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TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

The work now offered to the public is translated from the fifth and last German edition, which was published in 1848, about a year before its lamented author's death. Although some of the questions discussed in it have since that time so changed their aspect as to require a different treatment, the work as a whole has not been superseded. It is still a standard of high authority, and possesses a permanent interest and value. The translator at one time entertained the idea of adding to the notes, and filling out the list of works referred to, so as to show the changes and results of critical thought and inquiry during the past ten years, and thus, so far as possible, while leaving the original unaltered, to bring the work into line with the most recent criticism. The prospect of being able to do this within any reasonable time was, however, rendered too uncertain, by the pressure of other engagements, to warrant the attempt. The work is therefore presented in the form which De Wette gave it,—a monument in the history of New Testament literature.

The translator has sought to make his work as correct as possible. His aim has not been elegance of style, but fidelity and accuracy in the rendering of the thought. The
better to secure this, he subjected his manuscript to the examination of Professor Noyes, of the Cambridge Theological School, and the proof-sheets to the keen scrutiny of Ezra Abbot, Jr., Esq., of Harvard University. To both of these gentlemen he begs to express his thanks for the improvement which the work has received at their hands.

THE TRANSLATOR.
AUTHOR'S PREFACE

TO THE FIRST EDITION.

In giving at length to the public this long-announced Introduction to the New Testament, with the joyful feeling which attends the completion of a long-delayed task, I cannot conceal my fear of disappointing the expectations which seem to have been entertained respecting the work. The friends of critical inquiry may be dissatisfied because the results arrived at are, to a large extent, indefinite; while they who regard our Holy Scriptures with devout reverence only, may be disturbed by the freedom of the investigation. I would gladly have arrived at results more definite and more in harmony with the views generally received in the Church; but the Truth can alone decide. That is no genuine love of Truth which is not ready to sacrifice its inordinate curiosity where certainty is unattainable, as well as its pious prejudices. The value of criticism I place chiefly in the activity to which it excites the spirit of inquiry; but this spirit of inquiry can never harm a genuine Christian piety.

There are two subjects of investigation in regard to which I have especially failed to satisfy myself,—the History of the Text, and the Origin of the first three Gospels.
vi  AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

My fears respecting these long discouraged me from undertaking the work. In the history of the text I have done little besides giving the opinions of others. In the inquiry concerning the Gospels, I regret being compelled to offer a new hypothesis, or a new modification of an old one. The genuineness of two books I have distinctly denied, that of several others doubted, or stated the arguments for and against; but in general I cannot be charged with excessive scepticism. I desire only that my work may be put to the severest test, and give occasion to fresh investigation of the truth in this department of study.

THE AUTHOR.

BASFL, August 18, 1826.
PREFACE

TO THE FIFTH EDITION.

In the edition of 1842 — the second edition appeared in 1830, and the third in 1834 — this work was materially altered and enlarged, especially in the sections devoted to the Ancient Versions, the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles. It has undergone, however, a more important alteration in this, the fifth edition, in the sections on the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline Pastoral Epistles, the Catholic Epistles, and the Revelation of John, but without essentially changing the conclusions arrived at. In the section on the Uncanonical and the Canonical Gospels, I was obliged to defend my views against the criticism of Baur and his school, to scare away the apparitions summoned back by them of the Gospel of the Hebrews as the oldest of all the Gospels, and of the original Luke, and to oppose the hypothesis belonging to their "tendency" theory of criticism, that the third Gospel is merely an arbitrary creation out of the materials of the first, as well as to resist the destructive attacks directed by the same criticism against the fourth Gospel. This necessitated an almost entire recasting of the sections therewith concerned. It will be found that I have placed myself decidedly more than heretofore...
among the defenders of the Gospel of John, although I am still far from being so decided as my friend Bleek. His valuable "Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik"—whose dedication to me gave me great pleasure—has done me most excellent service in this as well as other departments of my labor. I thank him for it with the cordiality of a true friend. My experience in New Testament criticism is singular. When I first entered this field I stood in the foremost rank, and was regarded by many as a dangerous assailant. Now I behold myself thrust back into the middle rank of conservative critics,—who indeed are far in advance of the Apologists who would retain the whole,—and yet my views and position are in general unchanged. I hope that this new tempest will pass over, as did that raised by Strauss. I admire the learning, acuteness, and dialectic skill of Dr. Baur, but in his investigations I miss freedom from bias, and blame the excessive haste with which he always seeks positive results, at the sacrifice of thoroughness; as, for instance, in respect of the Gospel of the Hebrews and Marcion's Gospel. I can, notwithstanding, learn from him, and wish that others likewise would do so, and oppose him with candor and calmness. To oppose his "tendency" theory by a style of criticism of the same character, is not serving the truth. Nothing is gained by magisterial decisions and bold assertions, arbitrary explanations and forced combinations; nor does a writer's assertion become true and valid, because another writer pronounces it excellent, "truly an acquisition." I cannot avoid declaring myself openly against the efforts of our young Apologists, and I take the liberty of warning especially Mr. H. W. J. Thiersch to use his gifts and acquirements more modestly, and not to make too light of things. What
expectations were excited by his "Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunktes für die Kritik der neutestamentlichen Schriften," and what has he therein achieved? Can a scientific man hope to solve the problem of the origin of the Gospels by a mass of verbiage like that in pp. 75–230? Mr. Thiersch has not even touched the real knots! Does he imagine that his dictum can establish the genuineness of the Second Epistle of Peter, and reverse the relation between it and the Epistle of Jude? I invite Mr. Thiersch to dismount from his high horse and enter with us on the work of a modest and thorough investigation. But that will not do; he is Evangelical, and we belong in a measure to the race of Antichrists. Mr. Thiersch and his associates hold a belief in the present contents of the canon such as neither the ancient Fathers nor the Reformers held,—a belief wholly unworthy an Evangelical Christian, and which would be ridiculous were it not in the highest degree pitiable. This delusion, and not the truth, is furthered by their criticism. Into harmony with this everything must be brought, whether it bend or break in the process. The critic, it is true, should not be without a theory or a belief; but his belief must be genuine belief, that is, belief in the historical truth of the Christian revelation, not in the views and the dicta of men. Such a belief will not enslave him nor blind him to the truth, nor prevent his freely using the rules of grammar, the art of interpretation and criticism. Of critical works in this sense there are not many in our day, and therefore I joyfully greet Dr. Schwanbeck and his "Versuch über die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte," a work based on firm historical grounds. The mistake which, in my judgment, he has frequently committed, of being too hasty in reaching positive results, it is to be hoped he will
try to avoid in his Second Part. — In the sections devoted to the Pauline Pastoral Epistles and the Catholic Epistles, the influence of my labors on my Exegetical Handbook, and the results of the same, are manifest. The investigation respecting James the brother of the Lord has also, I think, been improved by revision. — As regards the Apocalypse, I would gladly have used the new edition of Lücke's "Einleitung"; notwithstanding, I flatter myself that I have made some not unimportant improvements. — If sometimes I have forgotten works or essays by new writers in this department of theology, I ask pardon in advance. Attention and memory, alas! often fail me.

THE AUTHOR.

Basel, November, 1847.
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DIVISION I.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE CANONICAL BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

SECTION I.

OF THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Why was the New Testament written in Greek?

§ 1.

The Greek language was at that time extended over the whole civilized world. It prevailed even in several cities of Palestine,¹ and was to the Jews of Egypt, and of all other foreign lands, the language of the Bible and of literature. As soon, therefore, as Christianity passed the bounds of Palestine, it was necessarily propagated in this language, although at the outset it was preached first to the Jews (Acts xi. 19, xiii. 46). At an early period, however, there were found among the Christians native Greeks or Greek Jews, who preached the Gospel to the Greeks (Acts xi. 20). At Antioch, the point whence proceeded the missions to the Greeks and the Greek Jews (Acts xi. 20, ff., xiii. 1, ff.), the Greek language and culture prevailed. Barnabas and Paul, who led these missions, were Greek Jews; and the latter was probably the father of the New Testament literature (cf. § 60). Ancient tradition claims for but one of the New Testament books a non-Greek original (§ 97). The supposition of other such originals is inadmissible.²

¹ Joseph. Antt. XVII. 11. 4: Γάζα γαρ καὶ Γάδαρα καὶ Ἰππος Ἑλληνίδες
ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.


Impureness of the New Testament Language.

§ 2.

The Greek of the New Testament writers is not pure, but Judaistic. This arose from their Palestinian origin and education, from their imitating the example and yielding to the influence of the earlier Jewish-Greek Bible translators and writers, and from the nature of the spiritual matter which they had to present, which, being foreign to the Greeks, was in part borrowed from Judaism and in part new. The impureness, however, refers to the use of language rather than to the construction of sentences, and is greater in some writers than in others. The Greek, moreover, which they thus transformed, belonged to the so-called Common Dialect, especially to the popular language, and, in respect of certain peculiarities, to the Macedonio-Alexandrian popular language.

Hence we may discriminate in the language of the New Testament three elements: 1. the Greek; 2. the Jewish; 3. the Christian.


§ 3 a.

The superstitious reverence for the Bible prevailing among Protestants opposed an obstacle to the unbiased recognition of this mixed character of the New Testament language. Hence arose the controversy between the so-called Purists and the Hebraists.


§ 3b.

Although the latter have triumphed, the remarks of the former are not all to be rejected. A too hasty assumption
of Hebraisms was, to quite a late period, one of the vices of exegesis. Later biblical scholars and philologists, as C. F. A. Fritzsche, Winer, and H. A. W. Meyer, have gained themselves honor by their exact application of Greek philology to the language of the New Testament. Even here, however, there is danger of overdoing.

§ 4.

The language of the New Testament and the Septuagint has been considered a dialect, and termed Hellenistic, from the Greek Jews, who were termed Hellenists.\(^a\) But it is not a dialect, in the common sense of the word. Even the term Hellenistic seems inappropriate, although ελληνιστής, Acts vi. 1, ix. 29, denotes a Greek Jew.\(^b\)

The term Alexandrian dialect is improper, both for the New Testament language and that of the Septuagint, because it indicates the peculiar character of the Alexandrian Greek alone. The most correct term is the Jewish-Greek language, and, in regard to the New Testament, the New Testament language.


\(^b\) Salmatus’s opinion (cf. Carpzov. Crit. sac. V. T. p. 507. Eichst. ad Mor. I. 227), that the word in the passage referred to denotes a Greek proselyte, is without foundation; at least the circumstance that Nicolas (Acts vi. 5), a proselyte of Antioch, was one of those deacons who were probably selected from the Hellenists, proves nothing. That Paul (2 Cor. xi. 22, Phil. iii. 5) calls himself a Hebrew, and not a Hellenist, proves as little. In Acts xi. 20 we should read Ἠλληνας instead of Ἠλληνιστάς. See Griesbach on the passage.

§ 5.

To the right understanding of any historical phenomenon a proper apprehension of its origin and development is indispensable. Hence the New Testament philologist must not only reduce the New Testament language to its elements, but also from these reproduce it, as it were, in a living form. Thus he will avoid the danger of treating it as a spiritless and lifeless compound,—a mode of handling which affects not only the language, but also, and too sensibly, the ideas closely connected with it. To solve this problem successfully, he must, at the outset, gain a clear apprehension of its two component elements, namely, Hellenism and Judaism. (See Lücke, Hermeneut. p. 92.)

§ 6 a.

For the proper treatment of the Greek element, a knowledge of the Greek language in its pure, classical development among the Attics, and of its change into the so-called διάλεκτος κοινῆς, is necessary. This change, occasioned by the Macedonian conquest, was produced by the infusion of elements which in part were borrowed from other dialects, in part followed the general usage pretty closely, but differed from the especial peculiarity of the Attic, and in part came into use in the course of time. For comparing the New Testament language with both kinds of pure Greek we have valuable preparatory works, although they need sifting.

* For a knowledge of the difference between the earlier and the later Greek, see Phrynichis Eclogae nominum et verb. attior. c. nott. Nuncessi, Hoechstii, Scaligeri et de Pauw, ed. expl. C. A. Lobeck. Lips. 1820. 8vo.

The New Testament philologist has next to trace the distinctive peculiarities of the later popular language which appears in the New Testament, and into whose composition the various dialects entered, although the Macedonian predominated.*


Examples of the later Greek. Those indicated by * are found in no Greek author, but belong perhaps to the language of the people. Words: ἀναπόθομον, ἔπιστας, πάντοτε, καθώς for καθά, διαπορισθαί, ἵππος, ἱστανθήτως, ἱστάνθητι, ἱστανθήσαται, ἰστανθήσονται, ἰστανθήσαται, σκορπίζω. Word-formations: μετακεισθαί, γενεά, ἀναπόθομον, ἀπορίζω, ἀποφαίνω, ἀπαίνω, καθορίζω, καθῆρετο, ἱστανθήσαται, ἰστανθήσαται, σκορπίζω. Word-forms: ἁρέται for ἅρεται, σαρανά, κατά, νοεῖν γι' αὐτόν; τὸ πλούσιον for τὸ πλούσιον; δόοι, indeclinable in the genitive. Want of the dual: contractions, as ἀρτομάς from ἀρτομίδαρος, δημάς from δημίτριος στὶ δημαρχεῖον, κατά. Exchange of the terminations of the 2d aorist for those of the 1st aorist; as, ἀδειαν, ἀδραν (LXX.), ἠδρατε, ἡπειρα, ἠδόραν, παρελθέστω (Codd. N. T.); ἔγνωκαν for ἔγνωκα, ἐθλοῦσαν for ἐθλοῦσαν; κανακάσαν for κανακάσα, ἔδρα τῆς for ἔδρα τῆς, ἡμεθά τῆς. Rarity of the optative: construction of ἵνα with the pres.; weakening of ἵνα in such forms as θέλω ἵνα; prepositions with adverbs. For other examples, see Klausen, Hermen. d. N. T. p. 339, ff. Win. § 3. Eich. Einl. IV. § 13.
Supposed Cilicisms of the Ap. Paul. Hieron. ad Algasiam, Quaest. 10: Multa sunt verba, quibus juxta morem urbis et provinciae suae familiarius Apostolus utitur. E quibus ex gr. paucia ponenda sunt. Mihi autem parum est judicari ab humano die, h. e. óπο ἀνθρώπινη ἡμῖν (1 Cor. iv. 3); et, humanum dico, h. e. ἀνθρώπινον λέγω (Rom. vi. 19): et, ovi κατενάρκησα ἡμᾶς, h. e. non gravavi vos (2 Cor. xii. 13): et quod nunc dicitur, μηδὲς ἡμῖν καταβραβεῦστω, i.e. nullus brabium accipiat adversum vos (Col. ii. 18). Quibus et alius multis verbis usque hodie utuntur Cilices. Cf. Stolberg de Cilicismo a Paulo usurpatia, in his Exercit. ling. Gr.


§ 7.

For the proper treatment of the Jewish element of the New Testament language, an intimate acquaintance with the old Hebrew tongue, and with the books of the Old Testament, is needful, as well as a careful comparison of the Alexandrian version with it; for the Hebrew has exerted, not only a direct influence on the New Testament language, but also an indirect, through this version. An acquaintance with the apocryphal books of the Old Testament is also useful. As, moreover, at the time of Christ an Aramaic dialect was the language of the country parts of Palestine, its influence on the New Testament language must also be traced. For this, a comparison of the Syriac version, and of the Talmudic and Rabbinical writings, is useful. Preparations for this investigation have been made with more industry than judgment.


Examples of Hebrew words: ἀμίν, σατάν, σατανᾶς, κορβάν, βάτος, σίκερα, &c. Hebrewisms: Greek words with Hebrew meanings: αἰών, δικαιοσύνη, εἰρήνη, ἀνάθεμα, κοινόν, κρίσις, σάρξ, ψυχή, ρήμα, thing; δόξα, brilliancy, &c., φάβορ, φοβεσθαι of religious reverence, νύμφη, daughter-in-law, ξύλον, δύσκειν, ἔξομολογισθαι, to praise, ἐξβόλευς, send out, περιστερίων,
behave; Hebrew word-formations, phrases, and connections: παραδοθεῖα, πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, προσωποληπτικόν, τὸ πρόσωπον στηρίζεσθαι, ἵνα ἔχῃ κυρία, ἰδεῖ τὸν θάνατον, ἐρχομαί ὑπόσω, πορεύομαι εἰς, ἀμφιβάλομαι ἐκεῖνον, ἐκλει- γομαι εἰς, εἶναι εἰς, μια τῆς βασιλείας, μια ἀπειθείας, κρίνει τῆς ἄδικης, σκέψεως ἐκλογῆς, τὰ μέτα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης, εἰσελθομεν ἐν γυναικί, δύο ἄγια, προσέθηκεν πέμψας, πᾶς — αὐτ, &c.


Examples of Aramaic words: δῦμα, μαμωνᾶς, ρακά. Aramaismes: ἀφε- εῖνα τὸ ἀφελέματα θάνατον ὑποκείμενον ἁμαρτόν ἄνθρωπον, ὀμολογῶν ἐν τῷ, μία σαββάτων.

§ 8.

Rightly to treat of the usage of the New Testament language, one should be able to plant himself in the very spirit of primitive Christianity in general, and of each New Testament writer in particular, and thus, as it were, to observe the very process by which new expressions and new conceptions were formed from the existing materials. Here, too, the comparison of the apocryphal writings of the New Testament, and of the ecclesiastical writers, in which the New Testament language was still further developed, renders good service.a


Examples of N. T. idioms: δικαίωσις, δικαιοδοθεῖσα, πίστις, ἔκκλησις, ἐκκλησία, ἐκλεκτος, καμινίτης πνεύματος, γλώσσας λαλεῖν.

§ 9.

The Greek Church having for some time preserved, besides its ecclesiastical language, a generally correct under-
standing of the New Testament, the explanations of the old interpreters, scholiasts, and glossarists may profitably be used."

SECTION II.

THE ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Their Classification and Literature.

§ 10.

These must, like the versions of the Old Testament, be classified according to their immediate or mediate character, and to their age. We shall first adduce the Eastern, and then the Western.


§ 11a.

The ancient version in general use in the churches of Syria, called the Peshito (comp. Pt. I. § 64) contains in all its manuscripts, with a single exception (the Bodleian), and in the older printed editions of the New Testament, only the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the thirteen Pauline Epistles, together with the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 John, and the Epistle of James.a The omission of the remaining books, viz. 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse, is a remarkable circumstance in the history of the canon.b
PESBITO. § 11 a.


In regard to the manuscripts of the Peshito, of which the oldest are written in Estranghelo, while the Nestorian are suspected of containing occasional alterations (e.g. 1 Cor. v. 8, fermento puritatis instead of azymis puritatis), see J. G. Christ. Adler, N.T. vers. Syr., simplex, Philox.

b Cosmas Indicopleustes de Mund. 1. VII. (Galland. Bibl. Patr. XI. 535) : παρά Ξώροι δή εἶ μή αἱ τρεῖς μόναι αἱ προγεγραμμέναι ἕνεκεν εἰρήκοντες. λέγω δὲ Ἰακώβου, Πέτρου, καὶ Ἰωάννου. Dionys. Barsalibi (fl. 1166 – 1171) says in the preface to his Commentary on 2 Peter: This Epistle was not translated into the Syriac in ancient times with the (Holy) Scriptures, and is, therefore, found only in the translation of Thomas of Harkel. Hug (§ 65) supposes that the Apocalypse (cf. Eichhorn, Einl. II. 433) and the missing Catholic Epistles were not omitted until after the fourth century, because Ephrem Syrus knows and quotes these books; and indeed, as he was not acquainted with the Greek, must have read them in a Syrian translation. But this omission is quite inconceivable. Cf. Bertholdt, p. 635. Guericke, Beitr. z. histor.-krit. Einl. ins N. T. p. 2, ff. Michaelis’s (I. 363, ff.) doubts whether the version of the Epistle to the Hebrews belongs to the Peshito are set at rest by Hug, § 66.

§ 11 b.

