy to be worshipped, for he is indeed the Son of God." In that same hour the idol fell to pieces, and at his fall came all the inhabitants of Egypt with the other citizens running together; and a son of the priest, three years old, who was possessed of many devils, being seized with his frenzy, ran to the public house, where Mary was washing and drying her child's linen, one piece of which the demoniac boy caught down and placed upon his head, when immediately the devils came out of his mouth and fled away in the form of rams and snakes.

The holy family, proceeding on their journey, came

to a den of robbers; and the robbers hearing a noise, and supposing the king to be approaching with an army, took to flight, leaving behind them their booty and their prisoners. The prisoners stood up and began to break off each other's fetters, and were about to depart with their property, when, seeing the holy family drawing near them, they asked Joseph what king it was whose perceived approach had put the robbers to flight. Joseph replied, "He is coming behind us." In the city to which they came next, there met them a demoniac woman, who could neither live in a house nor endure clothing; but the very sight of Mary so completely pacified her, that the devil fled from her in the form of a young man. In another city there was a nuptial ceremony, but by the influence of Satan and the magicians, the bride was dumb. She took the Christ-child in her arms, folded him to her bosom and kissed him, when immediately the band of her tongue was loosed. They spent a night in another city, where was a woman whom Satan, in the form of a serpent, was accustomed to overpower and embrace; but she took the child in her arms and kissed him, and was thus delivered from Satan's power. This same woman the next day washed the child Jesus in perfumed water, which she kept. A girl whose body was white with leprosy, being sprinkled with the water, became entirely well. The people said, "Doubtless Joseph and Mary and their child are gods, for they do not seem to be mortals." The maiden who was healed, now attended them, and by the wash-water which had cured her, she now performed many miracles; as, for example, she cured the young son of a prince who

had been leprous from his birth. They came to another city to spend the night, and put up at the house of a man recently married, but, in consequence of some poison in his system, he was unable to consummate his marriage. The presence of the child Jesus entirely cured him of his infirmity, and he constrained them to stop the next day and feast with him.

The holy family then met three ladies in distress for their brother, who by magic had been transformed into a mule, and they were taking care of him very tenderly in this form. Mary placed the child on the mule and said, "O my son, by thy great power restore this mule and make him what he was before, a rational being;" whereupon the mule immediately became a beautiful young man, and afterwards married the maiden before referred to, who had been dispossessed of the devil, and was then attending them. The following night they came upon an encampment of robbers under two leaders, Titus and Dumachus. The first by a gift restrained the other from attacking the holy family, for which Mary blessed him, and Jesus said, "Thirty years from now the Jews in Jerusalem will crucify me and the two robbers with me, Titus on my right hand and Dumachus on my left; and on that day Titus will go before me into paradise." In the neighborhood of Matarea, Jesus called forth a fountain in which his mother washed his clothes; and from the perspiration which there fell from Jesus, there sprang up an abundance of balsam. They journeyed to Memphis and visited Pharaoh. They abode in Egypt three years, and Jesus wrought many miracles, which are recorded neither in this Gospel of the Childhood, nor in the *Evangelio perfecto*.

To the above narrative we add some incidents from the Latin *History of the Nativity of Mary and the Infancy of the Saviour* (No. 5). According to this, during the flight to Egypt, the holy family rested near a cave, out of which many dragons suddenly emerged, whereupon Jesus descended from the lap of his mother, and placed himself before the monsters, when they fled, and then turned and worshipped him. Likewise lions and leopards honored him, and even acted as his guides. Lions mingled with the oxen and other beasts of burden which they had with them; wolves associated with the sheep, and they were all equally peaceful and harmless. A tall palm tree, whose fruit was beyond reach, at the command of the child Jesus, bowed itself down to Mary and allowed her to pluck its fruit; and at a second command it restored itself to its original position. From the roots of this palm Jesus caused to flow a spring of the freshest and purest water. A branch of the same palm, at the command of Jesus, was carried into paradise by the angels, there to be a sign of victory to the soldiers of the Christian warfare. When the wanderers were oppressed by heat, Jesus by his word enabled them in one day to perform a journey of thirty days. It is also related here that when Jesus entered a temple, the idols all tumbled down.

We now return to the Arabic *Gospel of the Childhood* (No. 7), which proceeds to give an account of the return to Bethlehem, and of many miracles wrought by the water in which Jesus had been washed. This sprinkled upon a child enabled it to remain unhurt in a burning oven. A sick child also was healed by

being put into the bed of Jesus and covered with his clothes. Mary often distributed his washing-water as a miraculous tincture, and pieces of his clothing as amulets against all kinds of harm. A demoniac boy named Judas, was accustomed in his frenzy to bite at those who were near him; and when he was brought near to Jesus he began to snap and strike at him, but Satan soon came out of him in the shape of a mad dog. This was Judas Iscariot, and the same right side on which he struck at Jesus, the Jews afterwards pierced with the lance.

Then follow miracles which belong to his later childhood, and which are distinguished from the preceding in this respect, that they are not only performed by the power which dwelt in Jesus, but with a more definite consciousness and will of his own. Once, in his seventh year, he was playing with other boys, and they were making, with clay, images of oxen, asses, birds, etc., and while each was endeavoring to excel the others, the child Jesus said, "The figures which I have made I will command to walk." He did so; and to the astonishment of the other children, the clay images walked off, and returned at his command; he then made sparrows which flew about, obeyed his word, and received food at his hand. At another time, Jesus came into the house of Salem the dyer, and there were clothes there which were to receive different colors. All these Jesus threw into one dye-pot, whereupon the dyer coming in was exceedingly angry; but Jesus said to him, "I will give to each piece of cloth the color you desire;" and taking them out, each was dyed as the dyer wished. Then the Jews, who saw this sign and wonder, praised God.

Joseph, in his travels to his work, was accustomed to take the boy Jesus with him, and when anything was made too long or too short, too wide or too narrow, (for he was but a bungling carpenter), the child stretched his hands over it and brought it all right. Once he had a throne to make for the king in Jerusalem, and worked upon it two years. When it was finished, he found it too small for the place where it must be put, and being much cast down about it, the child Jesus bade him be of good cheer, and each taking hold of an end of the throne, they pulled upon it till it came to the right size. The throne was made of the figured wood which was in use in the time of Solomon. At another time, the boys who were playing with him he turned into little goats, and they hopped about him and honored him as their shepherd. The women seeing this, cried out, "O our Lord Jesus, Son of Mary, thou art indeed the good shepherd of Israel, have mercy on thy handmaidens." Then, at the entreaty of these women, he restored the boys to their proper shape. In the month Adar, Jesus collected the boys together, as their king. With their clothes they spread for him a seat, they made him a crown of flowers, placed themselves around him as his guards, and compelled all who passed by to do him honor. Then came men bearing on a bier a boy who had been bitten by a serpent in the woods. They were compelled to come up and do homage to the little king. Jesus commanded them to take the wounded boy back to the place where he had received the bite, to force the snake from his hole and compel him to suck out the poison, which was promptly done, and immediately

the snake burst asunder. This boy was the Simon Zelotes afterwards mentioned in the Gospels.

Once as the boys were playing, one fell from a roof and was killed. The others fled, but Jesus stood by. The relatives coming up accused Jesus of throwing the child down, but he ordered the boy to arise and give testimony, which he did, and affirmed that it was another who threw him down. Another time Mary sent him for water, but the pitcher, after he had filled it, broke in his hands; so he caught the water in his apron and brought it to his mother. One sabbath day he was playing with other boys by a brook, and he made sparrows which he placed around a little artificial pool; but a son of the Jew Hannas, enraged at this profanation of the Sabbath, ran and destroyed the pool. Jesus let the sparrows fly, and then said to the boy, "As the water has disappeared from this pool, so will thy life disappear;" and from that moment the child sickened, and soon after died. One evening as Jesus was going home with Joseph, a rough, careless boy ran against him, and he said: "As thou hast overthrown me, so shalt thou be overthrown and not rise again," and immediately the boy fell down and died. Other revengeful acts of the boy Jesus may be found in the *Gospel of Thomas* (No. 2). Joseph at length gives Jesus to understand that they could no longer be tolerated among parents whose children had been slain by his mischievous power, and Jesus answered: "I know those are not my words, but thine; nevertheless for thy sake I will be silent, but those who have complained of me shall receive their punishment;" and the complainers were soon struck blind. Jesus

subsequently restored them to sight, but no one after that dared provoke him to anger.

The *Gospel of the Childhood* and of *Thomas* have many anecdotes of the school-days of Jesus and of his being taught to read. A school-master in Jerusalem by the name of Zacheus, offered to teach the child, and when his parents brought him, the teacher wrote the alphabet, and told the new scholar to pronounce first *Aleph* and then *Beth*. Jesus said, "Tell me the meaning of *Aleph*, and then I will pronounce *Beth*." The master threatened to punish him for his impudence; but Jesus unfolded the meaning of the letters *Aleph* and *Beth*, and described their different forms and positions in a way the master had never heard of nor read in books; and then he pronounced the whole alphabet. The master then said, "I believe this boy was born before Noah;" and sent him back to his parents because he was more learned than all teachers, and had no need of instruction. It fared worse with another more able teacher, who on a like occasion struck the boy Jesus, and at once his hand was withered and he died, so that Mary said, "We will not any more let him go out of the house, for all who resist him are punished with death." A third teacher, who hoped to gain the boy's affections, was so astonished at his learning and the knowledge of the law which he manifested to all the by-standers, that he entreated Joseph to take him away. Jesus smiled and praised the teacher, and said he had spoken well; and on his account he healed the others. When at the age of twelve he was in the temple at Jerusalem, he asked questions on the different sciences; he explained the

law and the mysteries in the prophetical books, the depth of which no created mind can sound; he explained to an astronomer all the relations and movements of the heavenly bodies, and the rules of astrology which are thence derived; he showed knowledge of all parts of the human body, the fluids and solids, the bones, nerves and veins—all the faculties of the soul and their relation to each other and to the body; in short, all kinds of knowledge were entirely familiar to him; as the narrative expresses it, *the physical and the metaphysical, the hyperphysical and hypophysical*, so that a learned philosopher present arose and said, “O Lord, from this time onward, I am thy scholar and thy servant.”

From this time Jesus began to withhold the manifestations of his knowledge and his power till his thirtieth year.

The Death of Christ and his Descent to Hades. The account of these we find in the Greek *Gospel of Nicodemus* (No. 3). Pilate commands an officer to bring Jesus before him, but with gentleness. The officer spreads a cloth before Jesus for him to walk on. The Jews complain of this; and Pilate, asking him why he had done it, he replied, that he had witnessed the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem, and noticed how he was honored. Jesus was made to advance without the cloth, but as he stepped between the soldiers who held the standards, these eagles themselves bowed down to do him honor. The Jews, observing this, raised their voices in anger against the standard-bearers. Pilate called them before him, and inquired why they had done this; and they assured him that they, as pagans,

knew no reason for honoring Jesus, but the standards had done it of themselves. Then Pilate leaves it to the chief of the Jews to make trial for their own satisfaction, and they select twelve of their strongest and bravest men, and commit the two standards, each to a company of six, to hold them before Pilate. They are threatened with death if they allow the standards to bow. But when the officers bring in Jesus, again the standards bow and worship him. Now the Jews complain of Jesus that he is a magician ; that his birth was attended with infamy ; that he was born in Bethlehem, and was the cause of the massacre there ; that his parents fled to Egypt because they dared not confide in the people ; that he had profaned the Sabbath, etc. During this strife Pilate asked Jesus, "What is truth?" Jesus answered, "Truth is from heaven." Pilate again ; "Is there not truth on earth also?" And Jesus answered, "Mark how those who have the truth on earth, are judged by those who have the power on earth."

Then follows the narrative of the crucifixion and resurrection. After this, Joseph of Arimathea had a vision of Jesus, who appeared to him in a splendid light. Joseph sank down and knew not Jesus, but Jesus raised him up and said, "Fear not, Joseph, see me, who I am." Joseph cried out, "Rabboni, Elias." He replied, "I am not Elias, but Jesus of Nazareth, buried by you." For proof Jesus led Joseph to the tomb in which his body had lain, and showed him the clothes in which the corpse had been wrapped, and then led him back to his house, and blessing him separated from him. Joseph of Arimathea afterwards related to Annas and Caiaphas, that Jesus had not risen from the dead alone, but had called several others to

life, who had appeared in Jerusalem, among them two sons of the high priest Simeon, who had taken Jesus in his arms when he was a child. They were then living in Arimathea, but were silent as the dead, and engaged wholly in prayer. Joseph, Nicodemus, Anas and Caiaphas went immediately to Arimathea, and found them praying, and brought them reverently into the synagogue at Jerusalem, where, with closed doors, they adjured them to disclose the particulars of their resurrection. Charinus and Lenthius (these were their names), when they heard this, trembled and groaned, and they looked towards heaven and made the sign of the cross on their tongues. They then demanded writing materials, and when these were brought, they wrote in substance the following narrative:

They were with the fathers in the dark abyss, when suddenly a golden sunlight entered and shone around them. Father Adam, the patriarchs and prophets, arose and announced the arrival of the Deliverer; and their father Simeon, who had taken the infant Jesus in his arms, joined in the announcement. The whole multitude of the saints rejoiced; John the Baptist also stepped up and declared what had happened at the baptism, and that he had come there before Jesus to announce his arrival. Then Adam through Seth informed the patriarchs and prophets what he had heard from the archangel Michael, when in his weakness he had sent him to the gates of paradise to get for him some oil from the tree of mercy. Seth related that he was then referred to the coming of Christ on earth; he should bring to believers the oil of mercy, and should also lead father Adam into paradise to the tree

of mercy. Satan now commanded hell to arm against Jesus, who had boasted that he was the Son of God, though still a man who was afraid of death; he had himself tempted him while on earth, and excited against him his ancient people the Jews. Yet hell was afraid, for she had felt the power of Jesus, and could not retain Lazarus against his will. Finally the Lord of glory arrived in the shape of a man, enlightened the eternal darkness and loosed the perpetual bonds. Death and hell acknowledged themselves conquered, and against their will celebrated the glory of Jesus. Jesus smote death by his majesty, gave over Satan to the power of hell, and took Adam with him into his glory. He called to him all the saints who bore his image and likeness, he took Adam by the right hand and blessed him with his righteous descendants. Adam returned thanks, and all with him bowed the knee to Jesus. Then he marked them with the sign of the cross, and led them out of hell with Adam at their head. David uttered a song of praise, so did Habakkuk, Micah, and the other prophets, all the saints joining in. The Lord then delivered Adam and the saints to the archangel Michael, who led them into paradise. Here they were met by two very old men, who, on being asked who they were, replied that they were Enoch and Elijah; they had not yet tasted death, and were to be kept alive till the coming of Anti-Christ, with whom they were to fight, and to be slain by him, and then, after three days and a half, they would be taken up into the clouds alive. During this conversation there came along a poor, wretched looking man, bearing on his shoulder the sign of the cross,

and resembling in appearance a robber. On being questioned he acknowledged that he was the thief whom the Jews had crucified with Christ, that Jesus had sent him into paradise, that the angel of paradise had admitted him on account of the sign of the cross; and had informed him that Adam with his righteous and holy sons would soon arrive.

“These are the divine mysteries which we, even I, Charinus and Lenthius, saw and heard; more we dare not tell, according to the commandment of the archangel Michael. But repent, and make acknowledgment and give honor to God, that he may have mercy upon you.”

Charinus gave what he had written to Annas, Caia-phus and Gamaliel, and Lenthius gave his manuscript to Nicodemus and Joseph, when suddenly they were transfigured in glory and were no more seen. The two writings, on being compared, were found to correspond exactly, without the difference of a single letter.

REMARKS ON THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, AS COMPARED WITH THE CANONICAL.

The above is a full and faithful narrative of all that these apocryphal gospels contain; more full perhaps than some may think necessary or will have patience to read. But as the idea has been seriously advanced by Strauss and enlarged upon by others, that these apocryphal books are of very much the same kind, and got up in very much the same way as the canonical, it is time that the friends of evangelical truth fully understood the matter; and it can be understood only

by examination. The books are as yet in but few hands; some of them are published only in foreign and difficult languages, and it is desirable that the abstract, which we give, should be sufficiently full to make a fair and complete representation of what they actually contain. Such a representation we claim to have made, in the preceding pages.

Now let any candid man, with a reasonable share of common sense, carefully read the narratives above given, and compare them with our four Gospels, contained in the New Testament, and what will he say to the allegation of Strauss, and those like him? Is there anything to be said, except this, that the clumsiest counterfeit of a bank note which was ever issued, a counterfeit so gross that the most juvenile clerk of a country store can detect it as well as the most experienced banker, can not be more unlike the genuine note than these apocryphal gospels are unlike the canonical? In the great mass, there are some very few touches which seem to indicate a tradition above the ordinary level; but as a whole, in every aspect of the case, they present a perfect contrast. So far from possessing any of the excellencies of the canonical Gospels, there is not resemblance sufficient to make them even caricatures. Instead of simplicity, we have bombast; instead of strong, good sense, silliness; instead of purity, filthiness; instead of manliness, puerility; instead of dignity, meanness; instead of self-forgetfulness, self-exaltation; instead of generosity, spitefulness; instead of elevated, sublime sentiment, poor, degrading nonsense. Indeed, while the genuine Gospels are fully equal to and even above the delicacy

and true refinement and intellectual and moral elevation of the most cultivated nations and ages, the apocryphal generally fall below almost the lowest, and could scarcely find anywhere a public, mean enough to receive and relish them, except in the dark corners of the declining Roman empire, where they first originated, or the equally dark corners of the modern papacy and Mormonism.

Moreover, if the genuine Gospels were of the same character as the apocryphal, how could the philosophic historian, from such a beginning, account for the development of such an institution as the Christian church?

The Christian church exists; Hegel himself could not deny that, nor reason the fact into non-existence. The Christian church has existed for a long time; it has had a history, it has exerted influence, it has had a character; and here are results to be accounted for, events which have had a cause; and is the cause to be sought in such stuff as these apocryphal gospels are made of? Are these results to be accounted for by ascribing them to such persons as are described in these books, or such minds as produced these writings? With even more reason might you attribute the planning and rearing of such edifices as Westminster abbey and St. Paul's church, and the new parliament house, to such characters as Mr. Pickwick and Mr. Jingle, the Artful Dodger and Fagin the Jew. There is reason in all things that are really things; and that which has no reason in it, is nothing (an *Unding*), and neither deserves nor needs an answer.

COMPARISON OF THE CANONICAL GOSPELS WITH THE FRAGMENTS OF GOSPELS SUPPOSED TO BE LOST.

Besides these apocryphal gospels, which a mere inspection and comparison with the genuine show to be worthless and of comparatively late origin, there are preserved in ancient writers the names and certain passages of others, which seem nearer the apostolic period and more worthy of notice. That there were written memorials of our Saviour's ministry anterior to some of our canonical Gospels, is plain from the declaration of Luke in the prologue to his Gospel; and that these memorials were imperfect and unsatisfactory is equally evident from the same authority. To be fully satisfied on this head one need only carefully read the verses referred to, Luke i. 1-4.

It is not probable that Luke had here in mind Matthew and Mark, for *two* could not with propriety be called *many* (πολλοί); and had he referred to these divinely authorized historians, he could hardly have assigned it as his reason for writing, that Theophilus might know the *certainty* (ἀσφάλειαν) of the things wherein he had been instructed; for as far as the certainty is concerned, it could be as well ascertained from Matthew or Mark as from Luke. Luke, when he wrote, might not have known that Matthew and Mark had written before him; and it would seem from his introductory remarks, that Theophilus, his friend, had not yet found access to any written account of Christ, except such imperfect and fragmentary notices as had been penned by different men without divine authority. That such notices should have been written is in itself

in the highest degree probable; and existing as they must only in manuscript and in private hands, it is also certain that after the authentic Gospels were published, they would generally cease to be transcribed and would finally perish. Yet portions of them would probably remain extant for a considerable period; in certain places and by some persons, they would most likely be preferred to the true Gospels; and combined, augmented, and variously fashioned, they might hold their position several generations, before they would finally perish.

The earlier Christian writers, as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, make allusions and even quotations, which seem to establish the fact of the existence of such narratives in their time; and when we come down to the time of Origen and Jerome, we find gospels mentioned by name which differ both from the canonical and the apocryphal as we now have them. In the first homily on Luke, published with the works of Origen and ascribed to that author, there is the following statement; "Many undertook to write gospels, but all were not received so that you may know that not four gospels only but many were written, The church has four gospels, the heretics many; one of which is inscribed *according to the Egyptians*, another, *according to the twelve apostles*. . . . I know a certain gospel which is called *according to Thomas*, and *according to Matthias*." The last two of these may properly be called apocryphal, but the first two seem not with strict justice

to come under that designation, inasmuch as it seems probable that the first was mainly an Egyptian edition of the Gospel of Mark, and the second nearly identical with the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. In his preface to Matthew Jerome says: "There were many who wrote gospels, . . . which, being edited by different authors, became the sources of diverse heresies, as that *according to the Egyptians*, and *Thomas*, and *Bartholomew*, and also *the twelve apostles*." In his work *De Vir. Illust.* (c. 2), he makes mention of a "gospel which is called *according to the Hebrews*, which was lately translated by me into both the Greek and Latin languages." Eusebius, speaking of the Ebionites (Hist. Ecc. iii. 29), says: "They use only the gospel which is *according to the Hebrews*."

Of those writings, which may be supposed to have some connection with the "many" alluded to by Luke, we will present a translation of some fragments still preserved from that *according to the Hebrews*, from the one *according to the Egyptians*, and the *memorabilia* (ἀπομνημονεύματα) quoted by Justin Martyr. We shall add a brief notice of the Diatessaron of Tatian and of the gospel of Marcion, which last, being for substance an abridged edition of Luke, has been learnedly and laboriously restored and edited by Aug. Hahn, and published entire by Thilo in his *Codex Apoc. Nov. Test.* i. 401-486.

GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS.

Neither this gospel itself, nor Jerome's translation of it, have for many centuries been seen; and all the knowledge which we can now obtain of its contents,

must be derived from incidental quotations, like those which we herewith translate.

Clemens Alex. (L. ii. Strom. p. 380): "In the gospel according to the Hebrews, it is written, *He that hath admired shall reign; and he that hath reigned shall have rest.*"

Origen (in *Johan.* vol. iv. p. 63): "But if any one will go to the gospel according to the Hebrews, where the Saviour himself saith: *Now my mother, the Holy Ghost, took me by one of my hairs, and brought me to the great mountain even Tabor.*"

In *Matth.* xix. 19 (vol. iii. p. 691): "It is written in a certain gospel, which is called according to the Hebrews (if yet it may please any one to take it, not as authority, but as an illustration of the question proposed), and it says: One of the rich men said to him, Master, doing what good thing shall I live? He said to him, Man, fulfill the law and the prophets. He replied to him, I have done it. He said to him, Go, sell all which thou possessest, and divide among the poor, and come, follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him, How canst thou say I have fulfilled the law and the prophets, when it is written in the law, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; and behold many of thy brethren, the sons of Abraham, are covered with filth, dying with famine, and thy house is filled with many good things, and nothing almost goes out of it to them? And turning to Simon his disciple, who sat by him, he said, Simon, son of John, it is easier that a camel go through the eye of a needle, than a rich man go into the kingdom of heaven."

Epiphanius (Haeres. xxx. 13): "In the gospel with them (the Ebionites) called according to Matthew, yet not entire and pure, but adulterated they call it the Hebrew (gospel) . . . it is contained thus: There was a certain man, Jesus by name, and he was about thirty years old, who chose us. And going into Capernaum he went into the house of Simon, who is called Peter, and opening his mouth he said: Passing along by the sea of Tiberias, I chose John and James, the sons of Zebedee, and Simon and Andrew and Simon Zelotes, and Judas Iscariot; and thee, O Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom, I called and thou didst follow me. Wherefore I will that ye be twelve apostles for a testimony unto Israel. And John was baptizing, and the Pharisees went out to him and were baptized, and all Jerusalem. And John had raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins. And his food, it says, was wild honey, whose taste was that of manna, as honey-cakes with oil; and thence they may change the word of truth to a lie, and instead of *locusts* (*ἀκρίδων*) they may make it *cakes* (*ἐγκρίδας*) with honey. But the beginning of the gospel with them is this: It came to pass in the days of Herod, the king of Judea, John came baptizing the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan, who was said to be of the race of Aaron the priest, the son of Zachariah and Elizabeth; and all came to him. And after saying many things, it goes on, The people being baptized, Jesus also came and was baptized. And when he went up from the water, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the form of a dove descending and coming to him. And there was a voice

from heaven saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased. And again, I this day have begotten thee. And immediately a great light illumined the place. Which seeing, it says, John said unto him, Who art thou, Lord? And again there was a voice from heaven to him, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And then it says, John falling down before him, says, I pray thee, O Lord, baptize thou me. But he forbade him, saying, Suffer it, for thus it is becoming that all things be fulfilled."

xxx. 14: "Cutting off the genealogies in Matthew, they begin: To make the beginning, as I said before, saying, It came to pass, it says, in the days of Herod king of Judea, in the high priesthood of Caiaphas, a certain man, John by name, came baptizing the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan, and so on."

xxx. 16: "That which is called the gospel with them, contains this: I have come to destroy the sacrifices, and if ye will not cease to sacrifice, wrath will not cease from you."

Jerome (Contra Pel. iii. 2): "In the gospel according to the Hebrews the history narrates, Behold the mother of the Lord and his brethren said to him, John Baptist is baptizing for the remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by him. But he said to them, What have I sinned that I should go and be baptized by him?"

Comm. in Isa. xi. 1: "According to the gospel which the Nazaraeans read, the fount of every Holy Spirit shall be upon him. Moreover we find these things written: And it came to pass when the Lord ascended from the water, the fount of every Holy Spirit de-

scended and rested upon him and said to him, My Son in all the prophets I was expecting thee, that thou shouldst come, and I should rest upon thee. For thou art my rest, thou art my first born Son, who shalt reign forever."

Comm. in Mich. vii. 6: "In which (gospel according to the Hebrews) it is said in the person of the Saviour, My Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me lately by one of my hairs."

Comm. in Ephes. v. 3: "Also in the Hebrew gospel we read, that the Lord, speaking to the disciples, said, You may never rejoice except when you see your brother in charity."

De Vir. Ill. c. 2: "The gospel according to the Hebrews, after the resurrection of the Saviour, reports: But the Lord when he had given the linen cloth to a servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him. For James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he had drank the cup of the Lord, until he had seen him arise from them that sleep. And again, a little after, the Lord said, Bring a table and bread. And immediately it adds, He took the bread and blessed and break and gave to James the just, and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man has risen from them that sleep."

Con. Pel. iii. 2: "And in the same volume (Gospel of the Hebrews), he says, If thy brother sin against thee in word, and make satisfaction to thee seven times in a day, receive him. Simon, his disciple, said to him, Seven times in a day? The Lord answered and said unto him, Yes, I say unto thee, until seventy times seven! For even in the prophets, after they are

anointed with the Holy Ghost, is found matter of sin."

Comm. in Matt. vi. 11: "In the (Hebrew) gospel, the man who had the withered hand, is said to be a brick-layer (*caementarius*), and he prayed for help in this manner: I was a brick-layer, earning my living by my hands; I pray thee, O Jesus, that thou wouldst restore health to me, that I may not basely beg my bread."

Ep. 120, ad Hedib.: "In the (Hebrew) gospel we read, not that the veil of the temple was rent, but that the lintel of the temple, of wonderful magnitude, was broken down."

From the above extracts, it is manifest that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* was vastly superior to the latter apocryphal gospels, of which an abstract has already been given; and greatly inferior to the canonical Gospels of our New Testament. The ground-work of it would seem to have been the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, in some places mutilated, and in others enlarged by augmentations from a tradition not then remote. There were probably several different recensions of it; and it seems to have been substantially the same with that which was sometimes called the *gospel according to the twelve apostles*.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE EGYPTIANS.

Epiphanius, in speaking of the Sabellians, has the following passage (Haer. L. xxii. 2): "Their whole error, and the power of their error, they derive from certain apocryphal books, especially from one called the *Egyptian Gospel*, to which some give this name. For in it are contained many such things, as it were

mysteriously in a jumble, from the person of the Saviour, as that he declared to his disciples that he was the Father, and he the Son, and he the Holy Ghost."

Clemens Alex. (Strom. iii. 6, etc., p. 445, 52, 53): "To Salome, inquiring how long death should have power, the Lord said, As long as you women bear children. . . . Moreover, she saying, I have done well in not bearing children, the Lord answered, saying, Eat every herb, but that which is bitter thou mayest not eat; by which words he signifies, that celibacy or marriage is a matter within our own choice, neither being enforced by any prohibition of the other. This, I suppose, is contained in the *gospel according to the Egyptians*."

Clemens Romanus. In the second epistle, ascribed to this author (vi. 12), there are two quotations from a certain gospel, which, when compared with what is said of the *Egyptian gospel* by Clemens Alexandrinus, learned men have inferred to be from that work. The first is as follows: "For the Lord saith, ye shall be as lambs in the midst of wolves. Peter answered and said, What if the wolves shall tear the lambs in pieces? Jesus said unto Peter, Let not the lambs, after they are dead, be afraid of the wolves. And ye also, fear not them that kill you, and are then able to do nothing to you; but fear him who hath power, after that ye are dead, to cast both soul and body into hell-fire." The second passage is this: "Wherefore also he saith thus: Keep the flesh pure and the soul unspotted, that ye may receive eternal life."

The above is nearly all that remains of the *gospel*

according to the Egyptians; and it is not absolutely certain that all even of these passages are from that work, for Clemens Alexandrinus only *supposes*, and the source of the quotations of Romanus is wholly conjectural. So far as we are able to judge, this Egyptian gospel was still more faulty than that of the Hebrews.

Besides these, there are mentioned by ancient writers a *gospel of Peter* (Theodoret. Haeret. Fab. ii. 2), and a *gospel of Cerinthus* (Epiphan. xxvii. 5; xxx. 14); but no extracts are given from them, and from what is said about them, it would seem that the latter was closely connected with the gospel of the Hebrews, and the former with that of the Egyptians. According to this, the *gospel of Cerinthus* would have some connection with our canonical Matthew, and the *gospel of Peter* with our canonical Mark. (Guericke, Einleit. N. T. 198, 199.)

MEMORABILIA OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

This father in his writings frequently refers to the deeds and words of Christ, and cites passages from certain apostolic writings, which he calls *memorabilia* or *memoirs* and also *gospels*. These writings he affirms were the work of apostles and of companions of apostles. Two passages from his second Apology may be sufficient to illustrate the manner in which he refers to these authorities. *For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called gospels, have thus handed down, etc. For in the memoirs which I say were composed by the apostles or by those who accompanied them, etc.*

Some of the passages which Justin quotes, are literal

transcripts from our canonical Matthew; many are quotations, with slight verbal differences, from Matthew and Luke; some combine the sense of passages found in two or more of the Gospels; and others merely give the meaning of a text without attempting to give the words. There are still others which differ very much from our present Gospels, and some few, of which no trace can be found in our canon. Of the two kinds last mentioned we will give a full selection, and specimens of the others.

By comparing all the quotations, it would seem that Justin used mainly our Matthew, and was quite familiar with Luke; while he makes very little direct use of Mark, and still less of John. He seems also to have had traditionary reports of some passages in the life of Christ not contained in our Gospels, and access to some writings not now extant, as perhaps the original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, and some of the "many" referred to by Luke in the introduction to his Gospel. All this is very easily accounted for by the fact that Justin was a native and resident of Palestine, where these traditions and the writings from which he draws, originated and were longest preserved; while, of the two Gospels which he passes over almost without notice, the one (Mark) was written and published for the use of the Latins, the other (John) was originally designed for the Greeks of Asia Minor.

We begin our extracts with the sentences which differ most widely from our canonical gospels.

Dial. c. Tryph. : "And then the child, having been born in Bethlehem, since Joseph had not in that village a place to lodge, was lodged in a certain cave near the

village. They being there Mary brought forth the Christ, and laid him in a manger (*φάτνη*) where the Magi, coming from Arabia, found him."

"Then Jesus came to the river Jordan, where John was baptizing, and when he went down to the water, a fire was kindled in the Jordan; and while he was ascending from the water, his apostles write, the Holy Ghost like a dove flew upon him . . . and at the same time a voice came out of the heavens, *Thou art my Son, I this day have begotten thee.*"

(Jesus) "being among men, did carpenter's work, making ploughs, and yokes, by these things even teaching the symbols of righteousness and an industrious life."

"And they, seeing these things take place, said it was a magical fantasy, for they dared to call him a magician and a deceiver of the people."

"Christ said, In what things I apprehend you, in those also I shall judge you."

The matters in the above statements, to which there is nothing corresponding in our canonical Gospels, are evidently traditionary notices; and some of them very closely resemble what the fathers quote from the gospel according to the Hebrews.

We proceed to give extracts, of which the sense is found in the canonical Gospels, though not always in one passage nor in the same words.

Apol. ii.: "Be not anxious as to what ye shall eat, or wherewith ye shall be clothed. Are ye not better than birds and beasts? yet God feedeth them. Be not anxious, then, as to what ye shall eat or wherewith ye shall be clothed; for your heavenly father knoweth

that ye have need of these things; but seek ye the kingdom of heaven, and all these things shall be added unto you; for where the treasure is, there is also the mind of the man."

"Many will say to me, Lord, Lord, have we not eaten and drank in thy name, and wrought miracles? and then I will say to them, Depart from me ye workers of iniquity. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when the righteous shall shine like the sun, and the wicked shall be sent into eternal fire. For many shall come in my name, being clothed outwardly with the skins of sheep, but inwardly are ravening wolves. By their works ye shall know them. Every tree not bearing good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire."

"Be not afraid of those who destroy you, and after that are not able to do anything; but fear him who after death, is able to cast both soul and body into hell."

These extracts all have the appearance of being quoted from memory out of different parts of the canonical Matthew and Luke, without reference to the particular place, or any attempt at verbal accuracy.

Apol. ii. : "Whosoever is angry, shall be obnoxious to the fire."

"For whosoever heareth me and doeth what I say, heareth him that sent me."

"Woe to you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites; for ye tithe seasoning and rue; but consider not the love of God and the judgment."

"Many false Christs and false apostles shall arise, and shall lead astray many of the faithful."

“For Christ also said, Except ye be born again, ye can not enter into the kingdom of heaven. But it is plain to all, that it is impossible for those who have once been born, to enter again into the womb of those that bear them.”

Dial. c. Tryph. : “A certain one saying to him Good Master, he answered, Why callest thou me good? there is one good, my Father who is in heaven.”

These are the quotations by Justin which differ most widely from the text of our canon. He quotes often, generally without any variation in sense, and frequently with literal exactness. Very many verses of the New Testament are found complete in his writings. It is evident, on comparison of the whole, that his *memorabilia* or *memoirs* were the same Gospels which we now have, with perhaps the edition of a Hebrew Matthew; and when he gives what is not in our Gospels, he copies from the traditions of his own times, either oral or written, or both.

DIATESSARON OF TATIAN.

Tatian is described by Eusebius (Hist. Ecc. iv. 29) as once a hearer of Justin Martyr, in good repute among Christians; but after the death of Justin, he became an ascetic Encratite, abstaining from flesh and wine, and denying the lawfulness of marriage. He wrote against the gentiles a book which Eusebius commends, the object of which was to prove the superior antiquity of Moses and the prophets to the sages of Greece and Rome. He also wrote the *Diatessaron* (διὰ τεσσαρῶν), an abridgement and harmony of the four Gospels; and of this Eusebius speaks disparagingly.

Theodoret (Haer. Fab. i. 20) informs us that Tatian cut off the genealogies of Jesus and the account of his birth; and Bar-Salibi, an oriental writer (Asseman. Bibl. Or. i. 57), says his Diatessaron began with the first words of John's Gospel, *Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος*

Epiphanius (Haer. xlv. 1) says, that some called his *τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον* the gospel according to the Hebrews.

This, I believe, is all the reliable information we have respecting this work of Tatian, which some modern critics, as Eichhorn and Schmidt, would have to be a biography of Jesus, independent of our canon. There is not the least evidence of any such thing, but of the exact reverse. The most probable supposition is, that it was a harmony of our four canonical Gospels, somewhat mutilated and modified to suit his Encratite views, and based mainly on the Hebrew Matthew; as Tatian, it seems, was taught Christianity in Palestine, and by Justin Martyr. In any event, certainly, nothing can be made out of it to the disparagement of our canonical Gospels.

GOSPEL OF MARCION.

Marcion, an anti-Judaizing Gnostic, according to the uncontradicted testimony of antiquity, published for his followers a gospel, which was simply the Gospel of Luke, mutilated and changed to suit his own views. This is the testimony of both Tertullian and Epiphanius (adv. Marc. iv. 2, 6; Haer. xlii. 11). Some of the important parts omitted are cap. i., ii. and iii. 1-9, 29-35; xv. 11-32; xix. 29-46; xx. 9-18, 37, 38; xxii. 35-38, 42-44. Guericke, Einleit. N. T. 206.

The beginning of Marcion's gospel, according to the edition of Hahn, is as follows: "In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, God came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and was teaching on the Sabbath days. And they were astonished at his doctrine, for his word was with power. And there was in the synagogue a man, having a spirit of an unclean devil, and he cried out with a loud voice, saying:" and so on, word for word, according to Luke iii. 1; iv. 31-33, etc. In accordance with the above representation of the first appearance of Christ in Galilee, an ancient writer informs us that "Marcionites frequently affirm, that the good God suddenly appeared and came down immediately from heaven into the synagogue." (Pseudo-Orig. Dial. p. 823; Thilo, Codex Apoc. N. T. i. 403.)

The extract given above may be considered a fair specimen of the book, and of the manner in which it compares with the canonical Luke. It is perfectly plain from the testimony of the ancients, and from an inspection of the work itself, that it is in no sense a rival of our canonical Gospels, nor derived from any sources independent of them.

Of the other early gospels, sometimes alluded to, that of Bartholomew, according to the testimony of Eusebius (Hist. Ecc. v. 10) and Jerome (De Vir. Ill. c. 36), was nothing else than the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. Of those ascribed to Matthias and Thomas, no authentic trace remains; and there is not the shadow of evidence that either of these apostles ever wrote a gospel. Those ascribed to Apelles and Basilides were nothing more than extracts from the canon-

ical Gospels, variously mutilated and interpolated. None of these, certainly, are fit to hold any rivalry with our four which are contained in the New Testament.

Arabia has been prolific in the apocryphal literature of the New Testament; several of the apocryphal gospels have been preserved to us through the Arabic language; and Mohammed was much indebted to this source for his materials in the construction of the Koran. Chapters iii. and xix. of that strange book are well worthy the perusal of every Christian, for they contain a minute account of the families of Christ and John, and all the wonderful circumstances attending their birth, in the true Arabic fashion.

In drawing up the preceding account of the gospel fragments of the early age, we have been largely indebted to De Wette's learned and vigorous Introduction to the New Testament. The German unbelief can not now be successfully encountered without the help of the German learning. The antidote is scarcely to be found except where the poison grows. The climes which yield the most noxious plants, are the very climes which produce the most effective medicines, the sweetest fruits, the most luxuriant vegetation.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

THE MODERN SUBSTITUTES FOR THE GOSPEL HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE VALUE OF THE FOUR GOSPELS, AS WE NOW HAVE THEM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

To every man who feels the need of religion, and can not surrender his reason to the tyrannical and preposterous claims of the papacy, the four Gospels, as we now have them in the New Testament, are of priceless value. The human soul, in its wants and sorrows and conscious weakness, in view of its brief existence on earth, and the dread unknown which awaits it beyond the grave, is greatly in want of some *objective truth* to rest upon; and without it the only wise philosophy is that which says, *Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die*. If the four Gospels be received as objectively true; if Jesus Christ, as therein described, be an actually existing personage, and our ever-living, ever-present friend and guide, then we have what we need; then the soul can rest and rejoice; then the spiritual can gain a permanent victory over the physical; our life on earth can be made a time of usefulness and peace, and our death a season of triumph and joy. Moreover, having Jesus and the Gospels objectively true, on their authority we have also the other writings

of the New Testament, and the historians, the poets, and the prophets of the Old; and now, with an un mutilated, unimpeachable Bible in our hands, we, like our fathers, can march through the world with heads erect, and a joyous courage, bidding defiance to Satan, and sorrow, and wicked men.

But weaken our confidence in the Gospels; let them be regarded as a jumble of traditions, partly true and partly false, then the chief effect of the Christian religion is, to raise our hopes only to sink us the deeper in despair; to increase our fears, without showing us definitely our danger, or teaching us how to escape it; our life on earth is equally unfitted for sensual pleasure and for spiritual enjoyment; and beyond the grave we have only just light enough to make the darkness visible. With the mere mockery of a revelation which is then left us, there are but two classes of men who can be satisfied with life as it now exists—namely, those whose desires and aspirations never go beyond the physical comforts of the external world, and the proud, cold, self-sufficient thinkers, whose chief pleasure it is to despise the weaknesses of their fellow creatures, and think themselves above them.

Entertaining such views, I confess I never can read, or listen to a critique on the sacred writings, and especially on the Gospels, without deep feeling. If indifference as to the result, be an essential qualification for a good investigator of the Scriptures, then I must give up all hope of ever being one. To the result I can not be indifferent if I would, for there are all my hopes. Who would be expected to be indifferent, if the object of the investigation on which he is obliged to enter,

were to ascertain whether his father were a cheat, or his son a thief, or his wife false?

“But we must have a zeal for science; we must let truth work its way; we must be willing that every falsehood, and every mistake, however long and lovingly cherished, should be torn from our embrace.” Very true, so we must; but does a proper regard for science, a proper love of truth, a proper hatred of error, require the sacrifice of every humanizing and ennobling feeling? Is man, or is he required to be, all intellect and no heart? To honor the mind, must we crucify the soul? Is he the only anatomist who can lay bare to his knife the body of a beloved sister, with the same indifference with which he would hack upon the carcass of an unknown culprit just snatched from its dishonored grave? I believe no such thing; and while Christ is to me more than father or mother, more than wife or child, or my own life even, I do not believe that sound philosophy requires me to see that holy Gospel, which contains all that I know of him, treated by an irreverent critic, as the greedy swine would treat a beautiful field of growing corn. Nor do I believe that an irreverent, ungodly critic is the man to do justice to the Gospels, or tell the truth about them fairly, in any sense. He may investigate their language, and examine their history, and give correctly the results of his verbal criticisms; but the real substance of the Gospels is far above, out of his sight; he can have no sympathy with Christ; he can have no conception of the motives which influenced the apostles; he can have no idea of the feelings which animated the sacred writers; he is a total stranger to

the whole soul of that which he criticises. When a man who has never seen, can accurately describe colors, or one who has never had the sense of hearing, can give a good account of sounds, or a horse with iron-shod hoofs can play tunes on a church organ, then I will not refuse to believe that an ungodly critic can write a reliable book on the New Testament. It is only the very lowest part of the work, that such a critic can perform; and when he comes to the higher criticism, the interior life of the word, he is wholly out of his sphere. How can a man with no poetry in his soul, review a poem? How can a man with no mathematics, properly estimate a treatise on fluxions? How can one destitute of the first principles of taste, be a critic in the fine arts? And how can a man wholly irreligious, be a fit judge of the most religious of all books? Let the Gospels be estimated according to their real worth, and the writers upon them according to their real worth, and then justice will be done on both sides. We will refuse no help, and we will repel no truth, though it come from the most ungodly; but we will not idolize intellect which has no heart, nor allow profane hands to filch from us our choicest treasures.

There is a decided tendency, in our times, to award peculiar consideration and deference to profane writers on sacred subjects. If an author with the spirit and principles and talent of Voltaire, were to write a life of Christ, or a commentary on the Gospels, or especially an introduction to the Old Testament, it would be just in accordance with the spirit of the age to study and quote such works with more profound

respect than is awarded to the writings of Luther, or Calvin, or Bengel, or any other writer who loves and venerates the Word of God. This whole tendency is most particularly to be despised or deplored.

RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF THE HEGELIAN PHILOSOPHY.

The recent assaults on the Gospels have proceeded almost entirely from the Hegelian school of philosophy. The influence of this philosophy extends far beyond the circle of its professed disciples. It is found where the very name of Hegel is almost unknown, and where not a syllable of his writings has ever been read. It invades Christian and even orthodox pulpits, and sometimes neutralizes the power of the Gospel under the most evangelical forms. It is a proud and a godless philosophy ; and, like a cholera miasma in the atmosphere, often deals desolation and death where its very existence is unsuspected. Though the most abstruse of all speculations, it never exists as a mere speculation, but immediately proceeds to action—and its first acts are the annihilation of human responsibility, and of the spiritual world, and of God himself. While in some cases it retains the words and phrases of the most evangelical faith, it expels from them all their meaning, and leaves them the mere hieroglyphs of an atheistic mystery. There is a universe but no God—there is development but not creation.

In thus describing the religious character of this philosophy, I am far from intending a personal attack on its great founder. In many of the qualities which make up a man, he was among the noblest of men,—

a fine physical organization, a prodigious intellect, and a generous heart; and he would probably himself be one of the first to protest against the atheistic extremes of some of his followers. Nor are his disciples all alike. There is the *extreme right*, the *central*, and the *extreme left*—or, as I would characterize them, the *religious*, the *non-religious*, and the *anti-religious*. On the *extreme right* was Marheinecke, a clear-headed and sound-hearted Christian theologian and preacher, one of the best historians and one of the most accurate reasoners; and how he could be a Hegelian and the author of such works as his *History of the Reformation* and his *Christian Symbolik* was always a mystery to me. There, too, is Goeschel, a truly pious and eminent jurist; but inasmuch as he could find in Goethe an apostle of Christianity, and in the Faust a high development of the Christian spirit, it is not so surprising that he can see in Hegel the Christian philosopher. Dorner, too, one of the best of men, one of the most learned, conscientious and reliable of writers, the author of that most admirable work, the *Development-history of the Doctrine respecting the Person of Christ*, is said to be a Hegelian of this class.

The assaults on the Gospels have proceeded from the *extreme left*, represented by such men as the younger Feuerbach, and Strauss and Bruno Bauer, F. C. Baur, Renan, Schenkel, etc. This, I suppose, is the legitimate result of the Hegelian philosophy, and these men, whatever Hegel himself might think of them, I regard as his true followers.

But what is the Hegelian philosophy? I have been admonished more than once to treat this philosophy

with respect, to admire it at least as an "exquisite work of art if not a system of absolute truth." I shall do my best in this particular. I have acknowledged before, and here repeat the acknowledgment, that I have no very definite knowledge of it. It stands before me, in its bulk and its unintelligibleness, as a huge, shapeless, threatening spectre, most fitly described in the words of Virgil:

Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.

(A monster, horrid, hideous, huge and blind.)

But when I think of the tremendous influence it exerts, and the mighty mischief it is making, it assumes, to me, (in the language of Milton,)

"The other shape,
If shape it may be called, which shape has none
Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb ;
Or substance may be called that shadow seems,
For each seems either ; black it stands as night,
Fierce as ten furies, terrible as hell,
And shakes a dreadful dart ; and what seems its head
The likeness of a kingly crown has on."

We speak here of the Hegelian philosophy only in its connection with religion, and as it now exists. Whatever of obscurity may rest over some of its speculations, its principal bearings on religion are perfectly intelligible, and are carried out to their extreme consequences with a cool audacity that is almost frightful. According to Hegelianism, the *subjective* is not only more than the *objective*, but the subjective is the whole, it is the entire substance, and the *objective* has no existence except as the shadow or reflection or creation of the *subjective*. The great discovery boasted by He-

gel and his followers, the great first principle of all truth, the honor of whose development Schelling in vain attempted to dispute with Hegel, is the *absolute identity of subject and object*, that is, I suppose, the thing perceiving and the thing perceived are one and the same thing.

Admitting this as a fundamental principle, what is God? Is God the creator of man, or is man the creator of God? The latter of course. The human mind is the only development of God,—only by the workings of the human soul does God arrive at self-consciousness; and if there were no men there would be no God, as there can be no color without an eye, and no sound without an ear. There seems to be recognized a sort of *natura naturans*, a sort of blind, unconscious, fermenting leaven, constantly working; but this never attains to personality or consciousness except in the human soul.

We will not ourselves undertake to make the statements of the doctrines of this sect—we will take them just as they are made by one of the most able and active of the living advocates of the system, in his work entitled *Das Wesen des Christenthums*. This is a favorite book among the Germans of our own country, and can be obtained in any quantities at our principal German bookstores. A brief, but very satisfactory, notice of it has been given in the *Christian Examiner* published in Boston, No. clxi.

Says this writer, “The absolute Being, the God of man, is man’s own being.” “Since God is but our own being, the power of any object over us, is the **might of our own being**. In willing, loving, feeling,

etc., there is no influence but of ourselves over ourselves." "All limiting of the reason rests on error." "Every being is all-sufficient to itself." "It is delusion to suppose the nature of man a limited nature." "Religion is the consciousness of the infinite; it is and can be nothing but man's consciousness of his own infinite being." "If you think infinity, or feel infinity, it is the infinity of thought and feeling, nothing else. The knowledge of God is the knowledge of ourselves; for the religious object is within us." "God is man's revealed inner nature—his pronounced self. Religion is the solemn unveiling of the concealed treasures of humanity, the disclosure of its secret thoughts, the confession of its dearest secrets. The Christian religion is the relation of man to his own being as to another being." "Religion is the dream of the human soul."

This is not caricature, nor ridicule, nor misrepresentation. It is just a plain statement of some of the prominent doctrines of the system, by one of its most able advocates. There is no God; and the devout man, when he thinks he is worshipping God, is simply worshipping himself. There is no accountability; there is no individual immortality; when a man dies, his soul is re-absorbed into the great mass of being, by the *natura naturans* to be again, perhaps, in time developed, and so on from eternity to eternity. These principles are boldly and openly avowed, and find able and popular advocates both in Germany and in this country. One of the most eminent of the German republicans, Dr. Voight of Giessen, during the summer of 1848, declared publicly in the Frankfort par-

liament, that there could be no permanent freedom, till the idea of God and all responsibility to God were entirely banished from the human mind. No wonder that the German revolution, with such men to lead it, proved a miserable failure. No wonder that the pious, intelligent, sober men of Europe, viewed the whole movement with distrust, and finally abandoned it altogether. Atheistic liberty is the worst kind of tyranny. An editorial article in a political newspaper published in Cincinnati, says, "Religion is the cause of all the oppression which exists; inasmuch as it cajoles poor sufferers with the chimerical idea of a heaven hereafter; and the source of religion is want of education, ignorance. This is the origin of all evil." The same principles, with a little more regard to religious public sentiment, and partially disguised under a garb of specious phraseology, are zealously propagated in New England, and infect large numbers especially of our educated young men. Before they begin to feel the need of religion, the foundation of religious faith is taken away. For this work of ruin, the genius of Hegelianism has peculiar facilities. It can approach unperceived, and accomplish its purpose before its presence is suspected. It can use the language of any theology, even the most orthodox, and convey its own ideas in the words of an evangelical faith, and here is our danger now.

One of the phrases already quoted from Feuerbach, may serve as an example of the deceptive manner in which language may be used. It is this, "God is man's inner nature, his pronounced self." Here it may be alleged, is the New Testament doctrine of the Lo-

gos, the God-man, God revealed; and in like manner we may get the Holy Ghost, as that may be considered to be the inner nature of man re-acting upon itself, and this may be called that spiritual influence which good men crave and pray for. Thus can the Hegelian atheist, with most conscientious deceptiveness, use all the language of the Trinitarian Christian.

With this philosophy, testimony is nothing, objective narrative is nothing, history is not to be learned from external sources, it must be developed from within—facts must not be sought for, they must be made; and on this principle these philosophers act with great consistency and vigor, as we shall see when we come to examine their theories of the Gospel history. Another of the principles of this philosophy is eminently a practical one, namely, that “man is God, and must worship himself.” This the Hegelians do with the most enthusiastic devotion. Such self-worship was never before witnessed on earth. The enormous self-conceit of these men, the self-conceit of Hegel himself, the pitiful folly of his admirers who pronounced their eulogies over his grave, are among the greatest monstrosities which ever existed on this planet of monsters, comparable to nothing but the lizards larger than ten whales, and the frogs bigger than elephants, which are said to have existed on the pre-Adamite earth. Self-conceit is a symptom of the disease. The venerated Neander, in a letter to Prof. Schaff of Mercersburg, justly characterizes the system as “the philosophy of a one-sided logic, of intellectual fanaticism, and of *self-deification*.” My respected friend, Prof. S. himself, I am happy to see, takes no exceptions to this view of the subject.

Indeed, he himself calls this kind of Hegelianism, an "arrogant pantheism, different from atheism only in form"—"a lifeless formalism of the understanding, that destroys at last all soul in man, and turns him into a pure speculator on the open heath, an unfruitful thinker of thinking, a heartless critic and fault-finder." (Schaff's *Kirchenfreund* for Jan., 1851, also *Mercersburg Review*, vol. iii. p. 81, ff.)

There is no disinterestedness in this philosophy, there is no veneration, there is no love. Each being is all-sufficient to itself, and each revolves around itself as its own centre, and each is at the same time both planet and sun, both axis and orbit. And what can come of such kind of principles, but selfishness, and animalism, and every evil work?

Now, it is such philosophers as these, who presume to sit in judgment on the New Testament, to estimate the characters therein portrayed, to determine as to what is, and what is not, fitting in a revelation from God to man; to decide with solemn majesty *a priori*, from internal marks only, out of the depth of their own consciousness, and with nothing else to aid them, as to what is spurious, and what is genuine, in the sacred writings! How well they succeed, we shall see as we go on. And we will only say here, that if opposites are the best judges of opposites, if goats are the best judges of perfumes, if worms have suitable qualifications to decide on the merits of eagles, then are these men qualified to sit in judgment on Jesus, and the apostles, and the writers of the Gospels. Yet their writings are published, translated into different languages, and extensively read. In various ways

they exert a great influence even over those who never read them ; the echoes of their voice reverberate from many a newspaper and popular periodical ; their sound is heard in many a lyceum, and mechanics' institute, and mercantile association, and debating club ; they inflate the vanity, and heighten the self-conceit, and set loose the passions of many a young man in our institutions of learning, and in our mercantile and manufacturing establishments, and produce extensively a ruinous infection in the whole intellectual atmosphere—not sparing even the theological school, the ministerial study, or the Christian pulpit.

So many ingenious ways do poor short-lived men devise, and such infinite pains do they take, to rid themselves of God their heavenly Father, of Christ their gracious and only Saviour. It is often and justly remarked of rogues and freebooters, that they employ far more ingenuity, and energy, and perseverance, to get a living by dishonesty, than would be necessary to make them securely and reputably wealthy in an honorable calling ; yet, they are always poor, and in constant dread of detection and punishment. So these proud thinkers tax their minds and hearts more severely to be irreligious, than would be necessary to secure an eminent place in the Christian walk ; while they can look only for the *wages of sin*, which is *death* ; while *the gift of God*, and that only, *is life and peace*. According to the Scripture, it is *the fool who hath said in his heart, there is no God* ; and the same Scripture says, *The fool is wiser in his own conceit, than seven men that can render a reason* ; and, *though you bray a fool in a mortar with a pestle among wheat, yet will not*

his folly depart from him.. How wonderfully descriptive of the foolishness of Hegelian pantheistic atheism!

ANALYSIS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRINCIPAL HEGELIAN ASSAULTS ON THE GOSPELS.