The above-mentioned Bodleian manuscript gives the missing Catholic Epistles in a more modern and more literal version, but far inferior to the Peshito. We may assume, on the ground of a comparison which has been instituted, that this version contains the original text of the Philoxenian version before its revision by Thomas of Harkel (§ 13). That of the Apocalypse (in a Leyden and a Florentine manuscript) is shown, both by its literal character and by an extant account, to be a part of the same, after its revision by Thomas.

a It contains the Acts and the three Catholic Epistles according to the Peshito, and also the four above mentioned: 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude.

Crit. sacr. Amst. 1683. fol. The translation of these books is found also in Vol. X. of the Paris Polyglot, in Vol. V. of the London, and in the Guthirian and Leusden-Schaaf editions.

§ 11 c.

The later origin of the New Testament collection (Pt. I. § 21) does not allow of our ascribing an apostolic origin to the Peshito, or of dating its composition earlier than the end of the second century.\(^a\) It is old, in part because the so-called Antilegomena were not received into it; in part because it was accepted by all the Syrian church parties; in part because the text on which it is based is very old. The early Christian literature of the Syrians, beginning with Bardesanes (after the middle of the second century), also indicates that they early felt and met the want of a Syrian translation.\(^b\) That the Peshito was in church use in Edessa in the first half of the fourth century, is attested by Ephraem.\(^c\)

\(^a\) Traditions of the Syrians that Achæus, a disciple of the Apostle Thaddeus, was the author. Assemani Bibl. orient. II. 486. Michael. Einl. I. 386, places it in the first century. Hug, § 67, thought he observed a difference in the style of translation, and therefore of authors; against this, see Eichhorn, p. 406.

\(^b\) Hug, § 68. But in the remark (Euseb. H. E. IV. 22) of Hegesippus: ἐκ τοῦ καθ' ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς ἑβραῖος διάλεκτος των τίθει, — this scholar may be in error in finding a trace of the Syriac version, although το Συρ. cannot be the Gospel of the Hebrews written in Syriac (Olshausen, Echt. d. Evangg. p. 41).


§ 11 d.

The Peshito is an immediate, faithful, free, but seldom paraphrastic, translation. It even contains many Greek words. Also some errors, which can be explained only from the original text.\(^a\)

\(^a\) Greek words: ἀνάγκη, Matth. xviii. 7, and elsw. ; στοιχεία, Gal. iv. 9, and elsw. ; τυμη, ἄγρος, ξένος, Matth. xxvii. 6, f., and elsw. Mistakes: substitution of ἐπάροις for ἐπάρος, Luke xiv. 31, 1 Cor. iv. 6, and elsw. ; substitution of ἐκκλήθησαν for ἐκκληθοῦσαν, Mark vi. 1 ; of ἐπουρ. for ἐπουρ., Eph. vi. 12 ; — false construction : miratus est et credidit
THE ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

doctraen Christi, Acts xiii. 12. Free translations: omission of synonyms, Jas. i. 17, πάντα δόξας ἐγνώκα τινὰ δ́ ἡρμα τίλεων, omnis donatio bona et completa; Matth. xxiv. 24, σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τίρανα, signa magna; — omission of repetitions, Matth. v. 17, οὐκ ἦλθον καταλύειν, nemo nunc ut desctrum; Matth. iv. 23, xxiv. 38, xxv. 20; — omission of adjectives, αὐτος, Matth xxvi. 50; of pronouns; of the copula εἰμί; of an unnecessary verb, as ἀπο, Matth. xvii. 27; of conjunctions, as γάρ, καί, ὅτι; of adverbs, as ἐρε, ἢδη, ὥστε; — insertion of the copula εἰμί, Eph. ii. 7, and elsewhere; of adjectives, as ἐξ, Matth. viii. 2; of pronouns (often, not always, our Lord for the Lord), conjunctions, and adverbs; — change of substantives into adjectives, Eph. vi. 12, and the reverse, Eph. iv. 17; of one preposition into another, Matth. xxii. 37, and elsewhere; of one conjunction into another; of one case into another; of the active into the passive, and the reverse; of one tense into another; — change in the order of the words. Acts xxiii. 27, 31, σπαραγώς, Romanj. Matth. xvii. 19, ἐξῆλθον αὐτό, sanare illum; Acts ii. 42, προοριστοῦντες . . . κ. τῇ κοίμησιν κ. τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἀρτοῦ κ. ταῖς προσευχαῖς, et communicamus in precatione et in fractione eucharistiae, cf. Acts xx. 7; Matth. xii. 4, ἀπὸ τῆς προβιτέσεως, panis mensae Domini; 1 Cor. xi. 20, οὐκ οὕτως κυριακῶν δεῖσιν φαγεῖν, non, sicut justum est in die Domini nostri, comeditis et bibitis.

§ 11 e.

The text which this version follows is one of the oldest, and is closely related to that of Cod. D, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, and the Ital. 8, though often quite independent. Its use in criticism, if more carefully collated than heretofore, is important. Through its happy apprehension of the sense, it often renders the commentator good service.


* — indicates the omission, + the addition.

THE ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.


Offspring of the Peshito.

§ 12 a.

1. The Arabic version (probably prepared for the Syrians who spoke Arabic) of the Acts, the Epistles of Paul, James, 1 Peter, 1 John, called by the critics Arabs Erpenii.* That the Peshito is its parent has been most fully proved by Michaelis in the Book of Acts, although some sections of this book seem drawn from the Coptic version, and variations from the Syriac text also occur elsewhere.† The original text of the version of the disputed Catholic Epistles, in the Arabic New Testament of Erpenius, is uncertain.§


§ 12 b.

2. The Persian version of the Gospels, in Vol. V. of the London Polyglot,* shows its descent from the Peshito by misunderstandings of the Syriac text, by retaining Syriac words, and by peculiar readings of the Peshito.†

* Latin translation by Chr. A. Bode. Helmlst. 1751. 4to. in 4 pts. Against Mill’s and Bengel’s critical use of this version, see the same author’s Pseudo-critica Millio-Bengeliana. Ital. 1767. 2 vol.
† Eichh. V. § 90. Cf. § 11 e, note a. Besides the instances of critical variation there adduced, observe: Matth. x. 39, + τὸν βασιλέα; Luke viii. 11, the Pesh. does not give πορευόμενοι, the Pers. has it; Matth. i. 22,
PHILOXENIAN VERSION. § 13 a.


§ 13 a.

Another Syriac version contains all the books of the New Testament, excepting the Apocalypse (unless the version of this book mentioned in § 11 b belong to it), and differs from the Peshito, on which it is based, by a literalness so extreme as to be ungrammatical. Its text is moreover furnished with the Hexaplar signs, and the majority of the MSS. have critical and other remarks in the margin. It bears the name of Philoxenus or Xenaias, the Monophysite Bishop of Hierapolis, in whose time, and at whose request, it was prepared by the rural bishop Polycarp, A. D. 508, either to promote an exacter understanding of the Scripture (Bertoldt), or for a Monophysite sectarian purpose (Hug, Eichhorn). In A.D. 616 it underwent a revision by Thomas of Harkel (Harclea, usually Heraclea, whence it is also called the Harclean version), who collated it, in Alexandria, with two (or more) Greek MSS. It has been printed from this revision.*

* It has more Greek words than the Peshito, and even in the Greek cases (e.g. Mark i. 28); it imitates the Greek article by means of the pronouns οὖν, &c., the Greek etymology (e.g. of εὐρίθεια by timor pulcher), the Greek construction (e.g. John iii. 4, erat ei vestem, Mark xiv. 58, δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, per [⚫] tres dies, instead of in tribus diebus, Pesh.). Even the suffix pronoun, pleonastic in Syriac, is marked by an ovelos, Mark xiii. 26.

b Subscription of the Gospels, in Adler’s Versa. Syr. p. 45, sqq.: “Est autem hic Liber quatuor Evangelistarum s., qui conversus fuit ex lingua Graeca in Syram cum accuratissima sua et labore magni primum quidem in Mabug urbe a. 819 Alexandr. Mac. (Chr. 508) in diebus s. dom. Philoxeni confessoris, ejus urbi episcopi. (Polycarp is mentioned by Moses Agelaeus, in Asseman. Bibl. or. II. 83.) Collatus autem fuit postea multum diligentia a me Thoma paupere cum duobus (al. tribus) exemplaribus Graecis in Antonia Alexandri urbis magnae, in monasterio Antoniano, iterumque (⚫⚫) scriptus et collatus est in loco dicto a. 927 ejusd. Alexandri, indicatione quarta,” etc. On account of this iterum, Michaelis Storr, and Hug suppose a second revision or collation, but Eichhorn gives the word

"redditum est tertio Alexandriæ opera piii Thomæ Charkl." But in the passage before referred to he expresses himself otherwise, and the above subscript is decisive. Thomas was contemporary with the author of the Hexaplar Syriac Version of the O. T., Paul of Tellah (Pt. I. § 49), and perhaps imitated him.


§ 13 b.

What part of the Philoxenian version, in its present form, belongs to Polycarp, and what to Thomas, has become a subject of critical speculation. The critical signs and the remarks are ascribed by Wetstein and White to Thomas; but as a Medicean MS. in Florence, examined by Adler,* lacks the subscript in which Thomas is mentioned, and yet contains these signs, these must, as Storr supposed, have been already introduced, at least in part, by Polycarp. It is, however, disputed whether they refer to the variations of the new translation from the Peshito (*Wetst., Storr, Eichh., Griesb.*), or have come from a MS. of Origen’s already supplied with such signs (*Hug, Bertholdt*).b The marginal remarks Storr and Eichhorn ascribe in part to Polycarp, but Hug and Bertholdt to Thomas only,* for that Medicean MS. has nothing in the margin.

* Verss. N. T. Syriacæ, p. 52, seqq. He considers it as the apographum antiquioris Philoxenianæ vers. a Thoma Charklensi nondum revisæ et castigatae.

b They seem really to refer to the Peshito in the passages: Matt. xvi. 28, Pesh. quod sunt quidam qui stat hic; Philox. quod sunt quidam ¼ ex
This version is valuable in the criticism of the New Testament, and especially on account of the ancient readings contained in the marginal notes; although the confused state of its text makes its use in criticism difficult.

The critical signs have in part disappeared, the readings of the text come into the margin, and those of the margin come into the text, &c. Storr (ut supra), pp. 23, 41, f., 45. Eichh. p. 469, ff. The readings of this version Wetstein has already noted, in part, however, incompletely, and in part incorrectly; after him Gloc. Ridley, De Syr. veras. indole et usu dixit. Philoxeniannam cum simplici o duobus pervert. Codd. MSS. ab Amida transmissis conferens. Oxon. 1761, (in J. J. West. Libelli ad crit. et interpr. N. T. ed. Semler), Storr, Observ. super N. T. veras. Syr. 1779, and especially, with the use of White's edition, in Eichh. Rep. X. 1, ff. (but only on the Gospels: comp. also Mich. Or. Bibl. XVI. p. 146, ff.) they may be found in the editions of Griesbach and others.


§ 14.

A Vatican MS. of A.D. 1030, from a convent at Antioch, contains an Evangelarium in a Chaldean-Syriac dialect,
similar to that of the Jerusalem Talmud, and in a peculiar character. In its readings it often differs from the Peshito and the Philoxenian, and follows Codd. B and D.a


II. Ethiopic Versions.

§ 15 a.

1. The ancient Ethiopic version of the N. T., which may have had the same origin as that of the O. T. (see Pt. I. § 50), was made immediately from the Greek text, which it often follows very literally, and with misunderstandings. Its critical character is very variable; yet it often agrees with the Itala and the Peshito.b It has been very incorrectly published.c

b Schmidt, Einl. II. 142, ff. Hug, § 98. Eichhorn, § 78. Misunderstandings: Matt. iv. 13, ἐν ὅριοις Ζαβουλῶν,' in monte Z.; Acts ii. 37, κατενίγγασαν τῇ καρδίᾳ, aperti sunt quoad animum (καταροίχησαν); Acts iii. 20, προεκρωμένον, quem praecipit (but also Cod. 46 has προεκρομένον); Luke viii. 29, πέδαις φωλιασόμενος, a parvulis (παιδίοις) custoditus; 1 Cor. xii. 28, καὶ οὐκ ἔδετο, κ. τ. λ., autem (οὖ) posuit ecclesias. The Ethiopic often agrees with the Coptic. Hence Bengel thought it a translation of the Coptic. Against this, however, are many examples of variation (Chr. B. Michael. De var. N. T. lec. § 26). Agreement with the Itala against the Peshito: Matt. vi. 4, προσεύχεσθε, εἰκὸν ἐστεθεί; xiv. 3, καὶ ἔδεστο omitted; xvi. 3, ἰππορναί omitted; — with Pesh. contrary to It. : Matt. xi. 10, ἔργον instead of τέκνων; xiii. 52, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν or τῇ βασιλείᾳ (It. εἰς τῇ βασίλειᾳ); Mark i. 10, where the It. has the addition καὶ μένων; John i. 18, θεός instead of υἱός, with both; Matt. ix. 8, ἐφοβῆθησαν; ver. 13, εἰς μετάνοιαν omitted; ver. 35, ἐν τῷ λαῷ omitted; John i. 42, πρώτων; Eph. v. 9, φωτός, and often; — but frequent variation from both: Matt. xii. 35, τῆς καρδίας. It is a peculiarity of this version that it often combines two different readings: Mark xv. 8, ascendit et clamavit; Luke vi. 48; John i. 28, vi. 69, xii. 28.

c Edited by three Ethiopic ecclesiastics, Rome, 1548 – 49. 2 vol. 4to.
EGYPTIAN VERSIONS. § 16a.


§ 15b.

2. Of the version in the later Amharic dialect only a fragment of Luke is known. *


III. Egyptian Versions.

§ 16a.

The New Testament, like the Greek Old Testament (Pt. I. § 51), was translated into native Egyptian (Coptic), after the Greek language had been supplanted by the Coptic and become unknown even to the majority of the clergy. The existence of Egyptian versions of the Bible in the fourth century has been proved with tolerable certainty. * Perhaps, however, their origin dates in the second half of the third century. *

* Even in the fourth century all the monks in the Tabennic convent and on the shore of the Red Sea spoke Egyptian only (Renaudot, Liturg. Orient. collect. I. 205). Bishops who knew not Greek attended the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Hence, the Scriptures must soon have been read in divine service, not only in Greek, but also in Coptic. That this was the custom is shown, partly by a passage from an old Coptic glossary in Renaudot, p. 207, and partly by the very old fragment of John published by Georgi (see following §, note a). The Egyptian monastic regulations, especially of Pachomius, require the reading of Scripture, psalm-prayers, &c., which could scarcely take place except in the native language. Münter, Ueb. d. kopt. Ubersa. des N. T., in Eickh. Allg. Bibl. IV. 26, ff.

§ 16 b.

1. The version in the Upper Egyptian or Sahidic dialect, probably the older, of which only fragments and readings are known, agrees in its readings oftener with Cod. D, but also with the other most ancient Codd. and the Peshito, and is a valuable document.\(^a\)


§ 16 c.

2. The Lower Egyptian or Memphitic version, which has been published entire,\(^a\) often agrees with the Sahidic, but follows also its own course. Its readings, on the whole, follow the oldest text (that of Codd. ABCDL, Syr. It.).\(^b\)


According to Münter, in Eichh. Allg. Bibl. IV. 403, the text of this version is Alexandrian in Acts and the Epp., but in the Gospels more Western. Eichhorn holds that the comparison in 1 John by Woide, Or. Bibl. X. 199, ff., also shows the former. But as the Cod. Clarom. is here silent, it cannot be brought into the comparison. On the other hand, I have found that, when the Coptic agrees with ABC, others (such as the Syr. Vulg.) usually follow it, and that it frequently differs from the former; e.g. 1 John i. 3–5, ii. 6, 8, 21, iii. 2, 13, 14, 17, (+= τώκειον) 18, iv. 3 (+= εὐ απόκ. Δ.). In the Ep. to the Romans it often agrees with Codd. AC, especially in omitting xvi. 24; but sometimes also with DEFG, e.g. vii. 23, x. 5, 8, xiv. 16, xv. 10, 24, xvi. 26. In the Gospels it follows none of the characteristic readings of Cod. D, as Hug, § 23, ff., gives them, and in Mark i. ii. it coincides eleven times with the Alexand. Codd. (cf. also the omission, Mark xi. 26), and, on the other hand, not with D in the characteristic readings, ii. 19, 22, 23, 24, 27 (compare, however, the addition in Luke vi. 20, with Cod. 1. all. Arm. It.). According to Hug, § 93, the Coptic version follows in the Gospels the Codd. BCL, in Acts and the Epp. ABC, or (according to his system) the revised text of Hesychius, which is manifestly incorrect. More correctly, Eichh. § 95. According to our observation, it very frequently agrees with the Codd. ABCDEFG, though it not seldom varies from them, and adheres to the common text, e.g. Rom. ii. 8, 17, vi. 11, viii. 26, x. 15, xiii. 9, xv. 8, xvi. 14.

§ 16 d.

3. Remains of an Egyptian version in the Basmuric dialect are extant. It is disputed to what province this belongs. Perhaps it is only a variety of the Sahidic, from which the version seems to have come.


Hug, § 96. Tychsen, in Michaelis's N. or. Bibl. VIII. 311, ff.

Copto-Arabic Versions.

§ 17.

Translations of the Bible from the Coptic into the Arabic became a necessity in Egypt, as, in consequence of advan-
cing Mohammedanism, the Coptic language became superseded by the Arabic. The Arabic of the Apocalypse in Erpenius’s Arabic N. T. is a translation of this sort. Of an Arabico-Coptic version of the Pauline Epistles, the letter to Philemon has been published.b


b By Hug, § 103. [He gives, however, only the first eleven verses.]

IV. Armenian Version.

§ 18.

The Armenian version of the N. T. has the same origin as that of the O. T. (cf. Pt. I. § 52). It was made from the original Greek text; for Joh. Ekeleensis and Joseph Palensis, who assisted Miesrobr in the work, had (A.D. 431) brought with them a Greek Bible from Ephesus, and gone thence to Alexandria to perfect their knowledge of Greek. According to Gregory Bar-Hebraeus, this version has been interpolated from the Peshito (I. § 52, note c), and indeed its text has great affinity with the Syriac, though this may have its ground in the MS. or MSS. which they used. As little does its relationship to the Itala justify the assumption of interpolation from the Vulgate, from which 1 John v. 7 has, without doubt, been smuggled in.b


b Examples of agreement with the Peshito, see § 11 c, note a. With D, It.; Matt. xv. 39, ἡμέρας τριῶν, kal, κ. τ. λ.; xviii. 33, oὐκ ἐξει αὐν, κ. τ. λ. with Vulg. Sahid.: xix. 10, τοῦ ἀνδρός with Ambr.: Mark ii. 9, ἐπαναστάτη τῶν οὐκ οὖν σου; ver. 26, ἐφέυλη, κ. ἔδωκε . . . . οὖν, oὐκ oὐκ ἔχεσθαι, κ. τ. λ.; iv. 39, τῷ ἀνέμῳ κ. τῇ θαλάσσῃ κ. εἰπε; v. 33, δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐνεποιήκει λάθρα. Frequently this agreement is supported by other testimony, as B, Orig., e. g. John iv. 30, 46, Gal. iv. 21, 25, Hug, § 87, ascribes a mixed character to the Armenian text. Eichh., § 81, calls it an approximation to the unrevised text. Bredenkamp, in Mich. Or. B. VII. 139, ff., Alter in Paul. Mem. VIII. 186, ff., have given collations.

Edition in the whole Armenian Bible (I. § 52); latest critical ed., Venice,
IMMEDIATE ARABIC VERSIONS. § 21 a.


V. Georgian Version.

§ 19.

The Georgian version of the N. T. is immediate (I. § 53), but, like that of the O. T., interpolated from the Slavic.

Various readings have been collected from it by Alter, Ueber georgianische Literatur. Wien. 1798. 8vo. p. 26, ff.

VI. Persic Version of the Gospels.

§ 20.

The edition of a Persic version of the Gospels, begun by Wheelock and finished by Pierson, gives a mixed text, the MS. of the above-mentioned Syro-Persic (§ 12 b) having been more or less used. As an authority in criticism it is worth little. It appears in the critical apparatus as Pers. W.

* Quatuor Evagg. D. N. J. Chr. vers. Persica, Syriacam, et Arab. saussimae redolens, ad verba et mentem Graeci textus fideliter et venustae concinnatae. Cod. tribus MSS. . . . collati per Abr. Whelocum, etc. sub auspiciis et imp. . . . D. Thom. Adams. Lond. 1657. fol. So Rascon., III. 156, gives the title. According to others, the work has two titles with different dates [viz. 1659 and 1657].


VII. Immediate Arabic Versions.

§ 21 a.

1. An Arabic version of the Gospels is extant in several editions from two MSS. (a Roman and a Leyden) with
variations. It was prepared immediately from the Greek, but has suffered interpolation from the Syriac and the Coptic. On account of its use by the Syrians and the Copts, we must assign to it a tolerably ancient origin.

1. Evang. s. Dom. n. J. Chr. conscriptum a quatuor Evangelistias ss. i.e. Matth., Marc., Luc., et Joh. Rom. in typogr. Medici. 1591. fol.; 2d ed. Arab. Lat., with new title, 1619 and 1774. 2. In the Arab. New Testament of Erpen. Leyd. 1616. 3. In the Paris Polygl., from the 2d Roman ed., with some alterations by Sianita (cf. Hug, § 106). 4. In the London Polygl., from the Parisian. Lately, 5. In the Syro-Arabic N. T. Rome, Press of the Propaganda, 1703 (§ 11 a, note a). The variations are, in part, of small consequence, and consist of orthographical differences, substitution of synonymous words, change in the position of words, and the like, but in part also in readings; e.g. Matt. ix. 30, Erp. et dixit iis, Rom. et Polygl. dicens; x. 18, Erp. vobis, Rom. et Polygl. illis; vi. 16, Rom. thesauros tuus, ibi cor tuum; Erp. Polygl. thesauri vestri, ibi erunt corda vestra; — and also in readings which lean towards the Syriac and Coptic text; e.g. Matt. ix. 10, Erp. Copt. + Σιωνος; i. 22, Syr. Polygl. — λεγονος. Against the assertion of a difference of text in the four editions, which Wallon and Bode made in different ways, Storr (De Evangg. Arab. Tub. 1775. 4to) has shown that the editions are essentially alike. In No. 5, Hug, I. 438, found likewise the text of the Erpenian.

Etymological translations, e.g. Luke iii. 1, καὶ τεταρακοῦντος, κ. τ. λ. dum Herodes esset princeps super quartam partem Galilaeæ; xv. 25, τῶν πολιτῶν, ex magnatibus (from πολὺς); Luke xxii. 6, ἥσιμολογος, gratias egit, is peculiar; Matt. xxv. 21, εἰ δοῦλε ἐγαθι καὶ πιστεί, εἰλι διὰ γὰρ πιστεῦ, bene est, serve bone, fidelus inventus es in paucio, is mistaken. Cf. Mill. Prollegg. § 1260, sq. Hug, I. 443, f.

Occasioned by the use among the Copts and Syrians of bilingual codices, and of such manuscripts as the Vienna Cod. of the Arabic Gospels, No. 43, which has marginal and interlinear notes containing various readings from the Peshito, the Coptic, and the Greek text. Cf. Storr, 1. c. § 20, sq.


§ 21 b.

2. The likewise immediate translation of the Acts, the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse, in the Paris and London Polyglots, is by another author, who was probably a native of Cyrene. It follows the Constantinopolitan text.

* Proofs of its immediate character: Acts xii. 13, Ἡρόθη, rome; xix. 9, Τυράννου τινός, cujusdam ex magnatibus; xxviii. 11, εἰ πλοῖο παρακεχυ-
GOTHIC VERSION. § 22 a.


VIII. Gothic Version.

§ 22 a.

Of a Gothic version only the Gospels were found at first, in the Codex Argenteus, at Upsala, from which they have been printed. Fragments of the Epistle to the Romans were afterwards found in a Codex rescriptus in the Wolfenbüttel library. Important fragments of the Pauline Epistles (but not of the Epistle to the Hebrews), and two fragments of Matthew, have recently been discovered at Milan.


Several scholars have erroneously regarded this translation as Frankish. But the nature of the language, in which Greek and Latin words occur, and a comparison of it with other remains of the Gothic language, place the matter beyond doubt. The author is the Gothic Bishop Ulfilas (fl. A.D. 359), to whom history ascribes the invention of a Gothic written character and a translation of the Bible. It is made from the original Greek text, and its critical character stands about midway between the oldest unrevised text and the common text. It has experienced alterations in accord with the old Latin versions.
Gothic Version. § 22 b.


* Simeon Metaphrat. in Act. Sanct. Sept. V. 41. ed. Antv.: ὁδρείλος τὴν λεών ὡμον γραφήν .... ἀνὸ τῆς ἀλάδος εἰς τὴν γονικὴν γλώσσαν μεταβολὴν. Proofs of its immediate character: the approximation of the Gothic language to the Greek in the use of attraction, of participle construction, and the like; the closeness with which it follows it in the order of words; imitation of the Greek etymology, e. g. δικαναύματα, allbrunst, κερανθήσεα, kethrustakeins (tent-pitching), γύκαια, inniuitha (innovatio); many errors, e. g. substitution of διπτει for διποσει, Mark ix. 8; 1 Thes. v. 14, of ἄνωξιον. for ἄνωί.

* Acc. to Hug, § 140, Eichh. § 87, its text is the Lucian or Constantinopolitan (!). It often agrees with the oldest codds. and the other versions, e. g. Matt. vi. 18, viii. 8, ix. 13, 35 (cf. § 11 e, note a); xi. 2, διᾶ, with BCDPZ Syr. utr. Arm.; Mark i. 2, 11, ii. 1, 17, 18, 20, John vi. 29, 39; Rom. vii. 6, ἀποθανόντες; x. 1, xiii. 9; Gal. ii. 14, πῶς; iv. 17, ἤματ; iv. 26, — πώς; 1 Thess. iii. 2, v. 3, — γὰρ. It wants the pericope John vii. 1, 8. Observe too, Luke vi. 20, — τῷ πνεύματι, with Att. Syr. hieros. Arm. It often follows the common text in opposition to the oldest authorities, e. g. Matt. xx. vii. 4, Mark i. 5, ζ. βαπτ. πάντες; 16 (error in Grs. Sch.), 54, ii. 9, καὶ; John vi. 40, 58, 69, Rom. viii. 18, 25, viii. 38, (even against Eus. Damaasc.) xi. 22, xii. 11, 1 Cor. vii. 5, Gal. iii. 1. (against Chrys. Theodoret. Theoph. Oec.) iv. 6, 15, 1 Thess. ii. 15, iv. 13, and has its additions, but with other versions, Matt. vi. 14, Mark vi. 11. Sometimes it has the common reading only in part: Mark xi. 10, ἐν ὕπομ. without εὑροῦ; Rom. viii. 1, μὴ κ. σάρκ. πέπειν. without ἀλλὰ κ. πνεῦμα; or unites two readings, as Matt. viii. 8. A middle position is taken by the readings Matt. v. 47, φιλοῦσα, with EKLMS, many cursive MSS. Arm. Syr. p. Slav. Theoph.; Mark i. 5, ἐκοροενσάτο with EFHLS It. Theoph.

2 Cor. v. 10, τισα instead of τις. Wetstein (Proll. p. 306, ed. Seml.) erroneously assumes that the translator used Latin codices; Griesbach also (Zahn, p. 34) that the codices used by him were related to those on which the Latin version was based. Zahn, Hug, Eichh., Gabl.-Loeb., rightly assume that the translation was altered in Italy after Latin versions. Collation with such produced the marginal note lustuns (voluptates) on Eph. ii. 3, to the word viujans (voluntates). The words annastodeith (incipit) and ustauk (explicit), which stand at the beginning and the end, betray Latin influence. The Euthalian subscripts are also later additions. Gabl.-Loeb. Proll. p. xxiii.

IX. Slavic Version.

§ 23.

The Slavic Bible translators, Cyril and Methodius (I. § 54), in translating the N. T. used Greek MSS., probably of Constantinopolitan origin. Hence many critics consider the text also Constantinopolitan. Whether this version was subsequently altered after the Latin is a disputed question.\(^b\)

\(^a\) So Hug, § 143, after Alter's collation, in his edition of N. T. I. 1192, ff. According to Dobrowsky (Michael. N. or. Bibl. VII. 158, ff.), on the other hand, it follows chiefly Codd. D and L. Eichhorn, V. § 87, calls it Lucian or Constantinopolitan, but much mixed with Hesychian. Its relation to the oldest and to the common text as compared with the Gothic is characteristic (§ 22 b, note e). With the last it follows the first in Matt. viii. 8, Mark i. 11, John vi. 22, 39, 69, Gal. ii. 14, iv. 17, without and contrary to it in Mark i. 34, ii. 9, John v. 40, 58; without and contrary to the last it follows the second in Matt. vi. 18, ix. 13, 35, xi. 2, Mark i. 2, 5, ii. 1, 17, 18, 20, Rom. x. 1 (in opposition to Chrys.,) xiii. 9 (against Thdrt. Thphlct.) with it in the remainder of the passages quoted in § 22 b, note e. The bias of this translation towards the later text thus preponderates, as indeed its later origin (ninth century) would lead us to expect.

\(^b\) Hug (2d ed. I. 492, 3d ed. I. 523) modifies his earlier charge (1st ed. I. 436), yet rather out of respect for Dobrowsky — who, in his Slavanka (Pt. 2. Prag. 1815), defended the Slavic version — than from conviction. Eichhorn, § 89, explains the Latinizing of the Slavic text from the character of the Asiatico-Byzantine text, on which it is based, which is interspersed with Alexandrine-Oriental readings.

X. Latin Versions.

1. The Ancient Version before Jerome (the Ital.)

§ 24.

The remarks made in Part I. § 48, respecting the Old Testament, apply to the origin and character of the old Latin version of the New Testament, excepting that the latter is extant in a more complete and uniform shape, and comes directly from the Greek original. Its rendering is not only word for word, but often literal even to solecism. In its characteristic readings it follows the oldest documents, especially Codd. Cantab. and Claram. (D), and is remarkable for various excrescences and corruptions.

though altered by various readings (so also Wiseman, Two letters on some parts of the controversy concerning 1 John v. 7, etc. Rom. 1835. Lachm. ed. N. T. maj. p. xi.), and supports this assertion by examples of similar mistakes which run through the different quotations. Acts i. 6, si in hoc tempore substitui, etc. Cod. Laud. Cant.; si hoc in tempore representabis, etc. Aug. Mark x. 40, ἄλλοις for ἄλλ᾽ οί, Cant. Veron. Verc. Corb. (but also Cod. 225. Aeth.). John i. 13, δε ... ἐγεννηθή, Iren. Tert. Aug. all. He recommends the conjecture Usitata instead of Itala, and asserts the African origin of this translation, chiefly on the ground of its agreement with the Sahidic, from which he concludes that the text came thither from Alexandria.

b Mistakes: Matt. vii. 24, unum pietetur, ἀνέξετα; instead of ἀνέξεται; Eph. iv. 9, desperantes, ἀπελπισότες instead of ἀπελπιστές; Hebr. vi. 1, fundamentum diruenteres, θημελιῶν καταβαλλόμενοι. More examples in Wetstein (Prolegg. p. 226. ed. Seml.), among which, however, there are some which rest on false readings.

c διμ, that, it translates, even when used merely as a mark of quotation, by quia, quoniam. Matt. ix. 16, Mark ii. 21, πλήρωμα, plenitude, multitudo, fortitudo; John ix. 7, κολυμβήθησα, natatoria; ix. 24, clamaverunt eum; Luke iv. 30, ἄφιναι (to leave), dimittere; Rom. i. 24, ἐπιθυμία, desideria; ver. 28, δοκίμωσα, probaverunt; Gal. iii. 15, ἐπικατάλεγεν, superordinat; John v. 18, quarebant illum occidere, cf. vii. 20, and often; viii. 37, verbum meum non capit in vobis; x. 31, bajulaverunt lapides; xii. 13, exierunt in obrviam; iv. 33, adultil illi mandacere; vi. 19, juxta navem fieri; vii. 8, cum immanerent interrogare; iv. 23, adoraverunt patri; ix. 31, pecatorum audit; Matt. ix. 21, si tetigero ... vestimenti ejus; Luke ix. 19, nihil vos nocebit; Mark viii. 38, me confusus fuerit; Rom. i. 16, non erubescat evangelium; John i. 50, v. 20, majora horum; ix. 3, ut manifestetur opera Dei; xvii. 26, caritas quam dilexi esti me. Hebraism: John ii. 7, inplete hydriam aquam.

esurient et sitiunt, Ver. Corb. all. without D; John iii. 6, + quia Deus spiritus est, Corb. + et de s. ex Deo natus est, Verc. Harl.


Its Daughter, the Anglo-Saxon.

§ 25.

The Anglo-Saxon version of the N. T., of which the Gospels are known, comes from the ancient Latin, and is, therefore, probably older than that of the O. T. It had probably several authors; at least the Gospels were translated by several.


2. The Improved Version by Jerome.

§ 26.

Jerome, in improving the old Latin version (Pt. I. § 48), began with the N. T., and first with the Gospels. Proceeding very cautiously, he consulted only old Greek MSS. on whose text the old Latin version was based, and altered only where the meaning had been essentially changed; on
which account in his Commentaries he often varies from the translation. He asserts that he translated the whole N. T.

This improved version of the N. T. shared the fate of Jerome's translation of the O. T. (Part I §§ 70 - 72), suffered the same corruption, was subjected to the same critical attempts at improvement, and passed through the same editions. 


c Hieron. l. c.: Praetermitto eos codices, quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum asservit perversa contextio: quibus utique nec in toto Veteri Instrumento post LXX interpretis emendare quid licuit, nec in Novo profuit emendas: quum multarum gentium linguæ Scripturæ ante translatæ doceat falsa esse quae addita sunt. Igitur haec praesens praefatione polliceetur quatuor Evangelia—codicum Graecorum emendata collatione, sed veterum. But perhaps he sometimes consulted others also, as he does in his Commentary. Comment. on Matt. xxiv. 36: In quibusdam Latinis codicibus additum est neque filius: quum in Graecis et maxime Adamantii et Pierii exemplaribus hoc non habeatur adscriptum. Comm. ad Gal. iii. 1: Quod in exemplaribus Adamantii non habeatur, etc.

c Hieron. Praef. in Evangg.: Quae ne multum a lectionis Latinæ consuetudine discrepant, ita calamis temperavimus, ut his tantum, quae sensum videbantur mutare, correctis reliqua manere pateremur, ut fuerant. He thus dropped the most of those excrescences (§ 24, note c), and placed, e.g. Rom. xii. 11, Domino instead of tempor; 1 Tim. i. 15, fidelis instead of humanus; restored, v. 19, the words nisi sub duobus aut tribus testibus. But he did too little in this direction, and let much remain, e.g. Gal. v. 7, [μὴ δὲ υἱὸς ἑαυτοῦ]. The text of the Vulgate agrees with that of the It., other old versions, and the oldest codd. in most of the passages adduced in § 11 e, note a, as Matt. vi. 15, 18, viii. 8, ix. 13, 35, Mark i. 9, 11, 21, f.,
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Acts ii. 30, iii. 12, Gal. iii. 1, — τῆς ἀληθ. κ.τ.λ., and is also, on other grounds, one of the most valuable critical authorities. But it adheres to the bad readings of the Itala, in opposition to better (Luke xiv. 5), or to all codd., Acts ii. 1, iii. 12, and leaves it where it has good readings, Luke iii. 2, Acts iii. 20, Gal. iv. 15, 2 Cor. xi. 3.

Ad Eph. iv. 19: ἀπηλχαγηθέντος multo aliud in Graeco significat quam in Latino desperantes, quippe qui ἀπηλχαγηθέντος nominantur, etc. Other examples in Wetst. Prolegg. p. 228, ed. Seml.


SECTION III.
OF THE CRITICISM OF THE TEXT.

SUBDIVISION I.
HISTORY OF THE TEXT.

CHAPTER I.
HISTORY OF THE EXTERNAL FORM OF THE TEXT.


§ 27.

These greatly to be wished for documents were early lost. No trace of them is discoverable, even in the remotest antiquity. As, however, it is important for criticism to gain just views of the original external form of the text which comes under its review, we must seek to supply their loss, in some degree, by the teachings of ancient literature.


Legend of the discovery of the autograph of the Evang. John in Philo-
the same in Ephesus, Chronicon Paschale, ed. Du Fresne, p. 5. . . . aoró τε τὸ ιδιόχερον τοῦ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ, ὅπερ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν πεθύναται χριστι βεοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἐφεσίων ἀγωνίατῃ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, κ. τ. λ.


**Writing-Materials, Writers, Style of Writing.

§ 28 a.

The N. T. authors probably used Egyptian paper (πάνυρος, χάρτης, see 2 John 12), and the letter-writers the finer Augustan, which was very perishable. Subsequently, however, the N. T. was written on parchment* (διβέραι), and still later on cotton paper. The character generally in vogue was the uncial character. The smaller so-called cursive character first became general in the tenth century. The writing usually had neither division of words nor punctuation, and was without accents, breathings, or the iota subscriptum. Hence MSS. and old commentators sometimes divide the words of the N. T. differently. They also disputed about the division of the sentences, and differed from each other.


* Montfaucon, Palaeogr. IV. 262, sq. But there are also later MSS. in the uncial character, e. g. Cod. Evang. Mat. V. sec. XII. vel XIII., Cod. Evang. X. Ingolet. sec. XI. [Errors here. Cf. Scholz, N. T. I. p. xliii., sqq.] The Greeks after the time of Aristophanes of Byz., under Ptolemy Epiph., used punctuation for grammatical purposes (Montfaucon, p. 31). The stichometric method of writing was also known. Joseph. Antt. Lib. XX. s. n.: Ἕξι τούτους δε κατασαρόν τὴν ἄρχαλογλαν, Βίβλοις μὲν εἰκονι περιελημμένου, ἕξ δὲ μυρίαν στίχων. Comp. Martianay, Prolegg. ad Hieron. Opp. I. IV. 3. Morini, Exercitatis p. 444. The same Aristophanes is said to have divided the old sign of aspiration ἦ in halves, and to have used the one for the rough breathing, the other for the smooth; but most likely
the use of these signs was long confined to the schools. At length they found admission into the uncial writing of the N. T. and into the Codd. Vat. Clarom. etc. See the examples of writing in Montfaucon and Blanchini. — In the most ancient times an iota postscriptum (e.g. τῷ instead of τῷ) was sometimes used, sometimes not. After the fourth century it fell into disuse, and is wanting in all the uncial MSS. of the N. T.

4 Phil. i. 1, received text, σῶν ἐπισκόπους; Codd. 39. 67. 71. al. Chrys. Theoph. Cassiod., συμπισκόπους. Phil. ii. 4, received text, ἐκατος σκοπητή; All. ἐκατος σκοπητής οἱ σκοποῦντες; Cod. Boern., ἐκάτως καποῦντες. Ep. Jud. 6, received text, ἀλλὰ ἀπολυόντας; Cod. Diez. ἀλλαπολυόντας. Gal. i. 9, προειρήκας; Syr. Αοθ. all. προείρηκε μάν.

* Epiph. Anc. c. 75. p. 80. ed Pet. complains that some divide John i. 3 thus: πάντα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδείς; and proposes to divide it thus: πάντα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδείς, δὲ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ. Chrysost. Homil. V. in Joann.: 'Ο γὰρ δὴ τὴν τελείαν στιγμὴν τῷ οὐδὲ ἐν ἐπιθρόμον κατὰ τοὺς αἰερηκούς (the Macedonians). Ἐκείνῳ γὰρ βουλόμενον τὸ πνεῖμα πνεύμων εἰπότως, φανε τὸ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ, ζωή ἦν ... δό ταύτην ἀφέντες, ἐξε τὴν νοσημοσύνην ἐλθομεν ἀνάγονται τε καὶ εἰς θηραντες τούτων ἀπεαντήσασθαι τὸν λόγον εἰς αὐτῷ ἐκείνους ἔργασθαι τῆς ἀγγείους· ἐν αὐτῷ ζωή ἦν. Griesb. Var. lect. ad l. 1. Hieron. ad Eph. i. 5: Dupliciter legendum, ut curias vel cum superioribus vel inferioribus copuletur. Ad ep. ad Philem. 4 – 6: Ambiguum dictum, utrum gratias agat Deo suo semper, an memoriam ejus faciat in orationibus suis semper. Sometimes the commentators give the correct punctuation in doubtful passages. Theodoret. ad 2 Cor. i. 3, iv. 4, Rom. ix. 29. Ancient MSS. also have sometimes a point. Marsh, Anmerk. und Zusätze, l. 456, ff.