The four Gospels exist, they have for ages existed in all the languages of the civilized world, they have produced the most astonishing revolutions, they lie at the foundation of all modern civilization; they did not arise in a remote antiquity nor in a fabulous era, but in the zenith of the Roman empire and in immediate contact with the Grecian culture. The problem of the philosophic sceptic is to account for all this, on any other supposition than that of the historical truth of the Gospel narrative and the reality of miraculous interposition. The first regular, systematic, Hegelian attempt towards the solution of this great problem was made in 1836 by David Frederic Strauss, then a young man just commencing his career as a teacher in the university of Tuebingen. I was in Germany at the time when Strauss's *Life of Jesus* first appeared, and it was exciting as great a commotion among the learned of Germany then, as a few years after the prophesying of the millenarian Miller excited among the unlearned in America. That was the year fixed on by Bengel for the end of the world; and many who had no faith in Bengel or the apostle John, yet devoutly believing in Strauss, thought surely the end of Christianity had come. Prof. Tholuck told me he considered it the most formidable attack the New Testament had ever sustained, and he was right heartily at work in answering it, and soon after published his excellent book on

the Credibility of the Gospel History. The answers to Strauss were numerous, almost numberless, the controversy raged with great vigor for some six or eight years; but now Strauss, before he is an old man, finds himself an obsolete and antiquated writer; as much so as was, when he began, the old Paulus whom he treated so cavalierly. But though Strauss is already intellectually dead and buried, never to rise again, among the Germans, he just begins to live among those who use the English language, and translations of his book are read with the most innocent wonderment by many of our young men, who have no knowledge of the fact that it has long since been thoroughly exposed and exploded in the land of its birth. In the track of Strauss, with more or less of divergency, followed Weisse, Gfroerer, Bruno Bauer, Wilke, Schweitzer, Schwegler, Leutzelberger, F. C. Baur, Renan, Schenkel, and many, many others; the greater part of whom *remain unto this present*, though, as to any influence, they have already mostly *fallen asleep*.

In analyzing some of the principal Hegelian hypotheses of the Gospel history, as specimens of the whole, we shall avail ourselves liberally of the labors of Ebrard, who in his admirable work, entitled *Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte*, has with great industry, skill and fairness, epitomized, arranged, and made them intelligible.

(1) HYPOTHESIS OF STRAUSS.

(a) *The facts out of which the Gospel narratives have arisen.* These according to Strauss, were very few, and mainly the following: The Jewish nation,

during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberias, had the expectation of a national Messiah, predicted in the Old Testament, who would be a political deliverer and work miracles greater than Moses wrought. At this period there was a Jew born at Nazareth in Galilee named Jeschuah, (the sceptic sometimes gains considerably by simply changing the orthography of a well-known name); and another Jew, by the name of John, became a celebrated ascetic preacher and baptizer. Jeschuah attached himself to John as one of his disciples; and after the imprisonment of the latter, prosecuted the same work, and gathered disciples of his own. Jeschuah now formed the design of effecting by his doctrine the moral regeneration of his countrymen; and being under the influence of the supernatural prejudices of his times, imagined that God would interpose to help him in so worthy an attempt, and to re-establish the kingdom of David. This idea corresponded very nearly to the Messianic expectations of the Jews; and they, hearing him preach from time to time, began to think whether he might not be the expected Messiah. At first, Jeschuah shrunk from such a thought, but gradually became reconciled to it, and at length it gained full possession of his mind. He was however, entirely destitute of the means of carrying out this idea in practice, for he had no political influence nor any power of working miracles. He saw that the all-powerful priest party was daily becoming more and more incensed against him; the unhappy fate of the persecuted prophets of the Old Testament dwelt on his mind; some texts of the Old Testament, as he began to think, indicated a suffering and dying

Messiah ; and, on the whole, he at length anticipated a violent death from the hands of his enemies. His anticipations were realized, and he perished on the cross in early life.

This, according to Strauss, is the whole of the historical basis of the Gospels. There were no miracles wrought, nor even pretended to be wrought, during the lifetime of Jesus ; nor did he, at the commencement of his career, imagine himself to be the Messiah, nor anticipate the sad fate which at length overtook him.

(b) *Origin of the miraculous stories of the Gospels.* The disciples of Jeschuah believed him to be the Messiah ; and when the first shock of his terrible end and of their own bitter disappointment was past, they set themselves to devise some method of reconciling actual facts with their cherished expectations, and especially to see if they could not in some way get the idea of suffering and death into their notion of the Messiah. They searched the Old Testament, and found many passages which represented men of God as plagued, persecuted and slain ; and these answered to them for Messianic predictions. The Messiah, then, though departed, was not lost ; he had only gone into his glory ; he must still love and care for his own. This idea took such complete possession of their minds, that some of the women began to imagine they had actually seen him after his burial, and they so said to the men—and the whole company became so excited and talked about the matter so much, and got their imaginations so inflamed, that two or three times, when they were gathered together, some object dimly seen

in the mountain mist, or some unknown person approaching them, gave them the impression that they had actually seen the Lord in bodily presence.

The great miracle of the resurrection, being thus generated and born and brought into the world, becomes the fruitful parent of other miracles. According to the expectation of the Jews, the Messiah must work miracles, and if Jeschuah wrought no miracles, how could he be the Messiah? The matter was anxiously thought of, and the remembered words and deeds of Jeschuah were scrutinized to see if they might contain any germs out of which miraculous narratives could naturally grow. He had told them they should be *fishers of men*—happy reminiscence! what more natural than that out of this should grow the story of the miraculous draught of fishes? He had said the unfruitful tree should be cut down; and here we have the nucleus of the fig-tree which was cursed and withered away. True, the apostles could not themselves imagine that they had with their own eyes seen these miracles; but knowing as they did, that the Messiah must work miracles, they could not doubt that such miracles actually occurred. At least, if this was not the idea of the apostles, it must have occurred to those who had seen but little of Christ while he was on earth, and it became the popular belief of most of the Christian congregations.

The miracles being thus set on growing by Strauss, their increase is very rapid, and many a scion from the Old Testament tree is grafted into the New, and immediately bears fruit. The hand of Moses, the face of Miriam, the body of Naaman, had been leprous, and

were cured at a word; and the Messiah of course could heal leprosy as well as Moses and Elijah, and therefore he did. As Jordan occasioned miraculous cures in the Old Testament, so Siloam in the New; as Elijah struck men with blindness in the Old Testament, so Christ cured blind men in the New; as Jero-boam's withered hand was restored in the Old Testament, so Christ healed withered hands in the New; as Moses divided the Red Sea, so Christ stilled the Galilean Sea; as Moses turned water into blood, so Christ turned water into wine—and so all the miracles of the Old Testament find parallels in the New; and this accounts for very many of the miraculous narratives of the New Testament. But Strauss does not so clearly tell us how to account for these miracles of the Old Testament. On his principles, however, it is very easy to invent methods, and any invention is preferable to the plain, simple, matter-of-fact truth.

As with the doings of Christ, so with his sayings; those which stand recorded are compositions, amplifications, from brief hints of his remembered apothegms.

Now we have the materials of the Gospel story, and after a while, one and another writer works up these materials into a written narrative of which we have four still extant, ascribed severally to Matthew and Mark, to Luke and John.

(c) *Estimate of this hypothesis.* Such is the hypothesis of Strauss; and this sort of stuff forms the staple of two thick, heavy volumes (three in the English translation), written with great energy, clearness and show of learning, apparently in the most sober

earnest, and giving evidence of untiring industry. And these volumes have set the world on fire, and in the opinion of many have demolished the very foundations of Christianity, and left the world without a Saviour, and almost without a God. What a monstrosity; in every view of it a monstrosity! The church of Christ is an accomplished fact, a most mighty, efficient, working fact—a fact which confessedly began at the time alleged—and does the hypothesis of Strauss give us means in the least degree adequate to account for this fact? The African who imagines that when the moon is in an eclipse, there is a great serpent attempting to swallow her, and the child who supposes that when it thunders, God is riding in a big wagon over a tin bridge, are philosophers of the highest order in comparison with Strauss as he exhibits himself in his *Leben Jesu*.

What an inexplicable enigma is that Jeschuah, for whose existence we are indebted solely to the imagination of Strauss. What unheard of, unaccountable compounds of knavery and goodness, of silliness and greatness, are Strauss's disciples of Jeschuah! What wonderful proficient in stupidity must have been the men of that generation, and the generation immediately succeeding! How could *myths* arise and gain credence, in the manner and to the extent which he dreams of, in the same generation and the same country wherein the facts are alleged to have occurred? This difficulty is felt by Strauss, and he attempts to get rid of it by supposing that the stories originated mostly in those parts of Palestine east of the Jordan, where Christ had personally seldom appeared. The whole

of Palestine has scarcely one quarter the extent of the State of Maine ; and can men in Maine lie with impunity, by going east of the Penobscot ? That was an active, enlightened, revolutionizing, realistic age. The whole world was in motion, nations intermingled with each other, languages were cultivated—commerce, literature, the arts, military operations, kept everything a-stir, and there was neither sluggishness, nor stagnation, nor mental stupor to favor the growth of a new mythology. One might as well look for the growth of mushrooms at midday on the pavement of the Royal Exchange in London, under the tread of the thousands of feet which daily there perambulate, as expect the prosperous development of such myths as Strauss dreams of, in such an age and country as that which witnessed the lives and deeds of Christ and his disciples.

Again, how does Strauss know that matters came about in the way which he represents ? Who told him ? or was he there to see ? What authority does he bring, that we should postpone to this single statement the testimony of prophets and apostles and martyrs ? Ah ! he knows it by the Hegelian power of intuition—by means of which history is constructed subjectively, instead of being objectively learned from the proper sources. In such constructive history, or rather theories of history, we have no confidence.

Yet there is in Strauss's book not a little of learning, and a great amount of acuteness and ingenuity. He starts many difficulties in the Gospel narrative, which it requires a clear head and a steady hand and a thorough acquaintance with the subject, effectually to

obviate. His book has exerted a great and pernicious influence in Europe, and is doing the same in this country. By means of English translations he is in the hands of many young men who are greedily reading him without any sufficient knowledge of the subject to detect the groundlessness of his assumptions or the fallaciousness of his reasonings; and without dreaming that he has already been thoroughly refuted and antiquated in his own country. In the German bookstores the *critical writings* of Strauss and the *theological writings* of Tom Paine stand on the same shelf, and are apparently held in equal honor. Why should it not be so with us? In what respect is Strauss so much better than Paine, that he should be respected while Paine is despised? If he has more learning and more decency than Paine, he certainly has much less of sound, practical common sense. And we are sorry to be obliged to add, that much of what De Wette has said about the Old Testament (made current among us by Theodore Parker's translations) is very little better than what Strauss says about the New. Since the blazing celebrity of Renan has thrown its glare over the world, Strauss has entirely re-written his life of Jesus, but with no essential improvement.

(2) HYPOTHESIS OF WEISSE.

Chr. Herm. Weisse is an older man than Strauss, a philosopher of no mean pretensions, and a metaphysician. He had published a work on the *Fundamental Principles of Metaphysics*, another on the *Idea of God*, a *System of Aesthetics*, etc.; and in 1838, awakened by the celebrity of Strauss, he published a book enti-

tled the *Gospel History critically and philosophically investigated* (*bearbeitet, belabored*). Weisse understands animal magnetism, and all the mysteries of clairvoyance.

(a) *The facts out of which the Gospel narratives have arisen.* There lived in Palestine during the reign of Tiberias a good man, one Jesus of Nazareth, who among other happy gifts, possessed the magnetic power of healing. He was in fact a full charged galvanic battery, ready at any touch to be discharged. He went about Galilee preaching, collecting disciples, and applying his magnetic power to the healing of diseases and the quieting of demoniacs; so that he very naturally gained the affections of the Galileans, who recognized in him the Messiah, and would have been glad to make him king. But, though he felt his Messiahship, he had no political ambition, and sought rather the moral elevation of the people; and in prosecution of this purpose he uttered many parables. Thus he represented the blessed effects of his ministry under the image of the opening of the heavens and the descent of a dove; the strong faith which men should exercise in the grace of God, by the parable of a Canaanitish woman seeking help of a Jew, and taking no denial; the judgment which is to come upon men spiritually unfruitful, by the image of a barren fig-tree cursed and withered; the regeneration of the world by his word he compares to turning water into wine, etc., He once occasioned great excitement by awakening a maiden who had fallen into a swoon and was supposed to be dead. He never went to Jerusalem but once, and that was at the feast of the passover,

when he was immediately apprehended and crucified. We have no reason to believe that he prayed aloud the night before his apprehension; or that he said when they were nailing him to the cross, *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do*. During his crucifixion there was an accidental obscurity of the heavens which made much talk. He was buried, and his body remained in the tomb; but his *nervo-magnetic* spirit once appeared to his disciples and passed up into the clouds.

(b) *Origin of the miraculous stories.* These all came very naturally. After the death of Jesus his parables were turned into stories, and men thought they were actual occurrences. (How many times has this happened in respect to Æsop's fables!) These stories were not propagated by the apostles; they busied themselves only with teaching the doctrines of their Master, and said nothing about his biography. But somebody told the stories and found people to believe them; and other stories were made from very trivial circumstances. From what he once casually said, that *he whose feet are washed is every whit clean*, arose the story of his having washed his disciples' feet; the apostles practised baptism, and after a while began to think (Weisse does not tell us why) that Jesus had instituted such a rite. Once, after Jesus' death, when the apostles were at supper together, they became greatly excited with the idea of prosecuting the work which he had left unfinished; and this gave rise to the story that Christ himself had instituted the Lord's Supper; and also to the tradition, so much like the theophanies of Homer, of his supping with the two disciples at Emmaus after his crucifixion.

(c) *Origin of the written Gospels.* According to the testimony of Papias, (says Weisse,) the apostle Matthew wrote in the Hebrew of that time, a collection of the *discourses* of Jesus. According to the same authority, Mark, a scholar of Peter, wrote a *biography* of Jesus, as he had heard Peter relate it; and afterwards this narrative of Mark was combined with Matthew's collection of discourses, (now translated into Greek,) and this compilation is our present Greek Gospel of Matthew. Meanwhile, Luke, the companion of Paul, had written another biography from independent sources. Here we have the first three Gospels. As to the fourth Gospel, ascribed to John, it was not originally intended for a biography at all; but the apostle John, when he was a very old man, continually pondering over his ideal of the life of Christ, (now growing very dim and shadowy,) that he might not lose entirely this image out of his mind, wrote down fragmentary notices, as they happened to occur to him, without any view to publication, and not even intending any real *objective* biography, but merely for the purpose of defining and fixing his own *subjective ideal*. But, after the good apostle's death, some unlucky elders found these fragments in his study, and imagining they were written as an actual memoir of Jesus, arranged them for publication, and gave them to the world, with such modifications, additions, and connecting sentences, as the exigencies of the case seemed to require. Thus we have our present Gospel of John.

(d) *Estimate of this hypothesis.* The reader must understand that Weisse does not even pretend to have any testimony as to the facts being as he states

them. He would think it unworthy of a philosopher like him to come at a historical result in that way. It is but a specimen of the developing of history from internal consciousness, instead of learning it from external evidence. To illustrate the safety and accuracy of this method of developing historical facts, let us try it in reference to some book of American biography. Marshall's Life of Washington, as we now have it, was not written by Judge Marshall, except detached portions of it, nor has the book been seen in the United States, till within a few months past. The origin of the work was this: During the nullification excitement of 1827, Hon. John Holmes of Maine amused himself by writing notes across the Senate Chamber, to Hon. T. H. Benton of Missouri. Mr. Benton preserved these notes, thinking he might sometime have occasion for them, and he added some of his own. At the session of Congress during Mr. Clay's compromise efforts, Mr. B., perceiving that his time had come, committed these papers to Hon. Amos Kendall, who, out of them and Judge Marshall's papers, forged the book called Marshall's Life of Washington. In consequence of this publication, Col. Benton was elected president of the United States, and Gen. Cass, amid much *noise and confusion*, migrated to California! This, if not exactly like the Hegelian hypotheses of Scripture history, is just as good and just as true as the most of them.

(3) HYPOTHESIS OF GFROERER.

Aug. Gfroerer is a countryman of Strauss, and a writer of reputation. His church history especially (published in 1841-45) is spoken of by competent judges

as a work of great merit. He began (as he says) to meditate his theories earlier than Strauss, but they are no better, and if possible, in some respects even worse. The Gospel of John he considers genuine, but the other three, spurious and mythical. A few miracles, such as the healing of the nobleman's son and the sick man of Bethesda, he admits, and does not sympathize with Strauss in his rejection of all miraculous narratives. The three synoptical Gospels (Matthew, Mark and Luke), according to him, owe their origin to the influence of the writings of Philo and other Jews; and many ideas in them are derived directly from the Talmud, the Fourth Book of Esdras, the Book of Enoch, and other apocryphal writings. (The thing counterfeited owes its existence to the counterfeit.) He is at much pains to prove the antiquity of these apocryphal and Talmudic writings, to make them, if possible, seem older than the Gospels, but with very indifferent success. Even granting him the antiquity he claims, the resemblances on which here lies for the support of his theory are marvelously unlike, as if one should derive the wigs of the English bishops and judges from the head-dress of the Feejee islanders.

To cite a few examples: According to the Jerusalem Talmud, one day when Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Jonathan were riding together, the former began to discourse, when the latter hastily dismounted from his ass, and said: "It is not reasonable that I should bear the honor of my Creator, and thereby ride on an ass." They both sat down under a tree, and there fell fire from heaven and surrounded them (as a reward of their humility). From this and other similar passages,

Gfroerer concludes that in the time of Christ the Jews held fire to be a necessary accompaniment of revelations from God. Hence arose the tradition that John Baptist had declared that Jesus should baptize with fire! In the same Talmud it is related that Deuteronomy came to God and said: "O Lord, thou hast written down thy law in me;" and then complained that Solomon, when he took to himself many wives, took away the *jod* or *y* out of the word *nshym*, Deut. xvii. 17. Then God answered Deuteronomy and said: "Solomon and a thousand like him shall perish; but not a vowel shall perish from thee." Hence arose the tradition that Jesus had said, that not one jot or one tittle of the law should fail. The Targum of Jonathan, in Zech. xiv. 21, translates the word Canaanite by *merchant*; hence the tradition that Christ drove the money-changers out of the temple! These derivations certainly exceed Knickerbocker's etymology of the word *mango* from the name Jeremiah King; for in this case the steps are quite obvious, thus: *Jeremiah King, Jerry King, Jerkin, Cucumber, Mango*.

The doctrine of the Trinity, Gfroerer thinks is of Rabbinic origin. The text, Zech. xiv. 4, the predicted disruption of the Mount of Olives, is explained of the Messiah and his sister the Holy Ghost, who are both, according to the Rabbins, ninety-six miles high and twenty-four miles wide. Hence comes the whole Christian doctrine of the Trinity! O, Gfroerer, *thou art beside thyself; much learning hath made thee mad*.

Ebrard, in the first edition of his work, with great significancy certainly, if not with scrupulous delicacy, illustrates the probability of Gfroerer's hypothesis of

the origin of the Gospels, by the following figure: A company of leproous beggars wash themselves in a river, and from this river a beautiful young man is seen to emerge; the inference is certain that this young man was made from the impurities which the beggars had washed off. And what in this case is the more remarkable, the young man came to the shore before the beggars had been in the water at all!

(4) HYPOTHESIS OF BRUNO BAUER.

Bruno Bauer is a younger man than Strauss, and he may well be regarded as the *extreme extremity* of the extreme left wing of Hegelianism. In him self-deification and the annihilation of all objective truth have reached their culminating point. No subtilty or refinement or locomotive force of Hegelianism can ever go beyond Bruno Bauer. His thoughts are so misty, and his expressions so bombastic and overstrained, that it is exceedingly difficult to get his meaning, and still more difficult to give a translation of it in another language; for like very tenuous gasses, it all seems to evaporate as soon as it meets the air. It is, however, sufficiently plain that Bruno has a very high opinion of himself, a very low opinion of all theologians, and of God no opinion at all. At the very outset he annihilates all historical truth. There was indeed a Jesus, and there was a community in the Jewish nation which formed the nucleus of the Christian church; and this is nearly the whole of the historical basis which he is disposed to acknowledge. There were no Messianic prophecies or expectations among the Jews, there was no baptism of Jesus, there were no discourses, no mir-

acles, not anything to give an objective foundation to the historical narratives in the Gospels. These narratives are not records of facts which once actually occurred; but they are the spontaneous efflorescence of the innermost religious consciousness of the age. The writers did not even profess to themselves to record facts, nor did they pretend to make other people think they were recording facts. How it is that men could write long narratives without thinking they were facts and without intending to write fiction, Bauer himself explains in a way of his own. We will translate his language as well as we are able, and leave the reader to guess his meaning. Says Bauer: "The religious spirit is that disruption of the self-consciousness, in which the essential definiteness of the same steps over against the consciousness as a power separate from it. Before this power the self-consciousness must naturally lose itself; for it has therein cast out its own contents out of itself, and so far as it can still sustain itself as a Me for itself, it feels itself before that power as nothing, so as it must regard the same as the nothing of its own self. Nevertheless the Me as self-consciousness cannot entirely lose itself—in its subjective, secular thought filled with moral ends and its willing, it still maintains its freedom; and into this freedom also the religious consciousness and the historical development of the same are involuntarily drawn. Both the religious consciousness and free self-consciousness thus come into contact, to interpenetration, without which the first could be neither individually living nor capable of a historical growth. But so as this livingness and growth, after their first contact, become the sub-

ject of religious reflection, they are again torn from the self-consciousness, they step before the consciousness as the deed of another, and now also, necessarily, the interposition which had placed them in the self-consciousness as its own movement, becomes a machinery whose bands are guided in another world." (*Kritik der evang. Geschichte der Synoptiker*, i. 25 f.) Such is his explanation of this wonderful phenomenon, and doubtless it is to himself very profound and satisfactory.

These principles being settled, the origin of the first three Gospels, according to Bruno, was as follows: Somebody wrote the book which bears the name of Mark, and others very strangely mistook it for a veritable biography of Jesus. Another afterwards took this book in hand, and without thinking it was not historical, changed and modified it according to his own ideas, and thus we have the Gospel of Luke. Now comes a third, and compares these two writings together, seeks to reconcile the contradictions he finds, compiles and combines, reading first a verse in one and then a verse in the other. In this writer's reflection, subjectivity predominates; yet he, as well as his predecessors, is all unaware, that what he writes is simply the product of his own imagination, and not real, objective history. Here we have the Gospel of Matthew.

This Bruno is very confident, and feels great contempt for theologians. He says: "See how they (the theologians) stand there; how the theological hate glows from their eyes. Ha! would you grasp the thunder? Miserable mortals! well that it was not

given to you!" "Now, after the above *exploitations*, ask them whether they really think their Jesuitism can hold on; whether they believe that their deception and lying will endure forever? When the time comes that their falsehood must be a conscious and determined lie, then their judgment is no longer far off."

HYPOTHESIS OF RENAN.

The *Vie de Jesus* (Life of Jesus) by Ernest Renan, published in Paris some two years since, has become well known. It differs from the German works to which we have been attending as a Frenchman generally differs from a German. It is lively and popular in style but pre-eminently superficial and untrustworthy. It is not nearly so much a biography of Jesus as Daniel Defoe's History of the Devil is a biography of Satan.

Before expressing my own opinion of the work of Renan, I will give an estimate of it by a learned Prussian Jew, Dr. Philippson of Magdeburg. Dr. Philippson as a Jewish Rabbi is as much averse to admitting the historical credibility of the Gospels as Renan himself, but his solid Teutonic erudition is repelled and disgusted by the flippant shallowness of the Frenchman. He says: "The author who after Strauss has gained the greatest renown in literature of this kind is the Frenchman Ernest Renan (*Vie de Jesus*, cinquieme edition, Paris, 1863), but for our subject he is of no value. Renan is no critic; he is merely a rationalist."

"With the aid of lively colors, or psychological *raisonnements*, he, as a master of his language, produces a very readable biography. It was natural, therefore,

that his work found many readers, especially in France, and was met with violent refutation on the part of the clergy; but it could gain no great importance in the domain of science and historical criticism, for after all, much of the work rests upon arbitrary assumptions—very little upon critical principles and an examination corresponding with them.”

“He often contradicts himself most glaringly, even now and then on the same page of his book.”

“Meeting with such a confusion of ideas and such a misconception of all history, we may dispense with all further examination. We said so much lest we should be charged with an omission.”*

A very brief exposition of the style of thought and the general tone of Renan’s celebrated work, will, I think, satisfy every intelligent reader that the truly learned Jewish Rabbi whom we have just quoted, has given a fair and accurate estimate of his real merits as a writer on the Gospels.

In making out the following analysis we avail ourselves of an able article in the London Reader.


His Family and Native Place. He came from the ranks of the people. His father Joseph, and his mother Mary, were persons of middling condition, belonging to the class of artizans living by their labor, in that state, common in the East, which is neither one of easy circumstances nor of misery. . . . If we set aside something of the sordid and the repulsive which Islamism everywhere carries with it, the town of Nazareth, in the time of Jesus, did not differ much, perhaps, from

*Dr. Philippon on the “Crucifixion and the Jews,” translated from the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, by M. Mayer.

what it is at present. The streets where he played as a child, we see them still in those stony paths or those small crossways which separate the huts. The house of Joseph much resembled, doubtless, those poor shops, lighted by the door, serving at once as working-booth, kitchen, and bed-chamber, and having for their furniture a mat, some cushions on the ground, one or two clay vessels, and a painted chest. The family, proceeding from one or more marriages, was numerous enough. Jesus had brothers and sisters, of whom he seems to have been the eldest. All the others remain obscure; for it appears that the four persons represented as his brothers, and of whom at least one, James, became of great importance in the first years of the development of Christianity, were his cousins-german. Mary, in fact, had a sister, named also Mary, who married a certain Alpheus or Cleophas (these two names seem to designate one person), and was the mother of several sons, who played a considerable part among the first disciples of Jesus. These cousins-german, who adhered to the young master while his true brothers opposed him, took the name of "brothers of the Lord." The true brothers of Jesus were, as well as their mother, of no importance till after his death. . . . His sisters married at Nazareth, and there he passed the years of his first youth. Nazareth was a small town . . . the population at present is from three to four thousand souls; and it can not have changed much. The cold there is keen in winter, and the climate very healthy. The town, as at that epoch all the smaller Jewish towns, was a collection of huts built without style, and must have presented the dry and



VALE AND CITY OF NAZARETH.



poor aspect which villages in the Semitic countries still offer. The houses, as far as appears, did not differ much from those cubes of stone, without elegance either exterior or interior, which now cover the richer parts of the Libanus, and which, mingled with vines and fig-trees, have still a very agreeable look. The surrounding country, on the other hand, is charming; and no spot in the world was so fitted for dreams of absolute happiness. Even in our days Nazareth is still a delicious place of residence—the only spot, perhaps, in Palestine, where the soul feels itself somewhat relieved from the burden which oppresses it in the midst of desolation unequalled. The people are amiable and cheerful; the gardens are fresh and green. Antoninus Martyr, at the end of the sixth century, drew an enchanting picture of the fertility of the country round, comparing it to Paradise. Some valleys on the western side fully justify his description. The fountain, round which were gathered the life and gayety of the small town, is destroyed; its choked-up channels give now only turbid water. But the beauty of the women who meet there in the evening—that beauty which was already marked in the sixth century, and in which people saw a gift of the Virgin Mary—is preserved in a striking manner. It is the Syrian type, in all its grace, so full of languor. Doubtless, Mary was there almost every day, and took her place, the urn on her shoulder, in the string of her fellow-countrywomen who have left no name. Antoninus Martyr remarked that the Jewish women, elsewhere disdainful to Christians, are here full of affability. Even to the present day religious animosities are less keen at Nazareth than elsewhere.

His Youth and Education. He learned to read and write, doubtless according to the method of the East, which consists in placing in the child's hands a book, which he repeats in cadence with his little comrades until he knows it by heart. It is doubtful, however, whether he knew well the Hebrew Scriptures in their original tongue. His biographers make him quote them from the Aramean translations. . . . The school-master in the small Jewish towns was the *Hazan* or reader in the synagogues. Jesus frequented little the higher schools of the scribes, or *Soferim* (Nazareth, perhaps, had not one of them); and he had none of those titles which confer, in vulgar eyes, the rights of knowledge. It would, nevertheless, be a great error to imagine that Jesus was what we should now call uneducated. . . . It is not probable that he had learned Greek. That language was little spread in Judea beyond the classes which shared in the government, and the towns inhabited by pagans, like Cesaræa. The idiom proper to Jesus was the Syriac dialect, mixed with Hebrew, then spoken in Palestine. . . . Neither directly nor indirectly did any element of Hellenic culture reach Jesus. He knew nothing beyond Judaism; his mind preserved that frank *naïvete* which an extended and varied culture always enfeebles. Nay, within the bosom of Judaism, he remained a stranger to many efforts that had been made, often parallel to his own. On the one hand, the asceticism of the Essenians or Therapeutæ, on the other, the fine essays of religious philosophy made by the Jewish school of Alexandria, and of which his contemporary Philo was the ingenious interpreter, were unknown to

him. . . . Happily for him he knew nothing of the strange scholasticism which was being taught at Jerusalem, and which was ultimately to form the Talmud. If some Pharisees had already brought it into Galilee, he did not attend to them; and, when, afterwards, he came in contact with this silly casuistry, it inspired him only with disgust. One may suppose, nevertheless, that the principles of Hillel were not unknown to him. Hillel, fifty years before him, had uttered aphorisms which had much analogy to his own. By his poverty humbly endured, by the sweetness of his character, by his opposition to hypocrites and to priests, Hillel was the true master of Jesus, if it is lawful to talk of a master when one is concerned with so high an originality. . . . The reading of the Old Testament made far more impression upon him. . . . The law appears not to have had much charm for him. He believed that a better could be made. But the religious poetry of the Psalms was in wonderful accord with his lyrical soul; they remained, all his life, his food and sustenance. The prophets, in particular Isaiah and his continuator of the time of the Captivity, were, with their brilliant dreams of the future, their impetuous eloquence, their invectives mingled with enchanting pictures, his true masters. He read, doubtless, also, some of the apocryphal works—that is to say, of those writings sufficiently modern, the authors of which, in order to give themselves an authority more willingly allowed to the very ancient writings, sheltered themselves under the names of prophets and patriarchs. One of these books above all, struck him; it was the Book of Daniel. . . . Betimes his character in

part revealed itself. The legends delight in showing him, from his childhood, revolting against paternal authority, and walking from common paths in order to follow his calling. It is certain, at least, that the relations of kindred were to him of small concern. His family do not seem to have liked him; and, at times, he is found hard towards them. Jesus, like all men exclusively preoccupied by an idea, came to regard the ties of blood as of small account.

Galilee and Southern Judea. Every people called to high destinies ought to be a small complete world, enclosing opposed poles within its bosom. Greece had, at a few leagues from each other, Sparta and Athens, two antipodes to a superficial observer, but in reality rival sisters, necessary the one to the other. It was the same with Judea. Less brilliant in one sense than the development of Jerusalem, that of the north was on the whole much more fruitful; the most living performances of the Jewish people always came thence. A complete absence of the sentiment of nature, bordering somewhat on the dry, the narrow, the sullen, struck all works of purely Hierosolymite origin with a character grandiose indeed, but sad and repulsive. With her solemn doctors, her insipid canonists, her hypocritical and atrabilious devotees, Jerusalem could not have conquered humanity. . . . The north alone produced Christianity; Jerusalem, on the contrary, is the true native country of the obstinate Judaism which, founded by the Pharisees and fixed by the Talmud, has traversed the Middle Ages and reached our own days. A ravishing natural scenery contributed to form this spirit, much less austere, less fiercely

monotheistic, if I may so say, which impressed upon all the dreams of the Galilean mind something idyllic and charming. The saddest country in the world is, perhaps, the region near Jerusalem. Galilee, on the other hand, is a land very green, very shady, smiling all over—the true land of the Song of Songs and of the chants of the Well-beloved. During the two months of March and April the champaign is a dense thicket of flowers of incomparable freshness and colors. The animals there are small, but of extreme docility. . . . In no country in the world do the mountains lay themselves out with more harmony or inspire higher thoughts. Jesus seems to have particularly loved them. The most important acts of his divine career took place on the mountains; there was he best inspired; it was there that he held secret communion with the ancient prophets, and that he showed himself to the eyes of disciples already transfigured. . . . Jesus lived and grew up in this intoxicating medium; but, from his infancy, he made almost annually the journey to Jerusalem for the festival.

The Theology of Jesus. A high notion of Deity, which he did not owe to Judaism, and which seems to have been in all its parts the creation of his own great soul, was, in a manner, the principle of his whole power. . . . The highest consciousness of Deity that has ever existed in the breast of humanity was that of Jesus. One sees, on the other hand, that Jesus, starting from such a disposition of soul as his, never could have been a speculative philosopher like Cakya-Mouni. Nothing is farther from scholastic theology than the Gospel. The speculations of the Greek

fathers on the divine essence came from quite another spirit. God conceived immediately as Father—this is all the theology of Jesus. . . . It is probable that, from the first, he regarded himself as being to God in the relation of a son to his father. Here is his great act of originality; in this he is not like one of his race. Neither Jew nor Mussulman has understood this delicious theology of love. The God of Jesus is not that fatal master who kills us when he pleases, condemns us when he pleases, saves us when he pleases. The God of Jesus is Our Father.

Matured Notion of his Mission. This name “Kingdom of God,” or “Kingdom of Heaven,” was the favorite term with Jesus for expressing the revolution which he brought into the world. Like almost all the other Messianic terms, it came from the Book of Daniel. According to the author of that extraordinary book, to the four profane kingdoms, destined to sink, a fifth empire was to succeed, which should be that of the Saints, and should endure forever. This kingdom of God upon the earth had naturally received diverse interpretations. . . . All that Jesus owed to John was, to some extent, lessons in preaching and popular action. From that moment, in fact, he preached with much more force, and imposed himself on the crowd with authority. It seems, also, that his sojourn near John, less by the action of the Baptist than by the natural progress of his own thoughts, greatly matured his ideas respecting the “Kingdom of Heaven.” His watchword thenceforward was “Good tidings”—news that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. Jesus will no longer be merely a delightful moralist, aspiring to

enclose sublime lessons in some loving and brief aphorism; he is the transcendant revolutionist who strives to renew the world from its foundations, and to found on earth the ideal which he has conceived. To "wait for the Kingdom of God" will be the synonym for being a disciple of Jesus. . . . Who is to establish this Kingdom of God? Let us remember that the first thought of Jesus—a thought so profound with him that it had probably no origin, but belonged to the very roots of his being—was that he was the Son of God, the intimate of his Father, the doer of his will; and then the answer of Jesus to such a question will not be doubtful. The conviction that he would cause God to reign possessed itself of his spirit in a manner quite absolute. He considered himself as the universal reformer. Heaven, earth, all nature, madness, malady, and death are but his instruments. In his access of heroic will he believes himself all-powerful. If the Earth is not ready for this last transformation, the Earth will be burnt, purified by fire and the breath of God. A new Heaven will be created, and the whole world will be peopled with the angels of God. A radical revolution, embracing even physical nature itself—such was the fundamental thought of Jesus.

Inadequate Modern Appreciation of great Characters and Movements. Our principles of positive science are hurt by the dreams which the plan of Jesus embraced. We know the history of the earth; cosmical revolutions of the kind which Jesus expected are produced only by geological or astronomical causes, the connection of which with moral matters has never been

ascertained. But, to be just to great creative minds, it is necessary not to stop at the prejudices they may have shared with their time. . . . The deism of the eighteenth century and a certain kind of protestantism have accustomed us to consider the founder of the Christian faith only as a great moralist, a benefactor of humanity. We see in the Gospel only good maxims; we throw a prudent veil over the strange intellectual state in which it was born. There are people, also, who regret that the French Revolution went more than once out of the track of principles, and was not the work of wise and moderate men. Let us not impose our small plans of middle-class good sense upon those extraordinary movements so greatly beyond our stature. Let us continue to admire the "morality of the Gospel"—let us suppress in our religious instructions the chimera that was the soul of it; but let us not believe that, by simple ideas of goodness or individual morality, the world is ever stirred. The idea of Jesus was much more profound; it was the most revolutionary idea that was ever conceived in a human brain; it must be taken in its totality, and not with those timid suppressions which retrench from it precisely that which made it effective for the regeneration of humanity. Fundamentally, the ideal is always a Utopia. When *we* wish at present to represent the Christ of modern consciousness, the consoler, the judge of these new times, what do we do? That which Jesus himself did 1830 years ago. We suppose the conditions of the real world altogether other than they are; we represent a moral deliverer breaking, without arms, the chains of the negro, ameliorating

the condition of the poor, freeing the oppressed nations. We forget that this supposes a world turned upside-down, the climate of Virginia and that of Congo modified, the blood and race of millions of men changed, our social complications brought back to a chimerical simplicity, the political stratifications of Europe tilted out of their order."

What is all this but the sheerest and most extravagant moonshine? What shadow or even pretence of a shadow of historical testimony or historical evidence of any kind does Renan give us? Not a particle of evidence of any kind, except the vagaries of his own brain, does he pretend to give. Strauss, Renan, and all the rest simply start with the principle that a miracle is impossible, and then any hypothesis to account for the existence of Christianity, however wild, absurd and self-contradictory it may be, is more rational than the belief in its miraculous origin so simply and so clearly stated in our sacred books.

Compare the following passages: (1) "So long as the Gospels are regarded as historical sources, in the strict sense of the word, so long a historical view of the life of Jesus is impossible." (*Strauss* p. 40.) For "historical enquiry refuses absolutely to recognize anywhere any such thing" as a miracle (p. 146). (2) "In the person and work of Jesus nothing supernatural happened; . . . for thus much we can soon discover about our Gospels, that neither all nor any of them display such historical trustworthiness as to compel our reason to the acceptance of a miracle" (p. 15).

Similarly M. Renan: (1) "The first twelve chapters of Acts are a tissue of miracles. Now, an absolute

rule of criticism is, to allow no place in historical narration to miracles" (p. 43). (2) "Show me a specimen of these things, and I will admit them. . . . The *onus probandi* in science rests with those who allege a fact." (p. 45.)

HYPOTHESIS OF SCHENKEL.

Prof. Daniel Schenkel is probably the highest authority among the German rationalists of the present generation; and his is the most recent effort at *constructing* the life of Jesus out of one's own inward consciousness, without reference or rather in direct opposition to the historical testimony on the subject.*

From his own inward consciousness and without any external testimony, he thinks himself competent to correct the Gospel narrative as follows: "Jesus was born at Nazareth, not at Bethlehem. He was not in the wilderness all the time of the temptation, nor did he abstain from food. He made no journey to Jerusalem but the last, which terminated in his death. John the Baptist did not recognize Jesus' Messiahship, nor testify of him, nor urge any disciples to follow him. Jesus could not possibly have said that not one jot or tittle of the Old Testament would pass away. He could not have referred to his resurrection before his death, for he was not raised, and if he had been, he could not have known it beforehand. "Of a suffering Messiah the Old Testament knows nothing."

* The character of Jesus portrayed. A Biblical Essay with an Appendix. By Dr. Daniel Schenkel, Professor of Theology, Heidelberg. Translated from the third German edition, with introduction and notes, by W. H. Furness, D. D. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Of the writers of the four Gospels "Mark he thinks the most accurate of all, though many things have been added by another hand, which are not trustworthy. Matthew was written by a Jewish disciple, and, as it attempts to prove that the prophecies of a Jewish Messiah found fulfillment in Jesus, much of it must be rejected. Luke adds many incidents and parables to adapt the new religion to the Gentile world, and these must be carefully winnowed. Little reliance can be placed on John's Gospel, for it contradicts the historical order, by making Jesus have a distinct conception of his work from the beginning. This accords, indeed, with Old Testament teaching, and with the plan of God as revealed, but it can not have a place in Dr. Schenkel's historical theory, and must be rejected."

"Now one naturally imagines, from such statements, that Dr. Schenkel must doubt the veracity of the Gospel writers. It would seem as if there were but two alternatives in the case; either they told the simple truth, which they claim to have known, and to whose veracity they bore witness by suffering and death; or else they invented the whole or a part to deceive the world. But his theory is strangely elastic, and saves their credit while it denies their statements." He says:

"It is no device of writers aiming to establish a point, still less, as from a low historical point of view it may be thought, is it falsehood and deceit that we have here. In these extraordinary accounts we have the unconscious homage of a religiously inspired imagination paid to Jesus by disciples and friends."*

I can not see that Dr. Schenkel has improved at all

* Christian Watchman and Reflector.

upon Strauss, or that he is really any more reliable than Renan. All these hypotheses are utterly baseless, they have not a foot to stand upon, they are constructed not only without historical testimony, but in direct opposition to all the historical testimony we actually possess on the subject. They are simply the outgrowth of the fancy and the imagination of the writers. They are in fact the *Apocryphal Gospels* of the nineteenth century, in every respect as *apocryphal* as those compositions of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries which have already passed under review, only adapted to the faithlessness of this generation as those were to the superstitious credulity of the times in which they originated.

HYPOTHESIS OF F. C. BAUR.

It is generally admitted by these theorizers that there was no intentional deception on the part of the writers of our Gospels. Though there is very little, if any historical truth in their compositions, yet their intentions were good; a religious imagination, a harmless enthusiasm, an amiable fanaticism guided their pens. F. C. Baur, the founder and the most brilliant representative of the famous Tuebingen school, takes a somewhat different view. The Gospels were originally written for the express purpose of deception, for the express purpose of sustaining the theology of Paul against that of Peter, or the theology of Peter against that of Paul. Of course there is no historical testimony to that effect, he does not even pretend to any; he makes his conclusion from internal evidence alone; yet, strange to say, these writings have been

so modified and smoothed over since their original production, that all traces of this controversial tendency have pretty much disappeared from the pages. The following statements are from an elaborate article in the London Quarterly Review :

“According to Baur, each of the Gospels had a *tendency*—was written for a purpose. There was, he alleges, a much more active feud between two opposite elements in the early church—between the Ebionitish or Petrine element and the Pauline—than would be gathered from the New Testament itself. This controversy began from the time of the apostles and did not end until the middle of the second century. It was a contest between those who viewed Christianity as Judaism and the Lord as the Messiah, and those who viewed it as a new principle by which both Judaism and heathenism were to be moulded and transformed into a new system. Of the former opinion Peter was the chief champion; the supersedure of temple and law in favor of Christianity, an all-embracing system, was the work of Paul. But the contest, says Baur, was much more obstinate and lasting than we should infer from the Acts of the Apostles. The life of Paul was passed in the struggle for recognition as one of the apostles, for perfect equality of Jew and Gentile converts, for emancipation from the law. But the dispute continued far beyond his life, and all the early church literature is to be interpreted by the light of this dispute. The books of the New Testament are either party-writings on one side or the other, or else they are later productions, intended to conciliate and conceal this difference, and to unite all Christians upon

one common ground. And most of the books are of this latter class, and it follows, that they are not the genuine productions of those whose names they bear. The lateness of St. Mark's Gospel is inferred from the absence of controversial matter and other reasons. St. Luke's Gospel had originally a strong Pauline and anti-Jewish tendency; but in the later edition of it, which we possess, this tendency was much modified and softened! St. Matthew must likewise have been modified, the original Gospel being very different from that which we now possess, more decidedly Judaic in 'tendency,' whilst the Greek Gospel as we possess it has the general character of the other two Gospels, one of conciliation between the two great parties!

The critical power that can discover a strong Gentile prejudice in a narrative, after some one has gone over it with the express purpose of taking out all signs of this, does not belong to the region of science but of second sight. If ever there were books free from all taint of prejudice, from the stifling heat of controversy, the four Gospels are these books. If it had been reserved for this century to disclose a hidden purpose and bias in the writers, the grounds on which it rests should surely be accessible to us all. We can conceive that eyes long exercised in the twilight of antiquity may catch forms and shades that escape our own; but eyes that read not only what is there, but what would have been there if it had not been taken out, are beyond the reach even of imagination."

It is scarcely necessary to give any specimens of Schwegler, Keim, Volkmar, and other critics of the Tübingen school. Though differing somewhat from

the Hegelians already noticed, practically they belong to the same category. There is the same self-conceit and self-deification, the same reckless disregard of facts, the same extravagant baselessness and groundlessness of speculation. In one species of folly, they even exceed Gfroerer; for while they admit the writings of the apostolic fathers, Papias, Ignatius, Irenæus, etc., to be ancient and genuine, they affirm that the writings of the New Testament ascribed to John, Paul, Peter, etc., are spurious, and the product of a later age. They have been abundantly refuted by Thiersch, Ebrard, Dorner, and other writers; and though they are the most recent representatives of the sceptical spirit in Germany, and some of them (as for example, Baur), accomplished scholars and powerful writers, they are already growing obsolete, and fast hastening to a deserved oblivion.

Truth alone is immutable and permanent; error has numberless forms, and in all of them it is transient, and short-lived.

After all these assaults and speculations the honest old Bible stands just where it did before, speaks the same language, exerts the same influence, and emits the same heavenly radiance. *This sure word of prophecy will remain, and we do well to take heed to it, as to a light that shineth in a dark place, till the day dawn, and the day star arise in our hearts.*

The enormous self-confidence and self-estimation of this whole class of Gospel assailers, most forcibly reminds us of the words of Holy writ: *Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him. God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.*

THE REAL VALUE OF THESE SUBSTITUTES FOR THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

These assaults on the Gospels consist of two parts, namely, 1, Objections to the historical truth of the Gospels, derived from the narrative itself, and, 2, Hypotheses to account for the existence and influence of the Gospels, supposing them to be historically untrue. It is these hypotheses only which we have thus far considered. The objections are matters of detail, and must be considered in detail, and there is no room for them in a volume of this kind. A few will be selected as specimens of the whole, and answers given to them which will show how all the rest may be answered.

In considering these objections, we must always bear it in mind that the Gospels are not, and do not profess to be, complete histories. They are simply detached memoirs, or select anecdotes, intended solely to illustrate the character and teachings of Christ, to show what kind of a teacher he was, and to give an idea of the substance and manner of his teaching. This the writers themselves affirm in so many words. Says John, at the close of his narrative: *There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.*

And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name. John xxi. 25; xx. 30, 31.

BETHANY.





Out of the countless multitude of events in our Saviour's life, and from his numberless teachings, the different evangelists select different transactions and different discourses for this purpose, all equally appropriate, as would also have been thousands of others which are left unrecorded. The evangelists sometimes repeat each other, but very often they do not; and not one of them undertakes, or pretends, to give a complete narrative of all that Jesus did and said, but on the contrary, they all carefully and expressly disclaim any such undertaking or intention.

The most plausible of the objections to which we allude, are derived from supposed contradictions in the Gospel narrative; but such contradictions are *assumed* and *supposed*; they have never yet been *proved*.

For example, in Luke vii. 1-10, we are informed, that when Jesus was in Capernaum, a centurion there sent friends to him, requesting him to heal a sick servant of his, who was very dear to him.

In John iv. 46-53, we are told, that when Jesus was in Cana, a nobleman of Capernaum, whose son was sick, went himself to Jesus, and asked him to heal his son.

In both cases the sick person was restored without being seen by Jesus.

Because there are points of similarity in the two narratives, the objectors assume that they are intended as narratives of the same event; and then they point out the discrepancies between them, to show that the Gospel history is unworthy of credit. The fallaciousness of this mode of reasoning, especially when considered in connection with the nature of the Gospel

narrative as already pointed out, is very easily demonstrated. We will suppose two discourses by two different authors, intended to illustrate American character by incidents of American history. One of these authors gives in illustration, the battle of Baltimore; the other, the battle of New Orleans in 1815. In these two battles there were remarkable coincidences, as well as remarkable diversities. They both took place during the same war; in both, an assault was made by a British army on an American city; in both, the British commander was killed, and his troops repulsed. But, in the one case there were cotton-bale intrenchments; in the other, there were none. In the one battle, Gen. Jackson gained great celebrity; in the other, he was not present. One battle occurred on the southern border of the United States; the other, on the eastern. Some fifteen hundred or two thousand years hence, a Hegelian critic gets hold of these two discourses—and for the sake of destroying the credit of both, affirms that they both refer to the same battle; and gives the purpose and object of the writers, namely, the illustration of American character from American history, and states all the resemblances, to prove that they do both intend the same event; and then states all the discrepancies to show that they are not reliable histories. He will not hear to the suggestion that they may be giving accounts of different battles—the similarities are too numerous and striking to admit of that idea; nor will he allow that one of the two narratives, after all, may be true, for the style and tone of the two are so exactly alike, that if one is false, the other must certainly be false also.

This is a fair illustration of a multitude of the most plausible and strongest of the objections of Strauss and his collaborators; and sometimes they are even ten-fold more fallacious and absurd than this.

For example, Luke xvii. 11–19, at the gate of the city of Nain, Jesus raised from the dead a young man, the only son of a widowed mother.

Mark v. 35–43, in the house of Jairus, a ruler of the synagogue, Jesus raises from the dead a daughter of this Jairus, a little girl twelve years old.

Now, says Gfroerer, there are such resemblances in these narratives, that they must be identical, yet so diverse are they, that they destroy the historical credit of the writers. The difference of place, the difference of sex in both parent and child, the diversity of all the attending circumstances, prove, not that they were two different transactions, but that the writers are not truthful; for the resemblances are so strong, that the proof of identity is irresistible, whatever improbabilities may intervene. What are these resemblances which make the conclusion of identity so irresistible!

Why, these and these only—(1) they were both young people, (2) they each had a living parent, (3) they both died, and (4) they were both raised from the dead. By the same kind of argument we might prove irresistibly, and in spite of all inherent improbabilities, the identity of Gen. Jackson and Mr. Van Buren's grandmother, that they were one and the same person—for (1) they were both old people, (2) they were both very fond of Mr. Van Buren, (3) they both died, and (4) they neither of them ever rose from the dead—and the difference of sex, and name, and place

of abode, and all things of that kind are merely the discrepancies of unreliable historians.

Such is the character of the objections which these critics make—such is the kind of contradictions which they point out—and when we examine their *hypotheses*, we find them quite as baseless as their *objections*, and even more so. Their *positive* side is no more tenable than their *negative*. Their *constructive* efforts are even more decided failures than their *destructive*.

Their hypotheses have absolutely nothing to stand upon. They are made wholly out of air and fog, and the moment the sun shines on them they are gone. We can at any time and on any historical subject whatever, make a thousand suppositions, all false, yet all as plausible as any of these. That fine piece of burlesque by Archbishop Whately, entitled “Historical Doubts respecting Napoleon Bonaparte,” in which he shows how exceedingly improbable it is that any such person as Napoleon ever existed, is tenfold more plausible and sustained by arguments tenfold stronger than many of these Hegelian hypotheses of the Gospel history.

In all their hypotheses they entirely mistake the times and the men wherein the Gospel history originated. Their theories are such as could have arisen only in the minds of studious, speculative men, greatly in want of something to do, and driven to the necessity of inventing something to say that shall be new, striking and attractive, in order to draw attention to themselves and their sayings; and they seem to imagine that the early promoters of Christianity were very

much the same kind of men and in very nearly the same circumstances as themselves. Their theories all smell very strongly of the shop. In their judgment of the evangelists, apostles and martyrs of the early church, they are quite as much out of the way, as an exquisite of the west end of London would be, if he were to undertake, from his own feelings, purposes and daily employments, to form an estimate of the feelings, purposes and daily employments of a backwoodsman in the Western States of America. Were they to ask me the question: "Why are we not qualified to write critiques of the Gospel history?"—I would reply to them, as Henry More did to Southey, when he inquired: "Why am not I qualified to write a biography of John Wesley?" "Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep."

To think of the apostle John writing his Gospel as Weisse supposes—or the early teachers of Christianity inventing myths as Strauss' imagines—what can be conceived more utterly inappropriate to the times and the men—more entirely beyond the limits of all inherent probability? Indeed, these German unbelievers do not intend to be probable, nor have they any serious purpose of discovering and advocating truth. They delight in a sort of intellectual gladiatorship, and nothing with them is too serious to be made a plaything of. They sport with God and eternity, with heaven and hell, with their own souls and the souls of their fellow-men; all the while thinking only of the fine and fruitful subjects they are getting for lectures and books—but when their speculations are imported into this land of serious purpose and earnest endeavor and

practical results, they become immediately matters of life and death, of eternal life and eternal death, to thousands. That which is a fashionable, though far from an innocent, amusement in Germany, is a deadly, death dealing work in America.

But what are these *myths*, of which these assailants of the Gospel say so much? They suppose them to be fanciful or fabulous narratives, having but a remote resemblance to events of actual occurrence, and intended mainly to embody certain general ideas, which the inventors wished in this way to preserve for the world. According to Strauss, the myths of the Gospel illustrate mainly the dominion of mind over nature. The very idea of such myths so near the time and the place of the alleged occurrence of the events, presents to the sober mind nothing but the aspect of a blank impossibility. According to Strauss's own showing, not a single generation had passed away, before the myths began to spring up like mushrooms on the very soil of Palestine itself. As well might we now have a mythical history of the last war with Great Britain, or myths of the presidential election in 1840—and these poetical romances, these moral apologues, these elaborate fictions designed to illustrate great moral truths, invented and put in circulation by the hard old soldiers and the tough old politicians who took a leading part in the actual events, (whatever they might be)—and implicitly believed as actual matters of fact by the simple hearted people who did the fighting and the voting! Surely the legends and religious fables of the patristic and mediaeval period do not equal in baselessness and extravagance the inventions and hy-

potheses of these philosophic Gospel-assailers in the middle of the nineteenth century ; and besides, the former have at least the advantage of being imbued with the spirit of veneration and the love of God, of which the latter have not a particle.

True, there were apocryphal gospels, containing romances and myths—but these, for the most part, were remote both in time and place from the actual scenes of the Gospel history, and written after men had begun to withdraw into deserts and caves and convents, to spend their lives in solitude and mortification, hoping thereby to gain the favor of God ; instead of *going about doing good*, as Christ did, and as he taught all the early preachers of Christianity to do.

Theodore Parker occasionally says some very good things, and he happily illustrates the folly of this whole method of *inventing* history in regard to the Gospels rather than studying history, by applying it to an important event in our own American annals. He says :

“The story of the Declaration of Independence is liable to many objections, if we examine it *a la mode* Strauss. The Congress was held at a mythical town, whose very name is suspicious,—Philadelphia,—brotherly love. The date is suspicious, it was the *fourth* day of the *fourth* month (reckoning from *April*, as it is probable the Heraclidæ and Scandinavians, possible that the aboriginal Americans, and certain that the Hebrews did). Now *four* was a sacred number with the Americans ; the president was chosen for *four* years ; there were *four* departments of affairs ; *four* divisions of the political powers, namely, the people, the congress, the executive, and the judiciary, etc.

Besides, which is still more incredible, three of the presidents, two of whom, it is alleged, signed the declaration, died on the *fourth* of July, and the two latter exactly *fifty* years after they had signed it, and about the *same hour* of the day. The *year* also is suspicious; 1776 is but an ingenious combination of the sacred number, *four*, which is repeated *three* times, and then multiplied by itself to produce the date; thus $444 \times 4 = 1776$ Still farther, the declaration is metaphysical, and presupposes an acquaintance with the transcendental philosophy on the part of the American people. Now the "Kritik of Pure Reason" was not published till after the declaration was made. Still farther, the Americans were never, to use the nebulous expression of certain philosophers, an "idealo-transcendental-and-subjective," but an "objective-and-concretivo-practical" people, to the last degree; therefore a metaphysical document, and most of all a "legal-congressional-metaphysical" document, is highly suspicious if found among them. Besides, Hualteperah, the great historian of Mexico, a neighboring state, never mentions this document; and farther still, if this declaration had been made, and accepted by the whole nation, as it is pretended, then we can not account for the fact, that the fundamental maxim of that paper, namely, the soul's equality to itself—"all men are born free and equal"—was perpetually lost sight of, and a large portion of the people kept in slavery; still later, petitions,—supported by this fundamental article—for the abolition of slavery, were rejected by Congress with unexampled contempt, when, if the history is not mythical, slavery never had a legal

existence after 1776, etc., etc. But we could go on this way forever."