§ 28 b.

As the ancient writers, when composing their works, often made use of copyists, we may look for the same in the N. T. writers. The Apostle Paul, we know, adopted this practice (Rom. xvi. 22, 1 Cor. xvi. 21, Col. iv. 18, 2 Thess. iii. 17; the contrary in Gal. vii. 11). By this means, however, errors might creep into the text, that would not always be discovered and removed on its revision by the author.

Stichometry, Punctuation, Accentuation.

§ 29 a.

About A. D. 462 Euthalius, deacon at Alexandria, divided the text of the Pauline Epistles, and soon after that also of
the Acts and of the Catholic Epistles, into lines (στίχοι), corresponding to the pauses which would naturally be made in reading. This division was called στιχομετρία, stichometry, from the lines being measured off and numbered. It was much approved of, and passed into the MSS., of which several so arranged are extant. Others have at least the number of ρήματα, another designation of the same or a similar division.

* Euthalius explains himself on this point in his preface to the N. T. in Zacagni’s Collectan. monum. vet. Eccles. Gr. (Rom. 1698. 4to), I. 403, sqq. and Gallandi’s Bibl. patr. et antiqu. script. X. 199, sqq.: στίχοι δ’ συνειλα τούτων τ’ ύφος κατά την εαυτού συμμετρείαν πρὸς ειδοθέν ανάγκην. Cf. Wetst. Prolagg. ed. Seml. p. 196. J. G. Rosenmüller, De fatis interpretat. litt. sa. IV. 4, sqq. Hug., § 44. The Gospels were also stichometrically written (see the stichometrics in Mill. Proll. § 1029), though it is uncertain whether it was done by Euthalius himself.

b E. g. Cod. Cantabrig., where it appears thus: Acts i. 1.

TOMENPEREPONLOGONOPHISMHN
ΠΕΡΙΠΑΝΤΟΝΟΘΕΟΦΙΔΕ
ΩΝΗΡΩΑΘΗΣΠΟΙΕΙΝΤΕ
ΚΑΙΔΙΔΑΣΚΕΙΝΑΧΡΗΣΗΜΕΡΑΣ
ΑΝΕΔΗΜΦΩΘΕΝΤΕΙΛΑΜΕΝΟΣΠΟΙΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΧ
ΔΙΑΙΝΣΑΠΙΟΥΣΕΞΕΚΕΛΕΞΙΚΑΙΕΚΕΛΕΥΣΕ
ΚΗΡΥΣΕΙΝΤΟΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.


ΠΡΕΞΒΥΤΑΣ ΝΗΦΔΩΛΟΥΣ ΕΙΝΑΙ
ΣΕΜΝΟΥΣ
ΣΩΦΡΟΝΑΣ
ΥΠΑΙΝΟΝΤΑΣ ΤΗ ΠΙΣΤΕΙ
ΤΗ ΑΓΑΠΗ
ΤΗ ΥΠΟΜΟΝΗ
ΠΡΕΞΒΥΤΙΔΑΣ ΩΞΑΥΤΩΣ
ΕΝ ΚΑΤΑΣΘΗΜΑΤΙ ΙΕΡΟΠΡΕΠΕΙΩΣ
ΜΗ ΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΥΣ
ΜΗ ΟΙΝΟ ΠΟΛΛΩ ΔΕΔΟΥΛΩΜΕΝΑΣ
ΚΑΛΟΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΥΣ


§ 29 b.

Subsequently, to save space, the lines were not separated, but their close marked by a point, or their beginning
by large letters. This, according to Hug, Eichhorn, &c., led to the grammatical punctuation; but punctuation had found its way into N. T. MSS., e.g. Cod. Alex., before stichometry appeared, and, like the latter, served to facilitate the reading. The signs and principles of punctuation, which, after the ninth century, came more and more into vogue, were various, and first obtained a more fixed form in the printed editions. In the ninth century the separation of the words by spaces or points between them became usual.

a The former in Cod. Cyprius (on its age, cf. § 59). Matt. ii. 21, f. (Monas. Pal. Gr. p. 239): O de ephelthe paralabe to paidion kai tyn matere auton. kai elthen eis thn Iouan. akousa de ari Arkelas basilees evi tis Ioudaias. ari' Hrodov ton patros autov. ephothe ekei epelthei. The latter is found e.g. in the Cod. Boern. Hufsch, in Stud. u. Kr. 1837, p. 859, does not think that the points in the Cod. Cypr. are signs of the lines, because they are akin to the punctuation of the Cod. Boern.

b Hufsch, as cited above. He denies the distinction between grammatical and other punctuation.

c Isidor. Hisp. Orig. I. 19: Ubi in initio pronuntiationis neecessum plens pars sensus est, et tamen respirare oportet, fit commas, id est particula sensus, punctumque ad unam literam ponitur et vocatur subdiunctio ab eo, quod punctum subitus, id est ad unam literam accipit. Ubi autem in sequentibus jam sententia sensum praestat, sed adhuc aliquid superest de sententiae plenitudine, fit colon mediamque literam puncto notamus et mediam distinctionem vocamus, qui punctum ad mediam literam ponimus. Ubi vero jam per gradus pronuntiandi plenam sententiae clausulam facimus, fit periodus, punctumque ad caput litterae ponimus, et vocatur distinctio i.e. disjunctio, quia integram separat sententiam. So the punctuation of Cod. Basil. E. Others, as Cod. L, use a cross instead of a period; Cod. Vatic. 1067. Colb. 700. use it instead of almost all the signs of punctuation. The punctuation of Cod. Boern is very bad. Compare Ge. Fr. Rogall, De auctor. et antiquit. interpunct. in N. T. Region. 1734.

d In the Cod. Aug., written in the ninth century, the words are separated by points. Marsh, Zus. I. 461.

§ 29 c.

Euthalius, by his stichometric edition of the N. T., gave also wider currency to accentuation, which had previously, at least in the O. T., come into use. There are, however, later MSS. which have no accents; and accentuation did
not come into general use until the tenth century. The iota subscript came first into use about the same time in the cursive writing; though it is often found written in a line with the other letters.\(^a\)

\(^a\) Euthalius: τὴν τε τῶν πράξεων βιβλίων ἀμα καὶ καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν αὐξάνεται κατὰ προσφύγιαν . . . προσίστασας, ἄδελφε Ἀθανάσιε.

\(^b\) Epiphanius. De ponderibus et mens. c. 2: Ἐπείδη δὲ τινί κατὰ προσφύγιαν ἑστηκαν τὰ χρηματία, καὶ περὶ τῶν προσφύγιων τάδε: ὅσεια, δασεία, βαρεία, ψελη, περιπαρέση, κ. τ. λ.

\(^c\) Monfascon, Palaeogr. Gr. pp. 276, 278, 295.

**Chapters and Verses.**

§ 30 a.

The present division of the New Testament into chapters is, like that of the O. T. (Pt. I. § 78), an invention of Cardinal Hugo, who introduced it in his *Biblia cum postilla*, whence it came also into the Greek N. T. The present division of the New Testament into verses originated with Robert Stephens, who introduced it in his edition of A. D. 1551.

§ 30 b.

Quite early in antiquity κεφάλαια, capitula, chapters, occur;\(^a\) but probably they are, like the *Capitula of Jerome* in the O. T. (Pt. I. § 77, note c), undefined sections. There are two kinds of real sections in the Gospels: 1. In the middle of the third century Ammonius of Alexandria, to further his Harmony of the Gospels, divided the text into a multitude of small sections, κεφάλαια, which Eusebius, in the fourth century, used\(^b\) in his *Canones Evangelici* (a revised edition of that Harmony). 2. Larger sections of the Gospels came subsequently into use, perhaps in imitation of the divisions of Justinian's Institutes.\(^c\) They were called, to distinguish them from the former, τίτλοι, breves;\(^d\) but were also called κεφάλαια.\(^e\)

\(^a\) Tertull. Ad uxor. II. 2; De pudic. c. 16; De carne Christi, c. 19.
The Acts and Epistles were likewise divided into κεφάλαια. Euthalius also introduced into his stichometric ed. of the N. T. tables of their contents. Those of the Pauline Epistles he found already existing; those of the Acts and the Catholic Epistles he drew up. The Apocalypse, Andreas of Cappadocia divided into 24 λόγου and 72 κεφάλαια.

Euthal.: Καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπιστολήν προτάξας τὴν τῶν κεφαλάων ἑκάστου, ἐν τῶν συνοικίας τινὰ καὶ φιλοχριστῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν (Theodor. Mops. ?) πεποιησμένην. Wetstein (Prolegg. p. 197) erroneously regards Euthalius as the inventor of the division itself. Hug, § 48. Eichhorn, § 20. Number of the Chapters: Acts, 40; James, 6; 1 Pet. 8; 2 Pet. 4; 1 John, 7; 2 John, 1; 3 John, 1; Jude, 4; Ep. to the Rom. 10; 1 Cor. 9; 2 Cor. 11; Gal. 12; Eph. 10; Philipp. 7; Coloss. 10; 1 Thess. 7; 2 Thess. 6; Hebr. 22; 1 Tim. 18; 2 Tim. 9; Tit. 6; Philem. 2.

§ 30 c.

The Acts and Epistles were likewise divided into κεφάλαια. Euthalius also introduced into his stichometric ed. of the N. T. tables of their contents. Those of the Pauline Epistles he found already existing; those of the Acts and the Catholic Epistles he drew up. The Apocalypse, Andreas of Cappadocia divided into 24 λόγου and 72 κεφάλαια.

Euthal.: Καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπιστολήν προτάξας τὴν τῶν κεφαλάων ἑκάστου, ἐν τῶν συνοικίας τινὰ καὶ φιλοχριστῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν (Theodor. Mops. ?) πεποιησμένην. Wetstein (Prolegg. p. 197) erroneously regards Euthalius as the inventor of the division itself. Hug, § 48. Eichhorn, § 20. Number of the Chapters: Acts, 40; James, 6; 1 Pet. 8; 2 Pet. 4; 1 John, 7; 2 John, 1; 3 John, 1; Jude, 4; Ep. to the Rom. 10; 1 Cor. 9; 2 Cor. 11; Gal. 12; Eph. 10; Philipp. 7; Coloss. 10; 1 Thess. 7; 2 Thess. 6; Hebr. 22; 1 Tim. 18; 2 Tim. 9; Tit. 6; Philem. 2.
Lessons and Pericopes.

§ 31 a.

The N. T. books, like those of the O. T., were very early read in the assemblies for public worship (Pt. I. § 19, note a), and for this purpose were probably soon divided, like the Pentateuch, into sections.⁴ Euthalius introduced in his stichometric ed. a division of the Acts and Epistles into 57 lessons.⁵ This also took place in the Gospels. But the number of festival days increasing, this division became unsuitable, and passages were selected for church lessons to the exclusion of many others (e. g. Luke ii. 22–29, x. 43–xi. 27, xxi. 10–24, 28–32, John xiv. 18–20, xviii. 6–35). These sections were assigned to the Festivals and Sundays of the whole year, according to a certain cycle. They were then collected in a separate book called in general Lectionarium, ἐκλογάδιον, or in special Evangelarium, when it contained sections of the Gospels, Epistolare, Πράξεω-στολος, when sections of the Acts and Epistles. The sections in these books often follow the order in which it was customary to read them. These reading-books arose among the Latin Christians in the fifth century, but among the Greeks not before the eighth century.⁶

⁴ Whether περακοτη in Clem. Alex. Strom. IV. 503, VII. 750, is exactly such a section (Scholz, Prolegg. p. xxi.) is very doubtful. Probably the same holds in regard to these as to the oldest chapters (§ 30), as Jerome translates περακοτη in Origen by Capitulum.

⁵ Euthal.: Τήν τῶν ἀνεφώτευσεν ἀριστεράτην τομήν . . . ἡμᾶς τεχνολο-γίσασσις ἀνασκαλαμμάθεα. Number of the Euthalian Sections: Acts 16 (and indeed No. 1. contained 1 Ch. [i. 1–13], No. 2. 1 Ch. [i. 14–36], No. 3. 1 Ch. [iii. 1–iv. 31], No. 5. 2 Chh. [iv. 32–v. 49], No. 6. 2 Chh. [vi.], No. 7. 4 Chh. [vii. 1–viii. 39], &c., comp. Augusti, Denkwürd. VI. 124); Jas. 2; 1 Pet. 2; 2 Pet. 1; 1 John, 2; 2 John, 1; 3 John, 1; Jude, 1; Rom. 5; 1 Cor. 5; 2 Cor. 4; Gal. 2; Eph. 2; Phil. 2; Col. 2; 1 Thess. 1; 2 Thess. 1; Hebr. 3; 1 Tim. 1; 2 Tim. 1; Tit. 1; Philem. 2.

⁶ According to Hug, I. 266, Eichh. IV. 176, these 57 sections correspond to the number of Sundays and festivals, so that the whole N. T. was read through in order every year; but according to various statements of Chrysostom, Augustin, and others, certain books were read at certain times, e. g. Genesis in times of fast, Job and Jonah in Passion-week, and Acts between.

* Gennad. De script. c. 79, of Musaeus (about 450): Excerpsit de scripturis lectiones totius anni festivis diebus aptas. According to Sidon. Apollin. IV. ep. 11, Claudianus Mamereus introduced the use of lectionaria into the church of Vienne (Bingham, l. c. p. 71). Cf. Hug, I. 269. Capitulare, also Lectionarium, among the Greeks συναξάρια, was the name of a catalogue of the lessons arranged according to the first and last words; Menologium, of such a catalogue for the holy days. See the Synaxarium and Menologium of the Codd. K.M. 262. 274. in Scholz’s N. T. Vol. I. In the MSS. these lessons are indicated by α (ἀρχή), τ (τάλος), by the number of the Sunday 2A, 2B, &c., or by the word ἀνάγνωσμα.

§ 31 b.

Our modern Pericopes, or Lessons, of the Gospels and Epistles are remains of these ancient lessons, which varied according to time and place. They are found, with few variations, in the Lectionary called Comes, a work erroneously ascribed to Jerome, and perhaps belonging to the ninth century. On the other hand, the oldest extant catalogue of lessons, the Lectionarium Gallicanum, as well as the Lectionarium Romanum, differs from them more widely. The Pericopes of festivals are probably the oldest, although the selection of numerous accounts of miracles seems to indicate a time when the Divinity of Christ had to be maintained against the Arians.


b They are compared together in Rheinwald, Kirchl. Archäol. Beil. XXII. Augusti, Denkw. VI. 212, ff.


Superscriptions and Subscripts.

§ 32 a.

The superscriptions of the N. T. books were not given by their authors, but by readers after their time. This
appears,—1. from their character, which, at least in part, is not in harmony with the authors, their objects, or their relation to their first readers; 2. from their being different in different MSS.; 3. from the testimony of the Fathers. The Evangelists perhaps prefixed to their work the title εὐαγγέλιον only. The discriminating titles, κατὰ Ματθαίου, &c., were subsequently added.

1 E. g. πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων—ἡ πρὸς Κορινθίουσ ἐπιστολή πρώτη—Ιωάννου ἐπιστολή πρώτη.

2 E. g. οἱ πράξεις τῶν ἄγιων ἀποστόλων—λουκᾶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ πράξεις ἀποστόλων—οἱ πράξεις τῶν ἄγιων τοῦ ἀγίου Λουκᾶ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ—πράξεις τῶν ἄγιων ἀποστόλων, συγγραφεῖα ὑπὸ Λουκᾶ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ.


4 Chrysostom. Homil. I. in Matth. praef.: διὰ τὸ τότε εὐαγγέλιον τήν ἱστορίαν ἐκάλεσεν.

§ 32 b.

The subscripts were originally only repetitions of the superscriptions; afterwards, however, historic statements drawn from tradition or conjecture were added. Euthalius introduced such (in part) incorrect subscripts into his stichometric edition, using the statements of the Synopsis Scripturae [erroneously ascribed to Athanasius]. They have thus been propagated in the MSS.
CRITICISM OF THE TEXT.

Χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως . . . ἡμερεῖθη δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰακώβῳ αδελφῷ τοῦ κυρίου οὗ ἐν τῷ Ἰωάννου.


Conclusions from the Foregoing, affecting the Criticism of the Text.

§ 33.

Accordingly, the text of the N. T., whose investigation and restoration are the problem of criticism, comprises nothing but what is indicated by the mere letters, without regard to their division into words, their punctuation, or accentuation. The division into chapters and verses, and the super- and sub-scriptions are, moreover, adventitious.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEXT ITSELF.

I.—OF THE UNPRINTED TEXT.

It has remained free from gross Corruptions.

§ 34 a.

The Catholics, out of respect for the history, have refrained from extensive corruptions of the text. Under the early established unity of the Catholic Church, such were, indeed, scarcely possible. In this respect they were extremely watchful of the heretics, whom they charge, sometimes falsely, with corrupting the Scriptures.∗

thæus (xi. 27) posuit et Lucas (X. 22) similiter, et Marcus idem ipsum. Joannes enim praeter locum hunc. Hi autem, qui peritiiores Apostolus voluit esse, sic describunt: *Nemo cognovit patrem nisi filius, nec filium nisi pater et cui voluerit filius revelare:* et interpretantur, quasi a nullo cognitus sit versus Deus ante Domini nostri adventum, et eum Deum, qui a Prophetis sit annuntiatus, dicunt non esse patrem Christi. Comp., however, *Justin.* M. Apol. II. 95. — *Tertullian.* De carne Christi, c. 19: Quid est ergo: *non ex sanguine, neque ex voluntate viri, sed ex Deo nati sunt?* Hoc quidem capitulo ego potius utar, quam adulteratores ejus obduxero. Sic enim scriptum esse contendunt, non: *non ex sanguine, nec ex carnis voluntate, nec ex viri, sed ex Deo natus est:* quasi supra dictos credentes in nomine ejus designet. (The *non* must be read twice.) But the heretical reading is the correct one. — *Ambros.* De fide V. 8: *Scriptum est, iniquum (Arianis): De die autem illo et hora nemo scit, neque angelorum, nec filius, nisi sohus pater.* Primum veteres non habent codices Graeci, *quod nec filius scit.* Sed non mirum, si et hoc falsarunt, qui scripturas interpolaverer. But comp. the various readings of Matt. xxiv. 36 and Mark xiii. 32. — *Ambros.* De spir. sancto, III. 11: *Ipse Dominus dixit in Evangelio (John iii. 6): quoniam Deus spiritus est.* Quem locum ita expresse Ariani testificamini esse de spiritu, ut eum de vestris codicibus auferatis; atque utinam de vestris et non etiam de ecclesiæ codicibus tolleratis. But see the various readings of John iii. 6.

§ 34 b.

*Marcion* especially is charged with corrupting the Gospel of Luke and the Pauline Epistles. His course in regard to Luke we shall see further on (§ 70, ff.). As respects the Pauline Epistles, the charges of the Fathers are in a measure unfounded, for either he had correct readings or such as elsewhere occur, or his readings are innocent errors. Others of his readings, however, and especially certain omissions, are, not without reason, ascribed to heretical designs; and several are such and so important that they can be regarded only as designed corruptions. In other statements *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius* contradict each other. The former adduces from the Epistles to the Thessalonians only small corruptions; the latter declares them wholly corrupted (p. 371, ed. Petav.). The former complains of trifling corruptions of the Epistle to the Philippians (c. 20), and declares the Epistle to Philemon quite uninjured (c. 21); the latter declares both to be wholly corrupted (p. 373, sqq.).