The reader will notice that the names of Polycarp and Irenaeus occur in this volume as witnesses to nearly every book of the New Testament. To show how immediately these witnesses are connected with the apostles themselves, and that there is absolutely no room and no time for the formation of the *myths* on which Strauss, and Renan, and the other romancers on the Gospel history rely, we close this chapter with an extract of a letter from Irenaeus to Florinus, an elder in the church at Rome. (Euseb. E. H. v. 20.

"For I saw thee when I was yet a boy in the lower Asia with Polycarp, moving in great splendour at court, and endeavoring by all means to gain his esteem. I remember the events of those times much better than those of more recent occurrence. As the studies of our youth growing with our minds, unite with it so firmly that I can tell also the very place where the blessed Polycarp was accustomed to sit and discourse; and also his entrances, his walks, the complexion of his life and the form of his body, and his conversations with the people, and his familiar intercourse with John, as he was accustomed to tell, as also his familiarity with those that had seen the Lord. How also he used to relate their discourses, and what things he had heard from them concerning the Lord. Also concerning his miracles, his doctrine, all these were told by Polycarp, in consistency with the holy Scriptures, as he had received them from the eye witnesses of the doctrine of salvation. These things, by

the mercy of God, and the opportunity then afforded me, I attentively heard, noting them down, not on paper, but in my heart; and these same facts I am always in the habit, by the grace of God, to recall faithfully to mind."

The same facts also are stated by Irenaeus, *Contra Haer.* iii. 3, 4. Notice here that Irenaeus had the Christian Scriptures at the same time that he had the oral testimony of Polycarp.

CHAPTER NINTH.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND THE APOCRYPHAL ACTS.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

FROM the first sentence in this book it is seen that Luke intended it for a continuation of his Gospel rather than a separate work. The Gospel was an account of what Jesus *began to do and teach* while on earth in person, and the Acts, of what he continued, after his ascension to heaven, to do and teach through his apostles and by the Holy Spirit which he had promised. Throughout the Acts it is Jesus who does and teaches as really as in the Gospel. It is Jesus who works the miracles, sustains Stephen, delivers and enlightens Peter, converts and encourages and teaches Paul, and so on through the book. The headings or titles of the different books of the New Testament, as of ancient books generally, were usually the work of the publishers of the manuscript rather than of the original authors. Hence the titles are somewhat varied in successive publications; in the New Testament books the most ancient being the shortest and simplest. Thus in this book, the older manuscripts are entitled, *Acts of Apostles, Acting of Apostles, The Acts of the Apostles, The Acts of the Holy Apostles, Luke the Evangelist's Acts of the Apostles*, and then toward the mid-

dle ages, *Acts of the holy and all-praiseworthy Apostles, written by the holy, illustrious and all-praiseworthy Luke the Evangelist.* The oldest titles, *Acts* or *Acting of Apostles*, are much the most appropriate, for the book does not profess to give a full history of the apostolic doings, or of any of the apostles; but the same course is pursued as in the Gospels; a few leading pictures are presented, more or less connected with each other, to give the reader an idea of what the apostles did and how they discharged the important trusts committed to them. Only three of the apostles are particularly spoken of in the book, to wit, James, Peter, and Paul. Peter disappears from the book after his imprisonment by Herod and his escape aided by the angel (xii.), and appears but once afterwards, at the council of Jerusalem (xv.); while almost the entire book, from xiii. onward, is devoted to the life and labors of Paul. The narrative occupies the space of about thirty years; there are but few chronological notices in it, and these not very precise; the whole book is very brief, not much larger than some single sermons; yet so full and varied is the information it conveys that it seems to the reader like a long history. The story is told not in the way of dry abstract, but of lively anecdote; it combines in a wonderful degree condensation and fulness; there is one systematic purpose throughout, but the most unconstrained freedom of manner; the style is perfectly simple yet wonderfully graphic and animated, and is most skillfully varied as different persons and scenes are to be represented. This is seen to most advantage in the different speeches that are reported, for though

they must be of necessity the very briefest of abstracts, they are each amazingly characteristic and peculiar. Paul addressing the rough Jews in the interior of Asia Minor, the polished Greeks of Athens, the furious mob at Jerusalem, Festus the governor and Agrippa the king at Cæsarea, the elders of the church at Miletus, is always the same Paul, yet speaking in a style admirably varied to meet most skillfully the peculiar circumstances of each case. Never before nor since has an abbreviator of discourses retained so perfectly in every case the characteristic features of his original. It will be seen in the narrative of Paul's journeys that Luke generally accompanied him from xvi. onward, but was sometimes separated from him. Chrysostom testifies that the book was read daily in the churches between Easter and Pentacost in his time (Hom. i. 477), though it was introduced later for church reading than some of the other books. The chief witnesses for the Acts are Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Dionysius of Corinth, Justin Martyr, the Church of Vienne and Lyons, Irenæus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome. The testimony is full, varied and explicit, but only a few brief specimens can be given here.

Ignatius. "After his resurrection he did eat and drink with them." Acts x. 41.

Papias. "This Justus is mentioned in the book of Acts as the one over which the apostles prayed," etc. i. 23, 24.

Dionysius of Corinth. "Dionysius the Areopagite, who was converted to the faith by Paul the apostle,

according to the statement in the Acts of the Apostles."

Irenaeus. "But that Luke was inseparable from Paul, and his fellow-laborer in the Gospel he himself makes manifest, for he says." (Then Irenaeus quotes from the Acts the account of the separation of Paul and Barnabas, and their missionary journeys in different directions, and shows that Luke was with Paul from the narrative in xvi. 11, 13, 16, etc.)

Athenagoras. "The world was made not as if God needed anything." xvii. 25.

Tertullian. "It is stated in the commentary by Luke that at the third hour they were considered drunken." ii. 15.

Origen. "In the Acts of the Apostles Stephen testifies."

Eusebius. "Luke has left us in two inspired books—one of these is the Gospel—the other is his Acts of the Apostles. The Areopagite, called Dionysius, whom Luke has recorded in his Acts." iii. 4, also ii. 22.

The testimony is full, unequivocal, uncontradicted, that Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles, the same that we have in the New Testament; and this the internal evidence clearly shows.

Church of Lyons and Vienne. "As Stephen the perfected martyr, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." vii. 60.

Clement of Alexandria. "As Luke in the Acts of the Apostles mentions Paul saying, Ye men of Athens." etc. xvii. 22, 23.

APOCRYPHAL ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

Of these Prof. Tischendorf, the most indefatigable and successful scholar of modern times in this branch of literature, published in 1851, thirteen, to wit: 1, Acts of Peter and Paul; 2, of Paul and Thecla; 3, of Barnabas by Mark; 4, of Philip; 5, of Philip in Greece; 6, of Andrew; 7, of Andrew and Matthias; 8, Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew; 9, Acts of Thomas; 10, The Consummation (*Teleiosis*) of Thomas; 11, Acts of Bartholomew; 12, Acts of Thaddeus; 13, Acts of John.

Some of these are of very early date, reaching as high at least as the beginning of the third or latter part of the second century; but they were never delivered to any of the churches, they were written for the most part, as Tertullian, Eusebius, Gelasius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustin, and other ancient witnesses assure us (Tischendorf, Proleg.), in the interest of some particular error to which the churches were opposed, and they never had any very wide circulation. The most ancient existing manuscripts of these books are generally not earlier than the 10th or the 11th century; and a slight inspection of them fully justifies the sound discretion of the early Christians in rejecting them. It is indeed surprising that books written so near the apostolic times, and among the class of people to whom the apostles preached, should be so entirely different from all the apostolic writings. To the candid thinker the contrast affords one of the most striking proofs of the absolute divine inspiration of the New Testament books. We will select for examination two of the

best of these apocryphal Acts, those numbered 2 and 7 in the enumeration of Tischendorf, and will endeavor to make the analysis sufficiently comprehensive to put the reader entirely in possession of the means of judging between these and our sacred books.

ACTS OF PAUL AND THECLA.

This book must be very ancient, for it is mentioned by Tertullian, who was born A. D. 160. We have the most satisfactory evidence that the book, as we now read it, is to all intents and purposes the same as that which was read by Tertullian, though of course, as is the case with all ancient books, there are variations and errors in the written text. It sometimes had for its title, Concerning the holy and glorious and illustrious martyr Thecla, who was in Iconium. Thecla is a saint both in the Greek and Romish churches, and her virtues are celebrated by the latter on the 23d of September. The two oldest manuscripts which Tischendorf found, are both in Paris, and both of the eleventh century.

Tertullian says the book was first written in the interest of those that held that women had the right to preach and baptize; and it was much esteemed by the early Quakers as sustaining their views of the position of women in the church.

The following extract, being the first five chapters in the old English translation by Archbishop Wake, will give a sufficient idea of the whole book, and enable the reader to make a fair comparison between the best of the apocryphal and the canonical Acts:

“When Paul went up to Iconium, after his flight from Antioch, Demas and Hermogenes became his companions, who were then full of hypocrisy. But Paul, looking only at the goodness of God, did them no harm, but loved them greatly. Accordingly he endeavored to make agreeable to them all the oracles and doctrines of Christ, and the design of the Gospel of God’s well-beloved Son, instructing them in the knowledge of Christ, as it was revealed to him. And a certain man named Onesiphorus, hearing that Paul was come to Iconium, went out speedily to meet him, together with his wife Lectra, and his sons Simmia and Zeno, to invite him to their house. For Titus had given them a description of Paul’s personage, they as yet not knowing him in person, but only being acquainted with his character. They went in the king’s highway to Lystra, and stood there waiting for him, comparing all who passed by, with that description which Titus had given them. At length they saw a man coming (namely, Paul), of a low stature, bald (or shaved) on the head, crooked thighs, handsome legs, hollow-eyed; had a crooked nose; full of grace; for sometimes he appeared as a man, sometimes he had the countenance of an angel. And Paul saw Onesiphorus, and was glad. And Onesiphorus said, Hail, thou servant of the blessed God. Paul replied, The grace of God be with thee and thy family. But Demas and Hermogenes were moved with envy, and under a show of great religion Demas said, and are not we also servants of the blessed God? Why didst thou not salute us? Onesiphorus replied, Because I have not perceived in you the fruits of righteousness; nevertheless, if ye

are of that sort, ye shall be welcome to my house also. Then Paul went into the House of Onesiphorus, and there was great joy among the family on that account; and they employed themselves in prayer, breaking of bread, and hearing Paul preach the word of God concerning temperance and the resurrection, in the following manner; Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God. Blessed are they who keep their flesh undefiled (or pure); for they shall be the temples of God. Blessed are the temperate (or chaste); for God will reveal himself to them. Blessed are they who abandon their secular enjoyments; for they shall be accepted of God. Blessed are they who have wives, as though they had them not; for they shall be made angels of God. Blessed are they who tremble at the word of God; for they shall be comforted. Blessed are they who keep their Baptism pure; for they shall find peace with the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Blessed are they who pursue the wisdom (or doctrine) of Jesus Christ; for they shall be called the sons of the Most High. Blessed are they who observe the instructions of Jesus Christ; for they shall dwell in eternal light. Blessed are they, who for the love of Christ abandon the glories of the world; for they shall judge angels, and be placed at the right hand of Christ, and shall not suffer the bitterness of the last judgment. Blessed are the bodies and souls of virgins; for they are acceptable to God, and shall not lose the reward of their virginity; for the word of their (heavenly) Father shall prove effectual to their salvation in the day of his Son, and they shall enjoy rest for evermore.

While Paul was preaching this sermon in the church which was in the house of Onesiphorus, a certain virgin named Thecla (whose mother's name was Theoclia, and who was betrothed to a man named Thamyris) sat at a certain window in her house, from whence, by the advantage of a window in the house where Paul was, she both night and day heard Paul's sermons concerning God, concerning charity, concerning faith in Christ, and concerning prayer; nor would she depart from the window, till with exceeding joy she was subdued to the doctrines of faith. At length, when she saw many women and virgins going in to Paul, she earnestly desired that she might be thought worthy to appear in his presence, and hear the word of Christ; for she had not yet seen Paul's person, but only heard his sermons, and that alone. But when she would not be prevailed upon to depart from the window, her mother sent to Thamyris, who came with the greatest pleasure, as hoping now to marry her. Accordingly, he said to Theoclia, Where is my Thecla? Theoclia replied, Thamyris, I have something very strange to tell you; for Thecla, for the space of three days, will not move from the window, not so much as to eat or drink, but is so intent on hearing the artful and delusive discourses of a certain foreigner, that I perfectly admire, Thamyris, that a young woman of her known modesty, will suffer herself to be so prevailed upon. For that man has disturbed the whole city of Iconium, and even your Thecla among others. All the women and young men flock to him to receive his doctrine; who, besides all the rest, tells them, that there is but one God, who alone is to be worshipped, and that we ought to live

in chastity. Notwithstanding this, my daughter Thecla, like a spider's web, fastened to the window, is captivated by the discourses of Paul, and attends upon them with prodigious eagerness, and vast delight; and thus, by attending on what he says, the young woman is seduced. Now then do you go, and speak to her, for she is betrothed to you. Accordingly Thamyris went, and having saluted her, taking care not to surprise her, he said, Thecla, my spouse, why sittest thou in this melancholy posture? What strange impressions are made upon thee? Turn to Thamyris, and blush. Her mother also spake to her after the same manner, and said, Child, why dost thou sit so melancholy, and, like one astonished, makest no reply? Then they wept exceedingly; Thamyris, that he had lost his spouse; Theoclia, that she had lost her daughter; and the maids, that they had lost their mistress; and there was a universal mourning in the family. But all these things made no impression upon Thecla, so as to incline her so much as to turn to them, and take notice of them; for she still regarded the discourses of Paul. Then Thamyris ran forth into the street, to observe who they were that went in to Paul, and came out from him; and he saw two men engaged in a very warm dispute, and said to them: Sirs, what business have you here? and who is that man within, belonging to you, who deludes the minds of men, both young men and virgins, persuading them, that they ought not to marry, but continue as they are? I promise to give you a considerable sum, if you will give me a just account of him; for I am the chief person of this city. Demas and Hermogenes replied, We

can not so exactly tell who he is, but this we know, that he deprives young men of their (intended) wives, and virgins of their (intended) husbands, by teaching, there can be no future resurrection, unless ye continue in chastity, and do not defile your flesh.

Then said Thamyris, Come along with me to my house, and refresh yourselves. So they went to a very splendid entertainment, where there was wine in abundance, and very rich provision. They were brought to a table very richly spread, and made to drink plentifully by Thamyris, on account of the love he had for Thecla, and his desire to marry her. Then Thamyris said, I desire you would inform me what the doctrines of this Paul are, that I may understand them; for I am under no small concern about Thecla, seeing she delights in that stranger's discourses, so that I am in danger of losing my intended wife. Then Demas and Hermogenes answered both together, and said, Let him be brought before the governor Castellius, as one who endeavors to persuade the people into the new religion of the Christians, and he, according to the order of Cæsar, will put him to death, by which means you will obtain your wife; while we at the same time will teach her that the resurrection which he speaks of, is already come, and consists in our having children; and that we then arose again, when we came to the knowledge of God. Thamyris, having this account from them, was filled with hot resentment; and rising early in the morning, he went to the house of Onesiphorus, attended by the magistrates, the jailor, and a great multitude of people with staves, and said to Paul, Thou hast perverted the city of Iconium, and,

among the rest, Thecla, who is betrothed to me, so that now she will not marry me. Thou shalt therefore go with us to the governor Castellius. And all the multitude cried out, Away with this impostor (magician), for he has perverted the minds of our wives, and all the people hearken to him.

Then Thamyris, standing before the governor's judgment-seat, spake with a loud voice in the following manner: O governor, I know not whence this man cometh; but he is one who teaches that matrimony is unlawful. Command him therefore to declare before you for what reason he publishes such doctrines. While he was saying thus, Demas and Hermogenes whispered to Thamyris, and said, Say that he is a Christian, and he will presently be put to death. But the governor was more deliberate, and calling to Paul, he said, Who art thou? What dost thou teach? They seem to lay gross crimes to thy charge. Paul then spake with a loud voice, saying, As I am now called to give an account, O governor, of my doctrines, I desire your audience. That God, who is a God of vengeance, and who stands in need of nothing but the salvation of his creatures, has sent me to reclaim them from their wickedness and corruptions, from all (sinful) pleasures, and from death; and to persuade them to sin no more. On this account, God sent his Son Jesus Christ, whom I preach, and in whom I instruct men to place their hopes, as that person who only had such compassion on the deluded world, that it might not, O governor, be condemned, but have faith, the fear of God, the knowledge of religion, and the love of truth. So that if I only teach those things which I have received by

revelation from God, where is my crime? When the governor heard this, he ordered Paul to be bound, and to be put in prison, till he should be more at leisure to hear him more fully. But in the night, Thecla, taking off her ear-rings, gave them to the turnkey of the prison, who then opened the doors to her, and let her in; and when she made a present of a silver looking-glass to the jailer, was allowed to go into the room where Paul was; then she sat down at his feet, and heard from him the great things of God. And as she preceived Paul not to be afraid of suffering, but that by divine assistance he behaved himself with courage, her faith so far increased, that she kissed his chains.

At length Thecla was missed, and sought for by the family and by Thamyris in every street, as though she had been lost; till one of the porter's fellow-servants told them, that she had gone out in the night time. Then they examined the porter, and he told them, that she was gone to the prison to the strange man. They went therefore according to his direction, and there found her; and when they came out, they got a mob together, and went and told the governor all that happened. Upon which he ordered Paul to be brought before his judgment-seat. Thecla in the mean time lay wallowing on the ground, in the prison, in that same place where Paul had sat to teach her; upon which the governor also ordered her to be brought before his judgment-seat; which summons she received with joy, and went. When Paul was brought thither, the mob with more vehemence cried out, He is a magician; let him die. Nevertheless, the governor attended with pleasure upon Paul's discourses of the holy

works of Christ; and, after a council called, he summoned Thecla, and said to her, Why do you not, according to the law of the Iconians, marry Thamyris? She stood still, with her eyes fixed upon Paul; and finding she made no reply, Theoclia her mother cried out, saying, Let the unjust creature be burnt; let her be burnt in the midst of the theatre, for refusing Thamyris, that all women may learn from her to avoid such practices. Then the governor was exceedingly concerned, and ordered Paul to be whipped out of the city, and Thecla to be burnt. So the governor arose, and went immediately into the theatre; and all the people went forth to see the dismal sight. But Thecla, just as a lamb in the wilderness looks every way to see his shepherd, looked around for Paul; and as she was looking upon the multitude, she saw the Lord Jesus in the likeness of Paul, and said to herself, Paul is come to see me in my distressed circumstances. And she fixed her eyes upon him; but he instantly ascended up to heaven, while she looked on him. Then the young men and women brought wood and straw for the burning of Thecla; who being brought naked to the stake, extorted tears from the governor, with surprise, at beholding the greatness of her beauty. And when they had placed the wood in order, the people commanded her to go upon it; which she did, first making the sign of the cross. Then the people set fire to the pile; though the flame was exceeding large, it did not touch her; for God took compassion on her, and caused a great eruption from the earth beneath, and a cloud from above to pour down great quantities of rain and hail, insomuch that by the rupture of the earth, very many

were in great danger, and some were killed, the fire was extinguished, and Thecla preserved.

ACTS OF ANDREW AND MATTHIAS IN THE CITY OF THE
CANNIBALS.

In some authorities the latter apostle is Matthew instead of Matthias, though the above title is the usual one. With some the city of the cannibals is Sinope, in Pontus of the Scythians, while others suppose it to be Myrmene in Ethiopia. The book is ancient, but not so old as the preceding; and it exists in the manuscript and other authorities with very considerable variations. The two oldest manuscripts used by Tischendorf, are in Paris, and of the 11th and the 15th century. There are also a few fragments in Paris in the uncial letters, which Tischendorf and Thilo judge to be as early as the 8th century.

The following brief analysis of the story will give the reader a correct idea of the book, and enable him to make an intelligible comparison between it and the Acts in the New Testament.

The twelve apostles were gathered together and assigned their different missionary fields by lot, and it fell to Matthias to go to the country of the cannibals. Instead of bread and water, the cannibals ate the flesh and drank the blood of strangers who visited their coast. They put out the eyes of these unhappy wanderers and gave them a bewitching draught, which deprived them of their reason, so that they wandered about eating hay and grass like cattle. Immediately on the arrival of the man of God, they put him in chains, destroyed his eyes, and gave him the bewitch-

ing drink. But he retained his reason and continued to praise the Lord. At night, in prison, he shed bitter tears and offered earnest prayers to God. Suddenly the prison was illuminated and a heavenly voice assured him that he would soon be delivered from his distress by Andrew, who would shortly visit his prison. Every thirty days the heathen held a solemn assembly in which they designated the prisoner who in his turn would be served as a meal at their public table. Matthias awaited with patience his approaching doom.

Meanwhile Andrew, who was preaching in Achaia, received from heaven a command that he should in three days go to the city of the cannibals, where his brother and companion was in danger. At first he hesitated, it was a great distance and he did not know the way; but God commanded him to hasten to the sea-shore early the next morning. When Andrew and his companions reached the shore at the appointed time, he saw a skiff approaching manned with three sailors. These were Jesus the Almighty God, and two of his angels, all disguised in human form like common men, and Andrew, not knowing them, asked for a passage. At first the boat-master declined unless he was paid the passage money; but when Andrew assured him that he had neither money nor goods, but was an apostle of the blessed Saviour, and was travelling under his Master's directions, he and his associates were received into the boat. Andrew admired the youthful beauty and handiness of the boat-master, who directed his angels to refresh the poor pilgrims with food. A severe storm arose, and the companions of Andrew were afraid. The boat-master offered to set

them ashore, but they were ashamed to seek their own safety and leave the apostle. Andrew comforted them and reminded them that the blessed Savior had once suddenly stilled a like violent tempest. They fell asleep, the waves were calmed, and Andrew entered into edifying conversation with the heavenly boatmaster. He asked of the apostle an accurate narrative of the deeds and miracles of the Saviour. Andrew related how that Christ, when teased by the unbelieving multitude for a miracle, commanded the statues of the Cherubim and Seraphim, which were fixed on the walls of the temple, to come down and go to Mamre, and there call the three great patriarchs from their graves; and thus he gave them an irresistible proof of his divine power. In such conversation the time passed; and at length Andrew, overcome with weariness, fell asleep. In this condition God directed his angels to bear him safely to the shore, where on awaking the next morning he found himself in sight of the prison of Matthias. His associates were also asleep beside him, whom he aroused and informed them that the man with whom they had sailed the day before, could have been none other than the Supreme Being, the Lord Jesus Christ. Indeed, they answered, while we were asleep, eagles came and took our souls and bore them through the air to heaven; and there we heard an innumerable company of angels, with a thousand voices, praising the Lord God, and we saw the twelve apostles standing before the Son of God, and the angels ministering to them.

Delighted with this vision, Andrew offered thanksgiving to God, and besought pardon of the Creator,

for all he had said the day before, without recognizing the Almighty on board the boat. Then God again made himself visible and spake peace to him, and said, Thou wert guilty of a greater sin in Achaia, when thou didst despond on account of the long distance and the voyage by sea, for all things are possible with God. But go up to the prison and deliver thy brother and his fellow prisoners. Then thy sorrows will begin, but endure them steadfastly, and remember the torments which I suffered on the cross. Invisibly then, for the hand of God covered his steps, Andrew came up to the prison. Seven sentries stood before the door, and they suddenly fell dead. The door of itself sprang open, the heathen were in a drunken sleep, and Matthias sat alone in the murderer's den. The apostles recognized and embraced and kissed each other, and then knelt down and prayed. Matthias now without delay proposed to leave the prison, he and two hundred and forty others, whose way God concealed by a cloud, so that no swift messenger of the enemy could overtake them. Andrew attended them, and then cheerfully returned to the city and sat down by a brazen pillar to await what might happen.

Meanwhile the time of the heathen festival approached, and the heathen designed to bring out one of the prisoners and devote him to death. But they were disappointed. They found the prison open and the sentries dead. The frightful tidings spread, and hunger and terror took possession of the multitude. All the citizens were called together and lots cast to determine who should be slain, that his body might afford food for the rest. The lot fell upon a respectable

old man, whom they immediately bound. Lamenting he offered them his young son instead, whom the hungry multitude gladly accepted. Now the youth being fettered, raised a bitter cry, and Andrew, who saw all from his pillar, was inwardly moved by it. He prayed to God for the innocent one, and was heard, for the weapons which they directed against the boy melted like wax. The boy was set free, but raging hunger again began to be felt among the people.

Now the Devil, black and hateful, appeared in the form of a miserable man, and betrayed the presence of the saint, who had caused the prisoners to escape, that against him all the wrath of the people might be turned. Andrew ridiculed the fiend, who only inflamed the people the more. A divine voice directed the apostle to come out from behind the pillar and show himself to the people. His hands were now bound and the multitude dragged him through the streets and over stones and rocks all day till evening; his body was torn and trickled with blood, but his soul was steadfast and believing. Andrew spent the night in prison; but early in the morning he is again beset, and his tortures commence anew. The cries of the sufferer ascend to heaven; the Devil excites the multitude more and more; in the evening he comes with six others to insult Andrew, but is driven off by the sign of the cross.

On the third morning the tortures are again renewed, and are continued through the day. Andrew prays and longs for death, his blood is spread over the ground, his hairs are scattered along the way. The heavenly King directs him to look back, and he sees

blossoming trees growing up in the places where the drops of blood had fallen; and when the enemies had for the fourth time brought the saint back to his prison, God drew near and greeted him and gave strength and soundness to his wounded body as at the beginning.

Now he noticed by the wall two large weather-stained stone pillars, and one of them he thus addressed: It is the will of God, the Almighty, that streams should pour forth from thee among the heathen people. Thou art resplendent with gold, and in ancient times the Lord was pleased to write on thee his ten commandments; but to-day there is reserved for thee a still greater honor, for thou shalt proclaim the counsel of God. Scarcely had the saint uttered these words, when the stone was rent, and endless floods of water were poured forth from it, which increased to a mighty river. Many children were drowned and the men tried to flee to the mountains; but an angel with a flaming sword stopped the way, the waves increased, the wilderness howled, and fire-brands flew about. There was a universal yell of grief and terror; and at length one cried aloud, You see now for yourselves that we have laid the innocent stranger in chains; therefore a frightful punishment awaits us; hurry, let us unchain him and beg of him for help. They hastened to unbind him, but the water still increased, and the flood became so great that it reached to the neck and shoulders of the men. But Andrew addressed the water-flood, and the heavens became fair, and the earth opened its mouth and drank in the waters. Fourteen of the worst men were drawn into the abyss

and disappeared from the earth. All the people trembled for fear and acknowledged that God had sent this holy man. Andrew warned and exhorted, and uttered a prayer for the souls of the children who had found death in the flood. The prayer was acceptable to the Most High. He ordered that they should rise from the dead; and as soon as they had returned to life they were baptized and received under the divine protection. In the place where the flood sprung up and baptism was administered, Andrew caused a church to be built; and from all places men and women were assembled and were baptized and renounced the service of the Devil and the heathen altars. Afterwards Andrew appointed a pious bishop over them by the name of Plato, and longed himself to leave the country and go over the sea. All were grieved that he would depart from them so soon, and a voice from heaven warned him that he should remain yet seven days longer with his new flock and confirm their faith. So long did he teach and strengthen them, to the disgust of the Devil, who saw all these people delivered from hell. At the expiration of the appointed time, Andrew prepared himself for his journey, the people accompanied him with sadness to the shore, looked after the ship so long as their eyes could follow it, and praised the eternal God.

The above extract is modeled on the argument to an old Anglo-Saxon poem published by J. Grimm, which gives a very good general idea of the book. The book itself is quite too long to be inserted here, and in this case an abstract is better than extracts. In this poem it is throughout Matthew who wrote the Gospel, that is the associate of Andrew.

Here we have a fair example of the best of the Acts of the Apostles out of the New Testament. Is not the difference quite as great and of the same kind as that which we have already shown to exist between the apocryphal gospels and the canonical? Would it not be an insult to the common sense of the reader even to propose to him the question seriously whether the two classes of books could have proceeded from the same source? The apocryphal Acts were among the best products of the human mind of that period and among the people who were nominally Christian, and the canonical Acts, as the contrast shows, must have been from the divine and not the human mind.

CHAPTER TENTH.

THE FOURTEEN EPISTLES OF PAUL.

The following is the chronological order in which the epistles of Paul were written : Thessalonians I. and II., Galatians, Corinthians I. and II., Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Philippians, Hebrews, I. Timothy, Titus, II. Timothy.

As this book is written for those who use the common editions of the Greek Testament, and the common translations, it will be more convenient for the reader that we follow the usual arrangement.

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

That this epistle is a genuine production of the apostle Paul, is susceptible of the most satisfactory proof, and the fact has seldom been seriously called in question. The objections of the Englishman Evanson, published about a century since, never made much impression and they have been abundantly refuted. The testimony of the early Christian writers is full and unanimous. We have *direct testimony* from Irenæus (adv. Haer. III. xvi. 3), Tertullian (de Cor. Mil. c. 6, adv. Prax. c. 13), Clemens Alex. (Paed. i. p. 117, Strom, iii. 457), Origen, who wrote a commentary on this epistle, etc., etc. The *indirect testimony* also of

quotations and allusions is equally copious and reliable, e. g. Clemens Rom. (Ep. i. ad Cor. ii. 35), Polycarp (ad Phil. c. 6), Theophilus of Antioch (ad Autol. ii. p. 99; iii. p. 18), the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, quoted by Eusebius (E. H. v. 1), and many others. (Compare Guericke, New Test. Isagog. p. 329–30.) The *internal evidence* is no less clear and explicit. See Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ* chap. i., ii.

But why did the apostle write to the Romans in the GREEK language? Why did he not write in LATIN? The members of the church at Rome were not exclusively or principally natives of Rome or even of Italy. The population of Rome at that time was composed of persons from every part of the Roman empire, from every nation under heaven, and with them Greek was the common language of social intercourse, business and literature. The native Romans themselves neglected their own language and used Greek. Tacitus de Or. c. 29; Martial, Epig. xiv. 56; Juvenal, Lat. vi. 184–9.

Authors, Christian, Jewish and Pagan, living at Rome, composed their works in Greek, as Clement, Justin Martyr, Josephus, Plutarch, Epictetus, the emperor Marcus Aurelius (see Tholuck and Alford on Romans); and among the common people, with whom the Christians would generally be found, the predominant language was Greek. Juvenal, Sat. iii. 60–80.

If Paul then wished to be understood by the great body of the church members at Rome, it was necessary that he should write in Greek rather than Latin.

The epistle was written at Corinth, probably during the winter of A. D. 57–58. Paul had then been a

preacher of the Gospel twenty-eight years. A part of the summer A. D. 57 he had spent in Ephesus, the remainder of the summer and the autumn in Macedonia; and he was passing the three winter months at Corinth, whence he was about to make a journey to Jerusalem, with the contributions to the saints, in the spring. Acts xx. 2, 3; 1 Cor. xv. 25, xvi. 6.

Phœbe, a deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, the eastern seaport of Corinth, had occasion to go to Rome on business, and the apostle took the opportunity to send a letter by her to the important church there, though he had himself then never visited that city. Compare Acts xix. 21, xx. 1, 2, 6; Rom. xv. 24, 28, xiv. 1, 21, 23; 1 Cor. i. 14. Among the members of the church at Rome were some of Paul's relatives (Rom. xvi. 7), and some of his intimate friends, with whom he had been acquainted before their residence in Rome. He speaks of Rufus in particular, and sends salutation to the mother of Rufus as his own mother (Rom. xvi. 13). Was this Rufus the son of Simon the Cyrenian (Mark xv. 21), who bore the cross of Jesus? And was Paul an inmate of that family while he studied at Jerusalem?

Among the persons converted at Jerusalem during the first pentecost after our Lord's ascension, are mentioned *sojourning Romans* (Acts ii. 10), and among the distinguished teachers of that church, Paul mentions some of his own kinsmen (Rom. xvi. 7) who were Christians before he was. It is probable, then, that the first foundations of the Roman church were laid by Jewish Christians who had been converted by the preaching of Peter. The statements in the book

of Acts make it impossible for us to believe that either Paul or Peter were at Rome during the early period of the existence of that church. We may, however, without hesitation admit the historical fact that they were both there during the latter part of their lives, though probably their stay was but brief, Paul's first visit being about two years, and his second a much shorter time, and Peter's whole stay scarcely exceeding one year. It is not likely that either apostle ever held any official connection with that particular church (Alford, *Proleg. to Rom.* sec. 2). Paul's own statements show that he had not been at Rome when he wrote this epistle (*Rom.* i. 10, 13, 15, xv. 23), and we have the testimony of Origen that Peter did not come to Rome till quite the latter part of his life (*Euseb. E. H.* iii. 1), and there is no testimony in the Bible or in Christian antiquity to the contrary effect in regard to either. All the probabilities are decidedly in favor of the conclusion above stated.

It is obvious enough from the very nature of the case, and perfectly certain from the contents of the epistle, that the church at Rome was made up of both Jewish and Gentile Christians. *Chap.* ii. 17, iii. 19, iv. 1, 12, vii. 1-4, ix, xi, plainly have reference to Jews; while i. 16-32, vi. 17, ix. 24, 30, xi. 13-25, 28, 30, xiv. 1, xv. 14, as plainly refer to Gentiles. Perhaps it would not be easy to come to any certain conclusion as to the relative strength of these two component parts of the church; yet from some passages, as i. 5, 6, 13, xv. 16, we might infer that the Gentile part was the more powerful and influential.

The epistle, unlike the others we have from Paul,

except that to the Ephesians, was not called forth by any particular exigency in the church, nor is it designed to meet any peculiar circumstances. On this account its discussions stand on a broader basis and its topics are of a more general character, than those of the other epistles, with the exception already mentioned. In consequence of this general dogmatic character of the book, it occupies the first place in almost all manuscripts and printed editions of the epistles, though not by any means the first written in the order of time; the two to the Thessalonians, that to the Galatians, and the two to the Corinthians, having all preceded it, making the Romans the sixth instead of the first. The epistles would be much better understood if read in the order in which they were written, as they are arranged by Connybeare and Howson, and by Wordsworth, than as they stand in the common editions of the Testament.

It is the general object of the epistle to point out to both Jewish and Gentile Christians the peculiar mistakes to which they were each liable, in consequence of prejudices of education, position and habits, and to lay open before them the true theory and practice of the Christian religion. After a general introduction, i. 1-15, he makes a statement of his subject, namely, that the Gospel of Christ is the power of God to salvation for both Jew and Gentile, and that entirely through the justification and righteousness which is by faith (i. 16, 17). That such a method of salvation is needed by the Gentiles is plain from their well known and enormous wickedness (i. 18-42.) That the Jews also equally need the same method of salvation is plain,

because, though they have higher knowledge and better principles than the Gentiles, their character is equally bad if not worse; and God judges of men exactly by what they are and what they do, and not by what they have and what they profess, ii: 1-29. He then answers some objections to this statement, which might arise in the Jewish mind in consequence of the covenant relation of the Jewish nation to God, and the promises made to the fathers. iii: 1-20. He then sets forth the nature of that justification by faith, which is the basis of his instructions, iii: 21-31. He next insists that this method of justification is not new or peculiar to the Gospel, that Abraham himself was justified by faith, iv: 1-4, that David also distinctly recognizes the doctrine, iv: 6-8, that Abraham received justification by faith before he was circumcised iv: 9-12, and before the law was given iv: 13-15, therefore the Jews who have both circumcision and the law, cannot be justified unless they have Abraham's faith also, and the Gentiles, who have neither circumcision nor the law, may be justified without either if they but have the faith of Abraham. iv: 16, 17, and then follows an exhibition of the nature and strength of Abraham's faith, iv: 18, 22, and an application of the whole to the subject in hand, iv: 23-25. Next the advantages of this justification by faith, peace with God and confidence in his love, v: 1-11; and a contrast between what we have lost by Adam and what we may gain by Christ, showing the latter to be immeasurably the greater, v: 12-21.

Thus far the subject of *justification*,—now comes that of *sanctification*. This doctrine of justification

does not give license to sin, for 1st the very nature of our relation to Christ forbids us to sin, vi: 1, 14; 2d, the different wages of the two services, *sin* and *righteousness*, should bring us entirely into the service of the latter, vi: 15, 23; and 3d, being now dead to the law and united to Christ, instead of our old ineffectual struggle against sin, we have in Christ an inward principle of love which leads to a willing obedience, vii: 1, 6. Further to illustrate the same topic, he takes the most favorable case which can possibly arise under the law, that of a man approving and loving the law and sincerely desiring to become holy by it, but without Christ living in a fruitless struggle and baffled in every endeavor, vii: 7-25. In Christ and Christ alone sin is overcome and sanctification attained, viii: 1-17. So far then from the doctrine of justification by faith giving license to sin, it is the only principle which can possibly lead men to holiness. There is the *lawless* state of men, vii: 9; the *legal* state, vii: 5, vii: 7-25, and the glorious *spiritual* state, vii: 6, viii: 1-17, and this last is obtained by the Gospel and the Gospel only; and the fundamental principle of the Gospel is justification by faith alone, apart from the deeds of the law, iii: 20, 28.

The glorious consummation of the completed work of redemption, extending as widely as the ruins of the fall have extended, is then described, viii: 18-39. But if the preceding be true, many of the descendants of Abraham fall out of their covenant relations with God. He admits it ix: 1-5, but affirms that this is nothing new, ix: 6, 7, the same has happened often before as he shows in the case of Ishmael ix: 8, 9, and

Esau ix: 10, 13. God confers special favors, according to his own sovereign will, as he shows in the case of Moses ix: 14–16, and chooses his own time and manner of punishing transgressors, as he shows in the case of Pharaoh ix: 17; in all such matters he acts entirely as a sovereign, and with entire justice and mercy ix: 18–24; and moreover the ancient Hebrew prophets had themselves expressly predicted that the time would come when many Gentiles and comparatively few Jews would be in covenant relation with God, ix: 25–33. The cause of all this is entirely the unbelief of the Jews and nothing else, x: 1–13, and their inexcusable unbelief, for they had had abundant opportunity both to hear and accept the Gospel, x: 14–18, as Moses and Isaiah had before announced would be the case, x: 19–21. But the time would come when Israel would repent and be restored to all his covenant privileges, xi: 1–16; the Gentiles, therefore, were not to boast, or despise the Jews, but to be humble and loving, xi: 17–32; and then he breaks forth into a rapturous strain of praise to God for his marvelous wisdom and goodness, xi: 33–36. Thus closes the dogmatic part of this most wonderful epistle, and then follows the practical or hortatory part, xii.—xv. and the eminently social and sociable conclusion, xvi.

STYLE OF THE EPISTLE.

The style of Paul is altogether peculiar. Nothing like it, I believe, can be found out of the New Testament. It is the style of a Jewish Rabbi rather than of a classical Greek writer; but of a Rabbi of a very peculiar cast of character. His style is the natural

outgrowth of these elements, to wit, the firey impetuosity of his own nature, his thorough and strictly Jewish education, and the characteristic peculiarities of the Christian theology which he inculcated. All the characteristics of his style culminate in the epistle to the Romans. He cannot be called a *perspicuous* writer, but he is never *equivocal*. He is either *understood* or *not understood*—seldom, by the careful student, who analyses his own thoughts, *misunderstood*. He abounds in imperfect parentheses, that is, sentences which interrupt the flow of thought, and yet are so essential to the subsequent argument that they cannot be omitted; and he is full of those rhetorical irregularities which the Greeks designate by the hard names of *anantopodoton* and *anakolouthon*. He frequently uses an imperfect kind of antithesis, a sort of philological equation, of which the two sides are not always by any means equal as they stand, and the equalizing must be made by the reader, guided by the purpose and context of the sentences. He so isolates himself in a particular topic on hand, that often he states universally that which is true only with limitations; and he uses prepositions with great profuseness and a wide latitude. His mind had been so thoroughly imbued with the forms of Hebrew thought, that a knowledge of the Hebrew language is almost as essential to the intelligent study of his writings, as a knowledge of the Greek. He darts with inconceivable rapidity from thought to thought, so that one must be assiduously on the watch to keep him in sight. He gives himself no time to express one thought fully, before he hurries on to another; and multitudes of ideas are strug-

gling in his soul for a simultaneous utterance. Yet his sentences can be disintegrated and his meaning ascertained—and when once he is fairly unravelled, his thought comes out, not only with perfect explicitness, but with warmth the most genial and eloquence unsurpassed. No study can be more profitable as a disciplinary exercise, whether mental, ethical, or religious, than the writings of the apostle Paul.

The witnesses for the epistle to the Romans are Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Letter to Diognetus, Churches of Vienne and Lyons, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tetullian, Origin, Eusebius, Jerome, Augustin.

Clement of Rome. Hateful to God, not only those who do these things, but those who have pleasure in them, i: 23.

Ignatius. 'Of the race of David according to the flesh, son of man and son of God,' i: 9.

Polycarp. 'We must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and each give account of himself,' xiv: 10.

Justin Martyr. 'For all have gone out of the way, he cries out, they have together become corrupt,' etc., iii: 11–17.

Irenaeus. 'The Apostle Paul writing to the Romans, Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ, set apart for the Gospel of God,' etc., i: 1.

Again writing to the Romans concerning Israel, he says, whose are the fathers, and of whom as to the flesh Christ came,' etc., ix: 5.

Theophilus. 'By patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, honor and immortality, etc., ii: 6–9.

And he teaches to render all things to all, honor to whom honor, fear to whom fear,' etc., xiii: 7, 8.

Church of Vienne and Lyons. 'They hastened to Christ, showing in reality that the sufferings of this time are not to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed to us.' viii: 18.

Clement of Alexandria. 'Behold says Paul the goodness and severity of God.' xi: 22. 'Likewise also Paul in the epistle to the Romans writes, we who are dead to sin, how shall we live any longer in it?' vi: 2.

Tertullian. 'But I shall be able to call Christ alone God, as the same apostle says, Of whom Christ, who is God over all blessed forever.' ix: 4. 'Writing to the Romans, Gentiles by nature doing the things which are of the law.' ii: 14. 'As also Paul says to the Romans, and not only so, but we glory in tribulations also,' etc. v: 3-5.

Athenagoras. 'Why should I care for sacrifices and holocausts of which God has no need? He requires bloodless victims and a reasonable service.' Rom. xii: 1, Legat. p. 13.

Theophilus. 'Upon them will come indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish.' (Rom. ii: 6). ad Autol., p. 79.

'Divine wisdom requires that we should render to all their dues, honor to whom honor, fear to whom fear, tribute to whom tribute; and that we should owe no man anything, but to love one another.' (Rom. xiii: 7, 8). ad Autol., p. 126.

Clement of Alexandria. 'Behold therefore, says Paul, the goodness and severity of God; on those who fall severity, but to thee goodness, if thou continue in

his goodness, that is, faith toward Christ.' (Rom. xi: 22). Paed., p. 117.

'Likewise also Paul in his epistle to the Romans, writes: How shall we who are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Seeing that our old man is crucified, that the body of sin may be destroyed, ——— neither yield ye your members the instruments of unrighteousness to iniquity.' (Rom. vi: 2, 13). Strom. iii.

Tetullian. 'As also Paul to the Romans, saying the Gentiles by nature do the things of the law.' (Rom. ii: 14. de Coron., 2, 6).

'As also to the Romans Paul says, And not only so, but we glory in tribulation also, knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not ashamed.' (Rom. v: 3-9). Scorpi., 2, 13.

Eusebius. 'The epistles of Paul are fourteen, all well known and beyond doubt.'

'The same apostle in the addresses at the close of the epistle to the Romans (xvi: 14), has among others made mention also of Hermas,' etc.

Athenagoras. 'Why sacrifice to me, of which God has no need? It is needful to offer the bloodless victim, and to bring forward the *reasonable service*.' xii: 1.

Tatian. 'This God we know from his acts, and acknowledge the invisible things of his power from what he has made.' i: 20.

No book was ever better attested by unimpeachable witnesses, than Paul's epistle to the Romans.

The testimony is so constant, uninterrupted, abundant and undisputed, that there scarcely seems a necessity for quoting more.

For the remaining epistles of Paul, my principal guides and authorities are Guericke and DeWette, the supernaturalist and the rationalist. These two appear to me to have written, each from his own particular point of view, the most accurate and complete introductions to these epistles, that have yet been published. De Wette is by no means an extreme rationalist. He had no sympathy whatever with the extravagancies of Strauss, and had a real reverence for the Scriptures and for the Lord Jesus. He was rather a favorite author of the late Theodore Parker, who translated into English and published his Introduction to the Old Testament. Guericke is an old-fashioned orthodox Lutheran of the most unexceptionable type.

EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, FIRST AND SECOND.

Paul came to Corinth on his second missionary journey, in the year 53 or 54, and remained there a year and a half. It was a rich commercial city, specially devoted to the worship of Venus, corrupt and luxurious to a high degree even for a pagan city, yet distinguished also for learning and eloquence. The proconsul Gallio was quite indifferent to the movements of Paul, who supporting himself by tent-making in the establishment of Priscilla and Aquila, zealously preached the Gospel with much opposition and disturbance, but also with great success. Acts xviii: 1-18. While Paul was on his missionary journey through Phrygia and Galatia, Apollos, a learned and eloquent Jew of Alexandria, who had been instructed by Priscilla and Aquila at Ephesus, (Acts xviii: 24-28), preached with great acceptance at Corinth; and at the same time

Judaizing teachers from Jerusalem were there, who manifested bitter hostility to Paul and caused dissensions in the church (Acts xviii. 24–28, 1 Cor. ix. 2, 2 Cor. iii. 1, v. 12, xi. 4, 18, 22, xii. 11). To these troubles were added painful cases of immorality, occasioned by the gross corruptions of paganism still adhering to the recent Christian converts (1 Cor. v. 9.)

Such was the state of things at Corinth when Paul came to Ephesus from Galatia in the year 56. He received information of the unhappy circumstances by persons from the family of Chloe (1 Cor. i. 11), and also by others sent specially to him by the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 17 ff.). He accordingly sent Timothy to them (1 Cor. iv. 17), and afterwards this letter, appropriate not only to the Corinthians, but designed also (as was also the second letter) for all Christians in like circumstances (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1). He first re-proves them for their dissensions, then rebukes their immoralities and want of discipline, and afterwards corrects their false doctrines especially in regard to the resurrection.

From Ephesus Paul passed into Macedonia, learned something of the effect produced by his first letter from Titus (1 Cor. ii. 12, vii. v. 5–10), and then wrote his second letter to correct and deepen the impressions produced by the first. Both the letters are of a miscellaneous character, not admitting of the rigid systematic analysis which can with so much advantage be applied to the epistle to the Romans; but they are wonderfully eloquent, full of the most tender Christian feeling and practical wisdom, and admirably adapted to the instruction of Christian churches in all ages and

nations, and especially to vindicate his own claims to the genuine apostleship, which it would seem his enemies had called in question.

We may, however, give the following analysis (De Wette, p. 205) of the course of thought.

1. Opposition to the formation of parties in the church and a defence of his own simple method of preaching the Gospel (i.-iv.).
2. Opposition to the improper connection of one of the members of the church with his step-mother, and warnings against licentious indulgence (v.).
3. Against Christians going to law with their fellow Christians before the pagan courts, and more warnings against licentiousness (vi.).
4. Answer to the question respecting celibacy (vii.).
5. Instructions as to the proper course to be pursued by Christians in regard to heathen sacrifices, and a statement of his own principles and conduct in such matters (viii.-xi.).
6. Reproof of some unbecoming practices in the church in regard to the presence of females at worship with their heads unveiled, and of great disorders at the celebration of the Lord's supper (xi.).
7. Instructions in respect to spiritual gifts, and the paramount obligations of Christian love (xii.-xiv.).
8. The doctrine of the resurrection of the dead (xv.).
9. Directions in respect to almsgiving, and closing salutations (xvi.).

When Paul wrote the second epistle to the Corinthians he had already escaped from the dangers at Ephesus (2 Cor. i. 2; Acts xix. 23), and was now in Macedonia in company with Timothy (2 Cor. i. 1, 2, ii. 13, vii. 5, ix. 2; Acts, xx. 1); and there could have been but a short time between the writing of the first

epistle and the second. This second epistle was probably written in Macedonia near the close of A. D. 58, or the beginning of 59. It was occasioned by the extreme anxiety which the apostle felt in regard to the effect which might have been produced by his first epistle (2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 5 ff.). The influence had been for the most part good (2 Cor. ii. 6–11, vii. 8–13, ix. 2.), but the object of the writer had not yet been fully accomplished (2 Cor. vi. 14–18, xii. 20, 21, xiii. 11); his adversaries had even taken occasion from it to speak of him with contempt (2 Cor. i. 15–17, iii. 1, x. 9 ff.), so that he is obliged to warn them of severer measures which he will take if necessary. He also exhorts them to make a collection for the poor. Titus with two brethren is sent to take charge of the collection and the delivery of the epistle (2 Cor. viii. 6–23, ix. 3–5); and the apostle himself proposes soon to follow (2 Cor. ix. 4, x. 11, xiii. 1), which he afterwards did (Acts xx. 2).

The epistle is naturally divided into 3 parts. 1. The expression of his anxieties occasioned by the troubles at Ephesus, and the intelligence he had received from Corinth (i.–vii.). 2. Directions in regard to the collections to be made for the poor saints at Jerusalem (viii.–ix.). 3. Earnest exhortations and warnings, and the necessary vindication of himself (x.–xiii.).

The witnesses for these two epistles are Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, the church at Smyrna, Justin Martyr, Letter to Diognetus, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, Augustin, etc. The testimony is remarkably full and complete, and very few have

ever pretended to impeach either the external or the internal evidence of the genuineness of these epistles.

Clement of Rome, writing to the same Corinthians, says, "Take the epistle of the blessed apostle Paul. Certainly in the Spirit he sent letters to you, concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos because you were then at disagreement." 1 Cor. i. 11-13. "Let us consider, beloved, how the Lord demonstrates to us perpetually the future resurrection, of which he made the Lord Jesus Christ the first fruits when he raised him from the dead."

Polycarp. "Know we not that the saints will judge the world? So Paul teaches." 1 Cor. vi. 2.

Irenaeus. "And this the apostle in the epistle which is to the Corinthians most plainly shows, saying, I would not that ye should be ignorant, brethren, that all our fathers were under the cloud." 1 Cor. x. 1 ff. "But what they say, Paul has openly said in the second to the Corinthians, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not." 2 Cor. iv. 4.

Athenagoras. "This corruptible and dissipated must put on incorruption." 1 Cor. xv. 54. "Each one will receive a just sentence, according to what he hath done in the body, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. v. 10.

Letter to Diognetus. "The apostle says, knowledge puffeth up but charity edifieth." 1 Cor. iii. 1.

Clement of Alexandria. "The blessed Paul in the first epistle to the Corinthians, . . . writing, Brethren, be not children in understanding." etc. 1 Cor. xiv. 20.

"The apostle said in the second to the Corinthians, for to this day the same veil remains in the reading of the Old Testament." 2 Cor. iii. 14.

Tertullian. "Paul in the first to the Corinthians mentions the deniers and doubters of the resurrection."

The references are so full and explicit, that it can not be deemed necessary to multiply quotations. We add a few which refer more particularly to the second epistle.

Polycarp, ad Philip. c. 2. "He that raised up Jesus from the dead, will raise us up also if we do his will." 2 Cor. iv. 14, also ii. 6. "Providing for things honest both in the sight of God and man." 2 Cor. iv. 14, also ii. 4. "Let us arm ourselves with the weapons of righteousness." 2 Cor. vi. 7.

Clement of Rome. Ep. i. ad Cor. c. 30. "Let our praise be from God and not from ourselves." 2 Cor. x. 17, 18, also, c. 5. "Through zeal Paul received the reward of endurance, when he was many times in chains, was beaten, was stoned," etc. 2 Cor. xi. 24.

Irenaeus, Haer. iii. 7. "Paul openly spake in the second to the Corinthians, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not." 2 Cor. iv. 4, also iv. 28. "For also the apostle says in the second epistle to the Corinthians, 'For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, both in them that are saved and in them that perish; to some indeed a savor of death unto death, to some a savor of life unto life.'" 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.

Theophilus, ad Autol. iii. "You suffer fools gladly when you are wise." 2 Cor. xi. 19.

Clement of Alexandria. Strom. iv. "The apostle speaks of the savor of knowledge in the second epistle to the Corinthians." 2 Cor. ii. 14.

Tertullian. De Pud. c. 13. "They really suppose that Paul in the second epistle to the Corinthians gives pardon to the same fornicator, whom in his first epistle he had directed to be delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh." 2 Cor. ii. 6-11.

Epistle to Diognetus. "They are in the flesh but live not according to the flesh." "They are poor, yet make many rich." "They have nothing, yet they abound in all things." "They are cursed and they bless." "They are spitefully treated and they honor." "Doing good, they are punished as evil." "When they are punished they rejoice as those who are made alive." 2 Cor. x. 3-10

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

Galatia or Gallogræcia was a small territory of Asia Minor, bounded by Paphlagonia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, Phrygia and Lycaonia. It was occupied by Celtic or German emigrants about the year 250 B. C., and Jerome informs us that they retained in some measure their German speech to a very late period. It was subjugated by the Romans in the year 188 B. C., and became a Roman province in the year 26. There were Jews in the province, especially in the commercial cities, where they had enjoyed the special protection of the emperor Augustus.

Paul was the founder of the churches there (Gal. i. 3, iv. 13, 19). He made two missionary journeys

among the Galatians (Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23). They were a strong, rough, impulsive people, and the churches consisted mainly, though not entirely, of Gentiles (Gal. iv. 8, v. 2, vi. 12).

After Paul's departure Judaizing teachers had come among the Galatians (Acts xv. i. 5, Gal. ii. 12), who underrated the character and labors of Paul (i. 1, 11), disputed his doctrine and insisted upon the necessity of circumcision and a compliance with the Jewish laws (Gal. v. 2 ff. 11 ff.), so that the people were very much disturbed and misled (Gal. i. 6, iii. 1, iv. 9-21, v. 3 ff.). It was these disturbances and perversions which gave occasion to Paul's epistle. The epistle was written either at Troy or Corinth (Acts xvi. 3, xviii. 11), the time not quite certain, but about the year 55 or 56 after Christ. Contrary to his usual custom he wrote the epistle with his own hand without the assistance of an amanuensis (Gal. vi. 11).

The epistle may be arranged in two divisions. 1. The apostle's assertion of his own authority and dignity as a teacher of Christianity (i. ii.). 2. A denial of the necessity of the Mosaic law, and a vindication of the glorious freedom of the Gospel (iii.-v.), and an exhortation that this freedom should not be abused to licentiousness, concluding with ethical precepts and warnings (vi.). The genuineness of the epistle has never been seriously questioned, and it is perfectly well sustained both by internal evidence and external testimony.

Witnesses for Galatians. Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athe-

nagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Eusebius, Jerome, Augustin.

Specimens of Testimony. Irenaeus. "And again in the epistle which is to the Galatians Paul says, But when the fullness of time had come God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law," etc. Gal. iv. 4, 5. "But also the apostle Paul saying, For if ye served those who were not gods, but now knowing God, nay being known by God." Gal. iv. 3, 9. But also in that which is to the Galatians, he speaks thus, What then is the law of works? It was added until the seed should come," etc. Gal. iii. 19.

Clement of Alexandria. "Wherefore Paul, also, writing to the Galatians says, My little children, of whom I travail in birth again till Christ be formed in you."

Tertullian. "We also confess then the principal epistle against Judaism which teaches the Galatians."

"But of this no more, if it be the same Paul, who also in another place enumerates heresies among the works of the flesh, writing to the Galatians."

Justin Martyr. "Be as I am, for I am as ye are." Gal. iv. 12.

Clement of Rome. "Who gave himself for our sins, according to the will of God and our Father." Gal. i. 4.

Ignatius. "An apostle not of men nor by men, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised him from the dead." Gal. i. 1. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law." Gal. v. 4.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

The relations of the apostle Paul to the church at Ephesus were peculiarly tender and interesting. The 19th and 20th chapters of the book of Acts should be carefully read in connection with this epistle. It was written while Paul was a prisoner at Rome, about A. D. 61 or 62. (See Acts xxviii. 30 31, and Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20.) The peculiar circumstances under which he wrote and his deep interest in the doctrinal purity of that church, as evinced in his address to the Ephesian elders assembled at Miletus (Acts xx. 28-32), led him to a dogmatic discussion of the peculiar tenets of the religion of Christ, more characteristic of this epistle, perhaps, than of any other except the epistle to the Romans. It naturally divides itself into two parts of three chapters each. In the first part (i., ii., iii.), as might be expected, the dogmatic or theological element predominates, and in the second (iv. v. vi.), the ethical or hortatory. He gives great prominence to the doctrine of predestination, and insists with much emphasis on the idea that Christ is the sufficient and the only Saviour of lost man, and the Saviour equally and in the same way of both Jew and Gentile, in this respect particularly the letter bearing a strong resemblance to the epistle to the Romans. The epistle abundantly asserts itself to be the composition of Paul, and the composition of Paul addressed to the Ephesians (Eph. i. 1, iii. 1), and to this both the internal evidence and the testimony of the ancients exactly corresponds.

Witnesses for the Epistle to the Ephesians. Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Theophi-

lus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Epiphanius, Augustin, Jerome, Eusebius.

Specimen of Testimony. Irenaeus. "As the blessed Paul says in the epistle to the Ephesians, that we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones." Eph. v. 30. "And this also Paul says, for whatsoever doth make manifest is light." Eph. v. 13.

Polycarp. "As it is said in these Scriptures, Be ye angry and sin not. Let not the sun go down upon your wrath." Eph. iv. 26. "Knowing that ye are saved by grace, not of works." Eph. ii. 8.

Clement of Alexandria. "Wherefore, writing to the Ephesians, he revealed most openly that which was sought, speaking in this manner, until we all come in the unity of the faith and the knowledge of God, unto a perfect man." etc. Eph. iv. 13, 14. "Wherefore, also, in the epistle to the Ephesians he writes, Be subject one to another in the fear of God." Eph. v. 21.

Tertullian. "Here I pass by concerning the other epistle which we have, written to the Ephesians." "Indeed in the truth of the church we have that epistle sent to the Ephesians."

Origen. "But also the apostle in the epistle to the Ephesians, uses the same language when he says, Who chose us before the foundation of the world." Eph. i. 4.

Ignatius. "Let no one of you be found a deserter. Let your baptism remain as weapons, faith as a helmet, love as a spear, patient continuance as the whole armor." Eph. vi. 13, 17. "As being stones of the temple of the Father, prepared for the habitation of God the Father." Eph. ii. 20-22.

Hermas. "For it would become you as the servants of God to walk in the truth, and not to join an evil conscience with the spirit of truth, and not to make grief for the true and Holy Spirit of God." iv. 30.

Clement of Rome. "Why should there be among you contentions, wrath, dissensions, schisms and war? Have we not one God and one Christ? And is not one spirit of grace poured out upon us? And is there not one calling in Christ?" Eph. iv. 4.

EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

Philippi was the first city in Europe where Paul preached the Gospel and established a Christian church. A full account of this important event, of the difficulties which the apostle encountered, of the success which attended his efforts, of the shameful abuses which he suffered, and of his dignified assertion of his own rights as a Roman citizen, and the tardy but ultimately full concession of these rights by the magistrates; and a brief notice of a second visit there, is found in Acts xvi. and xx. 2-6. There was a very tender friendship between the apostle and the Philippian Christians; they had been liberal to him beyond what he desired or they could really afford (Phil. iv. 15, 16, 2 Cor. viii. 1-6); and the occasion of his writing the epistle was the generosity of his Philippian friends in sending Epaphroditus all the way to Rome with supplies for his wants while he was a prisoner there." Phil. iv. 18. It appears to have been written about the middle of the year 63 after Christ.

After an affectionate introduction (i. 1-11), and an account of his condition in Rome and the opposition

he had encountered from Judaizing teachers (i. 12-26), he exhorts them to union and humility (i. 27-ii. 16), and gives them information in respect to Timothy and the sickness and recovery of Epaphroditus (ii. 17-30.) He then refers again to the opposition which he had encountered from Jewish teachers, and the attitude of his own mind in respect to their doctrines (iii. 1-21), and concludes with affectionate exhortations and salutations (iv.). The epistle affirms itself to be the writing of Paul to the Philippians (Phil. i. 1), and to this all internal evidence and external testimony corresponds.

Witnesses to Epistle to Philippians. Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Letter to Diognetus, Letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, Irenaeus, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Eusebius, Augustin, Jerome.

Specimen of Testimony. *Polycarp* (writing to the Philippians). "Of Paul . . . who also being absent wrote letters to you, into which if ye look intently, ye will be able to be built up into the faith given to you." "You, among whom the blessed Paul labored, who are praised in the beginning of his epistle; for of you he glories in all the churches which alone then knew God." Phil. i. 5 ff.

Irenaeus. "As also Paul says to the Philippians, I am full, the things being received from Epaphroditus which were sent by you, an odor of sweetness, an acceptable sacrifice, well pleasing to God." Phil. iv. 18."

Clement of Alexandria. "Paul also confessing concerning himself, not as though I had already attained or were already perfect," etc. Phil. iii. 12-14.

Church of Vienne and Lyons. "Who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Phil. ii. 6.

Tertullian. "Paul himself writes to the Philippians, If by any means I may attain to the resurrection of the dead." etc. Phil. iii. 11 ff.

Cyprian. "Also Paul to the Philippians, Who being in the form of God," etc. Phil. ii. 6-11.

Clement of Rome. "You see, men beloved, what an example is given to us. For if the Lord so humbled himself, what shall we do who come under the yoke of his grace?" Phil. ii. 5 ff.

Ignatius. "I exhort you to do nothing by contention, but according to the discipline of Christ." Phil. ii. 3.

Irenaeus. "Concerning which resurrection the apostle, in that which is to the Philippians says, being made conformable to his death, if by any means I may attain to the resurrection which is from the dead."

Theophilus. "That indeed now these things are true and useful and just and lovely to all men, is very plain." Phil. iv. 8.

EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

Colosse was a city of Asia Minor, near Laodicea and Hierapolis, and in the same region with the seven churches to which the Apocalypse was directed. Paul had not been there personally (Col. ii. 1), though he had twice passed through that country (Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23), but there were members of that church who were very dear to him (Col. i. 7 ff., Philem); and at the time of his writing this epistle, about A. D. 61 or

62, Epaphras, the teacher of the church, was with him (Col. iv. 12, Philem. 23) while a prisoner at Rome. This visit of Epaphras, and the intelligence which he gave to Paul respecting the church at Colosse, afforded the occasion of his writing this letter and sending it on with the letter to Philemon by Tychichus and Onesimus (Col. iv. 7-9, Philem. 23).

After an introduction of thanksgiving and intercession (i. 1-12), he testifies to the Colossians the exalted dignity of the Redeemer and the benefits of the redemption received through him (i. 13-23), and affirms that he himself rejoices to suffer for their salvation (i. 24-29), in order the more effectually to warn them against those who by worldly craft would seduce them from Christ (ii. 1-15), for it is his chief object in writing to this church, for whose love and sympathy he felt deeply grateful, to protect them against certain false teachers, who combined bigoted adherence to certain Jewish principles with severe asceticism and high pretensions to superior and mysterious wisdom (ii. 16-23). The last half of the epistle is taken up with eloquent and earnest exhortations to holiness of life (iii., iv.).

In regard to this epistle also internal evidence and external testimony fully agree.

Witnesses for Epistle to the Colossians. Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Augustin, Jerome.

Specimen of Testimony. Irenaeus iii. 14. "And again in the epistle which is to the Colossians, he (Paul) says, Luke the beloved physician saluteth you." Col.

iv. 14. "And on this account the apostle in the epistle which is to the Colossians says, And you that were once alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through his death to present you holy and pure and without fault in his sight." Col. i. 21, 22.

Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph. p. 310. "He was made flesh from the virgin's womb, the first born of all creatures." "Knowing him to be the first begotten of God, and also of all creatures." "The first born of every creature." Col. i. 15.

Clement of Rome. "Ye see, beloved, . . . unless we walk worthy of him, and do those things which are honorable and well pleasing in his sight with all the heart." Col. i. 10.

Theophilus, ad Autol. p. 100. "He begat this word the first born of every creature." Col. i. 15.

Clement of Alexandria, Strom. i. "In the epistle to the Colossians, he writes warning every man and teaching in all wisdom that we may present every man perfect in Christ." Col. i. 28. Strom. vi.: "Likewise he speaks to the Colossians who were converted from among the Greeks, Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy," etc. Col. ii. 8.

Tertullian, De Praes. Haer. c. 7. "The apostle writing to the Colossians, See lest any one circumvent you by philosophy and vain seduction after the tradition of men," etc. Col. ii. 8. De Resurrect. Carnis. c. 23: "Indeed the apostle writing to the Colossians teaches that we were sometime dead, alienated and enemies of the Lord in our mind, when we walked in wicked works; thence buried in the baptism of Christ

with him, and rising again with him by faith of the efficacy of God, who raised him from the dead. And when ye were dead in sins in the circumcision of your flesh, he hath quickened you together with him," etc. Col. ii. 11-13.

There can be no need of tracing the quotations down any further. The testimony to this book, as to every other thus far, is uniform and uncontradicted from the beginning to our own day, or at least to the times of modern unhistorical criticism.

EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS—I. AND II.

Thessalonica, situated on a bay near the site of the ancient Therme, was a large and populous commercial city, the capital of one of the four districts into which the Romans divided the country of Macedonia. It received its name from its founder, Thessalonica, the wife of Cassander. Paul visited the city in company with Silas and Timothy, and in a short time gained many adherents, especially among the proselytes to the Jewish religion; but was soon compelled to leave on account of disturbances excited by the Jews (Acts xvii. 1-9). From thence he went to Beroea, and driven also from that city he repaired to Athens, leaving his two companions behind with directions to follow him speedily (Acts xvii. 10-15). He then went to Corinth, where Timothy and Silas rejoined him (Acts xviii. 5); and at a later period he made another journey to Macedonia and probably visited Thessalonica. These two are the earliest of Paul's epistles which we have, as the first was written as early as A. D. 52 or 53, and the second soon after, during his residence in Corinth (2 Thess. iii. 2, Acts xviii. 12 ff.)

Full of anxiety for the Thessalonians, he had sent Timothy from Athens to inquire after them, and had received information by him, (Thess. i. 1; ii. 17; ff. iii. 1-6,) and had twice endeavored himself to return. The church was in circumstances of affliction, and needed encouragement and confirmation and further development, (iii. 2-13); though it was strong in the faith and alive in love. (iii. 6-9, iv. 10.) They had faults for which the apostle had verbally reproved them, (iv. 3-6, 11, 12. v. 15,) and were in particular need of information in regard to what would be the future of those who were already dead at the final coming of Christ. (iv. 13-v. 11.)

The epistle consists of two parts, to wit:

1. The expression of the apostle's affection for the Thessalonian church, a notice of their circumstances, his reception among them, his care for them, and the comfort they gave him. i-iii.

2. Ethical exhortations, comforting assurances in regard to those who had died, (x.), and exhortations to always be ready for death and the coming of Christ, with concluding salutations. (v.)

TESTIMONIES TO I. THESSALONIANS.

Clement of Rome. 1 Epistle ad Cor. c. 38. We ought in every thing to give thanks unto him. 1 Thess. v. 18.

Wherefore let our whole body be preserved in Christ Jesus. 1 Thess. v. 23.

Ignatius. ad Polyc., 2, 1. Be diligent in increasing prayers. Thess. v. 17. Ad Ephes. 2, 10. And also pray without ceasing for other men.

Polycarp, ad Philip. 2, 4. Without ceasing interceding for all. Ibid. c. 2. Abstaining from all evil, (v. 22).

Irenaeus. Haer., v. 6. And on this account the apostle, in the first epistle to the Thessalonians, speaking thus, May the God of peace sanctify you wholly, and may your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved unto the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, (v: 23, v. 30.) This also the apostle says, When they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them. v. 3.

Clement of Alexandria. Paed. i. p. 88. But this also the blessed Paul most plainly signified, saying, When we might have been burdensome as the apostles of Christ, we were gentle in the midst of you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children. ii. 7.

Strom. i., p. 296. Prove all things, says the apostle, and hold fast that which is good. v. 21:

Tertullian. De Resur. Carn., c. 24. Learn with the Thessalonians, for we read, How ye turned from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus. i: 7, 10. And in the epistle itself, to the Thessalonians, he suggests, Of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you; for yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. v. 1, 2.

The second epistle to the Thessalonians was written especially to correct a misunderstanding which had arisen out of the first. 1 Thess. iv. 17. In speaking of the day of judgment he had said, *Then we who are alive and remain, etc.* From this some had inferred

that he meant to teach that Christ would come to judgment during the life time of that generation. In 2 Thess. ii., he positively denies that he entertains any such idea, or had given any such instruction. He affirms that many important events were to occur before the second coming of the Lord, and they might occupy a long time. He fixes no time, and inasmuch as the time is entirely uncertain, he uses the first person plural, as a convenient indefinite designation of Christians, at whatever time they might meet the Lord at his coming. So Peter labors very earnestly to show the Christians of his time, that without any violation of the divine promise, a long time, as men view time, might yet intervene before the final coming of the Lord, 2 Pet. iii. Whatever might have been the current opinion on this subject, among private Christians, the inspired teachers of the New Testament not only did not teach the doctrine of the immediate coming of the Lord, but they earnestly, emphatically and repeatedly taught the direct contrary. These two chapters, 2 Thess. ii., and 2 Pet. iii., are perfectly explicit on this point; and the same idea is sufficiently indicated in other passages, such as Acts i: 7, John xxi: 21-23, Mark xiii: 32, etc.

The second epistle to the Thessalonians consists :

1. Of thanksgivings, prayers and approval of the Thessalonians, especially in reference to their praiseworthy conduct under suffering.

2. A correction of their mistaken notion that the second advent of Christ was immediately to occur, and warning them that this event must be preceded by a great apostacy, requiring a considerable interval of time.

3. Admonitions and exhortations appropriate to their condition; concluding with a remarkable statement of the manner in which he authenticated all his epistles.

TESTIMONIALS TO SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

Polycarp. ad Phil., 2, 11. ‘Yet esteem not such as enemies, but as erring members recall them, that ye may save your whole body.’ 2 Thess. iii. 15. Among whom the blessed Paul labored, who are in the beginning of his epistle, of you there is glorying in all the churches, which then alone knew God.’ 2 Thess. i. 5.

Justin Martyr. Dial., p. 336. ‘When also the man of the apostacy, speaking proud things against the Most High, will dare upon the earth lawless things against us Christians.’ 2 Thess., ii. 3, 4.

Irenaeus. Haer. v. 7. ‘And again, in the second to the Thessalonians, speaking concerning Anti-Christ, And then shall that wicked one be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus Christ will slay with the spirit of his mouth, and the presence of his advent will destroy him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, in all power of signs and lying wonders.’ 2 Thess. ii. 8.

Ibid. v. 25. Concerning whom the apostle, in the epistle which is the second to the Thessalonians, thus speaks, Unless there come a falling away first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or is worshipped, so that he sits in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God.’ 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.

Clement of Alexandria. Strom. v., p. 554. The apostle says there is not knowledge in all; but pray ye that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men, for all men have not faith.' 2 Thess. iii. 2.

Tertullian. De Res. Car. ii. 24. 'And in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, with a more correct solicitude to the same, But I beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in your mind or troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, to wit, of false prophets, nor by epistle, to wit, of false apostles, as if by us, as that the day of the Lord is at hand.' 2 Thess. ii: 1-3. *Scorpi.*, p. 498. 'But Paul the apostle, concerning the first persecutor, who first shed the blood of the church, and afterwards changing the sword for the pen ———— says, so that we ourselves may glory in you in the churches of God, for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations which ye endure, a token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye may be counted worthy of His kingdom, for which ye also suffer.' 2 Thess. i. 4, 5.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

The two epistles to Timothy and the epistle to Titus are called *pastoral epistles*, because in them Paul gives directions to these two helpers of his, as to how they should conduct themselves as the shepherds and the patterns of the flock over which they were placed. Timothy was a native of the city of Lystra in Lycaonia in Asia Minor, the son of a Greek father and Jewish mother. He was received into the church by Paul, be-

came his companion and fellow-laborer in Macedonia and Achaia and was his fellow-prisoner at Rome. Acts xvi-xx.

It is not easy to determine the precise date of the first epistle to Timothy, nor is this necessary to an understanding of its contents or the establishment of its genuineness. It is quite probable that it was written from Macedonia, about A. D. 63 or 64, and not impossible that it might have been written from Laodicea, according to the old superscription.

Paul had departed from Ephesus for the purpose of going to Macedonia, with the intention of speedily returning; and leaving Timothy meanwhile in charge of the Ephesian church, writes to him these directions, (1 Tim. i. 3, iii. 13.) The epistle begins with personal reminiscencies and affectionate talk with Timothy, (i.) proceeds to instructions in regard to public worship, (ii.) and the qualifications of church officers, (iii.) He then foretells the coming in of false teachers and various corruptions, and instructs Timothy in regard to the course he was to pursue when he had these difficulties to encounter, and concludes as usual with the *grace be with thee.* iv-vi.

TESTIMONIALS TO THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

Polycarp. ad Philip. 2, 12. "Pray for all the saints, pray also for kings and princes and all that are in authority." 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

Ibid. 2, 4. "The love of money is the beginning of all evils. But knowing that we brought nothing into this world and can carry nothing out, let us arm ourselves with the weapons of righteousness." 1 Tim. vi. 7, 10.

Epistle to Diognetus. "Being reckoned faithful by Him they knew the mysteries of the Father. On which account he sent the Word that He might appear to the world; who was despised by the people, preached by apostles, believed on by the Gentiles." 1 Tim. iii: 16.

Epistle of the Churches at Vienne and Lyons. "But overwhelmingly their whole fury fell upon Attalus, a native of Pergamus, who had always been the pillar and stay of the faithful there." 1 Tim. iii: 15, compare Rev. iii: 12.

"Alcibiades, one of the martyrs, led a squalid and ascetic life, accepting no food but bread and water only up to that time. When he was put in prison he wished to retain the same mode of living; but after the first conflict in the amphitheatre it was revealed to Attalus that Alcibiades was not doing right, and set an evil example for others, in that he did not use the creatures of God. And Alcibiades being persuaded then began to use all kinds of food promiscuously and gave thanks to God." 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4.

Irenaeus. Haer. i: 1. "And some opposing the truth bring in false words and vain genealogies, which, as the apostle says, minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith." 1 Tim. i. 4.

Ibid. ii. 4. "And well Paul says, novelties of words of false science. 1 Tim. vi. 20.

Athenagoras. Legat. pro Christ. p. 15. "For God is all things to himself, light inaccessible, universe perfect, spirit, power, word." 1 Tim. vi. 16.

Theophilus. Ad Autol. iii. "And also that we should be subject to magistrates and powers, and pray for

them, our divine word commands in order that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life." 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, see Tit. iii. 1.

Clement of Alexandria. Strom. ii., p. 383. "Concerning which the apostle writing says, O, Timothy, keep that which is committed to thee, avoiding profane novelties of words and oppositions of science falsely so called, which some professing have erred concerning the faith. By this word are those heretics reprov'd who set aside the epistle to Timothy." 1 Tim. vi: 20, 21.

Ibid. ii. p. 464. "Whence also the apostle, I will says he that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully, for some are already turned aside to Satan." 1 Tim. v. 14, 15.

Admon. ad Gent. "Godliness is profitable to all things, says Paul, having the promise of the present life and of the future." 1 Tim. iv. 8.

Tertullian. De Praescr. Haer. 2, 25. "And Paul to Timothy uses this word, O Timothy keep that which is committed to thee." 1 Tim. vi. 20.

De Pudicit. 2, 13. "Plainly the same apostle delivers to Satan Hymenaeus and Alexander that they may learn not to blaspheme, as he writes to Timothy." 1 Tim. i. 20.

Jerome. Comment. in Epist. Tit. "Speaking of Marcion and Basilides and all heretics, Jerome says, that rejecting gospels and epistles he wonders how they dare assume to themselves the Christian name, for, to be silent concerning other epistles, from which they erase whatever they see contrary to their own dogmas,

“they reject some entire epistles, as Timothy, Hebrews, Titus, which we are now undertaking to explain. Indeed if they gave any reasons why they suppose these epistles not to be the apostle’s, we should endeavor to reply and perhaps satisfy the reader. But now they pronounce with heretic authority, and say, this epistle is Paul’s, and this is not.”

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

This epistle Paul writes from Rome, where he is imprisoned, inviting Timothy, who is at Ephesus, to come to him and bring Mark with him (2 Tim. i. 8, 12, 16, iv. 5, 9, 11, 16, 19, 21). The date of it is shortly before the apostle’s martyrdom, probably A. D. 65 or 66.

He expresses his affection for Timothy, and calls to mind various interesting personal incidents (i.), exhorts to purity of life and fortitude under affliction (ii.), warns of corruptions and false teachers, and expresses his own calmness and happiness in view of his approaching martyrdom (iv.).

Testimonies to the Second Epistle to Timothy. *Barnabas*, Epis. 7. “If the Son of God, who is the Lord, and will judge the quick and dead, suffered,” etc. 2 Tim. iv. 1.

Ignatius, ad Ephes. ii. 2. “But also Crocus, who is worthy of God and of you, whom I received as a proof of your love, refreshed me in all things; and in like manner will the Father of Jesus Christ refresh him.” 2 Tim. i. 16, 18. “You have refreshed me in all things as Jesus Christ refreshed you. You have loved me both absent and present; The Lord will reward you.” 2 Tim. i. 16, 18. *Ad Polyc.* c. 6: “Please

Him for whom you are soldiers, and from whom you receive wages." 2 Tim. ii. 4.

Polycarp, Ep. ad Philip. "As He hath promised us that He will raise us from the dead, and that, if we walk worthy of Him we shall reign with Him, provided that we believe." 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12.

Irenaeus, Haer, iii. 3. "The blessed apostle, therefore, founding and building up the church gave over the pastorship to Linus for the administering of the church. Of this Linus Paul makes mention in his epistles which are to Timothy." 2 Tim. iv. 21. *Ibid*, v. 20: "Ever learning and never finding the truth." 2 Tim. iii. 7.

Clement of Alexandria, Strom. iii. p. 448. "For we know what the most excellent Paul teaches respecting women deacons in his second epistle to Timothy." *Ibid*, i. p. 270: "Thou therefore be strong, also says Paul, in the grace which is in Christ Jesus, and what thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also. And again, Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly handling the word of truth." 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 15. Admon. ad Gentil. p. 56: "The apostle knowing this teaching to be really divine says, Thou, O Timothy, from a child hast known the sacred Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith in Christ." 2 Tim. iii. 15.

Tertullian, Scorpiac. c. 13. "You see how he describes the felicity of martyrdom, Exulting he writes to Timothy, For I am now ready to be offered and the time of my departure is at hand. I have

fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith, there remains for me a crown which the Lord will give me in that day." 2 Tim. iv. 6-8.

Origen, Comment. in Matt. iii. p. 916. "Also what he says as Jannes and Mambres withstood Moses; this is not found in the public Scriptures, but in a secret book which is entitled, The Book of Jannes and Mambres." 1 Tim. iii. 8.

Eusebius, E. H. iii. 4. "Linus whom he (Paul) has mentioned in his second epistle to Timothy." H. E. ii. 22: "While he (Paul) was a prisoner at Rome, he wrote his second epistle to Timothy in which he both mentions his first defence and his impending death. Hear on these points his own testimony respecting himself. In my former defence no one was present with me but all deserted me. May it not be laid to their charge. But the Lord was with me and strengthened me, that through me the preaching of the Gospel might be fulfilled and all the nations might hear it. And I was rescued out of the lion's mouth.' He plainly intimates in these words, 'On the former occasion he was rescued from the lion's mouth, that the preaching of the Gospel might be accomplished,' that it was Nero to whom he referred by this expression, as is probable on account of his cruelty. Therefore he did not subsequently subjoin any such expressions as 'he will rescue me from the lion's mouth,' for he saw in spirit how near his approaching death was. Hence after the expression, 'I was rescued from the lion's mouth,' this also, 'the Lord will rescue me from every evil work, and will save me unto his heavenly king-

dom,' indicating the martyrdom that he would soon suffer; which he more clearly expressed in the same epistle, 'for I am already poured out, and the time of my departure is at hand.' And indeed in this second epistle to Timothy, he shows that Luke alone was with him when he wrote, but at his former defence not even he." 2 Tim. iv. 16, 18, vi. 8, 11.

We see in all these testimonies, when the witnesses quote passages at large, that their New Testament books not only had the same names which we now have, but precisely the same contents, the ancient and the modern being identical throughout.

EPISTLE TO TITUS.

Titus, a Greek by birth, was an assistant of the apostle Paul, was with him on his journey to Jerusalem (Gal. i. 1-3); fulfilled commissions for him in Corinth (2 Cor. vii. 6-4, viii. 6-23, xii. 18), and was now left in Crete to attend to ecclesiastical duties in that island (Tit. i. 5 ff.). The object of this epistle is to give him instructions in respect to the discharge of those duties.

1. Instructions in regard to the appointment of elders and the treatment of false teachers (i.). 2. The guiding of the congregation in reference to the different ranks in society (ii.). 3. Ethical principles of a general character, warning in regard to controversies, and personal notices (iii.).

The epistle was probably written between the first and the second epistle to Timothy.

Testimonies to Titus. *Clement of Rome*, First Epistle to Cor. ii. 2. "Be ready to every good work." Tit. iii. 1.

Ignatius, ad Trall. c. 3. "Whose very behaviour (habit) (*κατασκημα*) is a great discipline." Tit. ii. 3, is the only passage in the New Testament where this Greek word occurs.

Irenaeus, Haer. iii. 3. "As the blessed Paul also says, A man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that he who is such is perverted and condemned of himself." Tit. iii. 10, 11, v. 15. "Jesus said to him, Go to Siloam and wash, at the same time restoring to him the clay ointment (*plasmationem*), and that which is the regeneration by washing." Tit. iii. 5. i. 16: "As many as stand off from the church and give heed to these old wives' fables are truly condemned of themselves, whom the apostle Paul commands us after the first and second admonition to reject." Tit. iii. 10, 11.

Theophilus, ad Autol. iii. p. 122. "But we have a lawgiver who is truly God, who teaches us to live a righteous, godly and honorable life." Tit. ii. 11, 12. ii. p. 95: "Men about to receive repentance and remission of sins all come to the truth by water and the washing of regeneration, and being regenerated receive blessing from God." Tit. iii. 5. 6.

Clement of Alexandria, Strom. i. p. 299. "Epimenides, a Cretan, a Greek prophet whom Paul knew, of whom he makes mention in the epistle to Titus, speaking thus, One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, the Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies." Tit. i. 12. Admon. ad Gent. p. 6: "But now, as the divine apostle of the Lord said, The grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and

worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in the world, looking for that blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Tit. ii. 11-13.

Tertullian, De. Praes. Haer. "And Paul suggests that a man who is a heretic should be rejected after the first admonition, because that such a one is perverse and in fault, and is condemned of himself." Tit. iii. 10, 11.

Tertullian here refers to the epistle to the Galatians as if the passage were to be found there; but it is only one of the numerous instances of quotations merely from memory, and without any solicitude for literal accuracy, which are so common with the fathers, and should always be taken into the account when we are reading them.

EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

This letter was addressed not only to Philemon, but also to the church which met at his house (1, 2). It belongs to A. D. 61 or 62. Philemon was a wealthy citizen of Colosse, a relative of Apphia and Archippus, (perhaps husband and father,) who had been converted to Christianity by the apostle Paul (13. 19). He was a generous believer, full of faith and good works (4, 7), and the apostle had entire confidence in him (14, 22). Onesimus, an ill-conditioned servant of his, had robbed him and then fled to Rome (10, 11, 18, 19); where he had met with the apostle Paul, had by him been converted to Christ and was much beloved by the apostle (12, 13). Wishing to return to his home the apostle sends him with this won-

derfully affectionate and beautiful letter, to be received by Philemon no longer as a slave, but as a friend, as a brother beloved (16); for so much the apostle required; and he had confidence in Philemon that he would do not only this, but even more than he had asked (21). The whole transaction was voluntary (19), spontaneous, joyous in regard to all three; there was no need of applying to the police or calling out the militia, or putting a chain around the courthouse, or doing any of those violent and disgraceful things, which made some of our American cities infamous, when fugitive slaves were to be returned to their southern masters. Of all the shameful travesties of Scripture, there never was one more shameful and ridiculous than that which put the story of Paul and Onesimus on a parallel with the transactions under the Satanic fugitive slave law of America.

Testimonies to the Epistle to Philemon. *Ignatius*, ad Ephes. c. 2, Magnes. c. 12, Polyc. c. 6. "I would enjoy you perpetually if only I may be worthy." "I would enjoy you in all things, if indeed I may be worthy." "I would enjoy you perpetually." Phil. 20.

Tertullian, ad Marc. v. 42. "Its brevity gave to this epistle alone the privilege of escaping the falsifying hands of Marcion."

Epiphanius, Haer. xlii. 9. "Marcion receives ten epistles of this holy apostle, . . . the ninth being that to Philemon."

Origen, Homil. in Jerem. 19. "Which Paul also knowing said to Philemon in regard to Onesimus, in his epistle to Philemon, that thy benefit should not be of necessity, but willingly." Phil. 14. Matth. Com.

LAKE OF TIBERIAS FROM THE BATHS.



tract. 34: "As Paul says to Philemon, For we have great joy and consolation in thy love, because the bowels of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother."

Phil. 7. *Ibid*, tract. 3: "But concerning Paul it is said to Philemon, being such an one as Paul the aged."

Phil. 9.

Jerome, Comment. Epist. ad Phil. Jerome is speaking of those who would exclude the epistle to Philemon from the canon on the ground that it is simply a private letter, treating of personal affairs, and not a public doctrinal treatise, and says, if epistles containing allusions to private affairs are to be judged not to be apostolic, not to belong to Paul, then we must reject Romans, Timothy, Galatians, Corinthians, and others; but if we receive these, there is no ground for rejecting Philemon.

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

It is the purpose of the epistle to the Hebrews to prove to the Hebrew Christians, that the new dispensation is the reality and perfection of that divine revelation of which the old dispensation was but the type and the imperfect beginning. It is written with great care and in a style of remarkable correctness. The name of the author is not attached to it. If Paul were the writer there is good reason for both these striking facts. His name and his doctrinal peculiarities were not in good odor among the Hebrews; and therefore, as a wise man, he would not needlessly parade his name before their eyes, and would exercise all possible care in the statement of his doctrines.

The learned and candid Roman Catholic, Professor

Hug concludes his laborious investigation of this subject with the following emphatic declaration: "The more intimately I become acquainted with the writings of the apostle (Paul), the more I am disposed to regard the epistle to the Hebrews as his masterpiece. It bears the seal of the completion, as the epistles to the Thessalonians do that of the commencement, of his literary career."

The question of authorship is and must be, as we have before stated, mainly a question of testimony, of external evidence; and, as we shall see in the exhibition of the testimony, if Paul is supposed not to be the author, the mention of any other name in connection with the authorship, is mere guess work without any solid foot-hold whatever.

The author first sets forth the connection between the old revelations and the new, and the infinite superiority of the Son of God, the author of the new revelation, over the prophets and even the angels who were the heralds of the old, (i. ii). He then proceeds to demonstrate the superiority of Christ to Moses, the one merely the servant, the other the Son, the rightful and only inheritor, (iii). Christ also as high priest is superior to the high priest of the old covenant, being a regal priest after the order of Melchisedek, having a perpetual priesthood, and a priesthood of the realities and not of the mere type and images of the heavenly things, (iv-x). Then follow practical exhortations, earnest warnings, illustrations of faith from Old Testament examples, and allusions to personal circumstances and feelings. The date of the epistle and the place of writing it is impossible now to ascertain. The old

inscription at the close says it was written in Italy and forwarded by Timothy; and nobody now knows anything more on this subject than the writer of this inscription. From the very earliest times, by the very first of the apostolic fathers, the personal friends of the apostles themselves, this epistle has been quoted and appealed to as an undoubted portion of Holy Scripture, though we do not find the name of the author mentioned till we come to Pantaenus, the celebrated principal of the theological school at Alexandria, about A. D. 180, who unhesitatingly ascribes it to Paul; and from that time the writers in the Eastern church almost without exception accept Paul as the author; while in the Western church there was more hesitation and doubt as to the author, though none in respect to its canonicity and authority; till we come to Jerome and Augustin, from which time it was universally received in the church as a genuine and scriptural epistle of the apostle Paul. Individual doubters as to the author have often shown themselves, and in modern times they have become numerous, but the great body of the believers have always recognized in it the hand of Paul the great apostle. All the ancient catalogues of any authority assign fourteen epistles to Paul, which necessarily includes Hebrews, for without this there are but thirteen. There is certainly no decided internal evidence against the authorship of Paul, while there is very much in its favor; while of the external evidence, the testimony, it is ten to one, ninety-nine to a hundred, in favor of Paul. In consequence of the controversies on the subject, it will be expedient to give these testimonies a little more at large than we have

done in some other cases, though after all our limits will allow us to give but a very small portion of the whole. The ancients knew no other author than Paul; if Paul were not the writer we find nothing in them on the subject.

Clement of Rome. In regard to the testimony of this writer respecting the epistle to the Hebrews, let us first attend to the following statement by Jerome, (Cat. Script. Eccl., c. 15). "Clement, in behalf of the Roman church, wrote a very valuable epistle to the church of the Corinthians, which in some places is publicly read, and which seems to me to correspond in character very much to the epistle to the Hebrews, which is circulated under the name of Paul. He takes many things from that epistle; not only in meaning but in the words themselves there is a great similitude between them."

The following extracts from this epistle of Clement, fully justify these statements of Jerome, and strongly corroborate the canonical authority of the epistle to the Hebrews. We select but a very few out of the whole number.

"By him would God have us to taste the knowledge of immortality; who, being the brightness of his glory, is by so much greater than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For so it is written, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But to his Son, thus saith the Lord, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession. And again he saith

unto him, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. (Heb. i).

Thus has the humility and godly fear of these great and excellent men, recorded in the Scriptures, through obedience, made not only us, but also the generations before us, better; even as many as have received his holy oracles with fear and truth. Having therefore so many, and such great and glorious examples, let us return to that peace, which was the mark that from the beginning was set before us: Let us look up to the Father and Creator of the whole world; and let us hold fast to his glorious and exceeding gifts and benefits of peace. (Heb. xii).

Let us receive correction, at which no man ought to repine. Beloved, the reproof and the correction which we exercise towards one another, is good, and exceedingly profitable; for it unites us the more closely to the will of God. For so says the Holy Scripture, The Lord corrected me, but he did not deliver me over unto death. For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. Let us be followers of those who went about in goat-skins and sheep-skins, preaching the coming of Christ. (Heb. xi).

All things are open before him; nor can any thing be hid from his counsel. For he is the searcher of the thoughts and counsels of the heart; whose breath is in us, and when he pleases he can take it from us. (Heb. iv).

Moses was called faithful in all God's House; and by his conduct the Lord punished Israel by stripes and plagues. (Heb. iii).

Having therefore this hope, let us hold fast to him who is faithful in all his promises, and righteous in all his judgments; who has commanded us not to lie, how much more will he not himself lie? For nothing is impossible with God, but to lie. (Heb. vi).

Justin Martyr. Dial. p. 341. "This is he who is according to the order of Melchisedec king of Salem, being an eternal priest of the most high." (Heb. v: 9, 16, vi: 20, vii: 12). (p. 323). "Eternal priest of God, and king, and Christ." Apol. i. "But he is also called an angel and apostle." Heb. iii: 1. This is the only passage in the whole Bible where Christ is called an apostle.

Irenaeus. Haer. ii. 30. "He alone is God who made all things, the only omnipotent, the only Father, building and making all things, both visible and invisible, both sensible and senseless, both celestial and terrestrial, by the word of his power." (Heb. i: 3). v. 5. "Enoch having pleased God was translated in the body, foreshowing the translation of the saints." (Heb. ii: 5).

Clement of Alexandria. Strom. vi. p. 645. "For Paul also — writing to the Hebrews — and ye again have need that I should teach you what be the first principles of the oracles of God, and have become as those who have need of milk and not of strong meat." (Heb. v: 12). *ibid.* ii. p. 420. "But we desire that each one of you should show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope, until made a high priest after the order of Melchisedec; the like things says the all virtuous wisdom to the apostle Paul." (Heb. vii).

Tertullian. De Pudic. c. 20. "Therefore admonish-

ing the disciples that leaving the first principles they should go on to perfection, not laying again the foundation of repentance from works of the dead, for it is impossible he says, that those who were once enlightened and have tasted the heavenly gift, and participated in the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the sweet word of God, when they fall away, that they should be recalled to penitence, they having crucified to themselves the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame." (Heb. vi. 1-6).

Origen. Epist. ad Afr. "The author of the epistle to the Hebrews says, They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were slain with the sword." Heb. xi. 37. Com. in Joan. ii. "And Paul himself says in the epistle to the Hebrews, In these last days He hath spoken to us by His Son, whom He hath made heir of all things, by whom also He made the world." Heb. i. 2. Com. in Epist. Rom. vii. "Angels themselves also, if you look to the sentiment of Paul, what he says, that they are ministering spirits sent forth to minister to those who shall be the heirs of salvation." Heb. i. 7, 14. Com. in Joan. xx. "When also it is written in the epistle to the Hebrews, But solid food is for them who are perfect." Heb. v. 14. De Orat. "But these are his very words in the epistle to the Hebrews, But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Heb. ix. 26. In Num. Hom. 2. "But Paul also himself, writing to the Hebrews says, Ye have not come to the tangible mountain and the burning fire, but ye have come to mount Zion. Heb. xii. 13.

Athanasius. Opp. i. p. 266. "For also the blessed Paul in the epistle to the Hebrews said, By faith we understand that the worlds were made by the word of God." Heb. xi. 3. *ibid.* p. 265. And also the apostle said, "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the world." Heb. i. 1, 2.

Epiphanius. Haer. 70. Which the apostle indicates in these words, "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." Heb. iv. 12, 13. And then also concerning those who have an honorable marriage he says, "Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." Heb. xiii. 4. Haer. 69. "But they (the Arians), repudiate this epistle to the Hebrews and reject it from the apostolic writings."

Theodoret. Interpret. Epist. ad Heb. "They who are afflicted with the Arian disease do nothing that is surprising if they rage against the apostolic epistles, and separate the epistle to the Hebrews from the rest and call it spurious."

Jerome. Epist. ad Dard. "The epistle which is inscribed to the Hebrews, is received as the work of the

apostle Paul, not only by the churches of the East, but by all the ecclesiastical writers in the Greek language." In Matth. i. 26. "For also Paul, in his epistle which is written to the Hebrews, though many of the Latins have doubts concerning it." Comment. in Isaiam. iii. 6. "Whence also Paul, in the epistle to the Hebrews, which the Latin custom does not receive, says, Are they not all ministering spirits?"

As Eusebius is so important a witness, and he collected and examined most of the testimonies which existed in his own time, it will be of decided utility, in regard to the books of which he expresses any doubt, to place in one view his own testimony and that which he collects from others. I therefore here place by itself, a portion of *the testimonies collected by Eusebius in regard to the epistle to the Hebrews*.

E. H. v. 26. "Besides the works and epistles of Irenaeus, above mentioned, there is ——— a book also of various disputations, in which he mentions the epistle to the Hebrews," etc.

E. H. vi. 14. The epistle to the Hebrews he (Clement of Alex'a) asserts was written by Paul, to the Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue; but that it was carefully translated by Luke, and published among the Greeks. Whence, also, one finds the same character of style and of phraseology in the epistle as in the Acts. "But it is probable that the title, Paul the Apostle, was not prefixed to it. For as he wrote to the Hebrews, who had imbibed prejudices against him, and suspected him, he wisely guards against diverting them from the perusal, by giving his name." A little after this he observes:

“But now as the blessed presbyter used to say, ‘Since the Lord who was the apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul by reason of his inferiority, as if sent to the Gentiles, did not subscribe himself an apostle of the Hebrews; both out of reverence for the Lord, and because he wrote of his abundance to the Hebrews, as a herald and apostle of the Gentiles.’”

E. H. vi. 41. Dionysius of Alexandria says, “There were some who took the spoiling of their goods joyfully, like those of whom the apostle Paul testifies.” Heb. x. 39.

E. H. iii. 38. “We may mention as an instance what Ignatius has said in the epistles we have cited, and Clement of Rome in that universally received by all, which he wrote in the name of the church at Rome to that of Corinth. In which, after giving many sentiments taken from the epistle to the Hebrews, and also literally quoting the words, he most clearly shows that this work is by no means a late production. Whence it is probable that this was also numbered with the other writings of the apostles. For as Paul had addressed the Hebrews in the language of his country; some say that the evangelist Luke, others that Clement, translated the epistle. Which also appears more like the truth, as the epistle of Clement and that to the Hebrews, preserve the same features of style and phraseology, and because the sentiments in both these works are not very different.”

E. H. ii. 17. Eusebius is quoting from an account of the ascetics in Egypt by Philo, and says: “After other matters, he adds: ‘The whole time between the morning and evening, is a constant exercise; for as

they are engaged with the sacred Scriptures, they reason and comment upon them, explaining the philosophy of their country in an allegorical manner. For they consider the verbal interpretation as signs indicative of a secret sense communicated in obscure intimations. They have also commentaries of ancient men, who, as the founders of the sect, have left many monuments of their doctrine in allegorical representations, which they use as certain models, imitating the manner of the original institution.' These facts appear to have been stated by a man who, at least, has paid attention to those that have expounded the sacred writings. But it is highly probable, that the ancient commentaries which he says they have, are the very gospels and writings of the apostles, and probably some expositions of the ancient prophets, such as are contained in the epistle to the Hebrews and many others of St. Paul's epistles."

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES AND THE COMPARISON OF THE APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES WITH THE CANONICAL.

THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

THE seven Catholic epistles, which in the common edition of the Testament immediately follow the fourteen epistles of Paul, though in the earlier manuscripts they precede instead of follow Paul, are so called because, with a single exception, and that the shortest one, the third of John, they are not addressed to any particular church or person, but have a general direction, and by some of the ancients they are called evangelical or circular letters (Oecumenius, Proleg. in Ep. Jac).

In general they have always formed a part of the canon of the New Testament. Any partial exception to this rule will be adverted to in the notices of the separate books.

EPISTLE OF JAMES.

In the historical books of the New Testament we read of James the son of Zebedee, one of the twelve apostles of our Lord, who very early suffered martyrdom (Acts xii); of James the son of Alphaeus, and of James the brother of our Lord. The last two are supposed

by many to be identical, and it is not easy, either from the statements of Scripture or the testimony of the early ecclesiastical historians, to decide positively whether they are so or not. From the best examination which I have been able to make, it is my opinion that James the brother of the Lord is a different person from James the son of Alpheus, and that it was the idea of the perpetual virginity of Mary which induced many of the early church fathers to identify the two.

James, the brother of our Lord, was, as I think, a younger son of Mary the mother of Jesus; he is the one mentioned in Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18, Gal. ii. 9, Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3; and it was he who presided so long and so honorably over the church at Jerusalem, till he met with a violent death at the hands of a mob as related by Josephus (*Antiq.* xx. 8: 1) and by Eusebius (*E. H.* ii. 23); and that this is the James who wrote the epistle. There are no data for fixing the time of its composition. It may have been as early as A. D. 45 or as late as 62, but the earlier date is the more probable.

It is the object of the epistle to exhort to steadfastness in the Christian profession, to rebuke certain faults which began to be prevalent in the Christian churches composed principally of Jews, and particularly to guard against the abuses of the doctrine of salvation by faith alone. This last characteristic favors the idea of the later date of the epistle. It was addressed particularly to Jewish Christians living out of Palestine (James i. 1, ii. 21); and it is not at all systematic in its arrangement, but impulsive and miscellaneous. It contemplates the afflicted and oppressed condition of

the Hebrew Christians, and warns against the mistake of those who are hearers of the word only without practical obedience (i.), rebukes a manifest partiality for rich men in the congregations (ii.), shows the necessity of good works as the fruit and the evidence of faith (iii.-iv.); gives a reproof of oppressive rich men, exhortation to steadfastness under persecution, warning against extra judicial oaths, and directions for the care of the sick (v.).

The epistle was received as genuine Scripture in the Syrian Peschito, and is quoted by the Syrian saint, Ephraem, as the work of our Lord's brother. It was read by the apostolic fathers, Clement of Rome and Irenaeus; it is expressly mentioned by Origen, doubtfully received by Eusebius, and rejected by Theodore of Mopsuestia. During the fourth century it obtained full canonical authority both in the Greek and Latin churches. All this will clearly appear in the quotations which follow.

TESTIMONIES TO THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

Ephraem Syr., Opp. Graec. iii. 51. "James, the brother of our Lord, says, Howl and weep." James v. 1.

Clement of Rome, 1 Epist. ad Cor. c. 30. "For God, he says, resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble." James iv. 6. c. 38: "Let the wise man shew his wisdom not in words but in good works." James iii. 13. c. 17: "Abraham had a great testimony and was called the friend of God." James ii. 23. c. 10: "Abraham, who was called God's friend, was in like manner found faithful, inasmuch as he obeyed the commands of God." James ii. 23. c. 31: "On what

account was our father Abraham blessed? Was it not that through faith he wrought righteousness and truth?" James ii. 2. C. 23: "Far be from us that Scripture which says, Miserable are the double minded and those who are doubtful of soul." James i. 8.

Shepherd of Hermas, Simil. v. 4. "Whoever is the servant of God and has the Lord in his heart, he seeks wisdom from Him and obtains it. . . . Let them not hesitate to seek of the Lord, for the Lord is of goodness so profound that to those seeking from Him He gives all things without interruption." James i. 5. Command. xii. 5: "The Devil can wrestle but he can not conquer; for if you resist him he will flee from you in confusion." James iv. 7. *Ibid*, 5: "Rather fear the Lord, who is able both to save and to destroy." James iv. 12. Vision. iii. 9: "See to it, therefore, ye who glory in your riches, lest they groan who are in want, and their groaning ascend to the Lord, and ye be shut out with your goods beyond the gate of the tower." James v. 1-4.

Irenaeus, ad Haer. iv. 16. He shows that Abraham himself was justified without circumcision and without the observance of the Sabbath. Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God," James ii. 23. 13: "Abraham was made the friend of God."

Athanasius, ad Serap. 1. "But with God, says James, there is no variableness neither shadow of turning." James i. 17. Cont. Arium. Or. 3: "As James the apostle taught saying, Of His own will begat he us with the word of truth." James i. 18.

Clement of Alexandria, Strom. iii. "And so he

called him (Abraham) His friend." James ii. 23. *Ibid*: "But the Scripture says to them, God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble." James ii. 6.

Tertullian, De Orat. c. 8. "But far be it from the Lord that He should seem to tempt, as if He were ignorant of his faith." James i. 13. "Whence was Abraham reputed the friend of God, if not from equity and righteousness of natural law?" James ii. 23.

Origen, Comment. in John xix. "For if it may even be called faith, yet it may be without works, but faith of this kind is dead, as we read in the epistle which is circulated under the name of James." Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. iv.: "Hear also James, the brother of the Lord, . . . when he says, he who will be the friend of this world, is the enemy of God." James iv. 4. *Ibid*: "And finally James the apostle says this, Resist the Devil and he will flee from you; draw nigh to God and he will draw nigh to you." James iv. 7, 8. *Ibid*, "So also James the apostle says, every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." James i. 17. In Psalm 30: "And in James, as the body without the spirit is dead." In Ps. 36: "For it is an apostle who says, in many things we all offend, and if any man offend not in word, he is a perfect man." James iii. 2. Select. Exod: "Wherefore it is said, God is not tempted of evil."

Epiphanius, Haer. xxxi. "And, again, St. James speaks concerning such teaching, that it is not the wisdom that cometh from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. But the wisdom which is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated,

full of mercy and good fruits." etc. James iii. 17. *Ibid*, lxxvii. : "According as it is written, pure religion before God and the father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." i. 27.

Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccl. c. 2. "James, who is called the brother of the Lord, and by surname the Just . . . after the passion of the Lord was ordained by the apostles bishop of Jerusalem, wrote only one epistle, which is of the seven Catholic epistles."

As Eusebius expresses some doubts as to the epistle of James, we here present in one view both his own testimony and that which he has selected from others, as we have done in regard to the epistle to the Hebrews, and for the same reason.

(Kirchhofer, p. 264-66, 62.)

In Psalm : "For the holy apostle says, Is any afflicted among you, let him pray; is any merry, let him sing praises." Dem. Evang. iii. 5 : "Afterwards James, the brother of our Lord, who was of those that formerly dwelt at Jerusalem, and was called the Just on account of the excellence of his virtue, being interrogated by the high priest and the magistrates of the Jewish nation as to what opinion he had concerning Christ, when he answered plainly, that he was the Son of God, they put him to death by stoning.

E. H. i. 12: *from Clement of Alexandria*. "The names of our Saviour's apostles are sufficiently obvious to every one, from his Gospels; but of the seventy disciples, no catalogue is given anywhere. Barnabas, indeed is said to have been one of them, of whom there is distinguished notice in the Acts of the Apos-

tles; and also in St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians. Sosthenes, who sent letters with Paul to the Corinthians, is said to have been one of these. Clement, in the fifth of his Hypotyposes or Institutions, in which he also mentions Cephas, of whom Paul also says, that he came to Antioch, and "that he withstood him to his face;"—says, that one who had the same name with Peter the apostle, was one of the seventy; and that Matthias, who was numbered with the apostles in place of Judas, and he who had been honoured to be a candidate with him, is also said to have been deemed worthy of the same calling with the seventy. They also say that Thaddeus was one of them; concerning whom, I shall presently relate a narrative that has come down to us. Moreover, if any one observe with attention, he will find more disciples of our Saviour than the seventy, on the testimony of Paul, who says, that "he appeared after his resurrection, first to Cephas, then to the twelve, and after these to five hundred brethren at once." Of whom, he says, "some are fallen asleep," but the greater part were living at the time he wrote. Afterwards, he says, he appeared to James; he, however, was not merely one of these disciples of our Saviour, but he was one of his brethren. Lastly, when beside these, there still was a considerable number who were apostles in imitation of the twelve, such as Paul himself was, he adds, saying "afterwards he appeared to all the apostles."

E. H. ii. 1. Then also James, called the brother of our Lord, because he is also called the son of Joseph. For Joseph was esteemed the father of Christ, because the Virgin being betrothed to him, "she was found

with child by the Holy Ghost before they came together," as the narrative of the Holy Gospels shows. This James, therefore, whom the ancients, on account of the excellence of his virtue, surnamed the Just, was the first that received the episcopate of the church at Jerusalem. But Clement, in the sixth book of his Institutions, represents it thus: "Peter, and James, and John, after the ascension of our Saviour, though they had been preferred by our Lord, did not contend for the honour, but chose James the Just as bishop of Jerusalem." And the same author, in the seventh book of the same work, writes thus: "The Lord imparted the gift of knowledge to James the Just, to John and Peter after his resurrection, these delivered it to the rest of the apostles, and they to the seventy, of whom Barnabas was one. There were, however, two Jameses; one called the Just, who was thrown from a wing of the temple, and beaten to death with a fuller's club, and another, who was beheaded. Paul also makes mention of the Just in his epistles. "But other of the apostles," says he, "saw I none, save James the brother of our Lord."

E. H. ii. 23. After giving from the ancients a minute account of the acts and martyrdom of James, he concludes as follows: "These accounts are given respecting James, who is said to have written the first of the epistles general, (catholic;) but it is to be observed that some consider it spurious. Not many indeed of the ancients have mentioned it, and not even that called the epistle of Jude, which is also one of the seven called catholic epistles. Nevertheless we know, that these, with the rest, are publicly used in most of the churches."

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

Peter was among the first, and most zealous of the twelve apostles of Christ, (John i. 43-45, Matt. iv. 18, xviii. 2); and after the resurrection, took a leading part in the formation and guidance of the Christian Church, being the first to form a church out of the Jewish community, and the first to admit the Gentiles also without requiring of them circumcision. (Acts i-xi). After his miraculous deliverance from prison by the help of the angel, he left Jerusalem, (Acts xii.), and does not appear again till the council was called at Jerusalem to consider the case of the Gentile converts, (Acts xv.), where he decidedly took the liberal side. We are informed by the apostle Paul, that he afterwards at Antioch yielded again for a while to his Jewish prejudices, and brought upon himself in consequence a sharp rebuke. (Col. ii). He was the apostle to the Jews mainly, as Paul was to the Gentiles. His field of labor was principally in the East, he directs his epistle to the Christians of the East, (1 Pet. i. 1), and dates it from Babylon the old Chaldean metropolis. (1 Pet. v. 13). There is no reason for understanding the word Babylon here in any other than its literal sense. It is only the anxiety of some to give Peter a long residence at Rome, that ever imagined here a spiritual Babylon, that is Rome.

It is sufficiently attested by Christian antiquity that Peter visited Rome, preached there, and there suffered martyrdom; but that he ever made any long stay in that city, or ever saw it till quite the latter part of his life, does not appear. Indeed a careful inspection

of the narrative in Acts and of the epistles of Paul to the Romans, leads us inevitably to the conclusion that he did not visit Rome till after that epistle was written. This whole subject is very ably and satisfactorily discussed by Prof. Tholuck in the introduction to his commentary on Romans.

There are no sufficient data for assigning the date of this epistle. It was probably written after Peter's first missionary tour through the East, and before Paul to the Romans, perhaps as early as A. D. 55 or 58.

The epistle is full of Christian love and sympathy, wholly of a practical nature, and so miscellaneous in its character as scarcely to be susceptible of a logical analysis, nor is such an analysis necessary to guide the reader in the study of it.

After a reference to the blessed future which awaits the true Christian; (i. 3-12), he exhorts believers to a pure and holy life worthy of their calling, (i. 14, ii. 12), especially to an observance of all their civil, social, and domestic duties, (ii. 13, iii. 12), and in view of the sufferings and death of Christ to bear patiently the slanders and persecutions to which they were subjected. (iii. 13, iv. 19). Finally, particular exhortations to elders and private Christians, (v. 1-9), together with concluding greetings. (v. 10-14).