*y* Gal. ii. 5. Marc. correctly: αὐτὲ νῦν. Tertull. (I. V. 3), with other Latin authorities, omitted it. 2 Cor. iv. 4: Tertull. (I. V. c. 11) charges him with connecting the words δὲ θέου τοῦ άιώνος τούτου, which alone is correct. 1 Thess. ii. 15: Marc. τοῦ δικαίου προφήτας, with text. rec.; Tertull. c. 15, τοῦ προφήτας. Gal. v. 9: Marc. with DE Vulg. etc. διὰ, Epiph. ζυγοὺ. 1 Cor. x. 19: Marc. δὲι ἡμῶν τίς ἐστιν η ἐνδοκοθύνω τι ἔστων; Epiph. δὲι ἐνδοκοθύνων τι ἔστων; text. rec. δὲι ἐνδοκοθύνων τι ἔστων; δὲι ἐνδοκοθύνων τι ἔστων; Cf. var. lect. in Griesb. 1 Cor. xiv. 19: Marc. with Ambros. διὰ τῶν νῦν insted of διὰ τοῦ νῦν μου. 1 Cor. ix. 8: Marc. εἰ καὶ ὁ νῦν Μωσῆς ταῦτα οὐ λέγει, where the εἰ probably sprang from η; for Marc. read ν. 10. Eph. v. 31: Marc. omitted τὴ γυναῖκα (comp. note d), a senseless error in transcription.

* The reading 1 Cor. xv. 45, ὁ ἐσχάτος κύριος instead of ὁ ἐσχάτος Ἀδαμ, had, according to Tertull. c. 10, this ground: Ne si et Dominum novissimum haberet Adam, et ejusdem Christum defenderemus in Adam novissimo, cujus et primum. 2 Thess. i. 8: Marc. omitted ἐν πυρὶ φλογοῦ, ne scilicet nostratem Deum faceret (Tertull. c. 16). Eph. ii. 15: Marc. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ σακεί (without οὗτοι), ut inimicitiae daret carnem quasi carnali vitio, non Christo aemulae. ... cujus supra sanguinem confessus es, hie negas carmen (Tertull. c. 17). Eph. ii. 20: Marc. omitted καὶ προφητῶν: timuit scilicet, ne et super veterum prophetarum fundamenta aedificatio nostra constaret in Christo (Tertull. c. 17). Col. i. 15: M. omitted προτοτοκος πάντης κρίσων and the whole 16 ver.: "haec enim Marcionii diaplicere oportebat" (Tertull. c. 19), which Ritschl and Baur erroneously deny.

* According to Jerome (Comment. in ep. ad Gal.), Gal. iii. 6—9 was omitted; and Hahn (Das Evangel. Marc. p. 59) finds this also in Tertull. V. 3: Quum adjicit: omnes enim filii estis fidei, ostenditur, quid supra haereticis industria eraserit, mentionem sc. Abrahamae. R. and B., however, assert that only ver. 7 can have been omitted, and probably through a mistake in copying. As Tertull. says: Acceptatus igitur beneficitionem spiritalem per fidem (Gal. iii. 14, second half) inquit. ... sed cum adijicit, omnes enim estis filii fidei (ver. 26), H. concludes that Marcion read only the second half of ver. 14, and proceeded at once to ver. 26, which R. contradicts. According to H. iv. 3 followed iii. 26, and ran thus: Adhuc secundum hominum dio (from
EARLY RISE OF FALSE READINGS. § 35.

ver. 15), dum essesmus parvuli, etc. according to Tertull. c. 4: Aduce secundum hominem dico, dum essesmus parvuli, etc. Aquin non est hoc humanitus dictum, non enim exemplum est, sed veritas. . . . Illud autem fuit (humanitus dictum) quod cum secundum hominem dixisset (ver. 15): tamen testamentum nemo spernit, etc. . . . Erubescat spongis Marcionis. According to R. the last words refer only to the supplying of the formula κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω; according to B. to the omission of ver. 7 (!). Of Gal. iv. 4, Marc. dropped γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὕπὸ νόμον (against this Ritschl, p. 160). He left the most of chap. iv. 21—31 standing, and helped himself by supposing an allegory after ver. 24; but he struck out ver. 27—30, which passage Tertull. does not quote. In 2 Cor. iv. 13, Marc. according to Epiph. omitted the words, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· ἐπιστέυει, διὸ εἰλήφη. Tertull. also omits to mention it. — After citing Rom. ii. 2, Tertull. says (c. 13): Quantas autem soveas in ista vel maxime epistola Marcion fecerit, de nostri instrumenti integritate parebit. Mihi sufficit, quae proinde eratenda non vidit, quasi neglientias et caecitates ejus accipere; and then goes on with chap. ii. 16, so that what lay between seems to have been wanting. But Epiphanius quotes chap. ii. 12. After Rom. viii. 11, Tertullian says (c. 14): Salio et hie amplissimum abruptum intercissae scripturae, sed apprehendo testimonium perhibentem Apostolum Israelici, quod quidem zelum Dei habeant (Rom. x. 1—4). — Aquin exclamat: O profundum discreturam, etc. (Rom. xi. 33). Unde ills eruptio! Ex recordatione scilicet scripturarum, quae retro revoluerat, ex contemplatione sacramentorum, quae supra dissererat in fidem Christi ex lege venientem. Haece si Marcion de industria erat, quid Apostolus ejus exclamaret? Cap. x. 5—xi. 32 was wholly wanting, and xi. 33 followed x. 4. Epiphanius cites only x. 4, between viii. 4 and xiii. 8. What R. and B. answer to this has no weight.

— Eph. iii. 9: Marc. τὸ θεό, τὸ τά πάντα κτίσατε, without ἐν and διὰ θεοῦ Χριστοῦ (Tertull. c. 18). In chap. v. 31, Marcion omitted καὶ προεκκλησίσθησαν πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ (Tertull. c. 18; according to Epiph. Schol. III. p. 318, only γυναῖκι [com. text πρὸς τ. γ. αὐτ.] was dropped). In chap. vi. 2, he omitted ἡς ἓτιν ἐστίν ὑπολή πρότη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ (Tertull. l. c.).

* Probably the Marcionites constantly allowed themselves to make alterations. Origens complains, Comm. in ep. ad Rom. ad xvi. 25, of a great corruption: Caput hoc (xvi. 25—27) Marcion, a quo scripturae evangelicae atque apostolicae interpolatae sunt, de hac epistola penitus abusti. Et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo, ubi scriptum est: omne autem, quod non ex fide est, peccatum est (xiv. 23), usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit.

Early Rise of False Readings.

§ 35.

Besides the natural occasions of false readings, the corruption of the text was promoted by the slight regard in
which the Christians of the first centuries held the letter, and the arbitrariness with which many allowed themselves to make alterations. False readings crept in at an early period, as was then expressly asserted, and is evident from the citations of the Church writers. But when, in later times, controversies about dogmas, and exegetical labor, brought about a greater regard for the text, this laxness passed away.

* Dionys. of Corinth, in Euseb. H. E. IV. 23: ἐνστολάς γὰρ .... ἐγραφαὶ καὶ ταύτας οἱ τοῦ διαβόλου ἀπόστολοι ζεικνύων γεγέμακαν, δὲ μὲν ἐξαιροῦντες, δὲ δὲ προστίθεντες .... οὗ θαυμαστῶν ἄρα εἰ καὶ τῶν κυριακῶν ῥᾳδιωρηθήσαι τινες ἐπιβλέπεται γραφῶν. Clem. Alex. Strom. I. IV. c. 6. p. 490, ed. Syll.: Μακάριοι, φησιν, οἱ δεισιμυνόντες ἔννεπεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτοὶ νοῦν δεόντων εἰσήγαγον· ὅ, ὅ τινας τῶν μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγελία, Μακάριοι, φησιν, οἱ δεισιμύνοντες ὑπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἔσωσαν τῆς. Origen, Comm. in Matth. xv. 671, ed. Reuse: Νυνὶ δὲ δηλοῦντες πολλὺ γέγονεν ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἰτε ἀπὸ μαθήματι τιων γραφῶν, εἰτε ἀπὸ τότης τιων μοχθῆται τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφωμένων, εἰτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοίς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει προστίθεντων ἡ ἀποφοίτως. Origen's own rashness in emendation, in John i. 28. Comm. in Joann. vi. 140. Epiphani. Ancor. c. 31, ed. Petav. II. 36: Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔκλαυσεν (ὁ Ἡρωδ), κεῖται εἰ τῇ κατὰ δουκὰν εὐαγγελίῳ, εἰ τοῖς ἀδιορθώσις ἀντιγράφοις. ὁ ὁβεσθεῖσιν γὰρ ἐκεῖνον τὸ μητὸν, φοβηθήντες καὶ μὴ νοσήσας αὐτὸ τό τελειοτάτον. Schol. Prolegg., to support his assertion that the text of the N. T. was preserved incorrupt during the first centuries, has laid down several untenable positions; among them (§ 4) this, that the oldest citations of N. T. passages often give the unadulterated text. Against him observe Polycarp. ad Philipp. c. 1: ὄν ἐγεῖρεν ὁ θεὸς λίωσεν τὰς ὁδίνας τοῦ ἄδου (Acts ii. 24). D. Syr. and others have this last instead of ὑδάτων. In c. 5 he omits in the passage 1 Cor. vi. 10, where with ABDE and others. Further see Tischendorf, Proll. ad ed. N. T. [Lips. 1841], p. xxv. sqq.


Modes of their Origin.

§ 36 a.

The same here took place as in the O. T. text (cf. Pt. I. § 83, ffl.). I. False readings arose through error: 1. Of sight: exchange of letters, misplacement of words, omission of words and sentences per ὁμοιοτέλευτον, or even repetition.
2. Of hearing; especially through itacism in pronunciation.\(^b\)

3. Of memory: misplacement of words, exchange of synonyms.\(^o\)

4. Of the understanding: false division of words, false reading of abbreviations, adoption of glosses and parallelisms into the text.\(^d\)

---


\(^b\) Rom. ii. 17: ἵνα for εἰ δέ. 1 John iv. 2: γινωσκεται for γινωσκεται.


§ 36 b.

II. The text was altered also with more or less distinct design: 1. To correct, beautify, or make perspicuous the language.\(^a\) 2. To remove historical, geographical, archæ-
ological, and dogmatic difficulties, and to introduce dogmas into the text.\(^b\) 3. To follow the explanations of distinguished commentators.\(^c\) 4. The liturgical use of the N. T. occasioned additions and omissions.\(^d\)


\(^b\) Mark ii. 26: ἐπὶ Ἀβιασάρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως was, on account of 1 Sam. xxi. 1, either wholly or in part omitted, or the name changed to Abimelech. Matt. xxvii. 9: some Codd. leave out ἢκριμιον, others read Ζαχαρίων. Mark xv. 25: ἐκτῇ for τρήτῃ after John xix. 14, and there τρήτῃ for ἐκτῇ. John i. 28, for Βεθανία, com. text according to Orig. Βεθβαρα. Mark x. 19: εἰς ἐλθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου for ἐκπολύειν τὸν ἁγία αὐτῆς. John vii. 39: οὕτω γὰρ ἐν πνεύμα ἅγιον: addition, εἰς αὐτοῖς, or δεδομένων, or δοθέων, and the like. Matt. v. 29, εἰκῇ was on moral grounds either added, or omitted by others. Luke ii. 33: ἔνωσθαι for δ ἄνερ αὐτοῦ. Mark xiii. 39: omitted, οὐκ ὁ νόος. Acts xx. 28: θεοῦ (recd. text) for κυρίου. 1 John v. 7, the addition of the three heavenly witnesses.

\(^c\) 2 Cor. i. 20, the reading διὸ for καὶ rests probably on Theodore's explanation.

\(^d\) Matt. iv. 12, and often, δ Ἰησοῦς introduced; vi. 13, addition of the doxology: xiii. 23, addition, δ ἧκον δότα, κ.τ.λ.; ἄμνι, at the end of books. The readings of the received text, Acts iii. 11, τοῦ λαβέντος χριστοῦ, and xx. 16, ἐκμετ., came from Lectionaries.

Griesbach's System of Recensions.

§ 37.

Griesbach noticed in the MSS. and versions of the N. T., and in the citations of the Fathers, certain peculiarities of
the text as a whole. Guided by these, he arranged the whole mass of critical authorities in three divisions, and thereby simplified the examination of their testimony. He called the different divisions of the text Recensions, and laid down the three following:

1. The Occidental Recension, whose authorities and documents are Tertullian, Cyprian, Irenæus (Lat. trans.), Ambrose, Augustine, &c.; the Latin versions before Jerome, the Sahidico-Coptic and Jerusalem Syriac; the MSS. of the Gospels D 1. 13. 69. 118. 124. 131. 157., of the Pauline Epistles DEF, of the character is exegetical, it contains glosses and circumlocutions, and is the most strongly Hebraistic.

2. The Alexandrine Recension, whose authorities and documents are Clement of Alex., Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Alex., Isidore of Pelusium, &c.; the Moplitico-Coptic, Philoxenian Syriac, Ethiopic, and Agmenian versions; the manuscripts BCL 33. 102. 106. of the Gospels, of the Epistles, ABC 17. 46. 47. Its peculiarity is greater grammatical purity and correctness of language.

3. The Constantinopolitan Recension, which consists of the writings of the Fathers of Greece, Asia Minor, and the neighboring provinces, from the fourth to the sixth centuries; the Gothic and Slavonic versions; the MSS. of the Gospels AEFGHS, the Moscow MSS. of the Pauline Epistles. Its peculiarity lies in the mixture of the other two recensions. It follows more closely the Greek idiom, but contains also glosses, and approaches the Received Text.

Griesbach assigns the Syriac Peshito to neither of these recensions, and thinks it has been repeatedly altered after different Greek MSS. Chrysostom's text of the Gospels, also, he regards as a mixture of various recensions. The text in manuscripts PQT is likewise mixed, and indeed several documents of the Occidental and Alexandrian recensions have suffered adulteration. MSS. also, which, on the whole, belong to the Constantinopolitan recension, e.g. Codd. KM 10. 11. 17. 22. 28. 36. 40. 57. 61. 63. 64. 72. 91. 108. 127. 142. 209. 229. 235., contain mixtures from other recensions.
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§ 38.

Griesbach considered only the Alexandrine form of the text the result of a genuine recension, which was undertaken on placing together the Εὐαγγέλιον and the Απόστολος (Pt. I. § 21); the Occidental, on the other hand, and the Constantinopolitan, as not, in strictness, entitled to the name.* These two he regarded as accidental results of the negligence and arbitrariness of copyists and pseudo-critics. The Occidental he derives from the ancient MSS. current before the Απόστολος was collected; the Constantinopolitan he regards as a mixture of the two old recensions. The birthplace of the recensions he deduced partly from their origin and circulation, and partly from their versions and from the Fathers who adopted them.

But in this system all is uncertain; for we know nothing of the rise of the oldest collections of N. T. books, and no critical document contains a recension in its pure state, or maintains throughout the character ascribed to it.\^b


Hug's System.

§ 39.

Hug agrees with Griesbach in finding in MSS. D 1. 13. 69. 124. of the Gospels, and DEFG of the Epp., and in the old Latin and Sahidico-Coptic versions, a text in general similar to the Occidental, but unrevised and debased, which he designates by the name (borrowed from the critical history of the LXX.) of κοινὴ ἐκδοσις; but differs from him in numbering the Peshito, and the Alexandrians Clement
and *Origen*, among its authorities. — As regards this version, Griesbach yielded in a measure, and acknowledged in it a peculiar form of the text akin to the *koumê*; but in regard to Clement and Origen he greatly limits Hug's assertion.

Later, according to Hug, an end was put to this debased condition of the text by *three different recensions* in the East.

1. *Hesychius*, the critical reviser of the LXX. (Pt. I. § 46), he supposes brought the text into the form in which it exists in some authorities of Griesbach's Alexand. recension, in *Codd. BCL* of the Gospels, *Codd. ABC* 17. 46. of the Epp., in the Memphitic version, *Athanasius*, *Cyril* of Alexandria, and others. — But the historic evidence in support of this recension is very unsatisfactory, for the MSS. ascribed to Hesychius seem to have had little circulation.

The form of the text which Hug ascribes to Hesychius belongs, moreover, to the time of *Origen*, and even of *Clement* of Alexandria.

2. The so-called Constantinopolitan recension (in MSS. *EFGH* of the Gospels, *SVbh Matth.*, and in most cursive MSS., in Cod. G of the Pauline Epp., and in the Moscow MSS.) *Hug* ascribes to *Lucian*, who is said to have revised the *koumê*, on which the Peshito was based. Against this Griesbach has adduced nothing, although the historical proof seems also unsatisfactory.

3. *Hug* finds a distinct recension, not laid down by Griesbach, in the MSS. *AKM* 42. 106. 114. 116. of the Gospels, in the *Philoxenian Syriac* version, and in the writings of *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret*, and ascribes it to *Origen*. But this form of the text is not sufficiently independent, and the fact that Origen undertook a recension of the N. T. cannot be proved, and is intrinsically unlikely.

* Einl. ins N. T. I. § 22, f.<br>
* Melet. II. p. xlvi. sqq. and Melet. I. In the latter he shows that Origen used an Occidental MS. only in the Commentary on Matt. *Hug* himself confesses that Clement often follows ABC. § 39. p. 183.<br>
* After subtracting the passages which *Hug*, § 36, cites (cf. Pt. I. § 46), and which refer to the LXX., only the following proofs remain. *Hieron.* Praef. in 4 Evangg. ad Damasum: Praetermitto eos codices, quos a Lu-
ciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum asserit perversa conten-
tio, etc. (§ 26, note b). Decret. Pars I. distinct. XV. § 27: Evangelia
quae falsavit Lucianus et Hesychius apocrypha. Already Semler (ad
Weisthenii libell. ad crisin N. T. pertinentes, pp. 83, 177) considered both
of these men authors of widely circulated recensions. Comp., on the other
side, Scholz (Prolegg. § 29); Rink, Lucubr. crit. pp. 7, 59.

Besides the passages adduced in note c, the following rather opposes
than supports it. Hieron. De vir. illustr. c. 77: Lucianus ... tantum in
scripturarum studio laboravit, ut usque nunc quaedam exemplaria scriptura-
rum Lucianea nuncupentur.

* Griesbach, l. c. p. lviii. sqq. Scholz, Prolegg. § 28. The traces in
Hieronym. (ad Matt. xxiv. 38) prove little: In quibusdam Latinis Codicibus
additum est: neque filius: quum in Graecis, et maxime Adamantii et Pierii
exemplaribus, hoc non habeatur adscriptum. Ad Gal. ii. 1: ... hoc
quia in exemplaribus Adamantii non habetur, omisimus. Opposed to it is
Origen's own testimony (Tom. xv. in Matt. III. 671), where the Latin
translator adds: In exemplaribus autem N. T. hoc ipsum me posse facere
sine periculo non putavi. Against Hug's view in general, see Rink, l. c.

Similar view of Eichhorn, IV. § 34, ff., save that he does not adopt
a recension by Origen. He discriminates an unrevised text in Asia and
Africa, a recension of the former by Lucian, of the latter by Hesychius, and
a mixture of both texts.

Dissenting Views.

§ 40 a.

Chr. Fr. Matthäi, who regarded the old Occidental and
Alexandrian MSS., the quotations of the Fathers, and
the old versions, as unreliable, rejects the whole recension
system, and finds the genuine text in his Moscow MSS.
alone.

Also J. Mart. Augustin Scholz declares the Constantin-
opolitans to be the genuine, uncorrupted text. The text
of what Griesbach called the Occidental and Alexandrian
authorities he puts together, and regards it as the result of
the prevailing carelessness of the Egyptian grammarians in
the first three centuries. The Constantinopolitan, on the
other hand, he deduces from the original text current in
Greece, Asia Minor, and Syria, and which, through the
conscientious regard that prevailed in the fourth century
towards the sacred writings, had been carefully preserved.
Dissenting Views. § 40 b.


§ 40 b.