The genuineness of the epistle has always been admitted, and the testimonies to it are uniform from the very beginning.

TESTIMONIES TO I. PETER.

Clement of Rome. "Love hideth a multitude of sins. 1 Pet. iv. 8.

Pastor Hermas. Vis. x. 2. "Cast your cares on the Lord and he will direct them." 1 Pet. v. 9.

Polycarp. Ad Philip. c. 1. "In whom, not seeing, ye believe, and believing ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." 1 Pet. i. 8. *Ibid.* c. 2. "Wherefore girding up your loins, serve God in fear and truth, believing in Him who raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and gave him glory and a seat at His right hand." Pet. i. 13, 21. *Ibid.* c. 10. "Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles, that you may have praise for your good works and the Lord be not blasphemed." 1 Pet. ii. 12. *Ibid.* c. 8. "Let us therefore unwaveringly persevere in our hope and in the earnest of our righteousness, which is Christ Jesus, who bore our sins in his own body on the tree, who did not sin neither was guile found in his mouth, but on our account and that we might live in him, endured all things; wherefore let us be imitators of his patience, and if we suffer on account of his name, we glorify him." 1 Pet. ii. 21-24. *Ibid.* c. 2. "Not rendering evil for evil nor cursing for cursing." 1 Pet. iii. 9.

"Who comes the judge of quick and dead." 1 Pet. iv. 5. c. 7. "Watching unto prayer." 1 Pet. iv. 7. c. 10. "Be ye all subject one to another." 1 Pet. v. 5.

Eusebius. E. H. iv. 14. "Polycarp, indeed, in his epistle to the Philipians which is extant, uses testimonies from the first epistle to Peter."

Papias. Eusebius E. H. iii. 39. "Papias uses testimonies taken from the first epistle of Peter."

Letter to Diognetus. "He gave his own son a ransom for us, the just for the unjust." 1 Pet. iii. 13.

Letters of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons. Euseb. E. H. v. 2. "They humbled themselves under the mighty hand by which they are now powerfully exalted." 1 Pet. v. 6.

Irenaeus. iv. 9. "Peter says in his epistle, whom not seeing ye love, in whom, not seeing him now, ye believe, and rejoice with joy unspeakable." 1 Pet. i. 8. 16. "On this account Peter says, have not your liberty as a cloak of maliciousness." 1 Pet. ii. 16.

Clement of Alexandria. Strom. iv. "But if ye suffer for righteousness sake, says Peter, happy are ye, and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled; but sanctify the Lord God in your hearts; and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear. Having a good conscience; that, whereas they speak evil of you, as of evil-doers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ. For it is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well-doing, than for evil-doing." 1 Pet. iii. 14-17. Paed. i. "And so Peter also says, wherefore laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, as newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby: if so be ye have tasted that Christ is the Lord." 1 Pet. ii. 1-3.

Tertullian. Scorpiac. c. 12. "Indeed Peter says to them of Pontus, How great is the glory, if ye bear it, when ye are punished not as delinquents. For this is grace and in this ye were called." 1 Pet. i. 21. c. 14. "Peter says the king is to be honored."

Origen. Comment. in Matth. xv. "From the first

epistle of Peter ——— Peter says, in whom, that is Christ, though now ye see him not, yet believing ye rejoice." 1 Pet. i. 8.

De Princip. 2. "They do not read what is written concerning the hope of those who were taken off by the flood, concerning which hope Peter says in his first epistle, Christ indeed was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water." 1 Pet. iii. 18–20. On Psalm third Origen again quotes the same passage at length.

Comment. in Joan. vi. "And concerning that journey in the spirit to the prison, in the catholic epistle, with Peter, put to death he says in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit."

Cyprian. De bon. pat. "Peter also on whom in the estimation of the Lord the church is founded, declares in his epistle, Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps: Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." 1 Pet. ii. 21–23. Epist. 58. "Peter also the apostle taught that persecutions would be experienced, in order that we might be proved ——— for he states in his epistle saying, Beloved, think it not strange, concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you: but rejoice, inasmuch as ye are par-

takers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy. If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you. On their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified." 1 Pet. iv. 12-14.

Eusebius. H. E. iii. 4. "And also in what provinces Peter, preaching Christ to those of the circumcision, delivered to them the doctrine of the new covenant, may be clearly ascertained from that epistle, which, as I have said, is by all and without controversy ascribed to him, which he writes to those of the Hebrews who are dispersed through Pontus, Galatia, Capadocia, Asia and Bithynia."

Athanasius, Epist. ad Serap. "Peter also writes, receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." 1 Pet. i. 9-11.

Epiphanius. vii. "For says the Scripture, Christ suffered for us in the flesh; and again, being put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit." 1 Pet. iv. 1, iii. 18.

Jerome. Catal. Script. 1. "Simon Peter wrote two epistles, which are called catholic, of which the second is by many doubted, on account of its diversity in style from the first."

Epist. 120. "And finally the two epistles which are

called Peter's are diverse in style and character and the structure of words; from which we may understand that he made use of different interpreters, according to the exigencies in different circumstances."

Ibid, E. H. v. 1. "A wonderful interposition of God was then exhibited, and the boundless mercy of Christ clearly displayed, a thing that had rarely happened among the brethren, but by no means beyond the reach of the skill of Christ. For those that had fallen from the faith on the first seizure, were also themselves imprisoned, and shared in the sufferings of the rest. This renunciation did them no good at this time, but those that confessed what they really were, were imprisoned as Christians; no other charge being alleged against them. But these, at last, were confined as murderers and guilty culprits, and were punished with twice the severity of the rest. The former, indeed, were refreshed by the joy of martyrdom, the hope of the promises, the love of Christ, and the spirit of the Father; but the latter were sadly tormented by their own conscience. So that the difference was obvious to all in their very countenances, when they were led forth. For the one went on joyful, much glory and grace being mixed in their faces, so that their bonds seemed to form noble ornaments, and, like those of a bride, adorned with various golden bracelets, and impregnated with the sweet odour of Christ, they appeared to some anointed with earthly perfumes. But the others, with downcast look, dejected, sad, and covered with every kind of shame, in addition to this,

were reproached by the heathen as mean and cowardly, bearing the charge of murderers, and losing the honourable, glorious, and life-giving appellation of Christians. The rest, however, seeing these effects, were so much the more confirmed, and those that were taken immediately, confessed, not even admitting the thought suggested by diabolical objections." Introducing some further remarks they again proceed: 'After these things their martyrdom was finally distributed into various kinds; for plating and constituting one crown of various colours and all kinds of flowers, they offer it to the Father. It was right, indeed, that these noble wrestlers, who had sustained a diversified contest, and come off with a glorious victory, should bear away the great crown of immortality.'" 1 Peter iv. 13-16.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

This epistle claims most distinctly to have been written by the apostle Peter, the author of the first epistle, and that too in near view of death, the death of a martyr (i. 1, 14-18, iii. 1, 13). The whole tone and bearing of the epistle are in exact accordance with this claim. Its sentiment is elevated, pure, sweet, Christ-like, most admirably appropriate to the position claimed, and scarcely equaled in the Bible itself except by the address of Paul to Timothy in like circumstances. Read the words i. 14-18: "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I

must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me. Moreover I will endeavor that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance. For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." And compare the utterances of Paul. 2 Tim. iv. 6-8.

To me it seems utterly impossible that a man who was practicing a deliberate and conscious imposture could feel or give utterance to sentiments like these. The internal evidence of genuineness, from this source alone, is morally irresistible. The internal evidence also from the peculiar use of single words in the two epistles is thoroughly convincing. Though both epistles are very short, yet there are striking peculiarities of language the same in both, which occur nowhere else, or but very seldom in all the New Testament. For example the word *αποθεσις* (*apothesis*) is found in 1 Pet. iii. 21, and 2 Pet. i. 14, in the same sense, and nowhere else in all the New Testament. So the word *αρετη* (*arete*) occurs in 1 Pet. ii. 9, and 2 Pet. i. 3, 5, and but once besides in all the New Testament. The word *ασπιλος* (*aspilos*), 1 Pet. i. 19, and 2 Pet. iii. 14, and only twice besides in all the New Testament. Again the word *αναστροφη* (*anastrophe*) occurs six times in the

first of Peter, twice in the second of Peter, and only once besides in each of the following epistles, to wit, James, 1 Tim., Eph. and Gal. In ordinary cases these facts alone would be deemed sufficient to establish the identity of authorship.

As to the difference of style of which Jerome speaks, it is only such a difference and exactly such a difference as we should expect in an apostle in the full vigor of his life and apostleship, and the same apostle at the close of his career and in the daily expectation of martyrdom; and the same difference which we find between the second of Timothy and the epistle to the Romans.

Several causes contributed to render its reception in the ancient churches later than that of the first epistle.

1. It was addressed mainly to obscure churches, remote from the great lines of communication, in a region strongly suspected of heresy (Euseb. E. H. vi. 20), and so near the time of the apostle's death that it did not have the advantage of his personal presence and authority.

2. It related to a state of things which was not fully developed till sometime after the epistle was written. That which in the epistle of Jude is history, is in 2 Pet. ii. prediction; in Peter the verbs are in the future tense, in Jude they are in the past tense; Peter utters the prophecy and Jude records the fulfillment of the prophecy. This one fact of itself is decisive of the relation as to time between Jude and 2 Peter. Compare 2 Pet. ii. 1-3 and Jude vs. 4, 8, 10-13, 16, 19, 22, 23.

The time of writing was near the apostle's death,

the place wholly uncertain as there are no data to fix it.

The course of thought is as follows:

The apostle, after a brief introduction and an ethical exhortation, speaks of the certainty of the Christian doctrine and its confirmation especially by the transfiguration of Christ on the mountain and the divine voice, which he had seen and heard, and also by the prophecies of the Old Testament (i.). He then speaks of the teachers of error who would afterwards arise (ii.). He then gives assurance that notwithstanding the vain talk of those "whose great principle it is that all things continue as they were, and who scorn the notion of the great God ever coming to touch the orderly mechanism of the universe"—the time will come for a miraculous dissolution and reconstruction of the whole present system of things, though, since one day is with the Lord as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day, we have no ground for affirming anything as to the nearness or remoteness of that great event, thus joining with the apostle Paul (2 Thess. ii.) in rebuking those presumptuous teachers, not divinely inspired, who even in that age insisted on the immediate advent of Christ as necessary to the fulfillment of prophecy.

TESTIMONIES TO II. PETER.

Clement of Rome, ad Cor. i. 7, 11. "Noah preached repentance; and as many as harkened to him were saved. Noah, being proved to be faithful, did by his ministry preach regeneration to the world; and the Lord saved by him all the living creatures, that went

with one accord together into the ark. By hospitality and godliness was Lot saved out of Sodom, when all the country round about was destroyed by fire and brimstone: the Lord thereby making it manifest, that he will not forsake those that trust in him; but will bring the disobedient to punishment and correction. For his wife, who went out with him, being of a different mind, and not continuing in the same obedience, was for that reason set forth for an example, being turned into a pillar of salt unto this day." 2 Pet. ii. 5 ff.

Shepherd of Hermas, Vis. iii. 7. "There are those who believed, but by their hesitation forsook the true way." 2 Pet. ii. 15. iv. 3: "Ye are they who escape from this world." 2 Pet. ii. 20.

Justin Martyr, Dial. p. 303. "We know the saying, one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, pertaining to this." 2 Pet. iii. 8.

Theophilus, ad Autol. ii. "But men of God, full of the Holy Spirit, and inspired by God, were appointed prophets, and were taught of God, holy and righteous." 2 Pet. i. 10.

Origen, Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. viii. "And Peter says in his epistle, Grace and peace be multiplied unto you in the knowledge of God—and again, As good stewards of the manifold grace of God." 2 Pet. i. 2, 1 Pet. iv. 10. Hom. in Levit. iv.: "And again Peter says, Ye are made partakers of the divine nature." 2 Pet. i. 4. Hom. in Num. xiii.: "As the Scripture also says in the passage, The dumb animal, speaking with a human voice, rebuked the madness of the prophet." 2 Pet. ii. 16. Hom. in Exod. xii.: "For I

know it is written, of whom any one is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage." 2 Pet. ii. 19. Dial. de rect. Fide. ii. : "But the apostle is mentioned by Peter, according to the wisdom, he says, given to my brother Paul." 2 Pet. iii. 15.

Firmilianus, Ep. ad Cyp. 75. "Defaming the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, . . . who in their epistles execrated the heretics, and admonished us to avoid them." 2 Pet. ii.

Athanasius, Dial. de Sac. Trin. i. "And it is written in the Catholic epistles, whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, that ye may be made partakers of the divine nature." 2 Pet. i. 4. Cont. Arian. Orat. ii. : "And this is what Peter says, that ye may be made partakers of the divine nature." 2 Pet. i. 4.

Epiphanius, Haer. lxvi. "Which Peter indicates in his epistle by these words, Giving heed to the prophetic word as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the daystar arise in your hearts." 2 Pet. i. 19.

Jerome. See testimonies to 1 Peter.

Melito. "At another time there was a flood of water, and the just were preserved in an ark of wood by the ordinance of God. So also it will be at the last time; there will be a flood of fire and the earth shall be burned up, . . . and the just shall be delivered from the fray, like their fellows in the ark from the waters of the deluge." 2 Pet. iii. 5, 6, 10-12. Horne's Introd. iv. p. 606, tenth edition.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

There is no reasonable doubt, there never has been any, that the first epistle ascribed to John in the New Testament, is a genuine production of that apostle and evangelist. The internal evidence is conclusive, and the external testimony unanimous and uncontradicted. If we have evidence that the Tusculan Questions belong to Cicero, we have evidence still stronger (if possible) that this epistle belongs to the bosom friend of Jesus. It is true that the passage v. 7, is not found in any of the early Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, and we may admit it to be an interpolation without any prejudice to the integrity of the epistle. There is no internal evidence against the passage, it is quite in place where it stands, it is quite in the style and manner of John; but there is a lack of external testimony in its favor; and on all such questions the internal and external must co-operate to produce a decision.

There are no data to determine positively the time or place of writing or the particular persons to whom the epistle was at first addressed; but all the probabilities are that it was written at Ephesus after the publication of the Gospel, consequently at a late period of life, and addressed especially to the churches with which he was personally conversant in Asia Minor and the vicinity. It is full of the loveliness of the Gospel, and while the Boanerges is clearly seen in its pages, the predominating qualities are clearly those which made John *the disciple whom Jesus loved*.

According to one of the most eminent of the mod-

ern commentators on John, after the introduction (i. 1-4), there are two principal sections, each pervaded by a single master-thought, and both tending to illustrate the leading subject of the whole, to wit, fellowship with God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. 1. The theme (i. 5-ii. 28) is, God is light. 2. God is righteous (ii. 29-v. 5). 3. The conclusion, Jesus is the Son of God and the eternal Life.

TESTIMONIES TO THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

Ignatius, ad Magnes. c. 6. "Being intrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ, who before the ages was with the Father and in the end was manifested." 1 John i. 2.

Polycarp, ad Phil. c. 7. "For every one who doth not confess that Jesus Christ hath come in the flesh is anti-Christ." 1 John iv. 3.

Papias, Euseb. H. E. iii. 39. "He used testimonies taken from the first epistle of John." Papias, it will be remembered, was a pupil of John himself.

Epistle to Diognetus. "For God loved men to whom He sent His only begotten Son, to whom also He promised the kingdom in heaven, and to those who love Him will He give it. . . . How greatly should you love Him who first so loved you!" 1 John iv. 9.

Irenaeus, iii. 16. "Because that John also testified to us in his epistle, Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but

they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us. Wherefore know that every lie is extraneous and is not of the truth. Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." "And again he says in the epistle, Many false prophets are gone out into the world. In this know the Spirit of God. Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, is of God. And every spirit which says Jesus is not of God, is of antichrist." 1 John iv. 1-3. "Wherefore he again says in his epistle, Every one who believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." 1 John v. 1. Euseb. H. E. v. 8: "He also (Irenaeus) makes mention of the first epistle of John, bringing very many testimonies from it."

Clement of Alexandria, Paed. iii. "But this is the love of God, says John, that we keep his commandments, . . . and his commandments are not grievous." 1 John v. 3. Strom. ii.: "John also appears in his larger epistle, teaching the differences of sins in these words, If any one seeth his brother sinning a sin which is not unto death, he may pray and he will give him life. He says to those sinning not unto death, For there is a sin unto death. He does not say that any one should pray concerning that." 1 John v. 16.

Tertullian, Scorp. c. 12. "But John exhorts that we should lay down our lives for the brethren, denying that there is any fear in love." 1 John iii. 16, iv. 18. Adv. Prax. c. 15: "And finally let us look upon him whom the apostle saw. What we have seen, says John, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes and our hands have handled of the word of life, for the

word was made flesh." 1 John i. 1. c. 25: Which three are one (*unum*), not one person (*unus*); as it is said, I and the Father are one (*unum*), as to unity of substance not as to singleness of number." 1 John v. 7, 8.

Origen, De Orat. "As John says in the catholic epistle, he is of the Devil, for the Devil sinneth from the beginning." 1 John iii. 8. Comment in Evan. Joan. xix. "John in the Catholic epistle saying these things, he that denieth the Father denieth also the Son; for every one who denieth the Son, neither hath he the Father." 1 John ii. 22. ii: "But in the Catholic epistle of John himself it is said, God is light."

Cyprian, Epist. 28. "And the apostle John in his epistle says, In this we understand that we know Him, if we keep His commandments. He who says that he knows Him, and keeps not His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John ii. 3, 4. Epist. 69: "And also John the blessed apostle, . . . Ye have heard that Anti-Christ cometh, and now there are many Anti-Christ, whence we know it is the last time. They went out from us, but they werè not of us: if they had been of us, they would no doubt have remained with us." 1 John ii. 18, 19. De Bon. Pat.: "As John the apostle teaches, he who says he abides in Christ ought himself to walk as He also walked." 1 John ii. 6.

Athanasius, Cont. Ar. Orat. 5. "But that the Son did not have beginning of existence, but was always in the Father before He became man, the apostle John declares, saying in his first epistle, 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, of the Word of life; for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us. Epist. ad Serap.: "And John writes in his epistle, by this we know that we abide in Him, and He in us, because He has given unto us of His Spirit." 1 John iii. 24.

THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

These two letters are very short, they are addressed to private individuals, and are not of any particular dogmatic interest. They were therefore late in getting into circulation as a part of the New Testament Scriptures, the ancient church exercising great caution on this subject, as we see in the example of 2 Peter. Eventually they were universally acknowledged.

The second epistle is addressed to a Christian woman by the name of Kuria or Latinized Cyria. It is a mistake in the English translation to render this word *lady*. The epistle begins, *The Elder to the elect Cyria and her children, whom I love in the truth*; exactly as the third epistle begins, *The Elder to the beloved Gaius whom I love in the truth*. Both introductions are exceedingly characteristic of the apostle John, who here styles himself *elder*, just as Peter does (1 Pet. v. 1.), on account of his advanced age and his position in the church. Who this Cyria was we have now no means of ascertaining; but John exhorts her to persevere in Christian charity and to beware of false teachers, and gives her the hope of soon receiving a visit from him.

Of Gaius he commends the hospitality, warns him against Diotrephes and commends to him Demetrius. There is a Gaius mentioned by Paul (Rom. xvi. 23, compare 1 Cor. i. 14) as the entertainer of himself and the whole church at Corinth, and therefore a very hospitable person, and the name also occurs in Acts xix. 29 and xx. 4; but there is no certainty whether any of these were the Gaius to whom John wrote. There is an ancient tradition that this Gaius was a personal friend of the apostle, who brought his Gospel from the island of Patmos to the churches. Gaius is the same name as Caius.

TESTIMONIES TO THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

Irenaeus, iii. 16. "And John his disciple, in the aforesaid epistle, commands that we should avoid them, saying, For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. Look to yourselves that ye lose not those things which ye have wrought." 2 John 7, 8. i. 16: "For John, the disciple of the Lord, pronounces a curse upon them, and wills not that we should bid them God speed, saying, Whoever bids them God speed is a partaker of their evil deeds." 2 John 4.

Clement of Alexandria, ad Numb. "The second epistle of John, which is the most simple, is written to virgins."

Eusebius, Dem. Evang. iii. 5. "And John also you will find like to Matthew, for in his epistle he does not mention his own name, but calls himself *the elder*, never the apostle or evangelist. And in the Gospel

when he speaks of the disciple whom Jesus loved, he does not reveal himself by name.

Epiphanius, xxxiv. "But John, the disciple of Christ, condemns them with a greater punishment, when he does not suffer us even to salute them, for whoever, says he, bids them God speed, is a partaker of their evil deeds." 2 John 4.

Jerome, Epist. Evang. "The son of thunder, whom Jesus especially loved, who drank streams of doctrine from the breast of the Saviour, sounds with the Gospel trumpet, *The Elder to the woman elect of the Lord*, etc., and in the other epistle, *The Elder to Caius*.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

Jude was the brother of James, the author of the first Catholic epistle, who presided over the church at Jerusalem for many years; and consequently he was a younger son of Mary the mother of Jesus. A very interesting incident respecting his grandsons is preserved to us by Eusebius (E. H. iii. 20), from the historian Hegesippus:

"There were yet living of the family of our Lord, the grandchildren of Judas, called the brother of our Lord, according to the flesh. These were reported as being of the family of David, and were brought to Domitian by the Evocatus. For this emperor was as much alarmed at the appearance of Christ as Herod. He put the question, whether they were of David's race, and they confessed that they were. He then asked them what property they had, or how much money they owned. And both of them answered, that they had between them only nine thousand dena-

rii,* and this they had not in silver, but in the value of a piece of land, containing only thirty nine acres; from which they raised their taxes and supported themselves by their own labour. Then they also began to show their hands, exhibiting the hardness of their bodies, and the callosity formed by incessant labour on their hands, as evidence of their own labour. When asked also, respecting Christ and his kingdom, what was its nature, and when and where it was to appear, they replied, 'that it was not a temporal nor an earthly kingdom, but celestial and angelic; that it would appear at the end of the world, when coming in glory he would judge the quick and dead, and give to every one according to his works.' Upon which, Domitian despising them, made no reply; but treating them with contempt, as simpletons, commanded them to be dismissed, and by a decree ordered the persecution to cease. Thus delivered they ruled the churches, both as witnesses and relatives of the Lord. When peace was established, they continued living even to the time of Trajan. Such is the statement of Hegesippus."

But little is known of the life and labors of Jude. The epistle must have been written at a late period, for he mentions as historical facts already occurring, what Peter, in his second epistle, had predicted as still future at the time when he was writing (2 Pet. ii). The late date of the epistle and the fact that not much was known in the great body of the churches respecting its author, were probably the reasons why it was slow in coming into universal use; though it was very

* About 1500 dollars.

generally acknowledged at quite an early period, as will be seen in the testimonies. The author, in 9, 14, 15, refers to matters not on record in any of the canonical books of Scripture, and which, probably, like the names of Jannes and Jambres (2 Tim. iii 3), had been preserved till that time by tradition. It is true that the passage in 14, 15, is found in our present book of Enoch; but as this book was not completed in the form in which we now have it till after this epistle was written, it is probable that Enoch quotes from Jude rather than Jude from Enoch.

After a brief introduction (1-3) the author proceeds to expose the corrupt, blasphemous and wicked men, teachers of error and panderers to vice, who had crept into the churches (3-19), and concludes with the exhortation and the expression of the hope that his readers would persevere in the right way, and be finally received to the joys of the upper world (20-25).

TESTIMONIES TO THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

Clement of Alexandria, Paed. ii. "Says Jude, For I wish you to know how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them that believed not. And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. And again, Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and run greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core. These are spots in your feasts."

• Strom. iii. "Concerning these and similar heresies

I think Jude spake prophetically in his epistle. Likewise also these filthy dreamers——and so on to this. And their mouth speaketh proud things.” Jude 16.

Adumb. in Ep. Jud. “Jude who wrote the Catholic epistle, a brother of the sons of Joseph, being very religious, when he knew his relationship to the Lord, nevertheless he did not say that he was his brother, but what said he? Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ, as of the Lord, but a brother of James.”

Tertullian. De Cult. Tem. i. 3. “Enoch has testimony in the apostle Jude.”

Origen. Comment. in Matth. i. “Jude wrote an epistle indeed of few verses, but filled with efficacious words of heavenly grace, and says in the beginning, Jude a servant of Jesus Christ, but the brother of James.”

xv. “And indeed many of the first heavenly beings became lost, being kept in eternal chains under darkness for the judgment of the great day.” Jude 6.

xiii. “And in the epistle of Jude, to those who are beloved in God the Father, and preserved and called in Jesus Christ.” Jude 1.

Comment. in Rom. iii. “And unless they had been held by this law, the divine Scripture would never have said concerning them, The angels also, who kept not their principality, but left their own habitation, hath God reserved, under darkness bound in Tartarus with eternal chains, for the judgment of the great day.” vi. v. “In what manner then can we explain what the apostle Jude says in his Catholic epistle? For thus he speaks, The angels also, who kept not their principality,” etc.

De Princip. iii. 2. "The apostle Jude in his epistle says, Michael the archangel disputing with Satan concerning the body of Moses." Jude 9.

Jerome. Catal. Script. Eccl. c. 4. "Jude the brother of James, left a short epistle, which is of the seven Catholic epistles."

Epiphanius. xxvi. "As also I judge the Holy Spirit was moved in regard to these things in the apostle Jude, in the Catholic epistle, I say, which was written by him. But this Jude is called the brother of James and of the Lord."

THE APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES.

What are called the Apocryphal Epistles are for the most part very different compositions from the Apocryphal Gospels and Acts, which have already been reviewed. Those are generally either spurious or anonymous fictions and worthless, except as they occasionally embody some early Christian traditions not elsewhere to be found. But these epistles are, as a whole, the writings of the men whose names they bear, good and useful men and honored teachers in the church, the public companions of the apostles themselves. Hence the more common and appropriate designation of these books is, the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. They bear somewhat the same relation to the New Testament that such Apocryphal books as 1 Maccabees, Jesus Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon do to the Old. Though genuine they are somewhat interpolated and corrupted, and the falling off in tone and sentiment from the inspired to the uninspired must be obvious to the dullest reader. Com-

pare Barnabas for example, the fellow-missionary of Paul, or Hermas his personal friend, (Rom. xvi. 14), with the apostle himself; and it is seen at once how wide the difference is between an inspired writer and an uninspired writer, even of the same age and class. We admit that the epistle of Barnabas is strongly interpolated, and that the author of the Shepherd may be a Hermas who lived at Rome three-quarters of a century after Paul; but even with this admission, the contrast between the words which man's wisdom teacheth and the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth is sufficiently marked and strong. It is difficult to conceive how Irenaeus, a cotemporary of the second Hermas, should ascribe this work to the first Hermas and speak so very highly of it, if it had been a product of his own day.

The writings referred to include the First Epistle of Clement of Rome (Phil. iv. 3) to the Corinthians, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistle of Ignatius, the Epistle of Polycarp, and the Shepherd of Hermas. These persons and their works are all briefly described in the Fourth Chapter of this Volume, to which the reader is here referred. To these may be added the Epistles of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, and the epistle to Diognetus.

I select for the purposes of comparison with the New Testament Epistles, the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians, the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, and the first Vision of Hermas. I take the shortest recension of the Epistle of Ignatius, which beyond reasonable doubt comes to us as Ignatius wrote it. Let

the reader now, before proceeding further, turn to the iv chapter and examine the paragraphs on Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp.

Hermas perhaps belongs more properly to the apocalyptic than to the epistolary Apocrypha; but I place him here with Ignatius and Polycarp, and after James and Peter, John and Jude, that the striking contrast between the inspired and the uninspired, at the very earliest period of the church, may be the more clearly seen.

THE EPISTLE OF IGNATIUS TO THE EPHESIANS.

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the church which is at Ephesus in Asia; most deservedly happy; being blessed through the greatness and fullness of God the Father, and predestinated before the world began, that it should be always unto an enduring and unchangeable glory; being united and chosen through his true passion, according to the will of the Father, and Jesus Christ our God; all happiness, by Jesus Christ, and his undefiled grace. I have heard of your name, much beloved in God; which ye have very justly attained by a habit of righteousness, according to the faith and love which is in Jesus Christ our Saviour. How that being followers of God, and stirring up yourselves by the blood of Christ, ye have perfectly accomplished the work that was con-natural unto you. For hearing that I came bound from Syria, for the common name and hope, trusting through your prayers to fight with beasts at Rome; that so by suffering I may become indeed the disciple of him who

gave himself to God, an offering and sacrifice for us (ye hastened to see me). I received, therefore, in the name of God, your whole multitude in Onesimus. Who by inexpressible love is ours, but according to the flesh is your bishop: whom I beseech you, by Jesus Christ, to love; and that you would all strive to be like unto him. And blessed be God, who has granted unto you, who are so worthy of him, to enjoy such an excellent bishop. For what concerns my fellow-servant Burrhus, and your most blessed deacon in things pertaining to God; I entreat you that he may tarry longer, both for yours and your bishop's honor. And Crocus, also, worthy both of our God and you, whom I have received as the pattern of your love, has in all things refreshed me, as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ shall also refresh him, together with Onesimus, and Burrhus, and Euplus, and Fonto, in whom I have, as to your charity, seen all of you. And may I always have joy of you, if I shall be worthy of it. It is therefore fitting that you should by all means glorify Jesus Christ who hath glorified you; that by a uniform obedience ye may be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment; and may all speak the same things concerning every thing: And that being subject to your bishop, and the presbytery, ye may be wholly and thoroughly sanctified. These things I prescribe to you, not as if I were somebody extraordinary: for though I am bound for his name, I am not yet perfect in Christ Jesus. But now I begin to learn, and I speak to you as fellow-disciples together with me. For I ought to have been stirred up by you, in faith, in admonition, in patience, in long suffering: but for as

much as charity suffers me not to be silent towards you, I have first taken upon me to exhort you, that ye would all run together according to the will of God. For even Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is sent by the will of the Father; as the bishops, appointed unto the utmost bounds of the earth, are by the will of Jesus Christ. Wherefore it will become you to run together according to the will of your bishop, as also ye do. For your famous presbytery, worthy of God, is fitted as exactly to the bishop, as the strings are to the harp. Therefore in your concord, and agreeing charity, Jesus Christ is sung; and every single person among you makes up the chorus: That so being all consonant in love, and taking up the song of God, ye may in perfect unity, with one voice, sing to the Father by Jesus Christ; to the end that he may both hear you, and perceive by your works, that ye are indeed the members of his Son. Wherefore it is profitable for you to live in an unblamable unity, that so ye may always have a fellowship with God.

For if I in this little time have had such a familiarity with your bishop, I mean not a carnal, but spiritual acquaintance with him, how much more must I think you happy who are so joined to him, as the church is to Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ to the Father; that so all things may agree in the same unity? Let no man deceive himself; if a man be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God. For if the prayer of one or two be of such force, as we are told, how much more powerful shall that of the bishop and the whole church be? He therefore that does not come together into the same place with it, is proud, and has

already condemned himself. For it is written, God resisteth the proud. Let us take heed therefore, that we do not set ourselves against the bishop, that we may be subject to God. The more any one sees his bishop silent, the more let him revere him. For whomsoever the master of the house sends to be over his own household, we ought in like manner to receive him, as we would do him that sent him. It is therefore evident that we ought to look upon the bishop even as we would do upon the Lord himself. And indeed Onesimus himself does greatly commend your good order in God: that you all live according to the truth, and that no heresy dwells among you. For neither do ye hearken to any one more than to Jesus Christ speaking to you in truth. For some there are who carry about the name of Christ in deceitfulness, but do things unworthy of God; whom ye must flee, as ye would so many wild beasts. For they are ravaging dogs, who bite secretly: against whom ye must guard yourselves, as men hardly to be cured. There is one physician, both fleshly and spiritual; made and not made; God incarnate; true life in death; both of Mary and of God; first passible; then impassible; even Jesus Christ our Lord. Wherefore, let no man deceive you, as indeed neither are ye deceived, being wholly the servants of God. For inasmuch as there is no contention, nor strife among you, to trouble you, ye must needs live according to God's will. My soul be for yours; and I myself the expiatory offering for your church of Ephesus, so famous throughout the world. They that are of the flesh cannot do the works of the spirit; neither they that are of the spirit the

works of the flesh. As he that has faith cannot be an infidel; nor he that is an infidel have faith. But even those things which ye do according to the flesh are spiritual; forasmuch as ye do all things in Jesus Christ. Nevertheless I have heard of some who have passed by you, having perverse doctrine; whom ye did not suffer to sow among you; but stopped your ears, that ye might not receive those things that were sown by them; as being the stones of the temple of the Father, prepared for his building; and drawn up on high by the cross of Christ, as by an engine. Using the Holy Ghost as the rope; your faith being your support; and your charity the way that leads unto God. Ye are, therefore, with all your companions in the same journey, full of God; his spiritual temples, full of Christ, full of holiness; adorned in all things with the commands of Christ. In whom also I rejoice that I have been thought worthy by this present epistle to converse, and joy together with you; that with respect to the other life, ye love nothing but God only.

Pray also without ceasing for other men; for there is hope of repentance in them, that they may attain unto God; let them therefore at least be instructed by your works, if they will be no other way. Be ye mild at their anger; humble at their boasting: to their blasphemies, return your prayers: to their error, your firmness in the faith: when they are cruel, be ye gentle; not endeavoring to imitate their ways. Let us be their brethren in all kindness and moderation, but let us be followers of the Lord: for who was ever more unjustly used? more destitute? more despised? That so no herb of the Devil may be found in you;

but ye may remain in all holiness and sobriety, both of body and spirit, in Christ Jesus. The last times are come upon us: let us therefore be very reverent, and fear the long-suffering of God, that it be not to us unto condemnation. For let us either fear the wrath that is to come, or let us love the grace that we at present enjoy; that by the one, or other, of these we may be found in Christ Jesus unto true life. Besides him, let nothing be worthy of you; for whom also I bear about these bonds, those spiritual jewels, in which I would to God that I might arise through your prayers. Of which I entreat you to make me always partaker, that I may be found in the lot of the Christians of Ephesus, who have always agreed with the apostles, through the power of Jesus Christ. I know both who I am, and to whom I write: I, a person condemned; ye, such as have obtained mercy; I, exposed to danger; ye, confirmed against danger. Ye are the passage of those that are killed for God; the companions of Paul in the mysteries of the Gospel; the holy, the martyr, the deservedly most happy Paul; at whose feet may I be found, when I shall have attained unto God; who throughout all his epistles makes mention of you, in Christ Jesus. Let it be your care, therefore, to come more fully together, to the praise and glory of God. For when ye meet fully together in the same place, the powers of the devil are destroyed, and his mischief is dissolved by the unity of your faith. And indeed, nothing is better than peace, by which all war, both spiritual and earthly, are abolished. Of all which nothing is hid from you, if ye have perfect faith and charity in Christ Jesus, which

are the beginning and end of life. For the beginning is faith; the end charity. And these two, joined together, are of God: but all other things which concern a holy life, are the consequences of these. No man professing a true faith, sinneth; neither does he who has charity, hate any. The tree is made manifest by its fruit: so they who profess themselves to be Christians are known by what they do. For Christianity is not the work of an outward profession; but shows itself in the power of faith, if a man be found faithful unto the end. It is better for a man to hold his peace, and be, than to say, he is a Christian, and not to be. It is good to teach, if what he says, he does likewise. There is therefore one Master who spake, and it was done; and even those things which he did without speaking, are worthy of the Father. He that possesses the word of Jesus, is truly able to hear his very silence, that he may be perfect; and both do according to what he speaks, and be known of those things of which he is silent. There is nothing hid from God, but even our secrets are nigh unto him. Let us therefore do all things, as becomes those who have God dwelling in them; that we may be his temples, and he may be our God; as also he is, and will manifest himself before our faces, by those things for which we justly love him.

Be not deceived, my brethren: those that corrupt families by adultery, shall not inherit the kingdom of God. If therefore they who do this according to the flesh, have suffered death, how much more shall he die, who by his wicked doctrine corrupts the faith of God, for which Christ was crucified? He that is thus

defiled, shall depart into unquenchable fire, and so also shall he that hearkens to him. For this cause did the Lord suffer the ointment to be poured on his head; that he might breathe the breath of immortality into his church. Be not ye therefore anointed with the evil savor of the doctrine of the prince of this world: let him not take you captive from the life that is set before you. And why are we not all wise; seeing we have received the knowledge of God, which is Jesus Christ? Why do we suffer ourselves foolishly to perish; not considering the gift which the Lord has truly sent to us? Let my life be sacrificed for the doctrine of the cross; which is indeed a scandal to the unbelievers, but to us is salvation and life eternal. Where is the wise man? Where is the disputer? Where is the boasting of those who are called wise? For our God, Jesus Christ, was according to the dispensation of God, conceived in the womb of Mary, of the seed of David, by the Holy Ghost: he was born, and baptized, that through his passion he might purify water, to the washing away of sin. Now the virginity of Mary, and he who was born of her, was kept secret from the prince of this world; as was also the death of our Lord; three of the mysteries the most spoken of throughout the world, yet done in secret by God. How then was our Saviour manifested to the world? A star shone in heaven beyond all the other stars, and its light was inexpressible, and its novelty struck terror into men's minds. All the rest of the stars, together with the sun and moon, were the chorus to this star; but that sent out its light exceedingly above them all. And men began to be troubled to think

whence this new star came, so unlike to all the others. Hence all the power of magic became dissolved; and every bond of wickedness was destroyed; men's ignorance was taken away; and the old kingdom abolished; God himself appearing in the form of a man, for the renewal of eternal life. From thence began what God had prepared: from thenceforth things were disturbed; forasmuch as he designed to abolish death. But if Jesus Christ shall give me grace through your prayers, and it be his will, I purpose in a second epistle, which I will suddenly write unto you, to manifest to you more fully the dispensation of which I have now begun to speak, unto the new man, which is Jesus Christ; both in his faith, and charity; in his suffering and in his resurrection. Especially if the Lord shall make known unto me, that ye all by name come together in common in one faith, and in one Jesus Christ; who was of the race of David, according to the flesh; the Son of man and Son of God; obeying your bishop and the presbytery with an entire affection; breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality; our antidote that we should not die, but live forever in Christ Jesus. My soul be for yours, and theirs whom ye have sent, to the glory of God; even unto Smyrna, from whence also I write to you; giving thanks unto the Lord, and loving Polycarp even as I do you. Remember me, as Jesus Christ does remember you. Pray for the church which is in Syria, from whence I am carried bound to Rome; being the least of all the faithful which are there, as I have been thought worthy to be found to the glory of God. Fare ye well in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ, our common hope. Amen.

THE EPISTLE OF POLYCARP TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

Polycarp, and the presbyters that are with him, to the church of God which is at Philippi; mercy unto you, and peace, from God Almighty, and the Lord Jesus Christ, our Saviour, be multiplied. I rejoiced greatly with you in our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye received the images of a true love, and accompanied as it behoves you, those who were in bonds becoming saints; which are the crowns of such as are truly chosen by God and our Lord: as also that the root of the faith which was preached from ancient times, remains firm in you to this day; and brings forth fruit to our Lord Jesus Christ, who suffered himself to be brought even to the death for our sins. Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death. Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory. Into which many desire to enter; knowing that by grace ye are saved; not by works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ. Wherefore, girding up the loins of your minds; serve the Lord with fear, and in truth laying aside all empty and vain speech, and the error of many; believing in him that raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and hath given him glory, and a throne at his right hand. To whom all things are made subject, both that are in heaven, and that are in earth; whom every living creature shall worship; who shall come to be the judge of the quick and the dead; whose blood God shall require of them that believe not in him. But he that raised up Christ from the

dead, shall also raise up us in like manner, if we do his will, and walk according to his commandments; and love those things which he loved: abstaining from all unrighteousness; inordinate affection, and love of money; from evil speaking; false witness; not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing, or striking for striking, or cursing for cursing. But remember what the Lord has taught us, saying, Judge not, that ye shall not be judged; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven; be ye merciful, and ye shall obtain mercy; for with the same measure that ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again. And again, that blessed are the poor, and they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of God.

These things, my brethren, I took not the liberty of myself to write unto you concerning righteousness, but you yourselves before encouraged me to do it. For neither can I, nor any other such as I am, come up to the wisdom of the blessed and renowned Paul; who, being himself in person with those who then lived, did with all exactness and soundness teach the word of truth; and being gone from you, wrote an epistle to you. Into which if you look, you will be able to edify yourselves in the faith that has been delivered unto you; which is the mother of us all; being followed with hope, and led on by a general love, both towards God and towards Christ, and towards our neighbour. For if any man has these things, he has fulfilled the law of righteousness: for he that has charity is far from all sin. But the love of money is the root of all evil. Knowing therefore that as we brought nothing into this world, so neither may we

carry anything out; let us arm ourselves with the armor of righteousness. And teach ourselves first to walk according to the commandments of the Lord; and then our wives to walk likewise according to the faith that is given to them; in charity, and in purity; loving their own husbands with all sincerity, and all others alike with all temperance; and to bring up their children in the instruction and fear of the Lord. The widows likewise teach that they be sober as to what concerns the faith of the Lord; praying always for all men; being far from all detraction, evil speaking, false witness; from covetousness, and from all evil. Knowing that they are the altars of God, who sees all blemishes, and from whom nothing is hid; who searches out the very reasonings, and thoughts, and secrets of our hearts. Knowing, therefore, that God is not mocked, we ought to walk worthy both of his command and of his glory. Also the deacons must be blameless before him, as the ministers of God in Christ, and not of men. Not false accusers; not double-tongued; not lovers of money; but moderate in all things; compassionate, careful; walking according to the truth of the Lord, who was the servant of all. Whom if we please in this present world, we shall also be made partakers of that which is to come, according as he hath promised us, that he will raise us up from the dead; and that if we shall walk worthy of him, we shall also reign together with him, if we believe. In like manner the younger men must be unblamable in all things; above all, taking care of their purity, and to restrain themselves from all evil. For it is good to be cut off from the lusts that are in the world; be-

cause every such lust warreth against the spirit : and neither fornicators, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, shall inherit the kingdom of God ; nor they who do such things as are foolish and unreasonable. Wherefore ye must needs abstain from all these things ; being subject to the priests and deacons, as unto God and Christ. The virgins admonish to walk in a spotless and pure conscience. And let the elders be compassionate and merciful towards all, turning them from their errors ; seeking out those that are weak ; not forgetting the widows, the fatherless, and the poor ; but always providing what is good both in the sight of God and man. Abstaining from all wrath, respect of persons, and unrighteous judgment ; and especially being free from all covetousness. Not easy to believe anything against any ; not severe in judgment ; knowing that we are all debtors in point of sin. If therefore we pray to the Lord that he would forgive us, we ought also to forgive others , for we are all in the sight of our Lord and God ; and must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ ; and shall every one give an account of himself. Let us therefore serve him in fear, and with all reverence as both himself hath commanded, and as the apostles who have preached the Gospel unto us, and the prophets who have foretold the coming of our Lord, have taught us : being zealous of what is good ; abstaining from all offence, and from false brethren ; and from those who bear the name of Christ in hypocrisy ; who deceive vain men.

For whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, he is Antichrist : and whoever does

not confess his suffering upon the cross, is from the Devil. And whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts; and says that there shall neither be any resurrection, nor judgment, he is the first-born of Satan. Wherefore, leaving the vanity of many, and their false doctrines; let us return to the word that was delivered to us from the beginning; Watching unto prayer; and persevering in fasting; With supplication beseeching the all-seeing God not to lead us into temptation; as the Lord hath said; The spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak. Let us therefore, without ceasing, hold steadfastly to him who is our hope, and the earnest of our righteousness, even Jesus Christ; Who his own self bear our sins in his own body on the tree; who did not sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. But suffered all for us that we might live through him. Let us therefore imitate his patience; and if we suffer for his name, let us glorify him; for this example he has given us by himself, and so have we believed. Wherefore I exhort all of you that ye obey the word of righteousness, and exercise all patience; which ye have seen set forth before your eyes, not only in the blessed Ignatius, and Zozimus, and Rufus; but in others among yourselves; and in Paul himself, and the rest of the Apostles: Being confident of this, that all these have not run in vain; but in faith and righteousness, and are gone to the place that was due to them from the Lord; with whom also they suffered. For they loved not this present world; but him who died, and was raised again by God for us. Stand therefore in these things and follow the example of the Lord; being firm and

immutable in the faith, lovers of the brotherhood, lovers of one another; companions together in the truth, being kind and gentle toward each other, despising none. When it is in your power to do good, defer it not; for charity delivereth from death. Be all of you subject one to another; having your conversation honest among the Gentiles; that by your good works, both ye yourselves may receive praise, and the Lord may not be blasphemed through you. But woe be to him by whom the name of the Lord is blasphemed. Therefore teach all men sobriety; in which do ye also exercise yourselves.

I am greatly afflicted for Valens, who was once a presbyter among you; that he should so little understand the place that was given to him in the church. Wherefore I admonish you that ye abstain from covetousness; and that ye be chaste, and true of speech. Keep yourselves from all evil. For he that in these things cannot govern himself, how shall he be able to prescribe them to another? If a man does not keep himself from covetousness, he shall be polluted with idolatry, and be judged as if he were a Gentile. But who of you are ignorant of the judgment of God? Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches? But I have neither perceived nor heard any thing of this kind in you, among whom the blessed Paul laboured; and who are named in the beginning of his Epistle. For he glories of you in all the churches who then only knew God; for we did not then know him. Wherefore, my brethren, I am exceedingly sorry both for him, and for his wife; to whom God grant a true repentance. And be ye also


moderate upon this occasion ; and look not upon such as enemies, but call them back as suffering and erring members, that ye may save your whole body : for by so doing, ye shall edify your own selves. For I trust that ye are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures, and that nothing is hid from you : but at present it is not granted unto me to practise that which is written, Be angry and sin not ; and again, Let not the sun go down upon your wrath. Blessed is he that believeth and remembereth these things ; which also I trust you do. Now the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and he himself who is our everlasting high-priest, the Son of God, even Jesus Christ, build you up in faith and in truth, and in all meekness and lenity ; in patience and long-suffering, in forbearance and chastity ; and grant unto you a lot and portion among his saints ; and us with you, and to all that are under the heavens, who shall believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and in his Father who raised him from the dead. Pray for all the saints : pray also for kings, and all that are in authority ; and for those who persecute you, and hate you, and for the enemies of the cross ; that your fruit may be manifest in all ; and that ye may be perfect in Christ. Ye wrote to me, both ye, and also Ignatius, that if any one went from hence into Syria, he should bring your letters with him ; which also I will take care of, as soon as I shall have a convenient opportunity ; either by myself, or him whom I shall send upon your account. The epistle of Ignatius which he wrote unto us, together with what others of his have come to our hands, we have sent to you, according to your order ; which are subjoined to this epistle :

By which ye may be greatly profited; for they treat of faith and patience, and of all things that pertain to edification in the Lord Jesus. What you know certainly of Ignatius, and those that are with him, signify unto us. These things have I written unto you by Crescens, whom by this present epistle I have recommended to you, and do now again commend. For he has had his conversation without blame among us; and I suppose also with you. Ye will also have regard unto his sister, when she shall come unto you. Be ye safe in the Lord Jesus Christ; and in favor with all yours. Amen.

THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS.

FROM THE FIRST BOOK OF HERMAS CALLED VISIONS.

He who had bred me up sold a certain young maid at Rome; whom when I saw many years after, I remembered her, and began to love her as a sister. It happened some time afterwards, that I saw her washing at the river Tyber, and I reached out my hand to her, and led her away from the river. And when I saw her, I thought with myself, saying, How happy should I be if I had such a wife, both for beauty and manners! This I thought with myself; nor did I think any thing more. But not long after, as I was walking, and musing on these thoughts, I began to honor this creature of God, thinking with myself how noble and beautiful she was. And when I had walked a little, I fell asleep. And the Spirit caught me away, and carried me through a certain place toward the right hand, through which no man could pass. It was a place among rocks, very steep, and unpassable for water. When I was past this place, I came into a plain; and



THE HOLY SEPULCHRE

there, falling down upon my knees, I began to pray unto the Lord, and to confess my sins. And as I was praying, the heaven was opened, and I saw the woman whom I had coveted, saluting me from heaven, and saying, Hermas, hail! and I, looking upon her, answered, Lady, what dost thou do here? She answered me, I am taken up hither to accuse thee of sin before the Lord. Lady, said I, Wilt thou convince me? No, said she; but hear the words which I am about to speak unto thee. God, who dwelleth in heaven, and hath made all things out of nothing, and hath multiplied them for his holy church's sake, is angry with thee, because thou hast sinned against me. And I answering said unto her, Lady, if I have sinned against thee, tell me where, or in what place; or when did I ever speak an unseemly or dishonest word unto thee? Have I not always esteemed thee as a lady? Have I not always revered thee as a sister? Why then dost thou imagine these wicked things against me? Then she, smiling upon me, said, The desire of naughtiness has risen up in thy heart. Does it not seem to thee to be an ill thing for a righteous man to have an evil desire rise up in his heart? It is indeed a sin, and that a very great one, to such a one; for a righteous man thinketh that which is righteous. And whilst he does so, and walketh uprightly, he shall have the Lord in heaven favorable unto him in all his business. But as for those who think wickedly in their hearts, they take to themselves death and captivity; and especially those who love this present world, and glory in their riches, and regard not the good things that are to come; their souls wander up and down, and know not where to fix. Now this is the case of such as are

double-minded, who trust not in the Lord, and despise and neglect their own life. But do thou pray unto the Lord, and he will heal thy sins, and the sins of thy whole house, and of all his saints. As soon as she had spoken these words, the heavens were shut, and I remained utterly swallowed up with sadness and fear; and said within myself, If this be laid against me for sin, how can I be saved? Or how shall I ever be able to entreat the Lord for my many and great sins? With what words shall I beseech him to be merciful unto me? As I was thinking over these things, and meditating in myself upon them, behold a chair was set over against me of the whitest wool, as bright as snow. And there came an old woman in a bright garment, having a book in her hand, and sat alone, and saluted me, saying, Hermas, hail! And I, being full of sorrow, and weeping, answered, Hail, Lady! And she said unto me, Why art thou sad, Hermas, who wast wont to be patient, and modest, and always cheerful? I answered, and said to her, Lady, a reproach has been laid to my charge by an excellent woman, who tells me that I have sinned against her. She replied, Far be any such thing from the servant of God. But it may be the desire of her has risen up in thy heart? For indeed such a thought maketh the servants of God guilty of sin; nor ought such a detestable thought to be in the servants of God; nor should he who is approved by the Spirit desire that which is evil; but especially Hermas, who contains himself from all wicked lusts, and is full of all simplicity, and of great innocence. Nevertheless the Lord is not so much angry with thee for thine own sake, as upon the account of thy house, which has committed wickedness against

the Lord, and against their parents. And for that out of thy fondness towards thy sons, thou hast not admonished thy house, but hast permitted them to live wickedly; for this cause the Lord is angry with thee: but he will heal all the evils that are done in thy house. For through their sins and iniquities, thou art wholly consumed in secular affairs. But now the mercy of God hath taken compassion upon thee, and upon thy house, and hath greatly comforted thee. Only as for thee, do not wander, but be of an even mind, and comfort thy house. As the workman, bringing forth his work, offers it to whomsoever he pleases; so shalt thou, by teaching every day what is just, cut off a great sin. Wherefore cease not to admonish thy sons, for the Lord knows that they will repent with all their heart, and they shall be written in the book of life. And when she had said this, she added unto me, Wilt thou hear me read?—I answered her, Lady, I will. Hear, then, said she; and opening the book, she read, gloriously, greatly, and wonderfully, such things as I could not keep in my memory. For they were terrible words, such as no man could bear. Howbeit I committed her last words to my remembrance; for they were but few, and of great use to us. Behold the mighty Lord, who by his invisible power, and with his excellent wisdom, made the world, and by his glorious counsel beautified his creature, and with the word of his strength fixed the heaven, and founded the earth upon the waters; and by his powerful virtue established his Holy Church, which he hath blessed: Behold, he will remove the heavens, and the mountains, the hills, and the seas; and all things shall be

made plain for his elect; that he may render unto them the promise which he hath promised with much honor and joy; if so be that they shall keep the commandments of God, which they have received with great faith. And when she had made an end of reading, she rose out of the chair; and behold four young men came, and carried the chair to the east. And she called me unto her, and touched my breast, and said unto me, Did my reading please thee?—I answered, Lady, these last things please me; but what went before was severe and hard. She said unto me, These last things are for the righteous, but the foregoing for the revolvers and heathen. And as she was talking with me, two men appeared, and took her upon their shoulders, and went to the east where the chair was. And she went cheerfully away; and as she was going, said unto me, Hermas, be of good cheer.

As I was on the way to Cuma, about the same time that I went the year before, I began to call to mind the vision I formerly had. And again the Spirit carried me away, and brought me into the same place, in which I had been the year before. And when I was come into the place, I fell down upon my knees, and began to pray unto the Lord, and to glorify his name, that he had esteemed me worthy, and had manifested unto me my former sins. And when I arose from prayer, behold I saw over against me the old woman whom I had seen the last year, walking, and reading in a certain book. And she said unto me, Canst thou tell these things to the elect of God?—I answered, and said unto her, Lady, I cannot retain so many things in my memory, but give me the book, and I

will write them down. Take it, says she, and see that thou restore it again to me. As soon as I had received it, I went aside into a certain place of the field, and transcribed every letter, for I found no syllables. And as soon as I had finished what was written in the book, the book was suddenly caught out of my hands, but by whom I saw not. After fifteen days, when I had fasted, and entreated the Lord with all earnestness, the knowledge of the writing was revealed unto me. Now the writing was this: Thy seed, O Hermas! have sinned against the Lord, and have betrayed their parents, through their great wickedness. And they have been called the betrayers of their parents, and have gone on in their treachery. And now have they added lewdness to their other sins, and the pollutions of naughtiness: thus have they filled up the measure of their iniquities. But do thou upbraid thy sons with all these words; and thy wife, which shall be thy sister; and let her refrain her tongue with which she calumniates. For when she shall hear these things, she will refrain herself, and shall obtain mercy. And they also shall be instructed when thou shalt have reproached them with these words, which the Lord hath commanded to be revealed unto thee. Then shall their sins be forgiven which they have heretofore committed, and the sins of all the saints, who have sinned even unto this day; if they shall repent with all their hearts, and remove all doubts out of their hearts. For the Lord hath sworn by his glory concerning his elect, having determined this very time, that if any one shall even now sin, he shall not be saved. For the repentance of the righteous has its end: the days

of repentance are fulfilled to all the saints; but to the heathen, there is repentance even unto the last day. Thou shalt therefore say to those who are over the church; that they order their ways in righteousness; that they may fully receive the promise with much glory. Stand fast, therefore, ye that work righteousness; and continue to do it, that your departure may be with the holy angels. Happy are ye, as many as shall endure the great trial that is at hand, and whosoever shall not deny his life. For the Lord hath sworn by his Son, that whoso denyeth his son and him, being afraid of his life, he will also deny him in the world that is to come. But those who shall never deny him, he will of his exceeding great mercy be favourable unto them. But thou, O Hermas! remember not the evils which thy sons have done, neither neglect thy sister, but take care that they amend of their former sins. For they will be instructed by this doctrine, if thou shalt not be mindful of what they have done wickedly. For the remembrance of evils worketh death; but the forgetting of them, life eternal. But thou, O Hermas! hast undergone a great many worldly troubles for the offences of thy house, because thou hast neglected them, as things that did not belong unto thee: and thou art wholly taken up with thy great business. Nevertheless for this cause shalt thou be saved, that thou hast not departed from the living God; and thy simplicity and singular continency shall preserve thee, if thou shalt continue in them. Yea, they shall save all such as do such things; and walk in innocence and simplicity. They who are of this kind, shall prevail against all impiety, and continue unto life eternal.