Although it may be objected to this view that it gives too little prominence to the distinctive character of the Occidental and of the Alexandrian text, and assumes without proof that the Constantinopolitan is the true transmission of the text originally current in Asia Minor and Syria;* the other views are also liable to the objection, that it is a manifest assumption, that the text of the older manuscripts is of course older and more authentic. The later manuscripts also may have preserved the original text, and in not a few passages really give it."

* J. S. Vater, in Kirchenhist. Archiv, 1824. I. 14, ff. Gabler, Praef. ad Griesbachii Opusc. Vol. II. p. xvii. Schott, Isag. § 142. Tischendorf, l. c. p. xxx. sqq. — That the Constantinopolitan text has been affected by the Alexandrian, Scholz himself (Prolegg. § 59) cannot wholly deny. The MSS., which Eusebius procured (§ 28 a, note a) at Constantine's command, were probably prepared from such as Origen had used and approved of.

b Decidedly wrong are the readings: Matt. xxvii. 49, ἁλακος δι λαβων, κ. τ. λ., BCL 5. all.; 1 Cor. iv. 9, ζητει for ζητεια, ADEFG 23. all.; 1 Cor. xv. 49, φορτωμεν, ABCDEFGI, against φορτωμεν, B text rec. The following are very doubtful: Matt. xxvi. 60, καὶ οὐχ εὺρον πολλ. ψευδομαρτ. προσελθ.; 1 Cor. viii. 7, τῇ συνθεία, AB, τῇ συνειδήσει ἐως ὅρις τοῦ
CRITICISM OF THE TEXT.

eidolou, BDEFG; xv. 44, εἰ τοιαύτα σάμα ψυχ. ν. τ. λ., ABCD*FG; 2 Cor.
i. 30, διο καὶ δ' αὐτοῦ, κ. τ. λ., ABCD*FG; xii. 1, the received reading has
much in its favor; ver. 7, likewise the received ίσα μη ἵππαρμασ, against
ADFG; Gal. iv. 31, the readings of the uncialis is not satisfactory; 1 Thess. ii.
18, διότι with ABD*FG is hardly correct. Cf. my Exeget. Handb. on the passage. Rink,
in St. u. Kr. 1846. p. 402, ff.

Conclusion.

§ 41.

If, in these attempts after a so-called history of the New Testament text, we separate theory from actual observation, the fact remains, that certain manuscripts and other critical authorities agree among themselves and differ from others, according to a certain analogy. This is chiefly the case with the Eastern (Alexandrian) and the Western, although even in these many transitions and admixtures occur. This fact, however, we must not seek to explain historically, because of the almost entire absence of information; but to complete it critically by first of all collating the critical documents more accurately, and more extensively, than has hitherto been done. In connection with this diplomatic or external criticism, the internal must be pursued, which estimates readings according to internal grounds, i.e. grounds drawn from the peculiar style of individual authors.* We shall then find that the oldest MSS. by no means deserve unqualified preference.


II. HISTORY OF THE PRINTED TEXT.

First and Standard Editions.

§ 42.

Long after the invention of printing, and the consequent circulation of the Latin Bible and the Hebrew Old Testa-
ment, the whole Greek New Testament was, in 1514, first printed at Complutum (Alcalá), in Spain, in Cardinal Ximenes's Polyglot, and a few years later published. It is uncertain from what MSS. this text of the New Testament was taken. The passage 1 John v. 7 seems to have been taken from the Vulgate.a

The edition of Erasmus, with a Latin version and annotations (Basel, 1516, fol.), appeared earlier; a second A.D. 1519, a third A.D. 1522, a fourth in 1527, and a fifth in 1535. In the Gospels he used Cod. 2 (Basil. B. VI. 25) as the basis of his text, in the Acts and the Epp. Cod. 2 (Bas. B. IX. ult.), and in the Apoc. Cod. Reuchlin.; and he sometimes collated Cod. 1 (Basil. B. VI. 27) and Cod. 4 (Basil. B. X. 20). Not until the third edition did he adopt 1 John v. 7, from the Cod. Montfort., and in the fourth he used the Complutensian edition. The critics are not wholly satisfied with his carefulness and accuracy.b

---


---

Origin of the Received Text.

§ 43.

Several subsequent editions give little else than the text of the two mentioned above, with, at the most, a few alterations from MSS. The Complutensian edition is followed by ed. 1. Rob. Steph. 1546. 16mo. (called the O mirificam edition); ed. 2. 1549. 16mo; edd. Plantin. et Rapheleng. (Antw. 1564-1612. 8vo, and miniature form); edd. Genev. 1609, 19, 20, 28, 32; the Paris Polyglot, T. IX. X. 1645; ed. Goldhagen (Mog. 1753), with var. readings. The ed. of
Erasmus is followed by ed. Andr. Asulani, “multis vetustiss. exempl. collatis” (Ven. 1518. fol.) ; Thom. Anshelm (Bad. Hagen. 1521. 4to) ; Jo. Bebelii (Bas. 1523, 31, 35. 8vo) ; Wolf. Cephalaei (Arg. 1524, 34. 8vo) ; Thom. Plateri (Bas. 1538, 40, 43, 44. 8vo) ; Nic. Brylingeri (1533, 43, 48, 49, 53, 56, 58, 86. 8vo) ; Froben. et Episcop. (Bas. 1545. 4to) ; Hoerwagen (Bas. 1545. fol.) ; Vögelin (Lips. 1570) ; Leonh. Osten (Bas. 1588, 8vo) ; ed. Viteb. 1622. 4to. Remarkable editions : ed. Sim. Colinaei (Par. 1534, 8vo) ; ed. Jac. Bogard (Par. 1543) ; ed. 3. Rob. Stephan. (1550. fol., called ed. Regia) “c. vetust. XVI. scriptis exempl.” ; ed. 4. 1551. 8vo, with Erasmus's version and the Vulgate, with the division into verses (cf. § 30 a) ; ed. Rob. Steph. fil. (1569. 16mo). These last edd. are followed by ed. Oporin. (Bas. 1552, 16mo) ; ed. Wachel (Frcf. a. M. 1597. f. 1600, 16, 61. fol.) ; Bryling. (Bas. 1563. 8vo) ; Crispin (Gen. 1553. large 16mo. 1563. 12mo. 1604. 16mo) ; Froschauer (Turic. 1559, 66. 8vo). The Erasmian and Complut. together are followed by Bibl. Antwerp. 1571, 72 ; ed. Plant. 1572, 84. fol. c. vers. interlin. Ar. Montani ; ed. Rapheleng. 1591. 16mo ; Commelin. 1599. fol.\*°


§ 44.

Theod. Beza advanced the N. T. criticism a step, by improving the text of the third edition of Stephens, with the help of H. Stephens's collation and some other aids.\* This text being frequently reprinted, especially in Holland, gained currency as the Textus Receptus.\b It owes its reputation, however, only to Beza’s renown, and to the fortunate activity of the Dutch printers, not to its internal excellence; for it is by no means the result of thorough and comprehensive examination.\* It has, however, with reason, been made the basis in almost all critical labors (§ 55 a).

* First edition, 1565 (Geneva), printed by H. Steph. the son, with the Vulgate, Beza’s own translation, and critical remarks. In the dedication he says: “Ad haec omnia accessit exemplar ex Stephani nostri bibliotheca cum
viginti quinque plusminus manuscriptis codd. et omnibus paene impressis ab Henr. Stephano ejus filio quam diligentissime collatum."


Critical Collections and Editions.

§ 45 a.

To English industry we owe the first important efforts for the development of N. T. criticism. Brian Walton added to the text of the London Polyglot (1657, Pt. V.) the readings of the Cod. Alex., and gave, in Part VI., a rich collection of variations from MSS. in part not before collated.* John Fell enlarged this collection in his edition,* but has the higher merit of occasioning and stimulating John Mill to issue a new and better edition.

* Among them also the Velesian readings, a work of fraud. Herb. Marsh, I. 477.


§ 45 b.

John Mill's edition surpassed all its predecessors, not only in richness of critical material, but also in critical exact-
Criticism of the Text.

Ness, for he first described and investigated the claims of the documents. He thus gave criticism a fixed course.*


§ 46 a.

Joh. Alb. Bengel issued a new recension of the text, with new collations. He laid down in his Introductio ad Crisin N. T. principles which simplified the work of criticism, and gave the first start to the classification of MSS. in families.*

* N. T. Graecum, ita adornatum, ut textus probatarum editt. medullam, margo var. lectionum in suas classes distributarum locorumque parall. delectum, apparatus subjunctus crisicos sacrae, Millianae praeertim, compendium, limam ac fructum exibeat, inserviente Joh. Alb. Bengelio. Tab. 1734. 4to. Introdt. in cris. N. T. § 26: . . . . ipis varietatisbus, ut sunt, excussis, videndum, quinam codices potissimum inter se bini, terni, quaterni et amplius, per minores majoresque syzygias in utramque partem congruant.

Nam sic via patefit ad decidendum, id est, ad varietates quae supercreeperant, resecandas, quo facto genuina lectio non poterit non superare. § 31. . . . .

Nam si quis omnem codicem varietatem probe secum reputaverit, perspiciet librarios Graecos in quasdam quasi nationes sive familias dissectionem ante etiam fecisse, quam versiones extitissent. As a basis for his assumption of two families, viz. an Alexand. and a Latin, he used Cod. Alex. and the old Latin version. Cf. § 22 and the subsequent observations. — The Apparatus criticus was published separately, cur. Phil. Dav. Burkio. Tab. 1763. 4to. Manual edition, Stuttg. 1734. 8vo; reprinted 1739, 53, 69, 76, with additions by E. Bengel, the son, 1790. 8vo.
§ 46 b.

Joh. Jac. Wetstein's edition, accompanied by learned Prolegomena, and elaborated with marvellous industry, added a multitude of new collations to the stock of critical material, and brought more light and order into it. He did not, however, adopt Bengel's views of criticism. He was obliged to refrain from editing the text according to his own judgment, and designated the changes which seemed to him necessary by signs and marginal notes. The text, as it would have been amended by Wetstein, was printed by Wm. Bowyer. b


§ 47 a.

Joh. Jac. Griesbach's name marks a new chapter in the history of N. T. criticism. He enlarged the critical material by collations and excerpts of his own, and, following Bengel's and Semler's example, laid down a system of principles of criticism (comp. § 37), by which he tested the authorities, and improved the Received Text, which he took for the basis of his, both on external and internal grounds.

\footnote{The New Testament, collated with the most approved manuscripts, etc. by E. Harwood. Lond. 1776, 84. 2 vols. small 8vo. Cf. Marsh, Anmerk. I. 451.}

\section*{§ 47 b.}

The stock of critical materials increased still further after this time. \textit{Chr. Fr. Matthäi}, in his edition, collated more than one hundred Moscow and other MSS., and gave a recension\footnote{Nov. Test. XII Tomis distinctum Graece et Latine. Textum denum recensuit, var. lectiones nunquam ante vulgatas ex centum Codd. MSS. variarum Biblioth., Mosqu., olim Patriarch. unam SS. Synodi, Typographiæ synod. et Tabularii Imperialis, Pultav., Nicephori Archipe., Dresd. Elector., Lips. Paulinae, Gotting. Univ. et suae, summa dilig. et fide collegit et vulgavit, lectionaria Eccles. Graec. primo accurate evolvit singularaque lectt. sedulo indagavit, plerorumque Codd. specimen aere expressa exhibuit, priorum editorum, clariss. virorum, nominatim Millii, Bengelii, Wetstenii,} nearly approximating to the Received Text, based on these, and on principles of his own (§ 40). — N. T. criticism owes still further enrichment to the edition of \textit{Franz Carl Alter}, in which he gives (greatly to the critic's inconvenience) the text according to the Vienna Cod. Lambeccii I., with various readings from many other Vienna MSS. and some versions.\footnote{Andr. Birch contributed his own and Moldenhauer's collation of many unexamined MSS. (Cod. Vat. C and others), and Adler's extracts from the Jerusalem Syriac version.} — \textit{Andr. Birch} contributed his own and \textit{Moldenhauer's} collation of many unexamined MSS. (Cod. Vat. C and others), and \textit{Adler's} extracts from the Jerusalem Syriac version.\footnote{Nov. Test. XII Tomis distinctum Graece et Latine. Textum denum recensuit, var. lectiones nunquam ante vulgatas ex centum Codd. MSS. variarum Biblioth., Mosqu., olim Patriarch. unam SS. Synodi, Typographiæ synod. et Tabularii Imperialis, Pultav., Nicephori Archipe., Dresd. Elector., Lips. Paulinae, Gotting. Univ. et suae, summa dilig. et fide collegit et vulgavit, lectionaria Eccles. Graec. primo accurate evolvit singularaque lectt. sedulo indagavit, plerorumque Codd. specimen aere expressa exhibuit, priorum editorum, clariss. virorum, nominatim Millii, Bengelii, Wetstenii,


§ 48 a.

This whole accession of critical materials, increased by new extracts from several versions and Church Fathers, was brought together and worked up by Griesbach in his second edition,* which, enriched with learned prolegomena, has become an indispensable hand-book to the critic. It is, however, no longer quite sufficient, for soon after the stock of critical materials was enlarged. Joh. Mart. Augustin Scholz described and collated several MSS., and issued a new ed. of the N. T., with a critical apparatus and a recension of the text, principally after Griesbach.5

CRITICISM OF THE TEXT.

Griesbach's edition, that it generally gives only the authorities for the variations from the common text, and not for the text itself.

* Bibl. krit. Reise, cf. § 40, not. b. Prolegg. §§ 41, 43, 64, 67, 70, 72, for the list of the MSS. first collated and used by him. Against his critical accuracy see Tischendorf, Prolegg. ad ed. N. T. p. liv.

* N. T. Graecae. Textum ad fidem testium criticorum recensuit, lectio-
num familias subjectit, e Graecis codd. MSS., qui in Europæ et Asiae
bibliothecis reperiuntur, fere omnibus, e vers. antiquis, concilia, ss. Patri-
bus et scriptoribus eccles. quibuscumque vel primo vel iterum collatis copias
criticas addidit atque conditionem horum testium criticorum historiamque
textus N. T. in prolegg. fusius exposuit, etc. Vol. I. IV. Evang. compl.

§ 48 b.

ing the Cod. Sangall. (§ 51 b), contributed to the correction and enlargement of the stock of critical material.

* Lucubratio crit. in Acta Apost., epp. cath. et Paulin., in qua de classi-
bus librorum MSS. quaeat instituitur, descriptio et varia lectio septem
coend. Marcianorum exhibetur atque observv. ad plurima loca cum Apostoli-
tum Evangeliorum djudic. et emend. proponentur. Bas. 1830. 8vo.

b See the works cited in § 38, note b. The MSS. collated are: Cod.
reg. 47 (in Scholz, Evv. 18, Act. 113, Epp. 139, Apoc. 51); Cod. reg. 61
(Evv. 263, Act. 117, Epp. 137, Ap. 54); Cod. reg. 103 (Epp. 140);
Cod. reg. 57 (Epp. 134); Cod. reg. 216 (Epp. 153).

§ 48 c.

Carl Lachmann undertook the peculiar task of presenting
"the text most generally received in the third and fourth
centuries," from the ancient Eastern MSS., with the help
of the Western authorities where the Eastern do not agree." This method rendered a certain degree of arbitrariness un-
avoidable; moreover, as he did not give his authorities, the
reader was left in the dark as to the ground of his decisions.
That this text is unserviceable without authorities, the editor
himself seems to have perceived; for he has issued a new
edition, with the critical authorities appended, and the Latin
Vulgate (§ 26, note f). Tischendorf's edition is more useful. He here gives the text, likewise according to the ancient MSS. alone, in, it must be confessed, a somewhat hasty manner, and indicates its sources, although not in a quite clear and satisfactory way. *Sam. Prideaux Tregelles* has published a new text of the Apocalypse, not merely according to the external authorities, but with the exercise of critical judgment after the manner of the older critics.


4. *Ἀποκάλυψις Ἡ. Χρ. τῆς ἀρχαίων ἀντιγράφων ἑκδοθείσα.* The book of Revel. in Greek, edited from ancient authorities, with a new English version and var. readings. Lond. 1844. large 8vo.

CHAPTER I.

DOCUMENTARY AUTHORITY IN N. T. CRITICISM.

I. MANUSCRIPTS.

General Observations.

§ 49 a.

I. Contents. While a few manuscripts contain, like the Alexandrian, the whole N. T., the majority give only detached portions, usually the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles, and many only extracts for reading (Lectionaria, Evangelia, Praxapostoli). Many contain the Greek text with a translation (Codd. mixti, Graeco-Latini, Graeco-Coptici), several with Scholia. In these, and the subscriptions, the lists of sections, lines, and lessons, and the menologies, we find indications of their age and origin.

II. Form and Material. They are not scrolls, as in the case of the O. T., but consist of a number of leaves (Quaterniones, Quinterniones, Sexterniones), in small folio, quarto, and even smaller, of parchment, and of silk, cotton, and linen paper, according to the age of the MSS.

which occur in purely Greek Codd. by the influence of the Latin language. For example, Col. ii. 10, δ (for δε) ἐνω ἡ κεφαλή; iii. 14, δ (for ἤν) ἐνι σύνδεσμος.


§ 49 b.

III. Character. The oldest manuscripts are written in the uncial character. This, however, is not always a sure sign of the age. The later MSS. (from the tenth century down) are in the cursive character. It is easy to distinguish the ancient upright square character from the later compressed. The practised eye can detect still minuter differences. The absence of the division into words is a surer sign of antiquity than the want of accents and punctuation; for while accents are wanting even in later MSS., punctuation is found in earlier. The presence or absence of stichometry and division into chapters is an uncertain sign. The orthography indicates their place of origin. Corrections in later ink are to be noted in estimating the readings.


Descriptions and valuations of the MSS. are given (not only by these and similar works, but) by the edd. of Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthaei, Birch, Scholz, in their Prolegg., Excursus, and Notes; also in the introductions to the N. T. by Michaelis (cf. Marsh, Anmerk. u. Zus.), Hug, and others. Rich. Simon, Hist. crit. du texte du N. T. chap. 29, ff. Dissert. sur les principaux actes manuscr. du N. T., in his Hist. crit. des prnc. Commentateurs du N. T. Descriptions of single MSS. are given by Hänlein, Einl. II. 59, ff., Rosenmüller, Handb. II. 194, ff., to which have been added those of the Cod. Vat. by Hug (1810), of Cod. Uffenbach. by Henke (1800), of Cod. Diez. by Poppelbaum (1815), of Cod. Berol. reg. IV. evangg. by the same (1824), of Cod. Ephr. by Tischendorf, of Cod. Sangall. by Rattig. See the following sections.

Some important MSS. in particular.

1. In the Uncia! Character.

§ 50 a.

1. Cod. Alexandr. (A in Wetst., Griesb., and others), so called from its supposed birthplace, and, as appears from
certain grammatical and orthographic peculiarities, undoubtedly written in Egypt (if not by St. Thecla), is in the British Museum. It contains the whole O. and N. T., (excepting Matt. i. 1—xxv. 6; John vii. 50—viii. 52; 2 Cor. iv. 13—xii. 7,) written in beautiful, square uncial character, on parchment, in two columns, without separation of words (except that it gives sometimes the sign of a section), with initial letters to the sentences, and with punctuation, but without accents or breathings. It contains the Ammonian sections and the τίτλοι in the Gospels, but no division in the Epistles, with simple superscriptions and subscriptions to the books. On this account Hug considers this MS. older than Euthalius, and places it in the fifth century. According to Montfaucon and Eichhorn, on the other hand, it belongs to the sixth century. *

2. Cod. Vatic. 1209 (B), containing the O. and N. T. (excepting Hebrews ix. 15 to the end, the Epp. to Tim., Titus, and Philemon, and the Apocalypse), is written in a most beautiful, regular, square, but throughout retouched character, in three columns, without division of words or punctuation (sometimes, though seldom, the latter, as well as accents, has been added by a later hand), without the Ammonian sections in the Gospels, and yet with sections peculiar to it, both there and in the Epistles. Its peculiarities of language indicate Egypt as its birthplace. Montfaucon assigns it to the fifth or sixth century, Blanchini to the fifth, Hug and Tischendorf to the fourth. * It has been collated by Birch (§ 47 b, note c), and before him by Bartolocci and another Italian for Bentley. *


* The latter is found in Append. ad ed. N. T. e cod. Alex. Oxon. 1799, fol. The second, first used by Scholz, is in the Paris library. Tischendorf (in the place last referred to) compares the three collations.
§ 50 b.

3. *Cod. Ephraemi*, Cod. Reg. 1905, now 9 (C), a Codex rescriptus or palimpsestus (it contained writings of *Ephraem*, which were subsequently obliterated), containing portions of the O. T. and the whole N. T., although incomplete. Its exterior is similar to that of the two foregoing manuscripts, the text in one column, the letters somewhat larger than in the Cod. Al., like it with initial letters to mark the sentences, and a simple punctuation (a point commonly at the middle of the letter, but sometimes lower; a third hand has added more frequent points and a cross). Originally it had no accents or breathings (these have been frequently added by a third hand). It contains the Ammonian sections and the τίνος at the end, but not in the text; and very simple superscriptions and subscriptions. It also was written in Egypt, about the same time with the Cod. Alex. Hug and Tischendorf place it earlier, Wetstein before A.D. 542.

4. *Cod. S. Matth. Dublin. rescbr. (Z in Schulz, Scholz, and others)* contains the greater part of the Gospel of Matthew, in its exterior resembles the Cod. Ephr., and is likewise very old.

---


§ 51 a.

5. *Cod. Cantabrigi.* or *Bezae* (who owned it, and gave it to Cambridge), D in the critical editions, contains the Gospels in the Latin order (Matt., John, Luke, Mark), the Acts (with gaps), and a translation earlier than that of
Jerome, in a beautiful round character. It has neither separation of the words nor accents, but is written stichometrically, with many corrections by various hands, and is one of the oldest manuscripts; written, according to Hug, in the time immediately after Euthalius.*

6. **Cod. Laudian.** or **Bodleian.** 1. (E), containing Acts (excepting xxvi. 29 — xxviii. 6), in Latin and Greek (the Latin column standing first), is written in short lines, containing one or two words, but without accents, and in a coarse, heavy character. It has the Euthalian sections. On account of its Alexandrianisms, Woide and Hug regard it as having been written at Alexandria. Marsh and Eichhorn assign it to Western Europe, perhaps Sardinia. Hearne dates it in the eighth, Hug in the sixth, or beginning of the seventh century.\(^b\)

7. **Cod. Claromont.**, Bibl. reg. Paris, formerly 2245, now 107 (D in the Pauline Epp.), containing the 13 Pauline Epp. (excepting Rom. i. 1–7; 1 Cor. xiv. 13–22 by another hand), is written in Greek and Latin, without separation of words, but stichometrically, and with accents and breathings. The elegant Latin and less elegant Greek characters indicate a Latin copyist; according to Montfaucon of the seventh, according to Hug of the eighth century. **Cod. Sangerman.** (E) is a copy of this (according to Griesb. of the tenth century).\(^c\)

* Fae-simile: Codex Theod. Bezae Cantabrig., Evang., et Apost. Acta compl., quadrata literis Graeco-Lat. . . . edidit, cod. histor. praefixit, notasque adj. Thom. Kipling. Cantabr. 1793. 2 vol. fol. Cf. Dav. Schulz, Disp. de Cod. D Cantabrig. Vratisl. 1837. Kipling, Hug, and Schulz think, chiefly on account of the Alexandrian idioms, that it originated in Egypt; Schulz, Prolegg. p. xxxix. (cf. Weitstein, Prolegg. p. 31), on account of Latinisms in the word-forms and the orthography, and of Gallicisms in the translation, and Eichhorn (V. 189) because it was first found at Lyons, suppose that it was written in Southern Gaul. Credner (Beitr. I.) concedes the latter in regard to the MS.; but he regards Palestine as the birthplace of the original from which it was copied, and its text as of Jewish-Christian origin. It is disputed whether this Cod. is the same as Cod. Steph. β. See Marsh, p. 588, f.

§ 51 b.

8. **Cod. Boerner.** (G), now in Dresden, contains the Pauline Epp., with the following gaps: Rom. i. 1–5, ii. 16–25; 1 Cor. iii. 8–16, vi. 7–14, Col. ii. 2–8, Philem. 21–25; and a Latin interlinear translation. It separates the words, partly by points, and uses stichometry, which is indicated by initial letters and points. It is in a degenerate uncial character, without accents, the translation in Anglo-Saxon cursive character. **Hug** regards it, on account of its Alexandrianisms, as a copy of an Alexand. MS.; *Matthaei*, of a good ancient MS., and, from the marginal remarks, "contra γοβδοσκαλκον, contra Graecos," as made in the tenth century. *a*

9. **Cod. Augiensis**, formerly on the island of Reichenaun, now in Cambridge (F), containing the Pauline Epp. (that to the Hebrews in Latin only) in Greek and Latin, in columns, with separation of words by points, is related to the foregoing, but, on account of its different arrangement, is not, as **Wetstein** supposed, a copy of it, or of its original.

10. **Cod. Sangallensis** (Δ in Scholz, Tischendorf.) contains the four Gospels, with a Latin interlinear translation. It separates the words more frequently than the Cod. Boern. by points, and uses stichometry, which is indicated by initial letters and points. It has no accents. The editor *b places it in the ninth century, and thinks that it was written at St. Gall, under the Abbot Hartmot († 834), and by several hands.

---

*a* XIII Epp. Pauli Cod. e. versa. Lat. vet. vulgo Antehieronym., olim Boernerianus, nunc Bibl. Elect. Dresd. ed. a **Cr. Fr. Matthaei**. Misen. 1791. 4to, with a fac-simile of the writing. **The transl.** in many places follows the Greek more literally than elsewhere, and the Greek is sometimes Latinized.

to Scholz, this Cod. belongs to the Alex. recension; but it oftener (e. g. Matt. i. 19, 25, ii. 3, 8, f. 7–19) differs from BCD I. &c., than agrees with them (e. g. i. 18, 22, ii. 11, 15).

§ 51 c.

11. Cod. Cypr., formerly Colbert. 5149, now Reg. 63. (K), contains the Gospels without gaps, has no separation of words, but a point is inserted after each stichos. On account of its compressed characters R. Simon and D. Schulz date it in the tenth century, Montfaucon and Hug in the eighth.*

12. Cod. Basil. B. VI. 21. (E), contains the Gospels with gaps, in a sometimes round and again compressed uncial character, with no separation of words, but with accents and regular systematic punctuation. The notices of the lessons and festivals are by the same hand. This MS., which was for a long time at Constantinople, is of the eighth century.b

13. Cod. Stephani η, Reg. 62. (L), contains the Gospels in a longish uncial character, without division of words, with imperfect accentuation, and punctuation by two signs. An Egyptian MS. of the ninth century.a

* Specimen of the writing in Montfaucon, Palaeogr. III. 6. p. 232. Scholz, Comment. de Cod. Cyprio, appended to his Curae Crit. p. 37, sq., hesitates between the eighth and the ninth century; in his Prolegg. he decides in favor of the ninth century. Schulz and Griesb., Prolegg. p. xcix., appeal to the similarity of the characters to those of Cod. S, which was written A. D. 949.


§ 51 d.

14. Cod. Synod., V in Matthaei, contains the Gospels (what follows John vii. 39 being continued by a later hand) in a small and elegant uncial character, with accents and
continuous punctuation, in sections similar to verses, of the
ninth century.a

15. Cod. Synod. 98 (g Matth.) contains the Pauline and
Cath. Epp. with accentuation and punctuation. Date,
tenth century, according to the scholia, written in current
hand.b

16. Cod. Reg., formerly 2243*, now 48 (M), contains the
Gospels with accents and punctuation, with various read-
ings in current character in the margin, of the tenth
century.c

a Described by Matthaei, Append. ad epp. ad Thessalon. p. 265. A fac-
simile in the Apocal. p. 66.
b Described by Matthaei after Ep. ad Rom. p. 265, sqq. A specimen of
the writing in the Cath. Epp.
c A specimen of the writing in Montfaucon, Palaeogr. III. 8. p. 260.

II. Manuscripts in the Cursive Character.

§ 52 a.

The following MSS. of this class are remarkable for their
agreement with the oldest critical authorities:—

1. Cod. Basil. B. VI. 27, also Reuchlin, in Bengel Bas.
γ, in Wetstein and Griesb. 1, on parchment, in Svo, con-
tains the whole N. T. except the Apocalypse, adorned with
pictures, and of the tenth century. The text of the Gospels
is the ancient, but that of the remaining books the common
text.

13, on parchment, in 4to, contains the four Gospels, with
gaps. It is closely allied to Codd. 1 and 69, but has many
peculiarities. Date, thirteenth century.

3. Cod. Colbert. 2844, now Reg. 14, in the Gospels 33
in Wetstein and Griesb., in Acts and Cath. Epp. 13, in the
Pauline Epp. 17, contains extracts from the Prophets, and
the whole N. T. excepting the Apoc., singularly arranged,
on parchment, in folio. According to Griesbach, it is of the
eleventh or twelfth century. Eichhorn calls it "the queen
of the cursive MSS."

5. Cod. Winchelsean., in Wetst. and Griesb. 106 in the Gospels. Date, according to Jackson, who collated it for Wetstein, tenth century.

§ 52 b.

The remaining MSS. in the cursive character present chiefly the so-called Byzantine text. Remarkable both in its origin and its exterior is

6. Cod. 10 in Matth. and Griesb., containing the Gospels, on parchment, in folio, with golden initial letters, and red-colored superscriptions and other additions to the text, was copied in Jerusalem, probably before the Crusades, from a MS. (according to Hug) of the Palestinian recension.


8. Cod. Mosqu. S. Synod. IV., in Matth. and Griesb. b, contains the Acts and Epp., on parchment, in folio; according to Matth. of the ninth or tenth century. Both MSS. are very carefully written, and were formerly found at Mount Athos.

9. Cod. Mosqu., in Matth. and Griesb. in the Epp. a, in Acts a 1, very accurately written and collated, with scholia. Matth., who writes it highly, dates it in the tenth or eleventh century.


CITATIONS OF THE FATHERS. § 54.


II. Versions.

§ 53.

The immediate ancient versions of the N. T. are more reliable records of the text than those of the Q. T., where misapprehensions of the language often occur. They are older than almost all the MSS., and are of special value in determining the local peculiarities of the text. Their statements must, however, be confirmed by the readings of Greek MSS. to command full acceptance.

III. Citations of the Fathers.

§ 54.

The citations from the N. T. in the old Church writers may be regarded as fragments of ancient MSS., provided they are made, not carelessly from memory, but from MSS. The latter is the case when the citators comment on, or otherwise direct their attention to, the text, and repeat their citations in the same form.*

CRITICISM OF THE TEXT.

CHAPTER II.

PRINCIPLES OF CRITICISM.

(Comp. Pt. I. § 117, ff.)

Method and Object of Critical Inquiry.

§ 55 a.

The natural course in criticism is to start from the existing common text, and proceed backwards towards the original, whose restoration is the problem of criticism. By taking the common text as a basis the work gains a unity, without which hopeless confusion must ensue. To assert that we must abandon the common text, and seek a new basis, viz. the text which can be historically proved the most ancient; that we must abandon the idea of restoring the original text, and hence refrain from using internal grounds, and confine ourselves to historic or diplomatic criticism, a is, to say the least, very hasty, and demands a thorough testing. We might obtain a useful view by giving the text according to certain authorities alone (though great difficulties beset this undertaking); but such a text, which would always contain much questionable matter, cannot be made the basis of all critical labor, without depriving the latter of all unity and certainty. With as little reason can we set aside the common text and the whole testimony of later authorities; for oftentimes the later and common reading is preferable to the older. b Finally, although our estimate of readings from internal grounds may be, and often has been, arbitrary; yet to set this altogether aside in favor of diplomatic criticism is wholly inadmissible. For the problem of diplomatic criticism will be solved only at a distant period, if ever; and, consequently, the application of critical acuteness, though so natural, and constantly forcing itself upon us, would have to be long, or even for
ever, suspended. We maintain, therefore, the common stand-point which we have indicated, and from it lay down a theory of the function of criticism.

* So Lachmann and his enthusiastic reviewer, Rettig. See § 48 c, note a.

b What shall the interpreter do with Lachmann's text alone in places where it is meaningless, as Matt. xxi. 28–31?

Exegetico-critical Grounds of Originality.

§ 55 b.

On grounds which lie in the connection of the passage, many readings must be rejected, for they convey either no sense, or a bad one.

Extreme caution is needful in applying the standard of verbal correctness to N. T. readings, because the N. T. writers sometimes violate the laws of Greek grammar, and oftener those of a pure style; so that, frequently, a verbally incorrect reading is to be preferred (comp. § 36. II. 1). The same applies to the rhetorical grounds. While in cultivated writers we are justified in preferring those readings which lend just sequence, proportion, completeness, and roundness to the style, we must in the N. T. often reject the more elegant readings as additions.

a E. g. 1 John v. 7: ἐν τῷ οἴρωμο, ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος καὶ τὸ δύον πνεῦμα, κ. τ. λ. Rom. v. 14: ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀμαρτήσαντας for ἐπὶ τ. μὴ ἀμ. Rom. vii. 6: ἀποθανόντως for ἀποθανόντες. 1 Cor. iii. 2: σοφτε. xv. 51: πάντες μὲν καὶ μηθησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ for π. μ. οὐ κοιμ., πάντες δὲ. Gal. ii. 5: the omission of οἷς οὐδὲ. Acts xi. 20: ἑλλησταί for ἑλληνας. But the apparently meaningless reading is often the correct one. Fritzche and Tischff., Mark x. 12, are wrong in preferring another to the common reading, because the latter does not accord with the Jewish custom. Cf. above, 36 b. II. 2.

Grounds in Peculiarities of the Writer.

§ 56.

The style of the N. T. writers has, like that of the writers of the O. T., much variableness and uncertainty; and yet it can be distinctly apprehended (§§ 91, 96, 105, 161, 189), and used as a standard of the correctness of readings.¹

¹ Matt. xii. 14: the reading ἐξταθοῦσε δὲ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔκβαλαν κατ' αὐτὸν is preferable to the common reading, according to Matt. i. 24, ii. 3; iv. 12; viii. 10, 14, 18; ix. 4, 8, 9, 11, 19, 22; xii. 25; xv. 21, 29; xvi. 5, 8, 13; xvii. 6; xviii. 27, 28, 31, 34 (against this Fritzsche, ad Matt. p. 849, sq.).—Matt. v. 29: εἰκὴ is suspicious on account of its position, comp. Matt. iv. 24; v. 16: πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἐξοντας; iii. 11: οἱ δὲ ὑπό μου ἐρχόμενοι; iv. 22: οἱ δὲ εὐθὺς ἀφίνοντες. It would be hasty to blot out (with Gersdorf, Credner) the οὖν that follows in v. 19. As Matt. regularly uses the part. λίγων without the dat. of the person addressed, the omission of αὐτῷ, xix. 3, xxvi. 17, in some Codd. is sustained; notwithstanding, in xxii. 2, αὐτοῖς must remain.—Luke vi. 3: καὶ ἀποκριθέντες πρὸς αὐτοῖς εἶπον ὁ Ἰησοῦς is not in accordance with i. 13; ix. 62; xix. 9; Acts ix. 10, 15; xxi. 25.—In favor of the common text in Acts iv. 14; v. 32; vi. 15; xvi. 7; xxvii. 3; and, on the other hand, of Ludwig's reading, xxvi. 23, grounds are found in Luke's style of writing; cf. Exeget. Hdb.—As John does not use the optative, the reading of Codd. BCL, and others, xiii. 24, gains weight. In 1 Cor. ii. 7, θεοῦ σοφίαν is analogous to Rom. iii. 5; xiii. 4; 1 Cor. iii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 4, &c.—In 1 Cor. vi. 2, the ₊ adopted by Griesb. is entirely in harmony with the Apostle's style.

Historico-critical Grounds of Originality.

§ 57.

From the general principle, that that reading to which the origin of the others may be traced is the original, we may deduce the following special rules, having reference to the modes in which false readings arise:—1. The more obscure and difficult reading is to be preferred to the clearer and easier; 2. The harder, elliptical, Hebraizing, and ungrammatical, to the more pleasing and grammatical; 3. The rarer to the more common; 4. That which is less favorable to piety (especially of the monkish sort) and to Orthodoxy
is to be preferred to that which is more favorable to them; 5. That which conveys an apparently false meaning to one which seems to give a fitter meaning; 6. The shorter to that which betrays itself as an explanatory interpolation, or is in general more wordy; 7. The less expressive to the emphatic; 8. Finally, that reading which stands midway between others, and contains their germ, is to be considered the more original. *


**Consideration of the Critical Authorities as a Whole.**

§ 58.

It is generally conceded that authorities are not to be counted, but weighed; their families or related classes discriminated; and the evidence of whole classes, rather than of individual manuscripts, consulted and estimated. In accordance with his system, Griesbach has laid down the rules:—1. All the authorities which belong to one recension, and agree with it, are to be regarded as but one testimony. 2. That reading in which all the ancient recensions agree is to be considered genuine. 3. When the Alexandrian agrees with the Occidental, in opposition to the Constantinopolitan, the oldest reading is authenticated. 4. When the Alexandrian agrees with the Constantinopolitan, in opposition to the Occidental, we must inquire whether the reading of the Occidental belongs to errors which are peculiar to it. The same holds when the Occidental agrees with the Constantinopolitan, in opposition to the Alexandrian. 5. If all three recensions give different readings, the preponderance of internal evidence, and not the number of authorities, must decide.


b The system of Griesbach thus includes the fundamental idea of Lachmann’s system of criticism, but only as one element in the whole. In most cases Griesbach went back only to the oldest text. It must be admitted, however, that the oldest text is not necessarily the correct one.

c Hug (Einl. I. § 146, ff.) gives somewhat different rules, as he makes...
the old unrevised text (κανέν εκδοσις) the basis of examination, see § 39. Tregelles (§ 48 c, note d), p. xxx., lays down the following rules: — 1. The reading that rests upon unanimous testimony is genuine. 2. When authorities differ, that reading is preferable, ceteris paribus, which has the preponderance of testimony. 3. The testimony of the old uncial codds. has precedence of the whole mass of later codds. 4. But there are cases where the former codd. agree in a certainly false reading (see § 40 b, note b), as is proved by its wrong sense, by its want of support from the versions, and by its probable origin in error (or perhaps in design). 5. In doubtful cases the testimony of the versions is of weight. 6. A reading which rests on a few later codds. alone is to be rejected (?), and so on.

Critical Conjecture.

§ 59.

As the N. T. text has suffered much less corruption than that of the O. T., and the materials for its restoration are very numerous, a resort to conjecture is very seldom necessary (as e.g. Hebr. xi. 37);* and as the N. T. stands in more intimate connection than the O. T. with the faith of Christians, critical conjecture can never lay claim to general acceptance.b

* In Heb. xii. 15 the original error may be discovered, but the author copied it from the LXX.

DIVISION II.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SEPARATE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

GENERAL PREFATORY REMARKS.


1. Epistles.

§ 60.

With the formation of a Christian life, occasions arose for a Christian literature. The first who seized the pen in the service of the Christian Church was probably the Apostle Paul, who has certainly also had the greatest influence on the development of a special Christian language. His writings were letters, addressed to the communities which he founded, and therefore called forth by circumstances, and devoted to specific objects. In this kind of writing he is the master and prototype. Following in his wake, other Apostles also wrote letters, which, however, all (2 and 3 John excepted) lack a distinctly epistolary character, and approach that of treatises. Even the author of the Apocalypse seems to have imitated Paul. In respect of their contents, the Apostolic Epistles may be termed doctrinal and hortatory writings.

2. Gospels.

§ 61.