FROM THE SECOND BOOK OF HERMAS CALLED COMMANDS.

When I had prayed at home, and was sat down upon the bed, a certain man came into me with a reverend look, in the habit of a shepherd, clothed with a white cloak, having his bag upon his back, and his staff in his hand, and saluted me. I returned his salutation; and immediately he sat down by me, and said unto me, I am sent by that venerable messenger, that I should dwell with thee all the remaining days of thy life. But I thought that he was come to try me, and said unto him Who art thou? For I know to whom I am committed. He said unto me, Do you not know me? I answered, No. I am, said he, that shepherd, to whose care you are delivered. Whilst he was yet speaking, his shape was changed; and when I knew that it was he to whom I was committed, I was ashamed and a sudden fear came upon me, and I was utterly overcome with sadness, because I had spoken so foolishly unto him. But he said unto me, Be not ashamed, but receive strength in thy mind, through the commands which I am about to deliver unto thee. For, said he, I am sent to show unto thee all those things again, which thou hast seen before; but especially such of them as may be of most use unto thee. And first of all write my Commands and Similitudes; the rest thou shalt so write as I shall show unto thee. But I therefore bid the first of all write my Commands and Similitudes, that by often reading of them, thou mayest the more easily keep them in memory. Whereupon I wrote his Commands and Similitudes, as he bade me. Which things if, when you have heard ye

shall observe to do them, and shall walk according to them, and exercise yourselves in them, with a pure mind, ye shall receive from the Lord those things which he has promised unto you. But if, having heard them, ye shall not repent, but shall still go on to add to your sins, ye shall be punished by him. All these things that shepherd, the angel of repentance, commanded me to write.

First of all, believe that there is but one God, who created and framed all things of nothing into being. He comprehends all things, and is only immense, not to be comprehended by any. Who can neither be defined by any words, nor conceived by the mind. Therefore believe in him, and fear him; and fearing him, abstain from all evil. Keep these things, and cast all lust and iniquity far from thee; and put on righteousness; and thou shalt live to God, if thou shalt keep his commandments.

He said unto me, Be innocent, and without disguise; so shalt thou be like an infant who knows no malice, which destroys the life of man. Especially see that thou speak evil of none; nor willingly hear any one speak evil of any. For if thou observest not this, thou also who hearest, shalt be partaker of the sin of him that speaketh evil by believing the slander, and thou also shalt have sin; because thou believedst him that spake evil of thy brother. Detraction is a pernicious thing; an inconstant, evil spirit; that never continues in peace, but is always in discord. Wherefore refrain thyself from it; and keep peace evermore with thy brother. Put on a holy constancy, in which there are no sins, but all is full of joy; and do good

of thy labours. Give without distinction to all that are in want; not doubting to whom thou givest. But give to all; for God will have us give to all, of all his own gifts. They therefore that receive shall give an account to God, both wherefore they receive, and for what end. And they that receive without a real need, shall give an account for it; but he that gives shall be innocent: for he has fulfilled his duty as he received it from God; not making any choice to whom he should give, and to whom not. And this service he did with simplicity, and to the glory of God. Keep therefore this command according as I have delivered it unto thee; that thy repentance may be found to be sincere, and that good may come to thy house; and thou mayest have a pure heart.

Moreover he said unto me, Love truth and let all the speech be true which proceeds out of thy mouth; that the spirit which the Lord hath given to dwell in thy flesh may be found true towards all men; and the Lord be glorified, who hath given such a spirit unto thee; because God is true in all his words, and in him there is no lie. They therefore that lie, deny the Lord; and become robbers of the Lord; not rendering to God what they received from him. For they received the Spirit free from lying: if therefore they make that a liar, they defile what was committed to them by the Lord, and become deceivers. When I heard this I wept bitterly. And when he saw me weeping, he said unto me, Why weepest thou? And I said, Because, sir, I doubt whether I can be saved. He asked me, Wherefore? I replied, Because, sir, I never spake a true word in my life; but always lived

in dissimulation, and affirmed a lie for truth to all men; and no man contradicted me, but all gave credit to my words. How then can I live, seeing I have done in this manner? And he said unto me, Thou thinkest well and truly, For thou oughtest, as the servant of God, to have walked in the truth, and not have joined an evil conscience with the Spirit of truth; nor have grieved the holy and true Spirit of God. And I replied unto him, Sir, I never before hearkened so diligently to these things. He answered, Now thou hearest them: take care from henceforth, that even those things which thou hast formerly spoken falsely for the sake of thy business, may, by thy present truth, receive credit. For even those things may be credited, if for the time to come thou shalt speak the truth; and by so doing thou mayest attain unto life. And whosoever shall hearken unto this command, and do it, and shall depart from all lying, he shall live unto God.

Furthermore, said he, I command thee, that thou keep thyself chaste; and that thou suffer not any thought of any other marriage, or of fornication, to enter into thy heart: for such a thought produces a great sin. But be thou at all times mindful of the Lord, and thou shalt never sin. For if such an evil thought should arise in thy heart, thou shouldest be guilty of a great sin; and they who do such things, follow the way of death. Look therefore to thyself, and keep thyself from such a thought: for where chastity remains in the heart of a righteous man, there an evil thought ought never to arise. And I said unto him, Sir, suffer me to speak a little to you. He bade me say on. And I answered, Sir, if a man that is

faithful in the Lord, shall have a wife, and shall catch her in adultery, doth a man sin that continueth to live still with her? And he said unto me, As long as he is ignorant of her sin, he commits no fault in living with her: but if a man shall know his wife to have offended, and she shall not repent of her sin, but go on still in her fornication, and a man shall continue nevertheless to live with her, he shall become guilty of her sin, and partake with her in her adultery. And I said unto him, What therefore is to be done, if the woman continues on in her sin? he answered, Let her husband put her away, and let him continue by himself. But if he shall put away his wife and marry another, he also doth commit adultery. And I said, What if the woman that is so put away, shall repent, and be willing to return to her husband? shall she not be received by him? He said unto me, Yes; and if her husband shall not receive her, he will sin; and commit a great offence against himself: but he ought to receive the offender if she repents; only not often. For to the servants of God there is but one repentance. And for this cause a man that putteth away his wife ought not to take another, because she may repent. This act is alike both in the man and in the woman. Now they commit adultery, not only who pollute their flesh, but who also make an image. If therefore a woman perseveres in anything of this kind, and repents not, depart from her, and live not with her: otherwise thou also shall be partaker of her sin.

FROM THE THIRD BOOK OF HERMAS CALLED SIMILITUDES.

After a few days I saw the same person that before talked with me, in the same field, in which I had seen those shepherds. And he said unto me, what seekest thou? Sir, said I, I come to entreat you that you would command the shepherd, who is the minister of punishment, to depart out of my house, because he greatly afflicts me. And he answered, it is necessary for thee to endure inconveniences and vexations; for so that good angel hath commanded concerning thee, because he would try thee. Sir, said I, what so great offence have I committed, that I should be delivered to this messenger? Hearken, said he; thou art indeed guilty of many sins, yet not so many that thou shouldest be delivered to this messenger. But thy house hath committed many sins and offences, and therefore that good messenger, being grieved at their doings, commanded that for some time thou shouldest suffer affliction; that they may both repent of what they have done, and may wash themselves from all the lusts of this present world. When therefore they shall have repented, and be purified, then that messenger which is appointed over thy punishments shall depart from thee. I said unto him, Sir if they have behaved themselves so as to anger that good angel, yet what have I done? He answered, They can not otherwise be afflicted, unless thou, who art the head of the family, suffer. For whatsoever thou shalt suffer, they must needs feel it: but as long as thou shalt stand well established, they can not experience any vexation. I replied, But, sir, behold they also now repent with all

their hearts. I know, says he, that they repent with all their hearts; but dost thou therefore think, that their offences who repent, are immediately blotted out? No, they are not presently; but he that repents must afflict his soul, and show himself humble in all his affairs, and undergo many and divers vexations. And when he shall have suffered all things that were appointed for him, then perhaps he that made him, and formed all things besides, will be moved with compassion towards him, and afford him some remedy; and especially if he shall perceive his heart, who repents, to be pure from every evil word. But at present it is expedient for thee, and for thy house, to be grieved; and it is needful that thou shouldest endure much vexation, as the angel of the Lord who committed thee unto me, has commanded. Rather give thanks unto the Lord, that knowing what was to come, he thought thee worthy to whom he should foretell that trouble was coming upon thee, who art able to bear it. I said unto him, Sir, be but thou also with me, and I shall easily undergo any trouble. I will, said he, be with thee; and I will entreat the messenger who is set over thy punishment, that he would moderate his afflictions towards thee. And moreover thou shalt suffer adversity but for a little time; and then thou shalt again be restored to thy former state; only continue on in the humility of thy mind. Obey the Lord with a pure heart, thou, and thy house, and thy children; and walk in the commands which I have delivered unto thee; and then thy repentance may be firm and pure. And if thou shalt keep these things with thy house, thy inconveniencies shall depart from thee. And all vexation shall

in like manner depart from all those, whosoever shall walk according to these commands.

Again he showed me a willow which covered the fields and the mountains, under whose shadow came all such as were called by the name of the Lord. And by that willow stood an angel of the Lord very excellent and lofty; and did cut down boughs from that willow with a great hook; and reached out to the people that were under the shadow of that willow little rods, as it were about a foot long. And when all of them had taken them, he laid aside his hook, and the tree continued entire, as I had before seen it. At which I wondered, and mused within myself. Then that shepherd said unto me, Forbear to wonder that that tree continues whole, notwithstanding so many boughs have been cut off from it; but stay a little, for now it shall be shown thee what that angel means, who gave those rods to the people. So he again demanded the rods of them; and in the same order that every one had received them, was he called to him, and restored his rod; which when he had received, he examined them. From some he received them dry and rotten, and as it were touched with the moth; those he commanded to be separated from the rest, and placed by themselves. Others gave him their rods dry indeed, but not touched with the moth; these also he ordered to be set by themselves. Others gave in their rods half dry; these also were set apart. Others gave in their rods half dry and cleft; these too were set by themselves. Others brought in their rods half dry and half green, and these were in like manner placed by themselves. Others delivered up their rods two parts

green, and the third dry; and they too were set apart. Others brought their rods two parts dry, and the third green; and were also placed by themselves. Others delivered up their rods less dry (for there was but a very little, to wit, their tops dry), but they had clefts, and these were set in like manner by themselves. In the rods of others there was but a little green, and the rest dry; and these were set aside by themselves. Others came, and brought their rods green as they had received them, and the greatest part of the people brought their rods thus; and the messenger greatly rejoiced at these, and they also were put apart by themselves. Others brought their rods not only green but full of branches; and these were set aside, being also received by the angel with great joy. Others brought their rods green with branches, and those also some fruit upon them. They who had such rods were very cheerful; and the angel himself took great joy at them; nor was the shepherd that stood with me less pleased with them. Then the angel of the Lord commanded crowns to be brought; and the crowns were brought made of palms; and the angel crowned those men in whose rods he found the young branches with fruit; and commanded them to go into the tower. He also sent those into the tower, in whose rods he found branches without fruit, giving a seal unto them. For they had the same garment, that is, one white as snow; with which he bade them go into the tower. And so he did to those who returned their rods green as they received them; giving them a white garment, and so sent them away to go into the tower. Having done this, he said to the shepherd that was with me, I

go my way; but do thou send these within the walls, every one into the place in which he has deserved to dwell; examine first their rods, but examine them diligently, that no one deceive thee. But and if any one shall escape thee, I will try them upon the altar. Having said this to the shepherd, he departed. After he was gone the shepherd said unto me, Let us take the rods from them all, and plant them; if perchance they may grow green again. I said unto him, Sir, how can those dry rods ever grow green again? He answered me, That tree is a willow, and always loves to live. If therefore these rods shall be planted, and receive a little moisture, many of them will recover themselves. Wherefore I will try, and will pour water upon them, and if any of them can live, I will rejoice with him; but if not, at least by this means I shall be found not to have neglected my part. Then he commanded me to call them; and they all came unto him, every one in the rank in which he stood, and gave him their rods; which having received, he planted every one of them in their several orders. And after he had planted them all, he poured much water upon them, insomuch that they were covered with water, and did not appear above it. Then when he had watered them, he said unto me, Let us depart, and after a little time we will return and visit them. For he who created this tree, would have all those live that received rods from it. And I hope, now that these rods are thus watered, many of them, receiving in the moisture, will recover. I said unto him, Sir, tell me what this tree denotes? For I am greatly astonished, that after so many branches have been cut off, it seems

still to be whole; nor does there any thing the less of it appear to remain, which greatly amazes me. He answered, Hearken. This great tree which covers the plains and the mountains, and all the earth, is the law of God, published throughout the whole world. Now this law is the Son of God, who is preached to all the ends of the earth. The people that stand under its shadow, are those which have heard his preaching, and believed. The great and venerable angel which you saw, was Michael, who has the power over this people, and governs them. For he has planted the law in the hearts of those who have believed: and therefore he visits them to whom he has given the law, to see if they have kept it. And he examines every one's rod; and of those, many that are weakened: for those rods are the law of the Lord. Then he discerns all those who have not kept the law, knowing the place of every one of them. I said unto him, Sir, why did he send away some to the tower, and left others here to you? He replied, Those who have transgressed the law which they received from him, are left in my power, that they may repent of their sins: but they who fulfilled the law and kept it, are under his power. But who then, said I, are those who went into the tower crowned? He replied, All such as have striven with the devil, and have overcome him, are crowned: and they are those who have suffered hard things, that they might keep the law. But they who gave up their rods green, and with young branches, but without fruit, have indeed endured trouble for the same law, but have not suffered death; neither have they denied their holy law. They who delivered up their rods green as they

received them, are those who were modest and just, and have lived with a very pure mind, and kept the commandments of God. The rest thou shalt know, when I shall have considered those rods which I have planted and watered. After a few days we returned, and in the same place stood that glorious angel, and I stood by him. Then he said unto me, Gird thyself with a towel, and serve me. And I girded myself with a clean towel, which was made of coarse cloth. And when he saw me girded, and ready to minister unto him, he said, Call those men whose rods have been planted, every one in his order as they gave them. And he brought me into the field, and I called them all, and they all stood ready in their several ranks. Then he said unto them, Let every one pluck up his rod, and bring it unto me. And first they delivered theirs, whose rods had been dry and rotten. And those whose rods still continued so he commanded to stand apart. Then they came whose rods had been dry, but not rotten. Some of these delivered in their rods green; others dry and rotten, as if they had been touched by the moth. Those who gave them up green, he commanded to stand apart; but those whose rods were dry and rotten, he caused to stand with the first sort. Then came they whose rods had been half dry, and cleft: many of these gave up their rods green, and uncleft. Others delivered them up green with branches, and fruit upon the branches, like unto theirs who went crowned into the tower. Others delivered them up dry, but not rotten: and some gave them as they were before, half dry, and cleft. Every one of these he ordered to stand apart;

some by themselves, others in their respective ranks. Then came they whose rods had been green, but cleft. These delivered their rods altogether green, and stood in their own order. And the shepherd rejoiced at these, because they were all changed, and free from their clefts. Then they gave in their rods, who had them half green and half dry. Of these some were found wholly green, others half dry; others green with young shoots. And all these were sent away, every one to his proper rank. Then they gave up their rods, who had them before two parts green, and the third dry. Many of these gave in their rods green; many half dry; the rest dry, but not rotten. So these were sent away, each to his proper place. Then came they who had before their rods two parts dry and the third green; many of these delivered up their rods half dry; others dry and rotten; others half dry and cleft; but few green. And all these were set every one in his own rank. Then they reached in their rods, in which there was before but a little green, and the rest dry. Their rods were for the most part found green, having little boughs, with fruit upon them; and the rest altogether green. And the shepherd upon sight of these rejoiced exceedingly, because he had found them thus: and they also went to their proper orders. Now after he had examined all their rods, he said unto me, I told thee that this tree loved life; thou seest how many have repented, and attained unto salvation. Sir, said I, I see it. That thou mightest know, saith he, that the goodness and mercy of the Lord is great, and to be had in honor; who gave his spirit to them that were found worthy of repentance.

I answered, Sir, why then did not all of them repent? He replied, Those whose minds the Lord foresaw would be pure, and that they would serve him with all their hearts, to them he gave repentance. But for those whose deceit and wickedness he beheld, and perceived that they would not truly return unto him, to them he denied any return unto repentance, lest they should again blaspheme his law with wicked words. I said unto him, Now, sir, make known unto me, what is the place of every one of those who have given up their rods, and what their portion; that when they who have not kept their seal entire, but have wasted the seal which they received, shall hear and believe these things, they may acknowledge their evil deeds and repent; and receiving again their seal from you, may give glory to God, that he was moved with compassion towards them, and sent you to renew their spirits. Hearken, said he; They whose rods have been found dry and rotten, and as it were touched with the moth, are the deserters and the betrayers of the church. Who, with the rest of their crimes, have also blasphemed the Lord, and denied his name which had been called upon them. Therefore all these are dead unto God; and thou seest that none of them have repented, although they have heard my commands which thou hast delivered unto them. From these men therefore life is far distant. They also who have delivered up their rods dry, but not rotten, have not been far from them. For they have been counterfeits, and brought in evil doctrines; and have perverted the servants of God; but especially those who had sinned; not suffering them to return unto repentance, but keeping them

back by their false doctrines. These therefore have hope; and thou seest that many of them have repented, since the time that thou hast laid my commands before them; and many more will yet repent but they that shall not repent, shall lose both repentance and life. But they that have repented, their place has begun to be within the first walls, and some of them are even gone into the tower. Thou seest therefore, said he, that in the repentance of sinners there is life; but for those that repent not, death is prepared. Hear now concerning those who gave in their rods half dry, and full of clefts. They whose rods were only half dry, are the doubtful; for they are neither living nor dead. But they who delivered in their rods not only half dry, but also full of clefts, are both doubtful and evil speakers; who detract from those that are absent, and have never peace among themselves, and that envy one another. Howbeit to these also repentance is offered; for thou seest that some of these have repented. Now all those of this kind who have quickly repented, shall have a place in the tower; but they who have been more slow in their repentance, shall dwell within the walls; but they that shall not repent, but shall continue on in their wicked doings, shall die the death. As for those who had their rods green, but yet cleft, they are such as were always faithful and good, but they had some enmity and strife among themselves concerning dignity and pre-eminence. Now all such are vain and without understanding, as contend with one another about these things. Nevertheless, seeing they are otherwise good, if when they shall hear these commands, they shall

amend themselves, and shall at my persuasion suddenly repent; they shall at last dwell in the tower, as they who have truly and worthily repented. But if any one shall again return to his dissension, he shall be shut out from the tower, and shall lose his life. For the life of those who keep the commandments of the Lord, consists in doing what they are commanded; not in principality, or in any other dignity. For by forbearance and humility of mind, men shall attain unto life; but by seditions, and contempt of the law, they shall purchase death unto themselves. They who in their rods had half dry and half green, are those who are engaged in many affairs of the world; and are not joined to the saints; for which cause half of them liveth, and half is dead. Wherefore many of these, since the time that they have heard my commands, have repented and begun to dwell in the tower. But some of them have wholly fallen away; to these there is no more place for repentance. For by reason of their present interests, they have blasphemed and denied God; and for this wickedness they have lost life. And of these many are still in doubt; these may yet return; and if they shall quickly repent, they shall have a place in the tower; but if they shall be more slow, they shall dwell without the walls; but if they shall not repent they shall die. As for those who had two parts of their rods green, and the third dry; they have by manifold ways denied the Lord. Of these many have repented, and found a place in the tower; and many have altogether departed from God. These have utterly lost life. And some, being in a doubtful state, have raised up dissensions: these may yet return,

if they shall suddenly repent, and not continue in their lusts; but if they shall continue in their evil doing they shall die. They who gave in their rods two parts dry, and the other green, are those who have indeed been faithful, but withal rich and full of good things; and thereupon have desired to be famous among the heathen which are without, and have thereby fallen into great pride, and begun to aim at high matters, and to forsake the truth: nor were they joined to the saints, but lived with the heathen; and this life seemed the more pleasant to them. Howbeit they have not departed from God, but continued in the faith; only they have not wrought the works of faith. Many therefore of these have repented; and begun to dwell in the tower. Yet others still living among the heathen people, and being lifted up with their vanities, have utterly fallen away from God, and followed the works and wickednesses of the heathen. This kind of men therefore are reckoned among strangers to the gospel. Others of these began to be doubtful in their minds; despairing, by reason of their wicked doings, ever to attain unto salvation. Others, being thus made doubtful, did moreover stir up dissensions. To these therefore, and to those who, by reason of their doings, are become doubtful, there is still hope of return; but they must repent quickly, that their place may be in the tower. But they that repent not, but continue still in their pleasures, are nigh unto death. As for those who gave in their rods green, excepting their tops, which only were dry, and had clefts, these were always good, and faithful, and upright before God: nevertheless they sinned a little, by reason of

their empty pleasures and trifling thoughts, which they had within themselves. Wherefore many of them, when they heard my words, repented forthwith; and began to dwell in the tower. Nevertheless some grew doubtful, and others to their doubtful minds added dissensions. To these therefore there is still hope of return, because they were always good; but they shall hardly be moved. As for those, lastly, who gave in their rods dry, their tops only excepted, which alone were green; they are such as have believed indeed in God, but have lived in wickedness; yet without departing from God; having always willingly borne the name of the Lord; and readily received into their houses the servants of God. Wherefore hearing these things, they returned, and without delay repented, and lived in all righteousness. And some of them suffered death; others readily underwent many trials, being mindful of their evil doings. And when he had ended his explications of all the rods, he said unto me, Go, and say unto all men that they repent, and they shall live unto God: because the Lord, being moved with great clemency, hath sent me to preach repentance unto all; even unto those who, by reason of their evil doings, deserve not to attain unto salvation. But the Lord will be patient, and keep the invitation that was made by his Son. I said unto him, Sir, I hope that all when they shall hear these things will repent. For I trust that every one acknowledging his crime, and taking up the fear of the Lord, will return unto repentance. He said unto me, Whosoever shall repent with all their hearts, and cleanse themselves from all the evils that I have before mentioned, and not add any

thing more to their sins, shall receive from the Lord the cure of their former iniquities, if they shall not make any doubt of these commands, and shall live unto God. But they that shall continue to add to their transgressions, and shall still converse with the lusts of this present world, shall condemn themselves unto death. But do thou walk in these commands, and thou shalt live unto God; and whosoever shall walk in these, and exercise them rightly, shall live unto God. And having showed me all these things, he said, I will show thee the rest in a few days."

The opinions of the ancients in regard to Hermas were not settled. Origen on Rom. xvi. 14, says, "I suppose that this Hermas is the author of the little book called the Shepherd (Pastor), a writing (scripture) which seems to me highly useful, and it is, as I suppose, divinely inspired"; and yet in his homily on Luke xii. 58, he expresses himself more doubtfully. The author of the Fragment of Muratori expresses himself more decidedly as to the author of the Shepherd. He says, "Hermas composed the Shepherd very lately, in our times, in the city of Rome, while the bishop Pius, his brother, occupied the chair of the Roman church."

Jerome (Catal. c. 10) writes, "Hermas, whom the apostle Paul mentions in the epistle to the Romans (xvi. 14) they assert to be the author of the book which is called Pastor, and which is even now publicly read in some of the churches of Greece. It is truly a useful book, and many of the ancient writers have taken testimonies from it, but it is almost unknown among the Latins;" and yet in another pas-

sage of the same work (c. 20) he seems to reject it altogether.

Tertullian, in the latter part of his life at least, decidedly rejected it; and affirms that it was classed by every council of the churches among the false and apocryphal books (De Pudic. c. 10 and 20); and the Muratorian Fragment says, "It should be read, indeed, but it can never be publicly read in the church, either among the prophets or the apostles."

The conclusions of Eusebius are given very distinctly, E. H. iii. 3, and are as follows.

"But as the same apostle in the addresses at the close of the Epistle to the Romans, has among others made mention also of Hermas, of whom they say we have the book called Pastor, it should be observed, that this too is disputed by some on account of whom it is not placed among those of acknowledged authority (*ὁμολογούμενοι*). By others, however, it is judged most necessary, especially to those who need an elementary introduction. Hence we know that it has been already in public use in our churches, and I have also understood by tradition, that some of the most ancient writers have made use of it."

The passage in Irenaeus respecting Hermas is as follows:

"Well has the Scripture spoken which says, First of all believe that there is one God, who created all things and ordered all things and made all things from that which is not." The quotation is from Hermas, Command i. 1, and with reference to this passage Eusebius (H. E. v. 8) says in regard to Irenaeus, "And he not only knew but also admitted the book called Pas-

tor, in these words, 'Well is it said in that work which declares, First of all believe that there is one God, who created and arranged all things,' " etc., or translating Eusebius with literal exactness, "Not only did he know, but he also receives the writing (Scripture, *γραφή*) of the Shepherd, saying, Wherefore well spake the Scripture (writing, *γραφή*) which says," etc. The word Scripture (*γραφή*) was probably then used with rather more latitude than it is now.

There is certainly no evidence that any of the apostles ever sanctioned the Shepherd of Hermas as of divine authority, or even knew of the existence of the book.



CHAPTER TWELFTH.

THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN AND THE APOCRYPHAL REVELATIONS.

REVELATION OF ST. JOHN, OR THE APOCALYPSE.—INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THE official activity of John extended through a much longer period than that of any other of the primitive teachers of Christianity; for he was the youngest of the apostles, and reached a far more advanced age than any of his associates.

On account of his known character as the personal favorite and bosom friend of his divine Master, the celebrity of his writings, the extent of his travels through christendom, the great age to which he lived, his being looked upon by all the churches for a long period as the only man living who had seen and familiarly conversed with Jesus of Nazareth, and on account of the number of young men who were prepared for the Christian ministry under his instruction—on these accounts, John was more extensively known, and more highly venerated among the Christian churches of the first and second century, than any other apostle, unless Paul should be regarded as an exception.

If then, the Apocalypse is falsely ascribed to John, we should naturally suppose that it would not have

been ascribed to him at a very early period ; that very few, if any, of the writers who lived at and near his time, would be likely to fall into the mistake ; and that in a later age, the book would gradually, and in the face of opposition from the better informed, work its way into public confidence, as a genuine production of the beloved disciple.

But the historical facts in the case are directly the reverse of all these reasonable expectations, which every one will see to be exactly in the natural course of events, on the supposition that the book is spurious. The testimony of the early and contemporary witnesses is unanimous and uncontradicted in favor of the book. Though well known and extensively used in the churches, not a breath of suspicion was ever blown upon its reputation, until nearly one hundred and fifty years after the death of the apostle to whom it is ascribed ; and then not confidently, but doubtingly, not on any critical grounds alleged or pretended, but solely on account of the supposed difficulty of its interpretation, the bad use which had been made of it, and a dislike to the doctrines which it was imagined to contain.

THE MILLENNIAL CONTROVERSY.

The occasion on which the genuineness of the Apocalypse was first called in question, was the following. About A. D. 230, Nepos, the pious and active bishop of Arsinoe, in Egypt, adopted the notion of the thousand years personal reign of Christ on earth, familiarly called the millennium, and published a book entitled, "Refutation of the Allegorists," in which he amplifies



L. Childs del. J. H. V.

ISLAND OF PATMOS.

this doctrine, advocating it with great zeal, and maintaining it principally by quotations from the Apocalypse. The book was very popular, and gained many adherents to the doctrine, and so high did their zeal run, that the chiliasts (as they were called) or the millennialists, began to secede from the mother church at Alexandria, which opposed their notions. After the death of Nepos, Coracion, the pastor of a country church, took the lead in propagating the same sentiments. Dionysius, the mild and learned bishop of Alexandria, desiring to put an end to this dispute, and unwilling to fulminate ecclesiastical thunders, which he knew could have no other effect than to irritate, without intimidating or subduing, went into the province of Arsinoe, where the seceders were most numerous, and proposed an amicable conference. They met him with their leader, Coracion, at their head, and the book of Nepos was carefully read, and its arguments examined. The good bishop Dionysius, with exemplary patience, spent three days in reasoning with his wandering sheep, quietly listened to every thing they had to say, answered all their objections; and by the mildness of his bearing, and the force of his arguments, so completely satisfied them that they had been in the wrong, that Coracion, in the name of all the rest, thanked him for his kindness and his instructions, and declared that they were all convinced that he was in the right, and accordingly they cheerfully renounced their own opinions, and adopted his. A rare result of theological controversy! (Neander's Church History, Part i. p. 1094 ff. in German.)

THE APOCALYPSE THEN FIRST QUESTIONED.

This took place A. D. 255, and Dionysius, to secure the victory which he had gained, wrote a work on the Promises. Notwithstanding his wonderful success, the affair had given Dionysius a great deal of trouble, the whole of which he was disposed to attribute to the influence of the Apocalypse, and began to doubt whether a book which he supposed had done so much mischief, could be of divine authority, or at any rate the production of an apostle. Accordingly, in his work on the Promises, he expresses himself to the following effect, namely, "that some before his time had rejected the book, alleging that it was altogether dark, entirely without sense and reason, and ascribed it to the heretic Cerinthus; that he, however, would not, himself, presume to reject it, as many of his christian brethren held it in high estimation. He acknowledged that he could not understand the book, yet would not, on that account, reject it, but would allow that it was written by a man named John, who was a holy and inspired man." "But I would not, (says he) easily agree that this was the apostle, the son of Zebedee, and brother of James, who is the author of the gospel and general epistles which bear his name. But I conjecture from the general tenor of both, and the form and complexion of the composition, and the execution of the whole book, that it is not from him." "That it is a John that wrote these things, we must believe him, as he says it; but what John it is, is uncertain." "I am of opinion, that there were many of the same name with John the apostle, who, for their love and admira-

tion of him, adopted the same epithet." "They say that there are two monuments at Ephesus, and that each bears the name of John; and from the sentiments and expressions (of the two works in question, the Gospel and Apocalypse) as also from their composition, it might be very reasonably conjectured that this one is different from that"—and thus he continues through several paragraphs—saying nothing directly—denying nothing positively, but exhibiting great doubt and perplexity. (Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. Book vii. 25).

This was the first open attack ever made on the genuineness of the Apocalypse; and it is plain from the above extracts, that Dionysius could sustain himself by no respectable authority, otherwise he would have produced it; and the "some before himself" to whom he alludes so generally, were probably those who had been engaged in the same controversy with Nepos, and whose minds had received a bias similar to his own. It is also plain, that he had no historical ground for his conjectures and suggestions, but that the testimony was all against him; that he was not himself at all confident in his own opinion; and that his wish to get rid of the authority of this book, arose entirely from his apprehension of its obscurity, and its influence on the millennial controversy. This controversy continued to prevail through several centuries, particularly in Asia; and wherever it prevailed, the anti-millennialists felt the same anxiety to rid themselves of the authority of the Apocalypse. This kept up the controversy in regard to the book; and all who have rejected the book, have been induced to reject it, not on historical testimony against it, or the want

of such testimony in its favor, but simply on doctrinal grounds.

TESTIMONIES TO THE REVELATION OF JOHN.

We introduce these testimonies by a striking passage from Irenaeus. Irenaeus here seems to say that the Revelation was seen in the reign of Domitian; but this is by no means certain, as the reader will see by turning back to the remarks on page 187 of this volume.

The ancients were by no means agreed as to the time when John saw the Apocalypse. It was fixed to the reign of Nero, certainly by Theophylact, Hippolytus, Arethas, and the Syrian translator, and probably also by Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian. Epiphanius puts it in the reign of Claudius the predecessor of Nero; while Eusebius, Jerome and Victorinus decide for Domitian. *Nero Claudius Domitius* or *Domitianus* was the full name of the persecuting emperor; and hence we see how it happened that by different ancient writers both *Claudius* and *Domitian* were put in the place of Nero. Some of the ablest modern commentators, as Stuart, Guericke and others, decide for the time of Nero. Compare, however, Alford's Greek Testament, Vol. iv. p. 230-36.

Eusebius (E. H. v. 8.) gives the passage of Irenaeus, (Hacr. v. 30) and as here we happily have the work of Irenaeus himself still extant, we know that the quotation by Eusebius is faithful and correct, and we have no reason for a contrary supposition in regard to any of the passages from ancient authors, quoted by Eusebius.

“Since we have promised in the outset of our work to give extracts occasionally when we refer to the declarations of the ancient presbyters and historians of the church, in which they have transmitted the traditions that have descended to us respecting the sacred Scriptures, among these Irenaeus was one. This is what this author says in the third book of the work already mentioned; and in the fifth, he thus descants on the Revelation” of John and the calculation of antichrist’s name: “As matters are thus, and the number is thus found in all the genuine and ancient copies, and as they who saw John attest, reason itself shows that the number of the name of the beast is indicated by the Greek letters which it contains.” And a little further on he speaks of the same John: “We, therefore,” says he, “do not venture to affirm any thing with certainty respecting the name of antichrist. For were it necessary that his name should be clearly announced to the present age, it would have been declared by him who saw the revelation. For it has not been long since it was seen, but almost in our own generation, about the end of Domitian’s reign.” (*της Δομετιανου αρχης.*) These are what he states respecting the Revelation. Irenaeus had been well acquainted with these men who had seen John, for they were his own teachers. No contrary contemporary testimony can be adduced. Could the Apocalypse have been so soon forged, so soon ascribed to John, so soon have gained general credence, while John was yet living, and among his personal friends? How could Polycarp and Papias have consulted John as to the reading of a passage in a work which he never wrote, and which

was falsely ascribed to him, without detecting its spuriousness?

Hermas. The Shepherd of Hermas was probably written very soon after the Revelation of John, and being a work of the same kind, contains frequent allusions to it. The most obvious difference between the two books, which must at once strike the mind of every careful reader is, that John, of the Revelation, is a good Christian of the apostolic age, writing under the immediate influence of divine inspiration, while Hermas, of the Shepherd, is a good Christian of the same age, or of the age immediately following, writing without any such special divine influence. Compare Hermas' Vision iii., with Rev. xxi. 14, iii. 12.

Papias and others. "Concerning the divine inspiration of the Apocalypse it is not necessary to multiply words, blessed men testifying that it is worthy of belief. Gregory the Theologian, Cyrill, and still earlier Papias, Irenaeus, Hippolytus and Methodius." Andreas, Proleg, in Apoc. p. 175.

Justin Martyr. "And a certain man of us whose name was John, one of the twelve apostles of Christ, in that revelation of Christ which was exhibited to him, foretold that the faithful would live a thousand years in Jerusalem, and after that a universal resurrection of all men and the final judgment." Rev. xx.

"John wrote the Apocalypse which Justin Martyr and Irenaeus interpreted." Jerome, de Vir. ill. c. 9.

"He, (Justin Martyr,) writes also, that even down to his time, gifts of prophecy shone forth in the church; mentions also, the Revelation of John, plainly calling

it the work of the apostle, and records also certain prophetic declarations, in his discussion with Tryphon." Euseb. E. H. iv. 18.

Melito. "He wrote two books concerning the pass-over—and concerning the Revelation of John." Euseb. E. H. iv. 26.

"Melito wrote concerning the Devil one book, and concerning the Revelation of John." Jerome de Vir. ill. c. 29.

Apollonius. "He quotes, also, the Revelation of John as testimony; and relates, also, that a dead man was raised by the divine power, through the same John, at Ephesus." Euseb. E. H. v. 18.

Churches of Vienne and Lyons. "For he was also a real disciple of Christ, and followed the Lamb whithersoever he went." Rev. xiv. 4. "Not abashed when overcome by the martyrs, but evidently destitute of all reason, the madness both of the governor and the people, as of some savage beast, blazed forth so much the more, to exhibit the same unjust hostility against us. That the Scriptures might be fulfilled, 'He that is unjust let him be unjust still, and he that is righteous let him be righteous still.'" Rev. xxii. 11. "But if any one of us, either by letter or in conversation, called them martyrs, they seriously reprov'd us. For they cheerfully yielded the title of martyr to Christ, the true and faithful martyr, (witness) the first begotten from the dead, the prince of divine life." Rev. i. 5, iii. 14.

Irenaeus. "But also John the disciple of the Lord, seeing in the Apocalypse the sacerdotal and glorious coming of the kingdom." Haer. iv. 20, Rev. i. 12-16.

“And yet more manifestly concerning the last time, and concerning the ten kings there, among whom the empire which now reigns will be divided. John the disciple of the Lord signified in the Apocalypse, distinguishing what the ten horns would be which were seen by Daniel, saying thus it was told to me.” Haer. v. 26. Compare also Eusebius, E. H. v. 3.

Athenagoras. “And the earth shall give up the dead which she hath received.” Legat. p. 39, Rev. xx. 13.

Theophilus. “And there is extant another book of Theophilus against the heresy of Hermogenes, in which he uses the testimonies taken from the Revelation of John.” Euseb. E. H. iv. 24.

“This Eve was the head and beginning of sin, as she was seduced by a serpent, through whom the malignant Devil spoke, who is called the Devil and Satan, and to this day operates in those who act in his spirit, and he does not cease to be called the Devil. He is also called Daemon and Dragon.” Ad Autol. ii. Rev. xii. 3–9.

Clement of Alexandria. “And though he may not be honored with the first seat on earth, he will be enthroned on the four and twenty thrones judging the people, as John says in the Apocalypse.” Strom. vi. p. 667; Rev. iv. 4, 11, 16.

“And we understand that the Jerusalem from above will be constructed of several stones; and we admit that twelve gates of the heavenly city, assimilated to precious stones, signify the distinguished grace of the apostolic voice.” Ibid. ii. p. 207, Rev. xxi. 21.

Tertullian. “John in the Apocalypse commands

that those who eat things offered to idols and commit fornication should be cast out." De Praesc. c. 33, Rev. ii. 20.

"For also the apostle John in the Apocalypse describes a sword coming out of the mouth of God, two-edged, very sharp, which should be understood of the Divine Word, two-edged with the two Testaments of the Law and the Gospel." Adv. Marc. iii. 14.

"We also have the churches brought up by John; for although Marcion rejects his Apocalypse, yet the order of bishops traced to the origin will stand to John as the author." Ibid. iv. 5.

Caius. Eusebius, E. H. iii. 28. About the same time, we have understood, appeared Cerinthus, the leader of another heresy. Caius, whose words we quoted above, in "The Disputation" attributed to him, writes thus respecting him: "But Cerinthus, by means of revelations which he pretended were written by a great apostle, also falsely pretended to wonderful things, as if they were showed him by angels, asserting, that after the resurrection there would be an earthly kingdom of Christ, and that the flesh, i. e. men, again inhabiting Jerusalem, would be subject to desires and pleasures. Being also an enemy to the divine Scriptures, with a view to deceive men, he said that there would be a space of a thousand years for celebrating nuptial festivals." Dionysius also, who obtained the episcopate of Alexandria in our day, in the second book "On Promises," where he says some things as if received by ancient tradition, makes mention of the same man, in these words: "But it is highly probable that Cerinthus, the same that established the

heresy that bears his name, designedly affixed the name (of John) to his own forgery. For one of the doctrines that he taught was, that Christ would have an earthly kingdom. And as he was a voluptuary, and altogether sensual, he conjectured that it would consist in those things that he craved in the gratification of appetite and lust; i. e. in eating, drinking, and marrying, or in such things whereby he supposed these sensual pleasures might be presented in more decent expressions; viz. in festivals, sacrifices, and the slaying of victims." John the apostle once entered a bath to wash; but ascertaining Cerinthus was within, he leaped out of the place, and fled from the door, not enduring to enter under the same roof with him, and exhorted those with him to do the same, saying, "let us flee, lest the bath fall in, as long as Cerinthus, that enemy of the truth, is within."

The above from Eusebius respecting Caius of Rome and Dionysius, I have inserted to indicate the reason why the authority of the Apocalypse was ever questioned in the ancient church, not because there was any evidence against it, or any lack of evidence in its favor, but simply because certain mischievous heretics had made a bad use of it.

Origen. "And John the son of Zebedee says in the Apocalypse, And I saw an angel flying through the midst of heaven having the everlasting gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth." Comment. in Joan. i. Rev. xiv. 6, 7.

John himself bears witness in the Apocalypse in these words: "I John, who also am your brother, and

companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ; and it appears that he saw the Apocalypse in the island." Comment. in Matth. xvi. Rev. i. 9. And therefore John rightly an apostle and evangelist, and now on account of the Apocalypse a prophet, described the Word of God in the Apocalypse. Comment. in Joan.

Hippolytus. "And also concerning the gospel and Apocalypse according to John." Canon pasch.

"Saint Hippolytus, the martyr bishop, composed a book concerning dispensation—and also an apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of John the apostle and evangelist." Ebed Jesu. Catal. v. 6. Syr. Lardner iii. 99.

"Hippolytus wrote some commentaries on the Scriptures, of which I have found these, in Hexaemeron—de Apocalypse, etc." Jerome de Vir. ill. c. 61.

"For he, being in the island of Patmos, sees the Apocalypse, in which awful mysteries are unfolded, and explaining them he teaches others. Tell me now I pray thee, O blessed John, apostle and disciple of the Lord, what thou didst hear and see concerning Babylon—and one of the seven angels came who had the seven phials," etc. De Christo et Antichristo, 36.

Dionysius of Alexandria. Eusebius (E. H. vii. 24, 25) makes a very prolix statement of the opinions of Dionysius respecting the Apocalypse, but it is too long to be inserted here.

By the following statement of Eusebius respecting

Dionysius, it is evident that he did at first receive the Apocalypse as a genuine work of the apostle John, like all the other pastors till his time. (E. H. vii. 10).

“Gallus had not held the government quite two years when he was removed, and Valerian, with his son Gallienus, succeeded in his place. What Dionysius has also said respecting him, may be learned from his epistle to Hermammon, in which he gives the following account : ‘In like manner it was revealed to John, and there was,’ says he, ‘a mouth given him, speaking great things, and blasphemy. And there was given him power, and forty-two months, but it is wonderful that both took place in Valerian, and especially when we consider the condition of the man before this, how kind and friendly he was towards the pious.’” (Rev. xiii. 5).

Cyprian. De Bon. Pat. “God the Father commanded that his Son should be worshipped, but in the Revelation an angel rebuked John wishing to worship him, and said, See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant and of thy brethren; worship Jesus the Lord.” Rev. xix. 10.

De Eleemos. “Hear the voice of the Lord in the Revelation, reproving men of this sort with just rebukes.” Rev. iii. 17, 18.

Epist. 63. “For the Sacred Scripture in the Apocalypse declares that *waters* signifies *peoples*.” Rev. xvii. 15.

Methodius. Conviv. p. 70. “But John in the Apocalypse, being inspired by Christ, teaches us that the word, which was made flesh, is also chief Virgin, and chief Pastor, and chief Prophet.” (He here quotes, Rev. xiv. 1-4).

Victorinus of Pettau. De Fabric. Mund. "And therefore without doubt there are twelve angels of the day and twelve angels of the night, according to the number of the hours. There are the twenty-four witnesses of the days and the nights, who are seated before the throne of God having golden crowns on their heads, whom in the Apocalypse of John the apostle and evangelist, he calls elders, because indeed they are elders both to the other angels and to men." Rev. iv. 4.

"The open book is the Apocalypse which John saw." Lardner iv. p. 216.

"John was in the island of Patmos—There he saw the Apocalypse—So afterwards he delivered this same Apocalypse which he had accepted from the Lord—that is, Thou must again prophecy," etc. Rev. x. xi. Kirchhofer, p. 322.

Victorinus, bishop of Pettau, was not so well skilled in Latin as in Greek. Whence his works are great in meaning, but low in the construction of words. They are these, Commentaries on Genesis—on the Apocalypse of John—and many others." Jerome, Catal. Vir. ill. c. 74.

"Of which book (the Apocalypse) Victorinus, called bishop, discussed certain most difficult passages." Cassiodor. Ju. Div. c. 5.

Pamphilus. Apol. pro. Orig. "John says in his Revelation, The sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell gave up the dead which were in them." Rev. xx. 13.

Lactantius. Epist. p. 42. "His name is known to none except to himself and His Father, as John teaches in the Revelation." (xix. 12).

Instit. vii. 10. "But he who contaminates himself with vices and crimes and is a slave to voluptuousness, he, being damned suffers eternal punishment, which the Divine Scriptures called the second death; which is also perpetual and full of the most grievous torments." Rev. ii. 11, xxi. 8.

Eusebius. Demonst. Evan. viii. p. 386. "Whence he says, the Lion of the tribe of Judah hath prevailed, and he himself hath opened the seals attached to the book, as we read in the Apocalypse of John." Rev. v. 5.

"In this persecution it is handed down by tradition that the apostle and evangelist John, who was yet living, in consequence of his testimony to the divine word, was condemned to dwell in the island of Patmos. Irenaeus indeed, in his fifth book against the heretics, where he speaks of the calculations formed on the epithet of Antichrist, in the above mentioned Revelation of John, speaks in the following manner respecting him." E. H. iii. 18, Rev. xiii. 18.

"About this time also, for a very short time, arose the heresy of those called Nicolaitans, of which mention is made in the Revelation of John." E. H. iii. 19, Rev. ii. 6, etc.

Athanasius. "The Holy Scripture pronounces that the Son eternally co-exists with the Father when it says, In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God. And in the Apocalypse, These things saith He who is and who was and who is to come." Cont. Av. ii. Rev. i. 8.

Epiphanius, in his great work on the Haeresies very often quotes the Revelation; and always as Scripture

and as the genuine work of John, the apostle and evangelist.

Hilary. In Psalm i. Lardner v. p. 252. "But that these leaves of the tree are not useless, but salutary to the nations, St. John testifies in the Apocalypse." Rev. xxii. 2.

De Trinit. vi. Matthew from a publican was chosen to be an apostle; and John on account of his familiarity with the Lord was worthy of the Revelation of the heavenly mysteries.

Jerome. In Psalm 149. "We read in the Apocalypse of John, which is read and received in the churches; for it is not held among the apocryphal Scriptures, but among the Scriptures of the church."

Adv. Jovin. ii. 14. "The apostle who wrote the book of the Gospel ——— is a prophet, for he saw in the island of Patmos ——— the Apocalypse, containing infinite mysteries of the future."

In Isaïam. Proe. Kirchhofer, p. 328. "In which way also, that is spiritually, the Apocalypse of John is to be understood.'

Augustin. Passim. "John the apostle in the Apocalypse." "The same John the evangelist in that book which is called the Apocalypse." "In the Apocalypse of John himself, whose is this Gospel," etc., etc.

OBJECTIONS TO THE APOCALYPSE.

Let us now turn our attention to the objections to its authenticity, which some regard of sufficient weight to counterbalance the whole force of this concurrent and uncontradicted testimony of the ancients.

1. It was conjectured by Dionysius, as you have

already seen, that the Apocalypse was written, not by John the apostle, but by a certain presbyter named John, who lived at Ephesus about the same time.

To this, we reply, 1st. It is directly contrary to all contemporary and early testimony. The writers of the first age knew of no such presbyter John, but ascribe the Apocalypse to John the apostle. 2d. The very existence of any such John the presbyter, as a different person from John the apostle, is very problematical. He makes no figure in ecclesiastical history, and we are strongly tempted to believe, that his existence is a mere conjecture of those who wished to get rid of the apostolic authority of the Apocalypse.

The apostle John styles himself the elder or presbyter in the first verse of his second and third epistles, and this might first have given rise to the story of two Johns at Ephesus. Eusebius infers and stoutly argues in favor of a presbyter John, distinct from the apostle, from the fact that the name of John twice occurs in the following passage of Papias, in which he says that he made it a point to inquire "what was said by Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord. What was said by Aristion, and the presbyter John, disciple of our Lord" (Euseb. iii. 39). Whether the presbyter John here mentioned, be the same with John the apostle, or John whose surname was Mark (Acts xii. 25), or some other John, it certainly can not prove, in direct opposition to all testimony, that John the apostle did not write the Apocalypse.

2. Another objection of Dionysius, and one which has been often repeated since, is, that John's name is affix-

ed to the Apocalypse, which is not the case with his Gospel or first epistle. This is a very singular argument; as much as to say, if a man publishes one work anonymously, and another with his name to it, we are to reject the one which bears his name, because the other is anonymous.

Again: though the apostle John does not describe himself by name, to be the writer of the Gospel, yet he does declare himself to be the author in terms so express, that he well knew any one would understand them (John xxi. 24 compared with verse 20, and xiii. 23-25, and xix. 35).

The nature of the Apocalypse, it being prophecy in the most sublime style of inspiration, required a more distinct enunciation of its author to give it authority, than the plain narrative of the Gospel. This is according to the analogy of other prophecies. Not a book of prophecy occurs in the Old Testament, which is not accompanied by the name of the writer. John while prophesying, of course, adopted the prophetic mode of writing.

3. The style and language of the Apocalypse is very different from that of the Gospel and Epistles. This is true, and the style ought to be different; for the whole subject and the whole mode of treating it is entirely different. Style varies with the varieties of the subject. Is the genuineness of Milton's *Paradise Lost* to be disputed, because it is not written in the same style with his *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*? Or Newton's work on *Chronology and the Bible*, because they are not in the style of his *Principia*? There is, however, a striking resemblance in some particulars, be-

tween the style of the Apocalypse and that of the Gospel. There is the same depth and peculiarity of feeling in both.

4. It is objected that the Greek of the Apocalypse is much less pure and more largely tinged with Hebrew idioms than that of the Gospel or Epistles. This is true, and for the best of reasons. The Apocalypse was written earlier than the Gospel or Epistles, and before the writer had become so familiar with the Greek language as he was afterwards. Again, almost every sentence in the Apocalypse is written with particular reference to some passage of the Old Testament prophecies, and of course it takes a Hebrew coloring. We are led to think that the apostle had no book with him in his exile and solitude but his Hebrew Bible; that this was his constant meditation, and the whole train of his thoughts was shaped and modified by its language and imagery.

5. It is said that the Apocalypse is not included in the most ancient Syrian translation. It is true, that some of the manuscripts of the Syrian translation which have been brought to Europe, do not contain this book. But that the book was well known and acknowledged as genuine in the Syrian churches, is evident from the fact, that in the second century it was quoted as Scripture by Theophilus, bishop of Antioch. In the early part of the third century its genuineness was vindicated against the attack of Caius by Hippolytus, who was held in high repute by the Syrians; and in the fourth century it is quoted as the work of John, by the Syrian saint, Ephraem. (Works of Ephr. t. ii. p. 332; iii. 616: and in Greek, ii. 252; iii. 52.)

The Syrian manuscripts which do not contain the books, were probably written after the millennial controversy had made the Revelation distasteful to a powerful party in the church.

6. But the great, and in fact, the only objection against the Revelation, which has had any real importance, has always been that which was at first stated by Dionysius, namely that it was very obscure, without sense and reason, as Dionysius says, exceedingly difficult to be interpreted; and the great storehouse from which heretics and fanatics have drawn their materials to trouble the church with. The want of 'sense and reason' belongs to the interpreters, and not to the book. Obscurity, to a certain extent, is an attribute of all prophecy, and heretics and fanatics always lay hold on the most highly figurative language, because this is the most easily perverted. Even allowing the objection to be just as it is stated, it has but little to do with the question of authorship, which is a question of fact, to be settled by the appropriate evidence; and no one has ever shown, or done anything towards showing, that there is anything in the Revelation so repugnant to the known character of John, that he can not reasonably be supposed to be the author of it. A writer is not accountable for the stupidity of his commentators, nor for the ignorance or wilful abuse, which weak men and bad men may make of his writings. I hope it will be seen that the darkness, the absurdities, the mysticism, and fanaticism, which have been attributed to the Apocalypse, no more belong to it, than dinginess belongs to the clear blue sky, when it happens to be observed through a dingy glass.

I have been thus particular in stating the whole argument, in respect to the genuineness of the Revelation, on account of the peculiar attitude in which it stands before the Christian world, and because of the many and various opinions respecting it.

I would here say to my readers, take the book of Revelation, and read it once through without reference to anything which you have ever heard said about it, and without attempting to apply its predictions to any of the events of history, with which you are familiar. Read it simply for the sake of enjoying it; read it as a glowing description of a series of magnificent pictures which were passing before the eye of the writer; read it for the sake of throwing your soul into its sublime acts of adoration of the Great Supreme; read it for the sake of becoming imbued with its spirit, without troubling yourselves as to the historical application of its symbols; and remember, while you read, that it is an Oriental, an Asiatic, and a Hebrew book. (On the subject of this chapter, compare particularly the introductions of Michaelis, Hug, and Horne, among the older writers; and Stuart, Guericke, Duesterdieck, Alford, and Wordsworth of the more recent ones.)

GENERAL DESIGN OF THE BOOK.

When we enter on the investigation of a much disputed subject, it is very desirable to find some common ground on which all agree and from which we may take our departure. Such a common ground we have, even in reference to the interpretation of the Apocalypse.

Almost all interpreters agree substantially in this: namely, that it is the general object of this book to ex-

cite and encourage Christians in times of depression and persecution, by disclosing to them the glories and the terrors of the invisible world; to show the dreadfulfulness of the punishments which await the enemies of religion, and the nearness and delight of the rewards which await its friends; and to assure those who are exposing themselves to suffering in the cause of Christ, of the ultimate and complete triumph of this cause over every form of hostility, however malignant and powerful. This was its original and acknowledged purpose, and this purpose it has abundantly answered in every age of the church, notwithstanding the numerous abuses to which it has been subjected. And this is an instance of the care which God takes to secure the original end, for which his institutions are designed. Notwithstanding all the abuses of this book, the church in times of distress has always used it, as it was designed to be used, for comfort and encouragement.

Diversity of opinion has arisen in making the application of its symbolic language, to particular events of subsequent history; and the diversity has been as endless as the varieties of fancy and passion among men; and the difficulty and obscurity which envelope the book, arise from its being read with the idea that each of its symbols must be appropriated to some one, corresponding event of history; and that the book is valuable only as a collection of predictions, which have had or are to have, punctual and literal accomplishment.

That the book contains much of prophecy, there can be no doubt; but I apprehend that the idea of proph-

ecy as applied to the Revelation is generally too literal and narrow ; that the constant and anxious search for the fulfillment of predictions has often prevented readers from seeing that the book contains much, of the highest value to the Christian, which is not prophecy.

It is desirable often to read the book, and leave the prophetic application of its symbols entirely out of view, and look at the passages just as they stand—living pictures of eternal realities, which are invisible to mortal eyes—and endeavor, at the same time, to unfold their more striking peculiarities, and to trace their connection with the prophetic poetry of the Old Testament.

INTERPRETATION OF THE APOCALYPSE.

The Laws of Interpretation, as we say in the Preface, are given in the volume on the Old Testament. A few brief hints on the subject of Symbolic Prophecy is all that can find place here.

A symbol is the same as a signal. From its own nature it can express only a general idea, never a specific one. You see a ship at sea with the flag at half mast. This gives you the general idea that there is distress on board, but what the distress is, the signal (or symbol) does not inform you. It may be sickness, mutiny, want of provisions or water, a leak, or any number of different kinds of misfortune, you have no idea which ; the single idea which you get is that the people are in distress and want help. The symbol is equally appropriate to express any of the different sources of calamity, and no more appropriate to express one than the

other. Just so in prophecy. The mere appropriateness of a symbol is no proof of its application to a specific event in prophecy, though inappropriateness is a decisive argument against its application.

The same symbols that appropriately represent the calamitous expedition of Xerxes into Greece, would also appropriately represent the calamitous expedition of Napoleon into Russia; the same symbols that would appropriately represent the distress of the French during their revolution, would also be appropriate to the Jewish-Roman war. To fix the specific application of symbols, you must always have, besides the appropriateness of the symbols themselves, some localizing fact or circumstance which confines the symbols to one historical series of appropriate events rather than another. Otherwise all disputes about the application of prophetic symbols, is like standing on shore and disputing about the particular calamity on board a ship at sea with the flag at half mast; one affirming it is cholera, another that it is small pox, another that it is mutiny, another that it is want of water, and none of them knowing in the least whereof they affirm.

They must hear directly from the ship itself before they can decide as to the particular kind of distress which she is suffering.

It is the neglect of this idea which is the cause of the interminable disputes about the historical application of prophetic symbols. Mere appropriateness is taken as sufficient ground for the historical application; but there are very many different historical events to which the symbols are all and equally appropriate. The particular localizing fact or circumstance must always be first ascertained.

Moreover a series of Symbolic Prophecies is like a gallery of historical pictures; the pictures are hung along upon the wall of the room in the order in which the events occurred. There is succession without chronology, order without dates, proximity in place without proximity in time. The superintendent of the gallery hangs the pictures along close together, and does not leave spaces between the frames proportionate to the intervals of time that intervened between the transactions represented in the several pictures.

Now just so is prophecy constructed. Just such a picture gallery are the symbolic prophecies of the Bible; succession without chronology, order without dates, proximity in place without proximity in time. A few pictures have the dates upon them, but a very few, and much fewer than is usually imagined.

The Numbers in the symbolic prophecies are themselves symbolic, and not literal. Thus in the Apocalypse, $3\frac{1}{2}$, 7, 10, 42, 1260, are all symbolic, and not to be literally understood. This is fully proved and copiously illustrated in the chapter on the Laws of Interpretation already referred to.

We are now prepared to give an opinion as to the

SPECIAL APPLICATION OF THE PROPHETIC SYMBOLS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

This whole book, with its names and imagery, is manifestly *symbolical*. Thus in ii. 6, 14, 20, Nicolaitans or Balaamites, designate selfish and money-loving ecclesiastics; Jezebel, a noisy, licentious woman, &c.

In the book two cities are represented as being destroyed, and a third is established on their ruins.

The first, Sodom, is clearly pointed out to be Jerusalem, xi. 1, 2, 8, by the mention of the *temple* and *the holy city*—‘where also our Lord was crucified.’ The seven trumpets, therefore, and chapters viii.–xi. clearly refer to Jerusalem, or Jewish institutions. This we are sure of on critical grounds.

The second city, Babylon, is clearly pointed out to be Rome (xiii. 18; xvii. 9, 18). Six hundred and sixty-six (666) is the sum of the numerals in the Greek word, *Λατίνος* (*lateinos*) meaning Roman; and the city on seven hills, which then ruled over the kings of the earth, could be no other than Rome. The seven vials therefore, and chapters xiii.–xviii. plainly refer to Rome, or Roman institutions. This, also, we are sure of on critical grounds. But Rome appears in two forms, first as a marine monster (xiii.), then as a woman sitting on a scarlet colored beast (xvii.); so that there must be two Romes, the Pagan and the Papal. The third city, established on the ruins of the two former, is the New Jerusalem, which descends from God out of heaven (xxi. 2). From this fact, we are also sure on critical grounds, that this third city must be symbolical, and not literal; and we are led to infer that the other two also are symbolical and not literal.

The circumstances in which the author wrote, the purpose for which he wrote, and the whole structure of the work, show, that the three cities are symbolical of the three religions then contending for supremacy; the first two of which were united against the last, that is Paganism and Judaism were united against Christianity.

— The general subject of the prophecy, then, is the

destruction of the two great antagonist powers of Christianity, persecuting Judaism and persecuting Paganism, and the triumph, and finally complete establishment of the religion of Christ over the whole world.

In accordance with the genius of prophecy, a full picture is given of the then present condition of things, and the most prominent and characteristic points of the future, are hastily, but clearly sketched.

ANALYSIS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

Two dates assigned to it,—one in the reign of Nero, the other in the reign of Domitian. External testimony strongest for the latter date; internal evidence for the earlier. Best statement of the argument for the earlier date, Guericke, Introduction to New Testament, and Stuart, Introduction to Apocalypse. Best for the later date, Alford and Wordsworth, Greek Testament with Notes.

A regular allegorical poem, as well as a book of prophecy. Its symbols are not confined to specific historic events, but they all have “springing and germinant accomplishment throughout many ages, the height and fulness of them” belonging to the great final judgment; like the prophecy against Edom, in Isaiah xxxiv. 1–8. See especially vs. 2 and 5.

The plan of the Apocalypse indicated in i. 19.

I. *The things which thou seest*,—the vision of Christ in his glorified body in the midst of the churches.

II.–III. *The things which are*,—the condition of the seven churches. Symbolic as well as literal.

IV.–XXII. *The things which shall be hereafter*,—the Prophetic Future.

IV.-VII. General, exhibiting the forces on the side of the saints in opposition to the persecutors.

IV. God on his throne.

V. The lamb with the book of fate.

VI. Seven seals, the methods by which persecutors in all times will be destroyed; vs. 1, 2, the conqueror; vs. 3-5, war; vs. 5, 6, famine; vs. 7, 8, pestilence; vs. 9-11, prayer of the saints for the great final judgment, and the acceptance of the prayer; vs. 12-17, the great final judgment itself.

VII. Perfect safety of the saints amid all the preceding judgments.

VIII.-XI.—Under the opening of the seventh seal, the overthrow of the first great persecuting power, that of Judaism, symbolized by the city of Jerusalem, xi. 1, 2, 8.

VIII.-IX. Seven trumpets, process of the overthrow.

X. A magnificent episode, limiting the time.

XI. The final result.

XII. Birth and early preservation of Christianity, symbolized in the history of the infancy and childhood of Jesus.

XIII.-XIX. Overthrow of the second great persecuting power, symbolized by the city of Rome, xvii. 18.

XIII.-XVI. Overthrow of Pagan Rome, considered as a persecuting power.

XIII. The beast, the world-power, as a persecutor. The false prophet, the power of superstition, aiding the world-power in its work of persecution.

XIV. The lamb and his forces.

XV.—XVI. Seven vials, process of the overthrow of the pagan persecuting power.

XVII.—XIX. Rome in another form,—the persecuting Papacy.

XVII The harlot riding on the beast, the apostate Papal church, using the world-power in aid of its own purposes of persecution.

XVIII.—XIX. Process and completeness of her overthrow.


XX. 1–6. Resurrection and judgment of the martyrs and the persecutors (see Daniel xii. 2). The Millennium.

XX. 7–XXII. Another rebellion and struggle, final and complete triumph of good over evil,—the last great day of judgment.

APOCRYPHAL REVELATIONS.

The Apocryphal Revelations, as a general fact, are the poorest specimens of the Apocryphal Literature. In nothing has the human mind more strikingly exhibited its own imbecility than in its attempts to imitate or counterfeit the divine revelations. Prof. Stuart in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, vol. i. pp. 36–127, and 475–504, has given an elaborate account, with specimens, of several of these works; and Tischendorf in his admirable manner published seven of them at Leipsic in 1866, of which the most interesting are, 1, Revelations of Moses; 2, of Ezra; 3, of Paul; and 4, of John, all in Greek, and much better edited than any of the preceding editions.

Among the best attempts of this sort are the Sibylline Oracles, the Book of Enoch, the Second Book of Es



JEW'S' PLACE OF WAILING.

dras as it stands in the Apocrypha of our English Bibles, and the Shepherd of Hermas; while among the poorest are the four which I have named as published by Tischendorf. Of the Shepherd of Hermas already a sufficient specimen has been given in the section on the Apocryphal Epistles.

The Second Book of Esdras, as it stands in the English Apocrypha, with the exception of the first two chapters and the last two, which are interpolations of a later date, was written very near the time when John saw his Apocalypse. It is one of the best attempts at apocalyptic writing by an uninspired pen, and I earnestly commend it as such to the reader's particular attention; but as it is printed in all the English Bibles which contain the Apocrypha, there is no necessity for making an extract from it here.

THE REVELATION OF PAUL.

This book was known to Augustin, who speaks of it (in Joan. Tract. 98) with great contempt, affirms that no church received it, that it was full of the most foolish fables, and that it professed to give utterance to the words which Paul himself said were not lawful or possible for man to utter. The church historian Sozomen, who wrote somewhat less than a century after Augustin, speaks of the book in the following terms: "The Apocalypse of the apostle Paul, though rejected by the ancients, is still esteemed by most of the monks. Some persons affirm that the book was found during this reign (that is of Theodosius) by divine revelation, in a marble box, buried beneath the soil, in the house of Paul, at Tarsus, in Cilicia. I have been informed that

this report is false, by a presbyter at Tarsus, a man of very advanced age, as is indicated by his grey hairs. He says that the rumor was probably devised by heretics." Sozomen, Ecc. Hist. vii. 21.

The oldest manuscript which Tischendorf finds is the Codex Ambrosianus, which he decides not to be earlier than the fifteenth century. There are, however, ancient translations of the book into the Coptic, Arabic, and Syriac; and our American missionaries discovered at Oroomiah a very ancient version in manuscript, which was skillfully translated into English by Rev. Justin Perkins, D. D., and published in 1865, in the eighth volume of the Journal of the American Oriental Society. It is from this translation of Dr. Perkins that we make the following extracts:

APOCALYPSE OF PAUL.

Revelation of the holy apostle Paul, which was revealed to him when he ascended to the third heaven, and was caught up into paradise, and heard words unspeakable.

"A certain most worthy man dwelling in the city of Tarsus in the house of the holy Paul the apostle, in the reign of Theodosius the pious emperor, and of the most illustrious Gratian, an angel of the Lord was revealed to him saying, Break up the foundation of this house, and what thou findest take away. And the man did not understand; he thought it was a lying dream, and paid no attention. And again he returned to him a second time and urged him, saying, I say unto thee, O man, pull down all the foundation of this house and see every thing that thou findest in it; take it and

make it known unto the sons of men, that they may turn from the evil way unto life."

"Then that man arose in wrath, and pulled down the building, and dug up the foundation, and found a box of white glass, and in it was that which the saint saw and wrote, namely Paul the apostle, the blessed and divine, with his sandals placed by the side of this Revelation—those sandals he used to wear on his feet at the time of prayer—and his cloak folded up, with this Revelation. When he found them he brought them unto a judge, thinking there was something of gold within. And he carried it, still sealed, to king Theodosius; and that faithful and righteous king opened it, and he saw thus inscribed: Unto you I say, O sinners, for your sake God descended from heaven, and took a body from the Holy Ghost, and was hung upon a tree, that he might make you free from sin. And I sent unto you my just and righteous servants, that ye might turn unto the way of truth; but some of them ye killed, and some of them ye stoned, while they were preaching unto you the truth. But ye believed not all these. And I gave unto you a sacrament (mystery) for the repentance of life, and ye repented not. Now, understand and behold this Revelation: and repent of your wicked ways, and of everything which is hateful in the world. Now ye see the torments which are recorded in this Revelation; and every one who turneth not to the way of repentance shall be thus tormented. Hitherto ye have said: We have not known. Now, behold, ye see everything which is recorded. Thus Christ gave this vision unto the great and blessed apostle Paul; who, so long as

he was in the world, taught and preached; and now also, in this Revelation, He hath made known unto him that the sons of men should turn through him; after his death by this Revelation should they be instructed. Be astonished, O my beloved, at this man of wonders! How much he loved his Lord! And he concealed not from him even one thing of what took place; not in regard to the righteous, nor in regard to the wicked.

Look on this, O ye sons of men, and see that everything which God has created has a zeal for him; but the sons of men forget him. It is not proper that we forget the long-suffering of God unto us, every day. Repent, therefore, O sons of men; for the Lord is merciful and of tender compassion; repent of your wicked deeds, and praise God without ceasing, by night and by day. And more especially in the evening and the morning pray on account of your sins, on account of evil temptations and snares; for every creature of God praises him always in the morning; and praise is becoming for him from every one. It is also necessary that we offer unto him good works, every one for himself. Everything that a man does from morning until evening, whether good or bad, the guardian angel goes forth in mourning and sorrow on account of men, unto God, namely he who preserves a mortal from all injuries; for in the image of God is he, wherefore the guardianship of the sons of men is committed to an angel. When the angel sees a mortal committing wickedness, the angel is afraid of him; for all the angels, guardians of the sons of men, from morning unto morning, go in before God, and every-

thing that a mortal does is known ; therefore prayer is appointed at that time, that peradventure at the hour when the angel of the Lord goeth, the mortal may be engaged in prayer ; and they present before him the works of man, whatever he doeth, by day and by night. Remember therefore, O ye sons of men, and praise God all your days, and especially at the time when the angels worship. For first do the holy angels run, that they may reach that hour which is appointed to them for service, with their companions and friends ; so also we, the sons of men.

Again after these things, I saw one of the spiritual ones coming unto me, and he caught me by the Holy Ghost, and carried me to the third heaven. And the angel answered and said unto me : Follow me, Paul, that I may show unto thee the place of the saints, that thou mayest know whither they go, when they depart from the world. Then I will carry thee to the abyss beneath and show thee the souls of sinners, where they dwell after the resurrection ; that thou mayest know, O Paul, what will be their reward. And I followed the angel, who made known to me all these things ; and he carried me above, and I looked upon the firmament of heaven ; and I saw that there were there principalities who had been in the world ; and there were there spirits of deception, who lead astray the heart of the sons of men from God ; and there are the evil spirits of accusation and fornication and the love of money, and all those things in which they walked ; and, behold, they are gathered for witness ; even all the evil spirits that are under heaven. And I saw there angels in whom there is no mercy ; and their faces

were full of wrath; every tooth they had protruded from their mouths, and their eyes sparkled like lightning; and the hair of their heads was thick and very strong; and as it were a flame of fire proceeded from their mouths. And I inquired of the angel who was with me, and said: What are these, my Lord? And he said to me: These are angels in whom there is no mercy, who are sent after the souls of sinners and the wicked, after those who had not repentance before they departed out of the world; who did not believe our God, nor wait for his salvation, that there might be unto them a Helper.

And I, Paul, groaned and I wept. Then I said unto him: O my Lord, wilt thou not grant that I may see in what manner the souls of the righteous and of the wicked depart out of this world? And he said unto me: Paul, look down and see the thing which thou requestest. And I looked and saw, and beheld one of the sons of men fallen nigh unto death. And the angel said unto me: This is a just one and righteous in all his works. And I saw everything which he did for God standing before him in the hour of his departure from the world. Then I, Paul, perceived that he was righteous who was now dying; and he found for himself rest, even before dying. And there approached him wicked angels — when a righteous one departs, they do not find a place by him — and those good angels ruled over that righteous one. And they drew out of him the soul, while alluring it with rest; and again they restored it to him, while inviting it and saying: O soul, be assured, as for this thy body, O holy one, thou wilt return into it in the resurrection, and

thou wilt receive the promises of the living God with all the saints. Then that soul was carried from the body; and they inquired after its health, as though it had grown up with them; and took delight with it in love; and they said unto it: Blessed art thou, O happy soul, which every day didst perform the will of God, and now takest delight in pleasures. And there came to meet it he who was its guardian in its life, and said to it: O soul of mine, be of good courage, and be joyful, and I will rejoice over thee that thou hast done the will of our Lord all the days of thy life; and I carried thy good works, by day and by night, before God. And again I turned and said to my soul: Do not fear, in that behold thou seest a place thou hast never seen. And while I was beholding these things, that spirit was lifted up from the earth, that it might ascend to heaven. And there went out to meet it wicked powers, those that are under heaven. And there reached it the spirit of error and said: Whither dost thou presume, O soul? and art thou running that thou mayest enter heaven? Stop, that we may see, perhaps there is in thee something that belongs to us, that we may narrate a little. And that soul was bound there; and there was a fight between the good angels and the evil angels. And when that spirit of deception saw, it bewailed with a loud voice and said: Woe unto thee, O soul, that we have found in thee nothing of ours! and lo, all the angels and the spirits are helping thee against us, and behold these all are with thee; thou hast passed out from us. And there went forth another spirit, the spirit of temper, and the spirit of fornication; and they came to meet it; and when they

saw it, they wept over it and said : How was this soul escaped from us ! It did the will of God on earth, and behold the angels help it and pass it, and pass it along from us. And all the principalities and evil spirits came to meet it, even unto it ; and they did not find in it anything that was from them ; and they were not able to do anything to it, and they gnashed their teeth upon that soul and said : How hast thou escaped from us ? And the angel which conducted it in life answered and said unto them : Return, O ye mortified ones ; ye have no way of access to it ; with many artifices ye enticed when it was on earth, and it did not listen to you. And after this I heard the voice of myriads of angels praising God and saying : Rejoice and be glad, O soul ; be strengthened and do not fear. And they marvelled much at the soul, when they saw it holding the seal of the living God in its hand. And thus they were giving it heart and saying : We all rejoice over thee, that thou hast done the will of thy Lord. And they carried it and placed it before the throne of the living God, while they all rejoiced with it. And there was a great cessation ; afterwards silence reigned for a considerable time. And afterwards the angels ceased, to wit, those angels that worshipped before the footstool of God with that soul. And there began the angel, who was the guide of that soul, and said : O Lord God, merciful and compassionate, remember this soul and do not forget it ; and do unto it according to the abundance of thy mercy and according to thy right judgments. And a voice was heard, saying : He is just. And the spirit of the Lord, the same which guided it in life, said : I am that spirit of life

that dwelt in it, and I found to myself rest. Do unto it, O Lord, according to thy right judgments. And a voice was heard, saying: As that did not distress thee, we will not distress that; and as it shewed mercy, we also will shew unto it mercy. And they committed it to Michael, the chief of the angels, the same who stands at the door of life; and he commanded it that it should carry it to Paradise, to remain until the day on which it shall return to its body, in the resurrection; and it shall take delight with its body, in that everlasting bliss and delight with the saints. And after this I heard a voice, saying: Righteous art thou, O Lord, and very right thy judgments, and with thee there is no partiality. This was the voice of the myriads of the adoring Cherubim and the holy Seraphim. And I saw twenty-nine aged ones, who were adoring and praising and saying: Thou art righteous, O Lord, and very right are thy judgments, and there is not with thee partiality; and thou rewardest every man according to his works. And the angel who was with me answered and said: Dost thou know, Paul? every man who doeth good findeth for himself rest when he goeth out from the world; and everything excellent and good is rewarded.

And the angel said: Look down, Paul, and see. And I looked down and saw, and behold another soul departing from the body. And I said unto him: O my Lord, whose soul is this? And he said unto me: Know thou that this man was wicked; and he provoked God by day and by night, while he said: There is nothing else for us in the world, except that we eat and drink with the young. For who has gone down to hell and

come back, or told us that there is a judgment? And I saw that bitter hour; and I saw all his wickedness coming before him and after him, while it encompassed him before his eyes; and I saw that hour embittered to him from the judgment that was to come. And that man was saying: O that I had not been born, nor brought forth in the world! And I saw that the good angels descended to meet him, and they looked upon him and saw darkness encompassing him round about, and the foul odor of his evil deeds, so that they could not come nigh unto him; and there came also those evil angels. When that soul saw both parties, it was shaken. And those good angels saw that it had not one good work; and when they fled away from it, those evil angels took the rule over it and pulled it out in severe anger and haste. And when it went out, they turned it back three times, saying unto it: Look, O miserable soul, upon thy body and think of thy house; as from that from which thou departest, again wilt thou return unto it in the day of the resurrection, and thou wilt be recompensed, all that is proper, for thy wickedness."

This book is of a much later period and altogether inferior to the second book of Esdras; and by taking the two and comparing them together, and then comparing both with the genuine Revelation of John, the reader has the means of forming his own opinion as to the character of these Revelations respectively.

CHAPTER THIRTEENTH.

HEBREW AND PAGAN PROPHETS, OR BIBLE PROPHECIES AND CLASSICAL ORACLES.

IN connection with the Revelation of John and the Apocryphal Revelations, it seems desirable also to see what can be offered in this department by the most cultivated nations of pagan antiquity. The Classical Oracles are very different from the Apocryphal Revelations, and equally different from the divine prophecies which we have in the Bible. Let us see how the case stands between them.

All early nations have had their prophets; but the affirmative to the question, have there been false prophets? is not of course the negative to the question, have there been true prophets? Rather, the universality of the false proves the necessity and actual existence of the true; for there is no feeling of human nature so universal as that which induces all men in every age to look for prophecy, which has not something in the arrangements of the God of nature to correspond to it. That disposition to worship, which so universally leads uninstructed nations to idolatry, proves that the necessity of religion is founded deep in human nature, and is a strong presumptive argu-

ment that there is a true religion adapted to this want of the human soul, and a true God worthy of the love and homage of men. The eye presupposes light, the sense of smell fragrance; and every natural desire has in nature its appropriate object of gratification.

The question is not, whether there have been prophets among the pagan nations? but whether the prophets of the heathen and of the Bible are alike? or whether the difference between them is so great as to render it impossible to ascribe their prophetic power to the same source?

The Bible continually and earnestly asserts that there is a difference, and that this difference is so marked, that no one who has had opportunity for observing, is excusable for confounding the one with the other. Let us look at the matter as it actually existed.

HEBREW AND PAGAN RELIGIONS.

The Hebrews were the only people of the ancient world who acknowledged and worshipped one spiritual God, the Creator and Ruler of the universe. To sustain their attachment to this simple and pure faith in the midst of surrounding idolatry, there existed among them, in addition to the Levites who were set apart for the same purpose, an order of men called prophets, to whom the will of their God was supposed to be made known by immediate revelation. It was their business to encourage the people in their obedience to the divine law, to instruct them when they erred, and to warn them when they went astray. In order to prove the validity of their claims to divine inspiration, they professed to predict future events which

no human sagacity could foresee, and to work miracles which no human power could effect.

The surrounding nations worshipped idols, and they also had prophets who professed to be inspired by those false deities. The Gentiles all acknowledged the God of the Hebrews to be really a God, and their prophets to be truly prophets; but the difference consisted in this, that while the Hebrews affirmed their God to be the only true God, and their prophets the only true prophets, the Gentiles merely claimed that their gods were equal to Jehovah, and their prophets equal to the prophets of Jehovah (1 Kings xx. 28). The God of the Hebrews, in many passages of the Bible, reproves the pagan nations for this their error, and calls upon them to renounce it. For example, in the forty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, after a very circumstantial prediction respecting Cyrus, in which that monarch is called by name, and his various achievements are particularly described, at least one hundred and fifty years before his birth; the God of the Hebrews is represented as declaring that he had uttered this prediction for the express purpose of showing to Cyrus, that Jehovah, the Self-Existent, the Everlasting God, was the God of Israel (Isaiah xlv. 1-7.)

He then contrasts his creative power, his open, frank declarations, and his undeviating truth, with the crooked cunning and falsehood of the pagan deities (vs. 18, 19). Finally, he calls all nations to come together, and, before them all, appeals to this prophecy as an instance of foreknowledge altogether beyond the reach of the heathen prophets, and a triumphant proof that he alone is the true God, and his prophets the only

true prophets (vs. 20–22). It will be my object in this chapter to follow out the train of thought here suggested, and by contrasting the Hebrew with the heathen prophets, to show that the former only have a just claim to divine inspiration.

PROPHETS OF ANCIENT GREECE.

The Grecians were the most celebrated for learning and refinement of all the ancient nations, and the epistles of Paul contain frequent allusions to the fame of their wisdom. The Greeks had their prophets, and to them the Greek moralists, lawgivers, and magistrates submitted the most important questions, and their decisions were considered sacredly binding by this polished and philosophical people. The prophets of ancient Greece, then, being the best which the heathen world can furnish, will be selected as the subjects of comparison with the prophets of the Bible.

To enable the reader to make the comparison for himself, I will attempt to give a brief and faithful description of the Greek prophets, as represented by the Greek historians, and of the Hebrew prophets as they are represented in the Bible.

There can surely be no objection to this mode of investigating the subject; for it allows each nation to give its own account of those for whom it claims divine inspiration, and to whom it attributes a knowledge of future events.

There was one class of sacred persons among the ancient Greeks called *theomantes*, who may, in some respects, be compared with the Hebrew prophets. They seem to have united in their occupation the

character of itinerant preacher and fortune-teller; for they rambled through the country, giving people advice in regard to their moral duties, chanting passages of the poets, and pretending to lay open the secrets of futurity. But they never ventured on predictions, till after offerings had been made and certain prescribed ceremonies accurately performed—the common expedient of all imposters to conceal the artifices by which they dupe vulgar credulity.

Poorly qualified as these theomantes were for religious teachers, it was to them alone that the common people of this celebrated nation could look for spiritual guidance. None of their instructions have descended to our times. (Compare Eichhorn's Introduction to the Old Testament, in German, preface to vol. iv.)

GREEK ORACLES.

Those, however, who can more properly be compared with the Hebrew prophets, were the attendants on the various oracles. These separated themselves from all human society and withdrew to some solitude, where a thick wood, a craggy mountain, a waterfall, or a dark cave, might awaken the awe of their superstitious countrymen, and impose upon them the belief that there was the residence of some pagan deity. There they lived in mysterious retirement, and pretended to hold intercourse with the invisible world. Thither must all repair who wished to consult them; and no one could obtain an answer to his inquiries, till he had presented gifts to the god of the place, and passed through various ceremonies, all calculated to put him in such a state of shuddering apprehension as would

prevent his detecting an imposition, or suspecting the artifice of which he was made the dupe. The responses were then given, artfully expressed in hexameter verse by poets hired for that purpose; but their language is so chosen, that it is always more or less equivocal and often unintelligible. Many of these oracles or prophecies have been preserved by the Greek historians, though no two writers, when they profess to record the same oracle, ever give it in precisely the same words.

We have enough of these remains to enable us to form an estimate of the subjects, which were usually laid before the Greek prophets, and of the manner in which they disposed of them. Religion or morality is very seldom mentioned. They were principally occupied about public enterprise, emigrations, wars, and controversies between states and individuals. When disputes were to be settled by them, they were often bribed by one party to give sentence against the other; if they desired to keep in favor with both, they would procrastinate and evade the question. When the issue of public enterprises was demanded, they sometimes learned from men of experience in public affairs what reply it would be most safe to give; or their answers were so artfully couched, that they could bear opposite meanings. If these expedients failed, they referred the inquirer to the superstitious arts of magic and astrology; or they evaded the point by railery, and instead of instructing by prophecy, amused or irritated by sarcasm; and when every source of cunning was exhausted, they would say that their god was angry and refused to answer. What is remarkable in all their

prophecies is, they seldom, if ever, have any good moral tendency. Virtue is not rewarded, nor vice punished. Power is flattered, however unjust; and weakness is left unprotected, however innocent. The grossest idolatry is always inculcated; and in many instances, the horrid superstition of sacrificing human beings to the infernal gods is expressly enjoined.

An extravagant pecuniary reward was generally the only condition on which these pretended prophecies could be obtained.

Every part of this description of the Greek prophets can be verified by quotations from the Greek historians. (Compare Potter's *Antiquities of Greece*, Book ii. chap. 7-12.)

ORACLES OF APOLLO AND TROPHONIUS.

It is obvious from history, that some of the most celebrated of the Greek oracles owed their celebrity to exhilarating or stupefying gases issuing from subterranean caverns. Of all the oracles of ancient Greece, none was more confided in than that of Apollo at Delphi. The manner of its discovery is thus related by Diodorus Siculus (Book xvi.): "Upon mount Parnassus, where goats were wont to feed, there was a deep cavern with a small narrow mouth, to which when any of the goats approached, they began immediately to leap after a most unusual and antic manner, uttering strange and unheard of sounds. The goat-herd observing this, and wondering what could be the cause of it, went himself to view the cavern, whereupon he also was seized with a like fit of madness, leaping and dancing, and foretelling things to come."

The effect of this gas on the officiating priestess, is thus described by archbishop Potter in the work already quoted: "She was no sooner inspired, but she began immediately to swell and foam at the mouth, tearing her hair, cutting her flesh, and in all her other behavior appearing like one frantic and distracted." In some instances the paroxysm was so violent as to occasion immediate death.

Pausanias informs us that "he who desired to consult the oracles of Trophonius's cave at Lebadea in Bœotia, was obliged to undergo various preparatory ceremonies, which continued through several days: he was to purify himself by various methods, and to offer sacrifices to many different deities; he was then conducted by night to a neighboring river, where he was anointed and washed; he afterwards drank of the waters of forgetfulness, that his former cares might be buried; and of the waters of remembrance, that he might forget nothing of what he was to see. The cave was surrounded by a wall; it resembled an oven; was four cubits wide and eight deep; it was descended by a ladder; and he who went down carried with him cakes made of honey; when he was got down he was made acquainted with futurity." (See Beloe's Herodotus, vol. i. p. 36.)

He was always pale and dejected on his return, and thence it became proverbial to say of a melancholy man, that he had consulted the oracle of Trophonius.

It was in contrast with oracles such as these that Jehovah declares, *I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth*: and in contrast with the difficulty of obtaining the oracular responses, and their ambiguo-

ous and unintelligible language when obtained, (which we shall now proceed to notice), that he makes the additional declarations: *I said not to the seed of Jacob, seek ye me in vain. I the LORD speak righteousness, I declare things that are right:* that is, as bishop Lowth translates it, "I speak truth and give direct answers." (Isa. xlv. 19).

The time of consulting the Delphic oracle was originally only during one month of the year, and generally on the seventh day of the month, that being considered Apollo's birthday; and when responses were given most frequently, they could never be obtained oftener than once a month.

"Whoever went to consult the oracle," says Potter, "was required to make large presents to the god, whereby it came to pass that this temple, in riches, splendor and magnificence, was superior to almost all others in the world." "It was the custom also to offer sacrifices to Apollo, in which except the omens were favorable, the prophetess would not give an answer. At the sacrifices there were five priests that assisted the prophets, and another priest also that assisted the prophetess in managing the oracle." (Potter's Antiquities of Greece, Book ii. chap. 9.,

As those priests were the sole judges of the omens, it was very easy for them to evade every question respecting which it might be inexpedient for them to commit themselves.

Among the presents which Cræsus sent to this oracle. Herodotus (B. i. c. 50, 51) enumerates the following, "one hundred and seventeen tiles of gold, four of which were of the purest gold, each weighing one

talent and a half; the rest of inferior quality, but of the weight of two talents; also a lion of pure gold, weighing ten talents; two large vessels or goblets, one of gold and the other of silver, the former weighing nearly nine talents, and the latter containing six hundred amphorae; a female statue of gold, three cubits high," and many other things of equal value.

To the oracle of Amphiaraus in Thebes he also sent "a shield of solid gold, with a strong spear made entirely of gold, both shaft and head. These were all, (continues Herodotus) within my memory, preserved at Thebes, in the temple of the Ismenian Apollo."

They who consulted this oracle of Amphiaraus, were to abstain from wine for three days, and from all nourishment for twenty-four hours. They then sacrificed a ram, on the skin of which they lay down to sleep, and received responses in their dreams.

CHARACTER OF THE ORACULAR RESPONSES.

The general character of the oracular responses is described by the pagan Cicero, with entire fidelity, in the following paragraph from his work *de Divinatione* (ii. 56).

"But now I come to thee, sacred Apollo, who dwellest at the centre of the earth, whence first proceeded the wild and superstitious sound.* For Chrysippus has filled a whole volume with thy oracles, partly false, as I think; and sometimes true by mere accident, as it frequently so happens in other cases; and sometimes

*Sed jam ad te venio,

Sancte Apollo, qui umbilicum certum terrarum obsides,
Unde superstitiosa primum sæva evasit vox fera.

enigmatical and obscure, so that the interpreter needs to be interpreted, and the response referred back to the oracle; and often purposely and artificially ambiguous. For when this response came to the richest king of Asia, "Cræsus by crossing the Halys shall destroy a great power," he supposed that he was to destroy the power of the enemy, but he destroyed his own. Whatever might have been the event, therefore, the oracle would have remained true."

Herodotus informs us (B. i. c. 91) that when Cræsus, after his defeat, made complaint to the priestess of Apollo, that she had deceived him in the oracle referred to in this passage of Cicero, she replied, "that Cræsus was not justified in his complaints; for Apollo had declared, that if he made war against the Persians, a mighty empire would be overthrown; the real purport of which communication, if he had been anxious to understand, it became him to have inquired whether the god alluded to his empire, or to the empire of Cyrus; but that not understanding the reply which had been made, nor condescending to make a second inquiry, he had been himself the cause of his own misfortune." By this evasion, the unfortunate king found that he had been outwitted, and was obliged to submit in silence.

To illustrate still further the nature of the subjects which were usually laid before the Greek prophets, and the manner in which they disposed of them, the following examples are selected from Herodotus.

On a certain occasion the Lacedæmonians, says Herodotus, "dissatisfied with the languor and inactivity of peace, and conceiving themselves, in all respects,

superior to the Tegeans, they sent to consult the oracle concerning the entire conquest of Arcadia. The Pythian thus answered them :

Ask ye Arcadia ? 'tis a bold demand,
A rough and hardy race defend the land.
Repulsed by them, one only boon you gain,
With frequent foot to dance on Tegea's plain,
And o'er her fields the meas'ring cord to strain.*

“No sooner had the Lacedemonians received this reply than, leaving the other parts of Arcadia unmolested, they proceeded to attack the Tegeans, carrying a quantity of fetters with them. They relied on the evasive declaration of the oracle, and imagined that they should infallibly reduce the Tegeans to servitude. They engaged them and were defeated : as many as were taken captive were loaded with the fetters which themselves had brought, and were thus employed in laborious service in the fields of the Tegeans.” (B. i. c. 66).

The Lacedemonians, after having been repeatedly defeated by the Tegeans, again sent to consult the Delphic oracle. “The Pythian (says Herodotus) assured them of success, if they brought back the body of Orestes, son of Agamemnon. Unable to discover his tomb, they sent a second time to inquire concerning the place of his interment. The following was the oracular communication :

* The above is Beloe's translation. Literally rendered, the latter part of the oracle reads thus : “ But I will not refuse you. I will grant you to dance on Tegea, struck with your feet, and to allot the fine soil with the cord.”

A plain within the Arcadian land I know,
 Where double winds with forced exertion blow,
 Where form to form with mutual strength replies,
 And ill by other ills supported lies :
 That earth contains the great Atrides' son ;
 Take him and conquer : Tegea then is won."

I give the oracle in the translation of Beloe, but the last line, on which the import of the whole depends, literally rendered, reads thus :

Having taken him (that is, the body of Orestes), thou shalt be a helper of Tegea.

The Lacedemonians were as much in the dark as ever in respect to the place where they might find the body of Orestes, but they continued their search for it without intermission. At length one of their distinguished countrymen named Lichas, being in Arcadia on public business, and happening to visit a smith at his forge, observed with particular curiosity the process of working the iron. The man took notice of his attention, and desisted from his labor. "Stranger of Sparta, said he, you seem to admire the art which you contemplate ; but how much more would you be excited, if you knew all that I am able to communicate ! Near this place, as I was sinking a well, I found a coffin seven cubits long. I never believed that men were formerly of larger dimensions than at present, but when I opened it, I discovered a body equal in length to the coffin. I correctly measured it, and replaced it where I found it."

"Lichas, after hearing this relation, was induced to believe that this was the body of Orestes, concerning which the oracle had spoken. He was further per-

suaded, when he recollected that the bellows of the smith might intimate the two winds; the anvil and the hammer might express one form opposing another; the iron also which was beaten, might signify ill succeeding ill, rightly conceiving that the use of iron operated to the injury of mankind."

The Spartans by stratagem got possession of the bones, and Tegea was conquered. (Herodotus, B. i. c. 68).

Both the above oracles, particularly in the original Greek, are entirely ambiguous, and would have been equally true in each case, whether the Spartans or Tegeans had conquered. They also sanction glaring injustice, for it is not even intimated to the Spartans, that their projected unprovoked attack on the peaceful Tegeans, for the sake of robbing them of their lands and making them slaves, was contrary to every principle of right. Nor does the historian himself seem to think it wrong for the Spartans to make war because they were tired of peace, nor a defect in the oracle that it has nothing to say on the subject of moral obligation. Politics, and not religion, war and revenge, not peace and good-will, were the topics most acceptable to the prophets of ancient Greece.

Herodotus also (B. vii. c. 140-142) details the oracles given to the Athenians, respecting the issue of the Persian invasion; and also several others in different parts of his history. They are all of the same general character with those already described.

It is well known, that the Greek oracles were frequently bribed by public men to give such answers as would promote their own schemes. Plutarch informs

us, in his life of Themistocles, that this general, "perceiving that he could not, by the force of human reason, prevail with the multitude, set his machinery to work as a poet would do in a tragedy, and had recourse to prodigies and oracles;" and Demosthenes publicly complained, that the Delphic oracle, being bribed by Philip, *philipized*. "He put the Thebans in mind of Epaminondas, and the Athenians of Pericles, how they reckoned such things (as oracles and prodigies) the mere pretexts of cowardice, and pursued the plan which their reason had dictated." (Plutarch's Life of Demosthenes).

Such was the estimation in which the Greek oracles were held by the most intelligent of the Greeks themselves. And do you not in this description of the Greek prophets, as given by the Greek historians, plainly discover all the features of selfishness, imposture, and crime?

How easy for these pretended prophets to deceive, if they chose; and how much their whole system of operations appears like an attempt to conceal a profitable fraud! Doubtless the phenomena known in modern times as *mesmerism*, *clairvoyance*, and *spiritism*, had much to do with the workings and the success of the ancient oracles.

Surely, "they have no knowledge that set up the wood of their graven image and pray unto a god that cannot save. He feedeth on ashes; a deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, is there not a lie in my right hand?" (Isaiah xlv. 20; xlv. 20).

MANNERS AND CHARACTER OF THE HEBREW PROPHETS.

From this scene of pagan imposture and credulity, let us now turn to the prophets of the Bible. In every respect we find them the reverse of those just described. They sought no concealment, and affected no mystery; but mingled with society, and lived generally like other men. They were at all times and in all places accessible to such as craved their advice, and this they freely imparted without exacting gifts to gratify their own avarice, or requiring ceremonies to work on the fears of those who consulted them. No arts were resorted to, to deceive others into a mysterious dread of their sacredness. It is true, that they sometimes used striking symbolic representations, but it was to awaken the attention of a sensual and thoughtless people to listen to their instructions. (Isaiah xx. 2-4).

They were sometimes seen in the habiliments of mourning; but it was to manifest the depth of the grief they felt for the sin and the obstinacy of their nation.

In their prophecies there was neither artifice, evasion, nor ambiguity; but they were prompt, direct, and decisive. On all occasions of great public interest, they were seen in the most frequented places, enforcing their instructions with the most sincere and impassioned eloquence upon the listening throngs who surrounded them. These public addresses they frequently committed to writing, and we have them in every form, from the simplest prose to the most lofty elevation of poetry. The writings of the Hebrew prophets which have descended to us, are so full and complete, that

we have every facility for ascertaining the usual subjects and general character of their prophecies.

SUBJECTS AND CHARACTER OF THEIR PROPHECIES.

Religion was the great subject on which they loved to dwell, and with them religion was neither an empty sound nor a superstitious ceremonial. The love and worship of one spiritual and holy God, obedience to his law, purity of heart, as the most acceptable sacrifice, (an idea beyond even the imagination of a heathen prophet); these constituted the religion of the Hebrew prophets. It was in contemplation of subjects such as these, that their spirits moved with rapture, rose on the wings of a holy enthusiasm to the very throne of the Majesty on high, which no mortal eye but theirs had ever seen, and no mortal tongue but theirs had ever dared to celebrate.

In all their prophecies, it was their constant aim to exert the most salutary moral influence. Calamity they always threatened as the punishment of sin, and prosperity was the sure reward of holy obedience. To the corruptions of their times, they presented independent, bold, and unyielding opposition; ungodly rulers, they fearlessly withstood, by severe and public rebuke; and when kings and people united to abolish or disregard the laws of God, these holy men came forth (though hatred, persecution, imprisonment, and death were often the reward of their fidelity) with direct, unequivocal, and solemn declarations of their own abhorrence of such evil designs and of the divine vengeance against them. Superstitious arts calculated to impose on the credulity of an ignorant multitude,

such as astrology, magic, and necromancy, they pointedly condemned; and the rich presents which were offered them, they rejected. Their predictions of future events were public, clear, impossible to be misapprehended, and such as no human foresight could have conjectured.

ILLUSTRATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

You scarcely need be referred to instances of what has now been advanced, for they occur so frequently on the pages of the Old Testament, that one who has any acquaintance with the Bible, will be at no loss to verify this description of the Biblical prophets.

You will at once remember how Elisha repelled the princely offers of Naaman; how Isaiah publicly and severely rebuked the idolatrous Ahaz; how steadfastly Jeremiah resisted the rebellious designs of his king and nation, though their reproaches and persecutions wounded him so deeply that he often wished for death to put an end to his anguish. In the whole character of the Hebrew prophets we see a frankness which disdained concealment, and a virtue which abhorred deception.

In further illustration of what has been advanced examine 2 Sam. xii; 1 Kings xviii. 10, 17, 18; xxi. 17-24.

The prophet Nathan did not hesitate to pourtray in the liveliest colors the sin which had been committed by his sovereign and patron, and boldly to say to the guilty monarch, *Thou art the man.*

The prophet Elijah knew that the tyrant Ahab had long been searching all the neighboring states to ap-

prehend and put him to death; but he fearlessly stood before him, and when the haughty monarch accosted him with the question, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" he instantly replied, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord; and thou hast followed Baalim."

When the same king had been guilty of another act of the most flagrant injustice respecting Naboth, the same prophet went to him with the appalling message: "Thus saith the Lord, In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine." And Ahab said to Elijah, "Hast thou found me, O mine enemy?" And he answered, "I have found thee, because thou hast sold thyself to work evil in the sight of the Lord." Where in the whole compass of the heathen oracles shall we find a resistance to regal tyranny, a defence of injured and helpless innocence, to be compared with this?

THE CONTRAST.

And now is not the difference between the Hebrew and the heathen prophets perfectly obvious? In the one case we see all the machinery of fraud, a total destitution of moral feeling, and every indication of an exclusive attachment to this world. In the other case we can discover no wish and no opportunity to deceive; we find a most acute moral sensibility and an inflexible adherence to what is right, and a total renunciation of all worldly hopes, whenever they interfered with the calls of duty. The former, just what we should expect from men of this world, who

had no faith in another ; the latter, just what we should expect from men of God, who had placed all their hopes in heaven. Who, that has any knowledge of the subject, can pretend to place them on equal ground, or say that they have equal claims to divine inspiration ? In the contrast, the interpreter of the Greek oracles, stands abashed before the Hebrew prophet, like the witch of Endor before the rising spirit of Samuel.

How shall we account for it, that the Hebrews, who were so far below the Greeks in learning, refinement, and power, should rise so far above them in the character of their religious teachers ? To the Hebrews were sent *holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost* ; while the Greeks, *seeking after wisdom, became vain in their imagination, and their foolish heart was darkened.*

Deficiency in religious feeling, and not the want of appropriate and sufficient evidence, is, after all, the great cause of scepticism in respect to the inspiration of the Bible. In the stillness of a Sabbath morning, when, if ever, the soul loves to commune with heaven, let the devout man open the sacred volume, and read till his heart glows with something of the fervor of the inspired writers, and while his affections are flowing with full tide towards the God of the Hebrew patriarchs and prophets, let him lay aside the Bible, and suddenly turn his attention to any, even the most lofty flights of heathen inspiration, and the painful revulsion of feeling which he experiences, shows him at once that he has changed his element, that he has fallen upon another world. The angels who were sent to warn Lot of his danger, could scarcely have found a

greater contrast when they left the courts of heaven, to tread the polluted streets of Sodom. The devout man, who reads the prophetic parts of the Old Testament, with one spark of the feeling with which they were composed, no more needs a philosophical proof of their divine origin, than Elijah needed a metaphysical demonstration of the existence of God, while ascending to heaven in his fiery chariot; and I suppose no one will consider it a breach of charity to say, that it is not by devout men, generally, that the divine authority of the Old Testament is called in question.

FULFILLMENT OF PROPHECY.

In further illustration of this subject, we will now notice a few of the more remarkable prophecies of the Bible, which with their fulfillment, the reader is requested to compare with the Greek prophecies introduced in this chapter.

1. Predictions respecting Cyrus, Isaiah xlv., xlv.

About one hundred and fifty years before the birth of Cyrus, the Hebrew prophet Isaiah described this monarch by name,* and intimated (Isaiah xlv. 4) that this was his *surname*, and not the name given him at his birth; accurately foretold the victories he was to achieve, and the benefits which he was to confer upon the Jewish people, by delivering them from the Baby-

* Herodotus informs us (B. i. c. 114) that Cyrus was not the original name of this monarch, but one which he assumed at a later period, probably on his accession to the throne, or after the achievement of some of his great victories. In the Hebrew the name is written *Koraesh*, and in the Pehlvi or ancient Persian, *Korshid*, which means *sun-glory*, or splendor like that of the sun. (See Jahn's Heb. Com. p. 148.)

lonian captivity. This prophecy was published nearly a century before Nebuchadnezzar subdued Judea. Babylon was then but just rising into notice ; the very existence of the empire was scarcely known to the Hebrews ; Persia, the native country of Cyrus, was yet in the darkness of barbarism ; while Judea was an old, established and powerful kingdom. The accomplishment of this prediction, therefore, would appear to the politicians of that age as improbable, as it would now appear to our politicians, if they were told that these United States in the course of a century would fall under the dominion of one of the new and still tottering republics of South America, and would finally be delivered from their bondage by a powerful monarch of the Pacific Islands. To this prophecy Jehovah appeals (as has been already observed), as an instance of foreknowledge altogether beyond the reach of the heathen prophets, and a triumphant proof, that he alone is the true God, and his prophets the only true prophets.

“Assemble yourselves (says he) and come, draw near together ye that are escaped of the nations : they have no knowledge that set up the wood of their graven image, and pray unto a god that can not save. Tell ye, and bring them near ; yea, let them take counsel together, who hath declared this from ancient time ? have not I the Lord ? and there is no God else besides me ; a just God and a Saviour, there is none besides me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth ; for I am God, and there is none else.” (Isaiah xlv. 20, 21).

2. Predictions respecting Babylon.

In close connection with the preceding are the predictions of Isaiah and Jeremiah respecting the overthrow of Babylon, the fulfillment of which we will now consider. Of these predictions that of Isaiah was uttered one hundred and sixty years, and that of Jeremiah fifty-six years before the event. (Compare Jer. l., li.) The historical proof on this subject is entirely conclusive, and will be exhibited in its proper place, when we come to the discussion of the authenticity of the prophetic writings of Isaiah and Jeremiah. It can not be said, therefore, with any show of reason, that these prophecies were written after the events.

The circumstantial particularity of these predictions, their antecedent improbabilities, their progressive accomplishment through a long series of ages, and the great variety of the events predicted, render it equally impossible to account for these prophecies on the ground that they were sagacious and happy conjectures.

To enable the reader to make the comparison for himself, I will exhibit the predictions in the words of the prophets, and in parallel columns the account of the events in the words of the classic historians, relying principally on Herodotus and Xenophon. The first of these historians lived two hundred and fifty years after Isaiah and one hundred and fifty after Jeremiah, and the latter three hundred and fifty after Isaiah and two hundred and fifty after Jeremiah.

Babylon was considered impregnable. Its high and strong walls surmounted by lofty towers, its broad and deep ditches, its large magazines, and the numerous squares within the city, which were planted with corn

and yielded an annual supply of provisions, seemed sufficient to secure the inhabitants forever from all attacks of their enemies. (Jahn's Heb. Com. p. 152.)

Some of the more remarkable circumstances of its capture and subsequent fate, exhibiting the coincidence between prophecy and history, are the following:

The besieging army to consist of various nations.

PROPHECY.

Go up, O Elam, besiege, O Media (Isaiah xxi. 2).

The noise of a multitude in the mountains, like as of a great people; a tumultuous noise of the kingdoms of nations gathered together: the Lord of hosts numbereth the host of the battle. They come from a far country, from the end of heaven (Isa. xiii. 4, 5).

Set ye up a standard in the land, blow the trumpet among the nations, prepare the nations against her, call together against her the kingdom of Ararat, Minni, and Ashchenaz; appoint a captain against her; cause the horses to come up as the rough caterpillars.

Prepare against her the

HISTORY.

While Cyrus was on his march to Babylon, we find him issuing the following orders to his troops: "Let Artabazus lead the Persian (Elam) shieldmen and archers; after these let Andramias the Mede, lead the Median foot; after these, Embas, the Armenian (Ararat) foot; After these, Artuchas, the Hyrcanians; after these, Thambradas, the Sacian foot; after these, Damades, the Cadusians." "And do you all attend ready on the road to Babylon, each of you with all things proper" (Xenophon, Cyrop. B. v. c. iii. 38).

While the army lay at Babylon, there are mentioned among his soldiers,

nations, with the kings of in addition to the above, the Medes, the captains the Phrygians, Lydians, thereof and all the rulers Arabians, and Cappadocians (Jer. li. 27, 28). (Ib. B. vii. c. v. 15).

The Hebrew name Elam corresponds to the Greek Persia, and Ararat and Minni to Armenia and the neighboring northern countries; the locality of Ashkenaz, is less certain.

The river to be dried up, the gates to be left open, and the city taken by surprise during a night of revelry and darkness.

The reader should recollect, that the river Euphrates passed through the midst of Babylon; and that besides the external wall, there was a wall on each side of the river, and the only entrance to the city from the river was by brazen gates, which were carefully closed every night. The river here was a quarter of a mile in width and more than twelve feet deep. (Herodotus, B. i. c. 180, 181.)

PROPHECY.

God saith to the deep,
Be dry, and I will dry up
thy rivers (Isa. xlv. 27).

A drought is upon her
waters and they shall be
dried up (Jer. l. 38).

I will dry up her sea and
make her springs dry (Jer.
li. 36).

I will loose the loins of
kings to open before him

HISTORY.

Cyrus placed one detach-
ment of his forces where
the river first enters the
city, and another where
it leaves it, directing them
to enter the channel, and
attack the town, wherever
a passage could be effected.
He pierced the bank and
introduced the river into
the lake, by which means

the two-leaved gates, and the gates shall not be shut (Isaiah xlv. 1).

In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken. And I will make drunk her princes and her wise men, her captains and her rulers and her mighty men (Jer. li. 39, 57).

The night of my pleasure hath he turned into fear unto me. Prepare the table, watch in the watch-tower, eat drink: arise ye princes, anoint the shield (Isa. xxi. 4, 5).

Therefore shall evil come upon thee, thou shalt not know from whence it ariseth; and mischief shall fall upon thee, thou shalt not be able to put it off; and desolation shall come upon thee suddenly, which thou shalt not know (Isa. xlvii. 11).

But these two things shall come to thee in a moment, in one day, the loss of children and wid-

the bed of the Euphrates became sufficiently shallow for the object in view.

The Persians in their station watched the proper opportunity, and when the stream had so far retired as not to be higher than their thighs, they entered Babylon without difficulty.

If the besieged had either been aware of the designs of Cyrus, or had discovered the project before its actual accomplishment, they might have effected the total destruction of these troops. They had only to secure the little gates which led to the river, and to have manned the embankments on either side, and they might have enclosed the Persians in a net from which they could never have escaped. As it happened they were taken by surprise. It was

a day of festivity among them, and whilst the citizens were engaged in dancing and merriment, Babylon

owhood: they shall come was, for the first time, thus upon thee in their perfection, for the multitude of thy sorceries and for the abundance of thine enchantments (Isa. xlvii. 9).

By comparing the prophecy with the history, it will appear that every circumstance known to the historian after the event, had been known to the prophets long before.

I will here subjoin the account of the taking of Babylon as given by Xenophon, which includes some particulars not mentioned by Herodotus.

Cyrus "measuring out the ground around the wall, and from the side of the river,—he dug round the wall on every side a very great ditch. When he heard they were celebrating a festival in Babylon, in which all the Babylonians drank and revelled the whole night; on that occasion, as soon as it grew dark, he took a number of men with him, and opened the ditches into the river. When this was done, the water ran off in the night by the ditches, and the passage of the river through the city became available." "Then making those that attended his person, both foot and horse, to go down into the dry part of the river, he ordered them to try whether the channel of the river was passable." They reported that it was. Cyrus then addressed his troops, and concluded by saying, "Do you Gobryas and Gadatas* show us the ways, for you

* These were two Assyrian noblemen who had gone over to Cyrus on account of the cruelties practised upon them by the Babylonian king.

are acquainted with them, and when we are got in, lead us the readiest way to the palace. It may be no wonder, perhaps, said they that were with Gobryas, if the gates of the palace are open, for the city seems to night to be in a general revel, but we shall meet with a guard at the gates, for there is always one set there." "When this was said, they marched; and of those that they met with, some they fell on and killed, some fled, and some set up a clamor. They that were with Gobryas, set up a clamor with them, as if they were revellers themselves, and marching on the shortest way that they could, they got round about the palace." "As soon as the noise and clamor began, they that were within, perceiving the disturbance, and the king commanding them to examine what the matter was, ran out, throwing open the gates. They that were with Gadatas, as soon as they saw the gates loose, broke in, pressing forward on the runaways, and dealing their blows among them, they came up to the king, and found him now in a standing posture with his sword drawn. They that were with Gadatas and Gobryas being many in number, mastered him; they likewise that were with him were killed." "Gadatas and Gobryas then came up, and having first paid their adoration to the gods, for the revenge they had had on their impious king, they then kissed the hands and feet of Cyrus, shedding many tears in the midst of their joy and satisfaction." (Cyropaed. B. vii. c. 5).

The death of the king, as described by Xenophon, had been predicted by the prophet in these words:

"But thou art cast out of thy grave as an abominable branch, and as the raiment of those that are slain,

thrust through with the sword, that go down to the stones of the pit; as a carcass trodden under feet." (Isaiah xiv. 19).

The joy occasioned by his death was predicted with equal clearness.

"The whole earth is at rest, and is quiet; they break forth into singing. Yea, the fir-trees rejoice at thee, and the cedars of Lebanon, saying, Since thou art laid down, no feller is come up against us." (Isaiah xiv. 7, 8).

3. *The place to be forever uninhabited, a dwelling of wild beasts, and a place of stagnant waters.*

PROPHECY.

And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah.

It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there.

HISTORY.

"The Persians destroyed a part of the city, time and the negligence of the Macedonians destroyed a part."

"It is now almost entirely deserted, so that we may safely say of it what a certain poet said of Megalopolis, the great city of Arcadia: the great city is now a vast solitude." (Strabo, B. xvi).

Babylon, once the greatest of all cities which the sun ever looked upon, has now nothing left but the walls. (Pausanias, B. viii. c. 33).

But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there.

And the wild beasts of the island shall lay in their desolate houses, and dragons in their pleasant palaces. (Isa. xiii. 20-22).

And Babylon shall become heaps, a dwelling place for dragons, an astonishment and a hissing, without an inhabitant. They shall roar together like lions; they shall yell as lions' whelps. (Jer. li. 37, 38).

I have learned from a certain Elamite brother, who came from those parts and now lives as a monk in Jerusalem, that the royal hunting grounds are in Babylon; and that wild beasts of all kinds are kept within its walls." (Jerome Com. in Is. c. 13).

"I soon distinguished that the causes of our alarm were two or three majestic lions, taking the air upon the heights of the pyramid." "We then rode close up to the ruins; and I had once more the gratification of ascending the awful sides of the tower of Babel. In my progress I stopped several times to look at the broad prints of the feet of the lions, left plain in the clayey soil; and by the track, I saw that if we had chosen to rouse such royal game, we need not go far to find their lair. But, while thus actually contemplating these savage tenants, wan-

dering amidst the towers of Babylon, and bedding themselves within the deep cavities of her once magnificent temple, I could not help reflecting on how faithfully the various prophecies had been fulfilled." (Sir R. K. Porter).

"The tower is still to be seen and is half a league in diameter, but is so ruinous, so low, and so full of venomous creatures, which lodge in holes made by them in the rubbish, that no one durst approach nearer to it than within half a league, except during two months in the winter, when these animals never stir out of their holes." (Rauwolf).

"Not only great part of this plain is little better than a swamp, but large deposits of the waters are left stagnant in the hollows between the ruins; again verifying the threat denounced against it." (Sir R. K. Porter).

I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water; and I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, saith the Lord of hosts. (Isaiah xiv. 23).

Some of the earliest and most minute of the prophecies are in a course of literal accomplishment even at the present day. For example, the remarkable predictions of Moses respecting the Jewish nation. (Deut. xxviii).

The predictions respecting the sufferings and death of Christ (Isaiah lii. 13–liii. 12); and those of Christ respecting the destruction of Jerusalem (Matthew xxiv.), are discussed by Dr. Paley with his usual skill and irresistible power of demonstration in his *Evidences*, (Part ii. chap. 1).

It would carry me far beyond the limits of the present work to go into an extended statement of the fulfillment of scripture prophecies. Nor is it necessary, for my only object in this chapter has been, as stated in the outset, by contrasting the Hebrew with the heathen prophets, to show that the former, and they only, have just claim to divine inspiration. The specimens already given are, I suppose, abundantly sufficient to accomplish this purpose.

The wonderful discoveries of modern times on the field of the old Bible narrative, by Layard, Rawlinson and others, which so marvellously illustrate and confirm the Bible history and the Bible prophecies, will find a more appropriate place in the volume on the Old Testament. My object is here to show the superiority of the Bible prophecies, dark and mystical as some suppose them to be, to the best oracles of the classical nations.

CHAPTER FOURTEENTH.

THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND THE REASONS FOR THEIR EXCLUSION FROM THE SACRED CANON.

As the volume on the Old Testament will necessarily be somewhat larger than the volume on the New, for convenience sake I here insert the chapter on the Old Testament Apocrypha. It will give a greater completeness to the present volume; and here I wish also to introduce the testimony of Church Councils. I have generally avoided citing such testimony on the New Testament; I wished to show that we can fully make out our case for the New Testament books without mentioning church councils or alluding to them at all. Their testimony is important, abundant and conclusive, but we do not depend upon it exclusively, as is often ignorantly affirmed; we can even dispense with it entirely if we choose.

I. THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE books pertaining to the Old Testament which the Romish church holds to be sacred and canonical, in addition to the original Hebrew canon, are the following: *Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, Maccabees I. and II., additions to Daniel, additions to Esther.*

Besides these, there are generally printed, as an appendix to the Vulgate, the Prayer of Manasseh, and Esdras III. and IV. In the English Apocrypha these two books of Esdras are designated as I. and II. The reason of the Vulgate numeration is, that the canonical Ezra is in that translation called Esdras I., and the canonical Nehemiah, Esdras II. In this it differs from the Septuagint, which retains for Nehemiah the Hebrew canonical name.

Before the time of the council of Trent, the books above mentioned had not been received as canonical by the Christian churches; most of them had been positively and very pointedly condemned by some one or more of the eminent church fathers; those who had received them to be read in churches made a marked distinction between them and the books of the original Hebrew canon, assigning to them a much lower place: and they who called any of them canonical, generally assigned the most trivial and unsatisfactory reasons for so doing. For example, Hilary (Proleg. in Psalm.) mentions that the Hebrews had twenty-two canonical books of the Old Testament corresponding to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet; but as the Greeks have twenty-four letters in their alphabet, they ought to have twenty-four books in their Old Testament canon; and he, therefore, in order to make out the number twenty-four, would add to the Hebrew canon the books of Tobit and Judith, for the Greek Bible. According to this principle, the Old Testament for the Arabs, Ethiopians, Cherokees, and many other nations, ought to be enlarged by a number of books greater than all the apocryphal writings, numerous as

they are, would be able to supply. Augustin, though the greatest man of his time intellectually, was a very poor critical scholar. He was disposed to receive all the books usually included in the Septuagint as canonical, because he ignorantly supposed that the Septuagint as a whole had the sanction of the apostles, (*quae etiam ab Apostolis approbata*, which also was approved by the apostles.) Epist. 32. ad Hieron. n. 35. Yet, though he called all the Septuagint books canonical, he made a marked distinction among them in respect to their authority. He says: *In canonicis Scripturis ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurium auctoritatem sequatur, ut eas, quae ab omnibus accipiuntur ecclesiis catholicis, praeponat eas, quas quaedam non accipiunt. In eis vero, quae non accipiuntur ab omnibus, praeponat eas, quae plures gravioresque accipiunt.* (In the canonical Scriptures he follows for the most part the authority of the Catholic churches, so that those which are received by all the Catholic churches he places before those which some do not receive. But in reference to those which are not received by all, he prefers those which the greater number and the more important churches receive.) Doctr. Christ. ii. 3. Here is license enough for the most liberal Protestant; and it is by such statements as these that Jahn and other enlightened Roman Catholic scholars endeavored to vindicate the Council of Trent for their decree respecting the canon, on the ground that there was an understood and admitted distinction among the sacred books between the *deutero-canonical* and the *proto-canonical*. If Augustin and some other fathers made such a distinction, it is clear enough that the Council of Trent did not.

Jerome was greatly superior to Augustin in scholarship, so far as a critical knowledge of languages and books is concerned, though greatly inferior in almost all other respects. Jerome *knew* that the apocryphal books had no claim to canonical authority, and he said so very plainly, and when exasperated by opposition, very bitterly. He in one place declares: *Sapientia, quae vulgo Salomonis inscribitur, et Jesu Sirach liber, et Judith, et Tobias et Pastor non sunt in canone.* (Wisdom which is commonly inscribed Solomon's, the book of Jesus Sirach, and Judith, and Tobias and Pastor are not in the canon.) In another place he says of these books very sharply: *Apocryphorum naenias mortuis, magis haereticis quam ecclesiasticis vivis canendas.* (The songs of the Apocrypha ought to be sung by dead heretics rather than by living ecclesiastics.) Proleg. Gal. et Prol. in Com. Matt. Augustin was at variance with Jerome, as the theologian is apt to be at variance with the scholar. He strongly condemned Jerome's Latin translation of the Old Testament, because it varied so much from the Septuagint; though it departed from the Septuagint only by coming nearer to the divine original in the Hebrew; but Augustin was not scholar enough to know or appreciate a fact of this kind. (Compare Marheinecke's *Symbolik*, Band ii. S. 224, ff. first edition, 1810.)

This is a subject of deep interest at the present time. Romanists among us are continually objecting to our Bible, calling it a *mutilated* Bible, and furiously resisting, wherever they can, its introduction into schools and families. In the following pages, we shall give a review of the debates and decisions on this subject in

the Council of Trent, that the reader may see on what very shallow and insufficient grounds that decision was made on which so much was depending; and then we shall show the grounds on which we pronounce that decision to be totally wrong, by exhibiting in full the reasons why the books in question ought to be excluded from the canon of Scripture. The following is a summary of the points which will be stated and proved in the ensuing discussion:

(1.) These books never had the sanction of Christ or his apostles, or any of the writers of the New Testament.

(2.) They formed no part of the original Hebrew canon, and were not written till after the Old Testament inspiration had ceased and the canon was closed.

(3.) They were rejected with singular unanimity by the early Christian churches and by the best of the church fathers.

(4.) The books themselves, examined individually, can be proved, each one by itself, to be unworthy of a place in the canon of Scripture.

Under this last head we shall give, in regard to each book: (a) a description of the book; (b) we shall examine its internal evidence in regard to its having a place in the canon, and (c) state the external testimony in respect to it.

II. DEBATES AND DECISIONS IN THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

The Council of Trent for its fourth session, which was held in the spring of the year 1546, collected several propositions respecting the Scriptures from the writings of Luther, which they alleged to be erroneous.

These propositions were earnestly discussed in the several congregations which preceded the session ; as was also the question, whether canons with anathemas annexed, in the usual manner, should be issued against these errors. Two of the alleged errors were these : (a) That no books ought to be received into the canon of the Old Testament except those which were found in the original Hebrew canon, and (b) That the original text, the Hebrew for the Old Testament and the Greek for the New, is the only ultimate appeal as the pure word of God, and that the Latin Vulgate, used in the churches, abounds in erroneous translations. We give not the words but only the substance, because it is only with these two points that we are concerned in the present discussion ; and it would lead us too far out of our track to follow the exact order and method of the treatment of the several topics in the council.

We propose to give, and that too in a very condensed form, only what pertains to the Old Testament canon, and the authority of the Latin Vulgate as compared with the original Text.

In regard to the canon, they were generally agreed, that a catalogue of the sacred books should be made out, after the example of the ancients ; and that all the books usually read in the Roman churches should be admitted into it, and that the Old Testament canon should not be limited to those books only which were received by the Hebrews. The catalogues of the Council of Laodicea, of Pope Innocent I., of the third Council of Carthage, and of Pope Gelasius, were proposed as models. As to the form of the catalogue there were four opinions : (1.) Some proposed that the books

should be separated into two divisions, the first of which should consist of those only which had always and without dispute been regarded as canonical, the *ὁμολογουμένων* of Eusebius; and the second, of those which had been by some rejected, and in regard to which there was more or less of doubt, the *ἀντιλεγόμενων*. (Compare Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.) They argued that, though this distinction had not been formally and expressly recognized by any pope or council, yet it had been in fact tacitly and universally acknowledged; that Augustin makes this distinction, and that it is received, and the authority of Augustin in respect to it confirmed, by the canon *in canonicis*. Gregory, also, who lived after Gelasius, declares, in his Exposition of Job, that the books of Maccabees were written for edification and adapted to it, but yet they were not canonical.

Aloysius of Catanea, a Dominican Friar, affirmed that this distinction was made by Jerome, and that the church had accepted it as the rule and standard for establishing the canon of the Holy Scriptures. He also quoted Cardinal Cajetan, who, following Jerome, had made the same distinction, and in the dedication to Clement VII. of his treatise on the historical books of the Old Testament, had declared it to be a settled principle of the church.

(2.) A second proposition was, that the books should be arranged, not in two, but three divisions, the first to consist of those which had always and without contradiction been received as divine; the second, those which had sometimes been doubted, but whose canonical authority had at length been confirmed by the

usage of the church, to which class belong certain epistles and the apocalypse of the New Testament, and some few passages in the evangelists; and the third division should consist of those books which had never been esteemed canonical, to which class belong *the seven apocryphal books of the Old Testament, and the passages of Daniel and Esther which are not found in the Hebrew text.*

(3.) The third opinion was that there should be no distinction made among the books, but after the example of the Council of Carthage and other synods, they should merely make out the catalogue and offer no remarks upon it.

(4.) The fourth proposal was this: that all the books in all their parts, just as they stand in the Latin Bible, should be declared equally of divine authority. The book of Baruch here made no little difficulty, for this book was not to be found in the catalogues of the Laodicean or the Carthaginian councils, nor yet in those made by the Roman pontiffs; and therefore it ought to be excluded, both for this reason and because the beginning of the book is wanting. Yet, because some lessons in the church books were taken from it, the members of the council could not be persuaded to relinquish its canonical authority; and they therefore resolved that it must have been regarded by the ancients as a part of the book of Jeremiah, and received into the canon under the name of that prophet. Thus their opinion of what the fact ought to have been, determined them to assume the fact itself, without evidence. A summary and convenient mode of proceeding, which has often been followed, both in ecclesiastical and other assemblies.

On the eighth of March, 1546, there was held an extraordinary congregation, in which it was unanimously resolved, that church tradition should be held of equal authority with the written word of God. With respect to the form in which they should put forth their catalogue of the canonical Scriptures, the theologians still entertained various opinions. One was, that the individual books need not be mentioned by name; another, that the books ought to be divided into three classes; and a third, that all the books of the Latin Bible should be placed in one rank as of equal authority. In this diversity of opinions it was agreed, that catalogues should be made out according to the three different proposals, and laid before the next congregation for examination; and then it should be decided which of the three should be adopted.

In the congregation of the fifteenth of March, the three catalogues were actually presented; each had its advocates; but the third was the one which triumphed. In the subsequent congregations, the authority of the Latin translation was discussed; and here arose a hot conflict between the few who had some knowledge of the Greek language and a good understanding of the Latin, and the many who knew nothing of the one and but little of the other. The Dominican Aloysius of Catanea here again made himself heard. He remarked, that in regard to this matter, nothing could be better in itself or more wisely adapted to the times than the principle asserted by Cardinal Cajetan, that justly celebrated divine, who from his early youth had devoted himself to the study of theology, and with a happy talent and unwearied

diligence, which had made him the most distinguished in this branch of science of any one for many centuries; insomuch that there was not a prelate or doctor in the whole council who need be ashamed to confess himself his inferior and pupil in point of learning. This great prelate, when he went to Germany in 1523, to hold his conference with Luther, being led to study earnestly the best means of reuniting the dismembered church and bringing the heretics to a confession of their errors, concluded that the only effective method must be a critical understanding of the Holy Scriptures in their original languages. Accordingly, during all the rest of his life, full eleven years, he devoted himself entirely to the study of the Scriptures, and wrote his expositions upon them, not according to the Latin translation, but according to the original text, the Hebrew for the Old Testament, and the Greek for the New; and, forasmuch as he was not himself skilled in these tongues, he employed men thoroughly acquainted with them to translate for him literally, word for word, as is abundantly manifest from his works on the sacred books. This excellent cardinal was wont to say, that to understand the Latin text was not necessary to understand the word of God; the word of God is infallible, but the Latin translators may have made mistakes. On this account, also, Jerome justly said, that to prophesy and write holy books is the gift of God's Spirit; but to translate these books from one language to another is matter of human skill. In reference to these words, Cajetan often said with a sigh; "Oh that the teachers of former times had been of this opinion, and then the Lutheran heresy would

not have arisen." Cataneus further declared, that the Latin translation could not be received as authoritative without violating the canon *Ut Veterum*, etc., *dist.* 9, where it is asserted that the truth of the Old Testament is to be sought in the Hebrew text, and that of the New in the Greek. To declare the one translation authentic, would be to condemn Jerome and all the others; for as these cannot be authentic, no further use can be made of them. A miserable business it would be, in a conflict with opponents, to select a text doubtful and not generally acknowledged, when one is in possession of the genuine and infallible text, which ensures a certain victory. With Jerome and Cajetan we must consider it certain that there is no translator, whatever care he may exercise, who may not sometimes fall into a mistake. If the holy council itself would undertake a translation, and examine and improve it by the original text, then it might not be doubted that the Holy Spirit, which guides all church councils in matters of faith, would so aid the fathers of the synod, that no error would be committed. A translation examined and established in this manner might safely be deemed authentic; but without such an investigation the synod ought not to venture to approve a translation or assure itself of the aid of the Holy Ghost. In the council of the apostles themselves there was a thorough investigation of the matters before them previous to a decision. But as such an investigation in this matter would require a ten years' labor, he thought it best that the affair should be left as it had been for fifteen hundred years past.

The greater part of the theologians were opposed to these views. They argued that the translation which had so long been received and used in the churches and the schools, must of necessity be declared authentic; otherwise, the Lutherans had already gained their point and the door was thrown open to endless heresies and unappeasable disturbances. The popes and the scholastic theologians had for the most part founded the doctrines of the Romish church, which was the mother of all churches, on certain passages of Scripture; and now, if there were granted to every one the right to call in question the translation, whether it were correct or not, whether this were done by comparing it with other translations or with the original Hebrew and Greek text, then the linguists and grammarians might bring all into confusion and set up themselves as umpires in matters of faith; and they would be the doctors of theology and of the canon law, and they would have the dignity of bishops and cardinals; and the inquisitors, if they were not skilled in Hebrew and Greek, could no more proceed against the Lutherans, but they would cry out, "it is not so in the original," "the translation is false," and in this manner every school-fox may put forth his novelties and the abortions of his own brain, conceived in wickedness or ignorance, as the true doctrines, and never be at a loss, by some grammatical trick, to find a text to justify them; and thus there would never be an end. Every body knows that Luther's translation of the Bible has brought after it numberless and contradictory heresies, worthy of being condemned to eternal darkness; and that Luther himself is continually changing his own

translation, and never publishes a new edition without altering at least a hundred passages. Were such liberty allowed to all who might choose to make use of it, the time would soon come when a Christian would no longer know what to believe.

These views were by the majority received with approbation, and it was furthermore argued that God had given to the Hebrew church an authentic Scripture, and to the Greek an authentic New Testament; and who could affirm, without offence, that the Roman church, more beloved of God than all the rest, should be left without so great a benefaction? Surely there could be no doubt that the same Holy Ghost which first gave these holy books, had also directed to the translation received by the Roman church.

To others it seemed going too far to consider a man a prophet and apostle because he was the translator of a book; and they modified their idea by saying that the translators had not the prophetic and apostolic spirit, but doubtless one very nearly related to it. And should any one hesitate to attribute to them the influences of the Holy Spirit, he must at least allow these influences to the council; and if, therefore, the council should confirm the Vulgate and pronounce an anathema against those who dared question its authority, then it must be received as infallible, if not through the Spirit which guided the translation, yet at least by the Spirit given to the council which had declared it authentic.

Isidor Clarus, a Benedictine abbot, and a scholar well-read in these studies, ventured, in the way of a historical review, to controvert these opinions, and

said, that in the most ancient church there were several Greek translations of the Old Testament, which were collected by Origen into one book and arranged side by side in six columns. The principal of these was the Septuagint, from which many Latin translations had been made; and the New Testament also had been many times translated from the Greek into the Latin. Of these translations of the Old and New Testament, the so-called *Itala* found the most favor; and this was generally read in the churches, and was preferred to all the others by Augustin; still it was always held subordinate to the Greek text. When that great linguist, Jerome, became aware that the version of the Old Testament, partly through the fault of the Greek translators, and partly through that of the Latin, was in many places defective, he resolved to make a new translation immediately from the Hebrew, and to improve the version of the New Testament by a careful collation of the original Greek. The celebrity of his name induced many to receive his translations, but many rejected them, partly from attachment to the old and suspicion of the new, and partly, as Jerome himself affirms, out of envy. But after time had abated the bitterness of the envy, the translations of Jerome were received by the Latins very generally, and were used together with the *Itala*, the latter being designated as the *old*, the former as the *new*. Gregory gives testimony to this effect, for in his work on Job he writes to Leander, that the apostolic See received both translations, that in his exposition of Job he had used the new because it came nearest to the Hebrew text, yet in his citations

he had sometimes used the one and sometimes the other, just as was most convenient for the purpose in hand. Thus theologians wavering between the two, and using sometimes one and then the other, according to circumstances, they at length combined both into one and gave to this the name of Vulgate. The Psalms, continued Clarus, were retained entire in the old translation, because they, being daily sung in the churches, could not well be altered. The minor prophets were all in the new translation; the major prophets were in a translation made up of the two. No one can doubt that all this was done in accordance with the Divine will, without which nothing can take place; yet no one can say that the human will was not equally concerned in it. Jerome himself had freely taught that no translator is inspired by the Holy Spirit; and since the Latin Bible which we use is mostly in the translation of Jerome, it seems extravagant to attribute to him the special inspiration of the Holy Ghost, when he himself expressly disclaims it. No translation, therefore, ought to be esteemed of equal authority with the original text. For these reasons, therefore, he would advise that the Vulgate should have the preference over all other editions; that it should be revised and corrected by the original text, and then declared to be authentic. If this were done, the other old translations would speedily go out of use, and new ones might be prohibited by a severe edict. Thus all the evils which arise from new translations, and which had been so ably set forth in the preceding congregations, would in a short time pass away.

Andrew de Vega, a Franciscan friar, would mediate between the two extremes. He would allow, with Jerome, that the translator has no prophetic inspiration, nor any gift of the Spirit which renders him infallible; and he would allow, with Jerome and Augustin, that the translations should be examined and corrected by the original text; yet he would add, that these admissions and views need not hinder the church from declaring the Vulgate to be authentic. Such a declaration would imply only that the translation contains no material error in respect to faith and practice, but not, that, in all its expressions and in every shade of meaning, it is equal to the original. No translation can reach to such a degree of accuracy, but must sometimes enlarge and sometimes limit the signification of particular words, and must sometimes avail itself of metaphors and other figures of speech not identical with those in the original. The Vulgate had been in use in the church for a thousand years and upwards, and in this time they had become certain that it contains no material error in respect to faith or practice. The ancient councils had recognized this translation as a sufficient one, and it ought now to be valued according to its worth thus indicated; and it ought to be declared authentic in this sense, that every one might rely on its correctness without hazarding his salvation. Learned men ought not to be withheld, by any prohibition, from applying themselves to the study of the Hebrew and Greek text; but the new and faulty translations, which bring confusion into the church, ought to be restrained.

The many difficulties urged did not hinder the

fathers from declaring, by almost general consent, the Vulgate translation to be the authentic Bible of the church. Some were so moved by the arguments of the theologians, that they wished the subject might be passed over for the present; but the majority were against it. Still, the proposal was made, and it was at length resolved, that the Vulgate, now declared to be authentic, should be carefully examined and corrected, and a copy made out according to which all others should be printed. Six men were selected for this labor, and they were required to engage in it with all diligence that the work might be published before the close of the council. They reserved to themselves the power of adding to this committee, if, in the course of their sessions, men should be found suited to such an undertaking.

Thus the Vulgate was received as the authentic text, and the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, being a part of it, were received with it as canonical, not because there was any argument in favor of the infallibility of the text or any proof of the canonical authority of these books, for all the argument and all the proof was directly the other way; but simply because the state of things was such, that to seem to question the entire accuracy of the text or the canon of the Vulgate, would occasion great inconvenience and trouble to the dominant party in the Romish church, and put them at a great disadvantage in their controversy with the Protestants. Grammarians and linguists must not presume to know more than bishops and cardinals; well-settled ecclesiastics must not be put to the trouble of learning Hebrew and Greek; the

church of the past must not in any respect be put in the wrong, nor must the common people be allowed to lessen their confidence in the teachers set over them in regular succession from the apostles. Whatever might be required by truth and Christian integrity, these things were by no means to be allowed.

There were strong men in that council, well-read and intelligent men, who saw the thing as it was, and labored to set it right; but their voice was lost in the clamor of the multitude, and truth and right availed little against the pressure of an immediate and urgent self interest. We are sorry to say, that the Council of Trent is not the only deliberative body which has been swayed in a similar manner; but that there have been abundant examples of the same kind from that day to this, both in ecclesiastical and political assemblies, and among Protestants as well as Catholics.

In regard to the sense of Scripture, the well-known views of Cardinal Cajetan occasioned no little discussion. This prelate had taught, both by precept and example, that a new interpretation of any passage, if it be in accordance with the text and not opposed to other Scriptures, may be received, although the majority of the doctors are against it; for God did not grant the knowledge of Scripture to the ancients alone, otherwise there would be nothing left for posterity or the present generation to do but just to copy the fathers. Some strongly advocated these sentiments of Cajetan and others opposed them; and, after a warm discussion on both sides, Cardinal Pacheco arose and said, that the Holy Scriptures had already been so well explained by so many pious and learned men, that there

was nothing to be added, and that the new interpretations which, from time to time, were brought forward, could give rise only to heresies. He considered it necessary to bridle the insolence of the present age, and hold it in subjection to the fathers and the church ; and, if a too bold spirit arise, it must be checked and not allowed to gratify itself and disturb the world by its new revelations. This declaration was vastly pleasing to almost the entire assembly. It is such an easy way of getting rid of difficulty and establishing the truth, that conservative majorities in all generations have been very apt to adopt it.

In the congregation on the twenty-ninth of March, the wording of the decree respecting the Scriptures came up for discussion. To many it seemed rather hard to thunder an anathema against a man, and curse him as a heretic, merely because he could not receive every unimportant passage of the Vulgate as authentic, and had some new view of the interpretation of a text or two of the Holy Scripture. After long discussion they concluded to make out the catalogue of the sacred books, including the Old Testament Apocrypha, and fortify that with an anathema, as also the authority of church traditions ; and then, as to translations and interpretations, they would so frame the decree as to make it a remedy against novelties and impertinent expositions. Thus all the learned men of the Roman Catholic church in all time were shut up to a reception of the apocryphal books as authentic and canonical, however clearly their investigations might teach them the contrary, and though they knew that these books had been expressly rejected by almost all the saints

and fathers of the church, who must therefore be regarded as openly anathematized by the council. The attempt of Jahn, and some other learned Catholics, to escape by classing the books as *proto and deuterocanonical*, is wholly unsuccessful; for, though this distinction was proposed in the council, it was triumphantly overborne by an almost unanimous vote, and all the books included in the Vulgate were placed on a footing of entire equality.

At the close of the congregation, Cardinal Montanus eulogized in high terms the wisdom and learning of the members, and earnestly exhorted them to an orderly and seemly behavior in the public session, and to avoid there all opposition and disputation, inasmuch as the points of difference had all been sufficiently discussed in the several congregations; and it was proper that the public decision should be characterized by harmony and unanimity. After they were dismissed, Cardinal Cervinus privately called together those who had opposed the reception of the Vulgate and its apocryphal additions to the original canon, as authentic and canonical, and endeavored to pacify them by urging that it was not prohibited but allowed to correct the Vulgate by the original text, that they were only to allege that there were in it no errors of faith so great that it ought to be rejected.

On the eighth of April the public session was held, and the decrees were read in due form. The catalogue includes the whole of the Old Testament Apocrypha, and the decree declares that the synod receives all the books enumerated, with the same affection and reverence, and then proceeds in the following terms: "But

if any one shall not receive these same books entire with all their parts, as they are wont to be read in the Catholic church, and the old Latin Vulgate edition, for sacred and canonical, and shall knowingly and intentionally despise the traditions aforesaid, let him be accursed."

This surely is sufficiently explicit; and by this decree the council anathematizes the great body of the saints and fathers of the church, as we shall soon see. The next decree is without the anathema, and the first paragraph is in the following terms: "Moreover, the same holy synod decrees and declares, that this same old Vulgate edition, which has stood the test of so many ages' use in the church, in public readings, disputings, preachings and expoundings, be deemed authentic, and that no one on any pretext dare or presume to reject it."

Notwithstanding the strenuous opposition to the sentiment of these decrees while under discussion in the congregation, when they were put to vote in the public session, but two voices were heard in opposition or remonstrance. The poor little troublesome bishop of Chiozza alone ventured to say *no*, but prudently added, *perhaps I shall submit (non placet, sed forsā obediā)*. One other member did not approve that traditions should be received *pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia* (with equal affection and reverence), but for *pari* he would substitute *summa* (for *equal* he would substitute *greatest*) All the others gave an unqualified affirmative.

When these proceedings of the council were made public, there were many, especially in Germany, who

expressed themselves very freely in regard to them. Some said it was strange that five cardinals and forty-eight bishops should take it upon themselves to decide so peremptorily in regard to points of religion of so much weight, and which had hitherto remained undecided, declaring books to be canonical which had thus far been regarded as apocryphal, or at most uncertain, making a translation authentic which in numerous passages departs widely from the original text, and deciding in how limited or how extended a sense men should understand the word of God. Moreover, among all these fathers there were none any way distinguished for learning; there were some good canon lawyers, but they had no extensive knowledge of religious matters; the few theologians there were below mediocrity; the assembly was principally made up of mere noblemen and courtiers; the greater part of the bishops had no actual sees, and those who were really bishops had such small dioceses, that all together they could not be considered as representing even the thousandth part of christendom. From all Germany there was not at this time a single bishop or theologian present in the council.

Others said that the points decided were after all of no such great importance as they appeared to be. As to traditions, the decree was a mere bag of wind; for to what purpose was it to ordain that the church should receive the traditions, and yet not decide which were the true traditions that must be received? Moreover, it was not even commanded that they should be received; it was only forbidden that they should knowingly and consciously be despised; so that one might

even reject them without violating the decree, provided he did it respectfully and reverently. The Papal court itself sets the example of such rejection; for it prohibits the ordination of deaconesses; it allows the people no vote in the choice of their pastors, when this was plainly an apostolic institution and observed in the church for more than eight hundred years; it obstinately withholds the cup from the laity, when Christ instituted the sacrament in both kinds, and it was so received by the apostles, and has been so observed by the whole church till within about two hundred years, and even now in all Christian churches except the Latin. If these be not traditions what else deserves the name? And in respect to the Vulgate, what signifies the affirmation of its authenticity, while the different editions vary so much from each other, and no one of these is pointed out as the correct one?

Such were the comments made at the time, and to this day they have lost none of their relevancy or significance. The *only* authority for the reception of the apocryphal books into the Old Testament canon is the authority of the Council of Trent; and the entire worthlessness of that authority the preceding pages abundantly show.*

* The statements in the above exhibition of the debates and decisions in the Council of Trent, rest on the following authorities: Sarpis's *Geschichte des Koncil von Trident*, uebersetzt von Winterer, Band I. S. 290—298. The same translated by Brent, pp. 150—162. Mendham's *History of the Council of Trent*, pp. 48—68. Marheinecke's *Christliche Symbolik*, II. S. 224—261. Perceval's *Roman Schism*, pp. 158—164.

III. THESE BOOKS NEVER HAD THE SANCTION OF CHRIST OR HIS APOSTLES, OR ANY OF THE WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The New Testament very frequently quotes, and much more frequently contains incidental allusions to, the Old. The Pentateuch, the prophetic books, the Psalms, and other parts of the sacred volume of the Hebrews, were continually in the minds of the writers, and flowed out in all their sayings and writings, as if welling up from the depths of their innermost religious consciousness. But in all these quotations and allusions, we look in vain for a reference to any of the apocryphal books. Though there are many places where incidents of the apocryphal writings would afford illustrations exceedingly apt and beautiful, yet no such illustrations are ever found. If the writers of the New Testament were acquainted with any of these books (and it is scarcely possible to doubt that they had seen some of them), most carefully must they have abstained from alluding to them in their canonical writings.

They sanctioned the whole Hebrew canon as it existed in their time; but they sanctioned none of the apocryphal books, for they never quote them, and these books never formed a part of the Hebrew canon. We speak of the ancient apocryphal books which are printed in the Vulgate Bible, and not of the more recent ones, such as the book of Enoch, the Ascension of Moses, etc. These, it is true sometimes borrow from the New Testament (compare 2 Tim. iii. 8, Jude ix. 14); but the New Testament never from

them, since it is itself more ancient than they are, or at least more ancient than the probably interpolated passages on which the stress is laid.

IV. THESE BOOKS FORMED NO PART OF THE ORIGINAL HEBREW CANON, AND WERE NOT WRITTEN TILL AFTER INSPIRATION HAD CEASED AND THE CANON WAS CLOSED.

On this point we have the most explicit, the entirely disinterested testimony of Josephus, the Jewish historian. In his work against Apion (i. 8), he gives an account of all the books held sacred by the Hebrews, and this testimony is also copied by Eusebius, the celebrated Christian historian (Eccl. Hist. iii. 10). This passage of Josephus we shall quote in full, as it stands in his writings, noting the variations that occur in Eusebius.

“We have not innumerable books which contradict each other, but only twenty-two, which contain the history of all past times, and are justly believed to be divine. Five of these belong to Moses, and contain his laws, and the history of the origin of mankind, and reach to his death. This is a period of nearly three thousand years. From the death of Moses to Artaxerxes [Eusebius: to the death of Artaxerxes], who, after Xerxes, reigned over the Persians, the prophets who lived after Moses wrote down the events of their times in thirteen books. The other four books contain hymns to God and precepts for men. From Artaxerxes to our own times our history has indeed been written; but these writings are not esteemed worthy of the same credit as the former, because since that time we have no certain succession of prophets.

“What trust we put in these our writings is manifest by our deeds. Though so long time has elapsed, no one has ever dared to add to, or take from them, or make any change in them whatever. It is as it were inborn with every Jew, from the very first origin of the nation, to consider these books as the doctrines of God, to stand by them constantly, and if need be, cheerfully to die for them. It is no new thing to see the captives of our nation, many of them in number and at many different times, endure tortures and deaths of all kinds in the public theatres, rather than utter a word against our laws, or the records which contain them.”

Josephus here clearly recognizes the existence of the apocryphal books and expressly excludes them from the canon; while he bears open testimony, as of a matter well known to all the world, to the extreme and scrupulous care with which the Jews preserved all their canonical books free from mutilation and addition and change of every kind.

Comparing these explicit statements of Josephus with the numerous quotations from the Old Testament which he has made in his historical writings, it is quite evident that the twenty-two books which he includes in the Hebrew canon, and which he affirms were held most sacred by the Jews who were contemporary with Christ and the apostles, are the following:

The five books of Moses :

- | | | |
|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| (1) Genesis. | (2) Exodus. | (3) Leviticus. |
| (4) Numbers. | (5) Deuteronomy. | |

The thirteen prophetic books :

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) Joshua. | (2) Judges and Ruth. |
| (3) 2 Books of Samuel. | (4) 2 Books of Kings. |
| (5) 2 Books of Chronicles. | (6) Ezra and Nehemiah. |
| (7) Esther. | (8) Isaiah. |
| (9) Jeremiah. | (10) Ezekiel. |
| (11) Daniel. | (12) 12 Minor Prophets. |
| (13) Job. | |

The four Books of hymns and precepts :

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| (1) Psalms. | (2) Proverbs. |
| (3) Ecclesiastes. | (4) Canticles. |

This is according to the Jewish arrangement and nomenclature of the books, which, in many respects, differs from that which has been received into our English Bibles from the Greek translation of the Seventy.*

V. THESE BOOKS WERE REJECTED WITH SINGULAR UNANIMITY BY THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND THE BEST OF THE CHURCH FATHERS.

(1) *Testimony of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, A. D. 170, who rejects them all.*

Melito was, after the apostles, one of the earliest bishops of the apocalyptic church of Sardis, a distinguished writer, and of great influence among the early Christians. He travelled to Palestine for the express purpose of ascertaining exactly the canon of the Old Testament, and gave the result of his investigations in the following letter to his friend Onesimus, which we find in Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. B. iv. 26)

* Compare Eichhorn's Einleit. ins Alt. Test. B. I. S. 143—163.

“Melito to Onesimus his brother, greeting: Since you have often, on account of your zeal for the word of God, begged of me to make selections for you, from the law and the prophets, concerning the Saviour and our whole faith; and as you, moreover, wished to learn accurately of the old books, how many they are in number and in what order they are written, I have earnestly endeavored to perform the same, well knowing your zeal for the faith and your great desire to learn the word of God; and that, through your earnest love toward God, you desire these more than all things else, striving for your eternal salvation.

“I accordingly went to the East, and, coming to the very place where these things were preached and transacted, I have accurately learned the books of the Old Testament. Their names are as follows: five books of Moses, to wit, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. Joshua Nave, Judges, Ruth, Four books of Kings [two of Samuel and two of Kings], two of Paralipomenon [Chronicles]. The Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon (which is also Wisdom), Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Job. Of the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah; and of the twelve prophets, one book; Daniel, Ezekiel, Esdras” [including also Nehemiah, and perhaps Esther].

Here this ancient bishop excludes every apocryphal book from the canon, though he must have known of their existence. From the names which he gives to some of the books, it is plain that he read them in the Septuagint translation; yet, though the apocryphal books had probably been added to this translation before his time, he carefully excludes them all. The

most ancient church fathers were much more discriminating in their investigation of the sacred books, than the comparatively modern fathers in the Council of Trent. Melito knew whereof he affirmed, for he had examined with the greatest care, at the very source of information, and under the pressure of a very strong and elevated motive.

Melito does not give the name of the book of Esther, and in some other of the church fathers this name is also omitted. But this does not prove that the book of Esther was by them excluded from the canon. Many, supposing that book to have been written by Ezra, included it under the general name of Esdras. In Hebrew the books have no names, but each is designated by its initial word. Melito arranges the books in the order of time, and the four historical books preceding the captivity (two of Samuel and two of Kings) he calls by the general name of Kings, and so it is possible that he might have designated the three historical books subsequent to the captivity by the general name of Esdras, especially as Nehemiah was usually included in that designation, and Esther was by some supposed to be the work of Ezra.*

It is possible, also, that Esther by these fathers might have been entirely excluded, on account of its being so encumbered with apocryphal additions, which they might have found it difficult to separate from the genuine work.

* Cary's *Testimonies of the Fathers*, p. 114. Eichhorn's *Einleit. Alt. Test.* i. 166.

(2) *Testimony of Origen, the great Biblical Scholar of the Early Greek Church, A. D. 200, who rejects them all.*

The testimony of Origen is preserved by Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. VI. 25), and is for substance the following: "It should be observed that the collective books, as handed down by the Hebrews, are twenty-two, according to the number of letters in their alphabet. These twenty-two books, according to the Hebrews, are as follows: (1) Genesis; (2) Exodus; (3) Leviticus; (4) Numbers; (5) Deuteronomy; (6) Joshua, the son of Nave; (7) Judges and Ruth in one; (8) first and second of Kings in one (Samuel); (9) third and fourth of Kings in one; (10) first and second of Chronicles (Paralipomenon) in one; (11) Esdras, first and second (i. e. Nehemiah) in one; (12) Book of Psalms; (13) Proverbs of Solomon; (14) Ecclesiastes; (15) Song of Songs; (16) Isaiah; (17) Jeremiah, with Lamentations and the epistle, in one; (18) Daniel; (19) Ezekiel; (20) Job; (21) Esther."

It is remarkable that, though Origen twice says the Hebrew books are twenty-two, the list which he gives contains but twenty-one. On examination, we find the book of the twelve minor prophets omitted. This added, would make the requisite number of twenty-two. That there is here, not a mistake of Origen, but an error in the text of Eusebius, is manifest from the fact that the Latin translation of Origen by Rufinus has this book, as does also Hilary's prologue to the Psalms. which includes this passage of Origen.* Ori-

* Eichhorn's *Einleit. ins Alt. Test.* I. 169, 170. Perceval's *Roman Schism*, p. 421.

gen's other writings, also, show his acquaintance with these prophets.

It is, perhaps, not easy to determine what Origen intends by the *epistle of Jeremiah*. Possibly it may be the letter contained in the apocryphal book of Baruch, chapter vi. That Origen understood the difference between the canonical and apocryphal books is manifest from what he says in immediate connection with his catalogue: "Separate from these (ἐξω δὲ τούτων) are the Maccabees," etc.

(3) *Testimony of the Apostolic Canons, about A. D. 250, which probably reject them all.*

The text here is somewhat uncertain, and has evidently been tampered with. The copies vary from each other. One manuscript includes Judith, and some admit Maccabees; but the oldest and best copies exclude all the apocryphal books. The following is the catalogue according to the best testimony:

"Let these be the sacred and holy books for all, both clergy and laity, namely, of the Old Testament, of Moses five, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; of Joshua, the son of Nave, one; of Ruth one; of Kings four; of Paralipomenon [Chronicles], the book of days, two; of Esdras two [including Nehemiah]; of Esther one; of Job one; of the Psalter one; of Solomon three, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs; of the twelve prophets one; of Isaiah one; of Jeremiah one; of Ezekiel one; one of Daniel." There is then permission given to read the Son of Sirach. The book of Judges is omitted, unless it be included under the name of Ruth. The text, how-

ever, is so imperfect, that we cannot very confidently rely upon it. Nevertheless, it shows, decidedly, that in the middle of the third century the apocryphal books had not yet found their way as canonical into the Christian church.*

(4) *Testimony of Athanasius, the great Champion of Orthodoxy, A. D. 330, who rejects them all except Baruch.*

The testimony of this father may be found in his works, Tom. II. p. 39, Paris edition, 1629. It is as follows: "The books of the Old Testament are twenty-two, which is the number of the letters among the Hebrews. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, of Kings four, two books; of Paralipomenon (Chronicles) two, one book; Esdras two, one book; Psalms, Proverbs; twelve prophets, one book; then Isaiah, Jeremiah with Baruch, Lamentations, and epistles; Ezekiel and Daniel. Then there are books uncanonical, but readable, the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit."

It is very curious that Athanasius should put Esther among the uncanonical books, and Baruch in the canonical; yet so it reads. Esther was encumbered with many apocryphal additions, and the epistle ascribed to Jeremiah in the book of Baruch was by some received as genuine. This may account for the mistake of Athanasius on this point; and the entire testimony of Athanasius clearly shows, that the apocryphal

* Labbe and Cossart, Concil. I. 44. Perceval's Roman Schism, 421, 422.

books, as a whole, were decidedly rejected by the church in his time.

There is another passage from Athanasius, very valuable on account of the clear distinction which it makes between the canonical and the apocryphal books. It is in the *Epist. Festal.* quoted by Carey (*Testimonies of the Fathers*, p. 117): "Since some persons have attempted to set in order the books that are called apocryphal, and to mix them with the divinely inspired Scriptures, of which we have been fully certified, as those who saw them from the beginning, and who, being ministers of the word, handed them down from our fathers, it seemed fitting to me, being exhorted thereto by the orthodox brethren, and having learned the truth, to set out in order the canonical Scriptures, which have been handed down, and are believed to be from God; that every one who has been deceived, may convict those who have led him astray." Here follows the list. He adds: "It is true that, besides these, there are other books which are not put into the canon, but yet are appointed by the fathers to be read by those who first come to be instructed in the way of piety." He then gives the names of most of the common apocryphal books.

(5) *Testimony of Hilary, the celebrated Bishop of Poitiers, A. D. 350, who rejects them all.*

Prologue to the Psalms, Sec. 15: "And this is the cause that the law of the Old Testament is arranged in twenty-two books, that they may correspond with the number of the Hebrew letters. According to the traditions of the ancients, they are so arranged that

there are five books of Moses; Joshua Nave, six; Judges and Ruth, seven; first and second of Kings, eight; third and fourth of Kings, nine; of Paralipomenon two, ten; book of days of Esdras, eleven; Solomon's Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, thirteen, fourteen and fifteen; twelve prophets, sixteen; then Isaiah, Jeremiah with Lamentations and Epistle, these and Daniel and Ezekiel and Job and Esther, make up the number of twenty-two books. Some are pleased to add Tobit and Judith, to make the number twenty-four, according to the letters of the Greek alphabet."

This hint of Hilary's, which has already been referred to in another part of this discussion, is not an unfair specimen of a very considerable portion of the logic which we find among the good old fathers of the first four centuries. The Greeks had two more letters in their alphabet than the Hebrews had in theirs, and therefore it was well that they should have two more books in their Old Testament canon, to make all correspond; and it is suggested that for this purpose two can be taken out of the Apocrypha! No wonder that where such reasoning prevailed, spurious books sometimes crept in.

(6) *Testimony of Epiphanius, the great opposer of Heresy, A. D. 360, who rejects them all.*

"The Hebrews have two and twenty letters, and five of these have two forms; and also their sacred books are so disposed that they number twenty-two, and yet twenty-seven are found, because five of them are divided into two parts. Thus Ruth is joined to

Judges, and both are reckoned as one book by the Hebrews; and the first of Paralipomenon is joined to the second, and both called one book; the first of Kings is joined to the second, and called one book; the third to the fourth, and so on. Thus the books are contained in four Pentateuchs, and two others remain besides; so that the canonical books are thus: five legislative, (1) Genesis, (2) Exodus, (3) Leviticus, (4) Numbers, (5) Deuteronomy; and this is the Pentateuch and the legislation. Then five are poetical, (6) the book of Job, (7) the Psalter, (8) Proverbs of Solomon, (9) Ecclesiastes, (10) Song of Songs. Then another Pentateuch which is called the writings, and by some the holy writings, which are as follows: (11) book of Joshua, son of Nave, (12) Judges with Ruth, (13) first of Paralipomenon with the second, (14) first of Kings with the second, (15) third of Kings with the fourth, (16) the twelve Prophets, (17) Isaiah, (18) Jeremiah, (19) Ezekiel, (20) Daniel; and this is the prophetic Pentateuch. Two others remain, which are, one of Esdras and this is also reckoned, and another book, which is called that of Esther. Thus the twenty-two books are completed, according to the number of the Hebrew letters." He then mentions two of the apocryphal books, to wit, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the book of Jesus Sirach, and says: "these indeed are useful books and profitable, but they are not placed in the number of the canonical." De Ponder. et Mens. II. 16.*

* Perceval's Roman Schism, pp. 423, 424. Carey's Testimonies, pp. 116—118.

- (7) *Testimony of the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 367, confirmed by the Fourth General Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, which rejects them all.*

The books of the Old Testament which must be read are: Genesis of the world, Exodus from Egypt, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua son of Nave, Judges, Ruth, Esther, of Kings first and second, third and fourth, Paralipomenon first and second, Esdras first and second, book of 150 Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, twelve Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah [and Baruch],* Lamentations and Epistles, Ezekiel, Daniel." Labbe and Cossart, Concil. I. 1509.

- (8) *Testimony of Gregory Nazianzen, the Fellow-student and distinguished Opponent of the Emperor Julian, A. D. 390, who rejects them all.*

Gregory gives a catalogue of the sacred books in one of those poetic effusions of his, which were quite famous in their day. We will content ourselves with simply giving the facts, without attempting to translate the poetry.

"All the historical books are twelve. The first is Genesis, then Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and the Second Law (Deuteronomy). Then Joshua, and Judges, and Ruth the eighth. The ninth and tenth books are the deeds of the Kings, then Paralipomenon, and you have Esdras the last. Five are the poetic

*The book of Baruch is omitted in the best copies; see above, p. 282, debates in the Council of Trent.

books, of which the first is Job, then David, then three of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song, and Proverbs. Five also are those of the prophetic spirit. Twelve [prophets] indeed are in one writing, Hosea, Amos, and Micah the third, then Jonah, Joel and Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah, Haggai, then Zachariah and Malachi. These make one book. The second is Isaiah, then Jeremiah, who was called from the womb, then Ezekiel, and the grace of Daniel. He gave two and twenty ancient books, corresponding to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet."

He then speaks of other books (τούτων ἐκτός) "separate from these," and (οὐκ ἐν γνησίοις) "not among the genuine;" thus showing that he was acquainted with the apocryphal books, and intelligently rejected them.

(9) *Testimony of Amphilochius, the celebrated Bishop of Iconium, A. D. 390, who rejects them all.*

Amphilochius is the one who invented the argument, once so famous, which convinced the Emperor Theodosius of the deity of Christ. Going to the emperor to induce him to take some measures against the Arians, he purposely omitted showing any respect to his son Arcadius. The emperor manifested indignation, and the bishop boldly said: "Sire, are you offended that an indignity is offered to your son? Then be assured God must abhor those who treat his Son with disrespect." The emperor, of course, after this, was very severe on the Arians.

The catalogue of Amphilochius is also in poetry, but it is not necessary for our purpose that we translate into verse.

"I will speak of the first books of the Old Testament. The Pentateuch, the Creation [Genesis], then Exodus; Leviticus is the middle book, after that, Numbers, then Deuteronomy. Add to these Joshua and Judges; then Ruth, four books of Kings, and two books of Paralipomenon; and upon these the first of Esdras, then the second. I will mention to you in order the five poetic books: Job, pressed with conflicts of various sufferings; the book Psalms, the melodious cure for souls; three books of Solomon the wise, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs; and to these add the twelve prophets, Hosea first, then Amos the second, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, also Jonah, the type of his three days' passion, after these Nahum, Habakkuk, then the ninth Zephaniah, Haggai and Zachariah, and the far-famed messenger Malachi. After which learn four prophets, Isaiah the great free speaker, Jeremiah the sympathetic and mystic, Ezekiel, and Daniel the last, the same most wise in words and deeds. To these some also add Esther." *Iamb. ad Sel.*

This father, like some others, suggests a doubt as to Esther; but in all other respects his canon is precisely like ours, and excludes every one of the apocryphal books.

(10) *Testimony of Jerome, the great Biblical Scholar of the Latin Church, the Author or Compiler of the very Vulgate itself, A. D. 400, who clearly and decidedly rejects them all.*

No one of the fathers had ever studied so thoroughly the literature of the Bible or understood it so well as Jerome. If Origen were his equal or even his su-

perior, in general learning and iron industry, Jerome had most decidedly the advantage in sound judgment and common-sense principles of interpretation. Jerome divides and arranges the books of the Old Testament in the following manner: (1—5) five books of Moses; (6) Joshua; (7) Judges and Ruth; (8) two books of Samuel; (9) two books of Kings; (10) Isaiah; (11) Jeremiah's Prophecy and Elegy; (12) Ezekiel; (13) twelve minor Prophets; (14) Job; (15) Psalms; (16) Proverbs; (17) Ecclesiastes; (18) Song of Solomon; (19) Daniel; (20) two books of Chronicles; (21) two books of Ezra, i. e. Ezra and Nehemiah; (22) Esther.

In his *Prologus galeatus* to the Vulgate, he makes the following statements, which are directly in the teeth of the decisions of the Council of Trent in respect to that very Vulgate. "There are twenty-two letters in the Hebrew alphabet . . . and five of these letters have two forms, to wit, Caph, Mem, Nun, Pe, Tsade. Hence with most, five of the books are divided into two, to wit, *Samuel*, *Melachim*, *Dibre Hajam-mim*, *Esdras*, and *Jeremiah* with *Cinoth*, that is, *Lamentations*.

"As there are, therefore, twenty-two elements, by which we write in Hebrew all that we speak . . . so there are reckoned twenty-two volumes. . . . The first book among them is called *Beresith*, which we name *Genesis*, the second *Veele Semoth*, the third *Vajicra*, that is, *Leviticus*, the fourth *Vajedabber*, which we call *Numbers*, the fifth *Elle Haddebarim*, which is styled *Deuteronomy*. These are the five books of Moses, which they appropriately style *Thora*, that is, the *Law*.

“They make a second rank of the *Prophets*, and they begin with *Jesus the son of Nave*, whom they call *Josue ben Nun*. Then they add *Sophetim*, that is, the book of *Judges*, in which they include *Ruth*, because her story belongs to the time of the judges. Third follows *Samuel*, which we call the first and second of *Kings*; the fourth *Melachim*, that is, *Kings*, which is contained in the third and fourth volume of *Kings*. The fifth is *Esaias*, the sixth *Jeremias*, the seventh *Ezekiel*. The eighth is the book of the *twelve Prophets*, which among them is called *Thereasar*.

“The third rank contains the *Hagiographa*. The first book by *Job* begins; the second is by David, the volume of *Psalms* in five divisions. The third is Solomon, having three books, *Proverbs*, which they call *Misle*, that is, *Parables*, the fourth *Ecclesiastes*, that is, *Cohemoth*, the fifth *Song of Songs*, which they entitle *Sir Hassirim*. The sixth is *Daniel*; the seventh *Dibre Hajammim*, that is, the *Words of Days* . . . which among us is entitled the first and second of *Paralipomenon* (*Chronicles*). The eighth is *Esdras*, which the Greeks and Latins divide into two books [*Ezra* and *Nehemiah*], the ninth is *Esther*.

Thus there are twenty-two books of the *Old Law*, five of *Moses*, eight of the *Prophets*, and nine of the *Hagiographa*. Some put *Ruth* and *Cinoth* in the *Hagiographa* . . . , and then the books of the *Old Law* are made twenty-four.

“This prologue of the Scriptures can serve as a fortified approach to all the books which we translate from the Hebrew into Latin; so that we may know that *whatever is beyond these must be put in the Apoc-*

rypha. Therefore the book of *Wisdom*, which is commonly entitled the *Wisdom of Solomon*; the book of *Jesus the son of Sirach*, *Judith*, *Tobias*, and *Pastor*, ARE NOT IN THE CANON. I have found the *first of Maccabees* in Hebrew; the *second is Greek*, as it can be proved from its very phraseology."

Preface to *Jeremiah*. "We omit the book of *Baruch* . . . which does not exist and is not read among the Hebrews."

Preface to *Daniel*. This book, "among the Hebrews has neither the story of *Susannah*, nor the hymn of the three youths, nor the fables of *Bel* and the *Dragon*."

Jerome also makes a similar remark in regard to the apocryphal additions to the book of *Esther*. In the very text of the *Vulgate* itself he notes with the most scrupulous care every apocryphal addition to the sacred text; and, had the Latin church but heeded the teachings of her great master on this subject, her Bible would never have been contaminated by its spurious excrescences nor would the fathers of the Council of Trent have made a decision alike discreditable to their reputation as scholars and their sincerity and integrity as Christian men.

We will adduce but one other witness.

(11) *Testimony of Rufinus, the learned Translator of Origen, A. D. 400, who rejects them all.*

Ruffinus was a theological opponent of Jerome, and had many a sharp controversy with him in regard to Origen; but when he gives a catalogue of the sacred books, he agrees with Jerome exactly, and then pro-

ceeds to remark: "These are they which the Fathers concluded within the canon; of which they would have the assertions of our faith to consist. But we must know that there are other books, which are not called canonical, but ecclesiastical, by the ancients; such as the Wisdom, which is called of Solomon, and another Wisdom, which is called of the Son of Sirach; which book among the Latins is called by this general term 'Ecclesiasticus,' by which word, not the author of the book, but the quality of the writing is designated. Of the same order is the little book of Tobit, also Judith and the books of Maccabees."*

From the preceding exhibition it is as plain as daylight can make anything plain, that the Romish church, in receiving the apocryphal books as a part of Scripture, has not only set at nought all historical truth, but acted in direct violation of its own fundamental principle. The *unanimous consent of the fathers* is what she requires for the establishment of a doctrine; but on this subject, instead of a *unanimous consent*, for the first four centuries she is met with an all but *unanimous dissent*. Her maxim is to receive only *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, (what always, what every where, what by all), is received; but here she obviously receives *quod nunquam, quod nullibi, quod ab nullo*, (what never, what nowhere, what by nobody,) is received; and she anathematizes the Protestants and spurns their Bible as *mutilated* because they exclude from it those spurious writings which were excluded with most remarkable unanimity by the churches and

* Perceval's Roman Schism, p. 426. Carey's Testimonies of the Fathers, p. 119.

the fathers of the first four centuries, including their own most boasted saints and their own most celebrated churches, the saints of Rome and the very church of Rome itself among the rest. The only shadow of a discrepancy from the strict Protestant view of the Old Testament canon, which we find in any of them, is, that, in one or two instances, the book of Baruch seems to be included and the book of Esther excluded. Yet even these instances, as we have already seen, are far from being certain; as to the great mass of the apocryphal books, the testimony against them for the first four centuries is unequivocal, unimpeachable, and perfectly decisive. The decree of the Council of Trent on this subject was neither more nor less than a most wretched blunder, arising partly from ignorance and partly from partisan heat and blindness. A church which claims infallibility, can never correct her own blunders, but must hold on upon them till they eat the very heart out of her, as a man may be destroyed, mind and body, by the morbid growth of an ineradicable wen.

The fourth point proposed, to wit, the examination of the apocryphal books themselves, will afford ample material for a separate discussion in the volume on the Old Testament.