The knowledge of the revealed salvation, the "glad tidings" (εὐαγγέλιον), was at first propagated orally by the
Apostles and their assistants; and their addresses recounted also the history of the life, doctrine, works, death, and resurrection of Jesus (comp. Acts xiii. 16, ff.). Subsequently the need of more exact instruction in the Gospel-history arose;* and this seems to have been the province of the Evangelists, while Prophets and Teachers attended to the other branches of Christian instruction (Eph. iv. 11). To aid the memory, the Gospel narratives were written down. Luke (i. 1)\textsuperscript{b} was acquainted with several such literary essays. The various needs of different classes of Christians demanded also a varied treatment of the Gospel. Especially was it necessary that the difference between the Jewish-Christian and the Pauline tendency should therein manifest itself. In view of their contents, the Gospels may certainly be called historic writings; but the history always has more or less the object of establishing the faith, and to this the selection and treatment of the historic matter correspond. The Acts of the Apostles contains a continuation of the Gospel history.

* According to Luke i. 4, we may certainly suppose a μαρτυρίας which included the Evangelic history; that it was neither accurate nor comprehensive appears from the preface of Luke. Thiersch (Herstell. d. histor. Standpunkts für die Kritik, etc., 1845, p. 91, ff.) asserts more in respect to this matter than can be proved.


3. The Revelation.

§ 62.

In the Gospels, a certain affinity with the books of Moses and the historic books of the Old Testament may be traced; in the Epistles, the doctrinal and hortatory element of prophecy,\textsuperscript{a} in connection with a renovated moral aphoristic wisdom; and thus, as the primitive Christian Church had her prophets (Eph. iv. 11), there sprang up on Christian soil a shoot of Old Testament prophecy, in the Revelation of John.

\textsuperscript{a} Jerem. xxix. 1–23, the prototype of the N. T. Epistles. Compare Baruch i. 10, ff.
LIST OF EXEGETICAL WORKS.


RISE OF A NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

SECTION I.

GOSPELS.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE GOSPELS GENERALLY.

Ancient Uncanonical Gospels.

§ 63.

In addition to our canonical Gospels, Christian antiquity was acquainted with several others; and it is in the last degree needful to obtain as accurate a knowledge of these as possible, for the opinion is pretty wide-spread that some of them are older and more original than our canonical Gospels.

* Origen. Hom. I. in Luc.: . . . multi conati sunt scribere Evangelia, sed non omnes recepti . . . ut sciatis non solum quatuor Evangelia, sed plurima esse conscripta, e quibus haec quae habemus electa sunt et tradita ecclesiis.


§ 64 a.

Of this Gospel, we find in antiquity the most numerous and certain traces. Several of the old Church teachers and
heretics, and especially the Ebionites, used it. But the oldest accounts contradict the idea of its being an original and independent work, by representing it as apocryphal, and as wavering between Matthew and Luke.¹


§ 64 b.

The statements of Epiphanius, a which are very confused, being drawn, probably, not from his own observation, but from some Ebionite work, show that the Ebionites read this Gospel — which they supposed to be by Matthew — without the first two chapters, and beginning we are still uncertain where; and that it was known to him. only through Greek fragments, b and contained a mixture of Matthew and Luke with in part apocryphal matter.


* Others, as Gieseler, erroneously refer this passage to the Elcesaites.

† Eichhorn, I. 29, considers what follows a subsequently added beginning, to justify the title, Gospel of the Twelve Apostles; but, according to Epiphanius, it is not the beginning. — See what follows, esp. in § 14.
Gospels.

αν, καὶ Θαδδαίον, καὶ Σίμων τοῦ ἤλωτης, καὶ Ἰουδάν τοῦ Ἰσκαριώτης, καὶ σε τόν Ματθαίον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελω-
νίου ἐκάλεσα, καὶ ἥκολούθησάς μοι. ἦμας οὖν βούλομαι εἰ-
nαι δεκαδύο ἀπόστολους, εἰς μαρτυρίον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Καὶ
ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων, καὶ ἐξήλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν Φαρισαίο-
ι, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο καὶ πάσα ἱεροσολύμα (εἰς Ματθ. iii. 15; Μαρκ. i. 4, 5). Καὶ εἰλή
ἐν Ἰωάννης ἑνόμη ἀπὸ τριῶν εἰρή-
nυν, καὶ ἄνευς ἄδεμπτην περὶ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ. Καὶ τὸ
βρωμά αὐτοῦ, φησί, μέλε άγριον, οὐ δὲ γεύσεις ἐν τοῖς μάντας,
οὐ ἐγκρίνει ἐν ἑλαῖο (εἰς Ματθ. iii. 4; Μαρκ. i. 6). ὅσι δὴ ποιεστρα-
ψοι τῷ τῆς ἁλθείας λόγῳ εἰς ψεῦδος, καὶ ἄντι ἀκρίδων τούτων ἐγκρί-
nεις ἐν μέλι. Ἡ δὲ ἄρχη τοῦ παρ αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίου ἤξει. διπ
ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἱρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας
(εἰς Λουκ. iii. 1, 1), ἔλθε Ιωάννης βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανο-
nεί ἐν τῷ Ἱορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, δε ἔγνετο εἰναι ἐκ γένους Ἀραμὸ-
τοῦ λείψων, παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ελεισάβετ, καὶ ἐξήρχοντο πρὸς
αὐτῶν πάντες. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐσπέραν πολλά, ἐπιφέρει, διὸ τοῦ λαοῦ
βαπτισθέντος ἔλθε καὶ ἦρασίζει, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοθα ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰω-
άννου. Καὶ (εἰς Ἰερ. ad Isa. xi.) ὡς ἀνέλθην ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱδροῦ,
νοιχησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδο τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἄγιον
ἐν εἰδί περιστεράς κατακλυθῆς καὶ εἰσελθοῦσας εἰς αὐτὸν.
Καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα: σὺ μου εἰ ὁ υἱὸς
ὁ ἀναψάτης, ἐν σοι εὐδοκία. Καὶ πάλιν, ἐγὼ σήμερον γε-
γέννηκα σε. Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τοῦ τόπου φῶς μέγα.
"Ον ἰδὼν, φησιν, ὁ Ιωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ: σὺ τέλει, Κύριε;
Καὶ πά-
λιν φωνὴ ἐν οὐρανοῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν: ὁδοὶ ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀναψά-
της, ἐφ' ὑμᾶς εὐδοκία. Καὶ τότε, φησίν, ὁ Ἰωάννης πα-
πασί καὶ πάντως αὐτῷ ἐλεγεν: δέομαι σοι, Κύριε, σύ με 
βάπτισον.
Ο δὲ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτῷ, λέγων: ἄφες, ὅτι οὗτοι ἐστὶν πρότερον πλη-
ρωθήσεται πάντα (εἰς Ματθ. iii. 13–17; Μαρκ. i. 9–11). § 14: . . .
πρακτόρων ταῖς παρά τοῦ Ματθαίου γενεαλογίαις ἀρχοντα τὰ ἀρχαὶ ποιεῖσθαι, ὅπως προεῖν (§ 13), λέγωντες, ὅτι ἐγένετο, φησιν, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις
Ἱρώδου βασιλεῶς τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπὶ ἀρχείας Καΐσαρα, ἤδη
τις Ἰωάννης ὑπόμεινα βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοεῖν ἐν τῷ πο-
ταμῷ Ἱορδάνῃ καὶ τὸ ἔξον. § 16: Τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐστοιγμένον καλοῦμενον
περίκει, ὅτι ἠλθεν καταλύει πᾶς τὸ σαραυά, καὶ ἔλαβε 
μὴ παύση σοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐ παύσηται ἀφ' ὧν ἦν ἡ ὀργή. § 22: Αὐτοὶ δὲ
ἀφαίρεσται ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν τῆς ἁλθείας ἀκολουθεῖ, ἡλαζον τῷ ῥήτορι...
καὶ ἐποίησαν τὼν μαθητῶν μὲ λέγοντας: τοῦ θέλεις ἐστί παρ' ὑμῖν, σοι
tὸ πᾶσα φαγεῖν (εἰς Ματθ. xxvi. 17.) καὶ αὐτῶν δῆθεν λέγοντας: μὴ
ἐπιθυμείς ἐπεθυμησας κρέας τοῦτο πᾶσα φαγείν μεθ' ὑμῖν;
(εἰς Λουκ. xxii. 15.) § 26: Φασι ... ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ εἰναι ἐν ὡς ἃ 
διδάσκαλος. Εἰς Ματθ. x. 25.
* This is manifest from the use of ἐγκρίνει for δικρίνει, which, moreover, 
rested on ascetic grounds. Cremer, Beitr. I. 34.
§ 65 a.

Jerome is the first authority who had himself seen the Gospel of the Hebrews, and in the Hebrew (Chaldee) language. At first he held the opinion, then current also in the Church, that it was one and the same with the Gospel of Matthew. He seems, however, to have subsequently retracted this opinion;* and, indeed, some of his quotations have little or no affinity with the latter Gospel.b

* De vir. ill. (about A. D. 392), c. 3: Matthaeus . . . . primus in Judaea propter eos, qui ex circumcisione crederant, Evangelium Christi Hebraicis litteris verbisque composuit: quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum* habetur usque hodie in Caesariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphila Martyr studentissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaraeis, qui in Berea urbe Syriae hoc volumine utuntur, descripti facultas fuit. In quo † animadvertendum, quod ubicunque Evangelista, sive ex persona sua, sive ex persona Domini Salvatoris, veteris scripturae testimoniiis abutitur, non sequatur LXX translatorum auctoritatem, sed Hebraicam; e quibus illa duo sunt: Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum; et: Quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur.—Ib. c. 2: Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos, et a me nuper in Graecum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes sepe utitur . . . . —Comm. ad Mich. vii. 6 (about A. D. 392): Qui crediderit Evangelio, quod secundum Hebraeos editum nuper transstulimus . . . . —About A. D. 398, in his Comm. ad Matt. vi. 11: In Evangelio, quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos. xii. 13: Evangelium, quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae, quo nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone translatum, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei auctore . . . . xxiii. 31: In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni. xxvii. 16: In Evangelio, quod scribitur juxta Hebraeos.—After A. D. 406, in his Comm. ad Isa. xi. 1: Juxta Evangelium, quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazaraei. xl. 9: In Evangelio, quod juxta Hebraeos scriptum Nazaraei lectitatur. Praef. ad libr. comm. in Isa. xviii.: Evangelium, quod Hebrae—

* This does not mean, as Eichhorn, I. 29, note y, thinks, that there is also a Gospel in the Syro-Chaldaic; but that this Hebrew Gospel of M. is (according to the assumption) extant in the Gospel of the Hebrews preserved at Caesarea.

† This refers certainly to the Greek Gospel of Matthew, whose identity with the Gospel of the Hebrews is, however, presupposed. Credner (Beitr. z. Einl. ins N. T. I. 394) considers the passage, Porro . . . . facultas fuit, a marginal note written by Jerome himself; and that he had not, at that time, examined the Hebrew Gospel, and therefore followed the prevailing opinion. Were that the case, the passage above must have been written earlier than that which follows.


§ 65 b.

Other passages have their parallels in Matthew, but are changed by additions and alterations. One of these alterations indicates a Greek original. Hence, the opinion that the Gospel of the Hebrews is the most ancient Gospel writing falls to the ground. Jerome makes no distinction between the Gospel of the Nazarenes and that of the Ebionites, and seems to have known only the latter. That the first two chapters were in his copy cannot be satisfactorily proved; but it is probable, as Hegesippus (§ 64 a, note a)
found them there. The Gospel of Peter must have been closely related to the Gospel of the Hebrews.\footnote{Contr. Pelagian. l. c.: ... Et in codem volumine: Si peccaverit, inquit, frater tuus in verbo, et satis illi frater, septies in die suscipe eum. Dixit illi Simon, discipulus ejus: Septies in die? Respondit Dominus et dixit ei: Etiam ego dico tibi, usque septuagies septies. Etenim in propheta quoque, postquam uncti sunt spiritu s., inventus est sermo peccati (cf. Matt. xviii. 21, f.). — Comm. in Matt. vi. 11: In Evangelio, quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos, pro supersubstantiali pane reperi: Mahar, quod dicitur crasrinum, ut sit sensus: Panem nostrum crasrinum, i. e. futurum, da nobis. — In Matt. xii. 13: In Evangelio ... homo ists, qui aridam habet manum, coemterarius scribatur, iustus modi auxilium precans: Coemterarius eram, malistant victum gueritans: precor te, Jesu, ut mihi restitutas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos. — In Matt. xxiii. 35: In Evangelio ... pro filio Barachiae filium Jojadae reperimus scriptum. — Ep. 120 ad Hedibiam: In Evangelio ... legimus non velum templi sese, sed superiminare templi mirae magnitudinis correississe. Cf. in Matt. xxvii. 51.}

\footnote{Hieron. in Matt. xxvii. 16: Iste (Barabbas) in Evangelio ... juxta Hebr. ... filius magistri eorum interpretatur. Exchange of מֶן שָׁם for מֶן רָב. Credner, as above, p. 345, f. 405. On the other hand, Steffert, Ueb. d. Urspr. d. ersten kan. Ev. p. 33, and Schechenk. Ueb. d. Urspr. d. erst. kan. Ev. p. 139, think it is only a witty interpretation of the name. This, however, presupposes the writing מֶן רָב, which came from the Greek.}

\footnote{Against Schwegler, Nachap. Zeitsgt. I. 199. Baur, Krit. Unterr. p. 573. Credner, p. 410, rightly remarks that the Hebrew Christians did not, till a later period, feel the need of a Gospel in their own tongue, and therefore translated the Gospel of Matthew, which was most widely circulated among the Greek-Jewish Christians.}

\footnote{From Comm. ad Matt. ii. 6: Bethlehem Judaeae: librariorum hic error est. Putamus enim ab evangelista primum editum, sicut in Hebraico legimus Judae, non Judaeae, — we may not conclude that he had compared the Gospel of the Hebrews here. Cf. ad Matt. vi. 11: Quod nos supersubstantialem expressimus, in Graeco habetur ετερον: quod verbum LXX interpretes περιονον frequentsimine transferunt. Consideramus ergo in Hebraeo, et ubicunque illi περιονον expresserunt, nos invenimus Sgolla (which is followed by the already quoted note a). Very little more is proved by the passage, Ad Isa. xi. 1: Illud quod in Evangel. Matth. omnes quaerunt ecclesiastic et non inveniunt, ubi scriptum sit, quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur, erudiri Hebraei (probably Nazarenes, whom J. was interrogating), de hoc loco assumum putant. — Ad Abac. iii. 3: Audivi ego Hebraeum istum locum ita disserere: quod Bethlehem sita sit ad austrum, in qua natus est Dominus, etc. Cf. Matt. ii. 1.}

\footnote{Euseb. VI. 19, states that Serapion found it in the community at Rhos- sus, in Cilicia, and in the hands especially of the adherents to the Docce-


2. Justin’s Gospel.

§ 66 a.

Justin Martyr (born A. D. 89, died 163), in his writings, often adduces from the Gospel history both deeds and sayings of Jesus and others. The latter bear distinct resemblance to corresponding passages in our Gospels, especially in Matthew and Luke, seldom in John, and are related to them as follows:—1. Several, but not many, agree word for word; a 2. Others agree in the matter, but differ in using similar words and combinations, in misplacing and omitting; b 3. Others give the thought only in general, or approximately; c 4. Others, in fine, give the contents of several passages and various sayings brought together.d


καὶ Φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν ὦρανῶν. Κφ. Matt. v. 20.


b The following quotations vary in only one word: —


The following quotations vary more: —

δ. Dial. κ. Τρ. π. 268: Ἔγω μὲν ὑμᾶς Matt. iii. 11, f.: Ἔγω μὲν βασιλέως βασίλειων ἐν ὑμῖν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑμῖν εἰς μετάνοιαν... σὲ τὸ ἐστίν, οὗ εἰμὶ ικανῶς τὰ ὑποδήματα βασιλέως αὐτῶν ὑμᾶς βασίλειαν ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πιστεύετε ὃ τὸ πῦρ καὶ τὸ πῦρ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ Χείρι αὐ- τοῦ, καὶ διακαδαρίαι τὴν ἁγίαν αὐ- τοῦ, καὶ τὸν ὀνόμαν συνάκουν εἰς τὴν ἀποθέσειν... τὸ δὲ ἄρχον κα- τακαύνει πιστεύεται αὐτὸ τὸ πῦρ ἀντέχεται τὴν ἀποθέσειν τὸ δὲ ἄρχον κα- τακαύνει πιστεύεται αὐτὸ τὸ πῦρ ἀντέχεται τὴν ἀποθέσειν τὸ δὲ ἄρχον κα-

ε. Απολ. Π. π. 61, sq., where several expressions of Jesus are quoted successively: —

Οὐ δὲ ἐμβλέψῃ γυναικα Matt. v. 28: .... πᾶσι ὁ βλέπων πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμηθῆκεν αὐτής, ἢ δὴ ἐμβλέψῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

ζ. Ιβ. Καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Matt. v. 29: Εἶ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου τοῖς οὖσιν αὐ- τῶν συμφέρει γὰρ σου μονο- φαβαλοὺς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν ὦρανῶν, ἢ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου τοῖς οὖσιν αὐ- τῶν συμφέρει γὰρ σου μονο- φαβαλοὺς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν ὦρανῶν.
μετὰ τῶν δύο περιβάλλεται εἰς τὸ αἰῶνιον πῦρ.

βλήθη εἰς γένναν. Cf., however, Matt. xviii. 9: ... καὶ λόγοι μουνόβαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωήν εἰσελθείν, ἢ δύο ὑβρισμοὶ ἔχοντα βληθήναι εἰς τὴν γένναν τοῦ πῦρος.

Matt. v. 32: ... δὲ ἂν ἀπολίθηση τῆς γυναίκας αὐτοῦ ... τοιεὶ αὐτὴν μοιχάσατο καὶ δὲ ἄν ἀπολελμηθὲν γαμήσῃ, μοιχάται.

θ. Ib. Εἰς τινες, οὕτως εὐνοούσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· εἰς δὲ οἱ ἐγεννήθησαν εὐνοοχοί· εἰς δὲ οἱ εὐνοούσιοι εὐαγγελίζων τὸ στέφει τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Πλὴν οἱ πάντες τούτο χοροῦσιν.

Matt. xix. 13: εἰς γὰρ εὐνοοχοί, οὕτως εἰς καλίας μητρὸς ἐγεννήθησαν οὕτως καὶ εἰς εὐνοοχοί, οὕτως εὐνοούσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· καὶ εἰς εὐνοοχοί, οὕτως εὐνοούσαν εἰς τὸ στέφετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

"Ο δυνάμενος χωρεῖν, χωρεῖ·


Matt. v. 46: Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶσας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μεθύσασθε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.

κ. Ib. Παρῇ τῷ αἰτοῦντι δίδοσαι καὶ τὸν βουλήμενον δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆτε· εἰ γὰρ δανείσασθαι παρ’ δὲ ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, τί καὶ τίνος ποιεῖτε; τούτοι καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιῶσιν.


λ. Ib. Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ θησαυρίζετε ἐαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου οὐκ εἰς καὶ βρῶσιν ἄφαντες καὶ λυπᾶται διὸ τὸ κατάρασας· θησαυρίζετε δὲ ἐαυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε οὐκ εἰς καὶ βρῶσιν ἄφαντες.

Matt. iv. 19: Μὴ θησαυρίζετε μείνας θησαυρούς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου οὐκ εἰς καὶ βρῶσιν ἄφαντες, καὶ δὸν κλέπτεται διορύσασθαι καὶ κλέπτοντες· θησαυρίζετε δὲ ὡς θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅπου οὔτε οὐκ εἰς καὶ βρῶσιν ἄφαντες, καὶ δὸν κλέπται δὲ διορύσασθαι οὐδὲ κλέπτοντες.

μ. Ib. Τί γὰρ ὁφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἄν τὸν κόσμον διόν κερδησῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἀπολέσῃ; ἢ τί διώκεις αὑτῆς ἀντάλλαγμα;

Matt. xvi. 26: Τί γὰρ ἄριστος ἄθλος, ἢ τὸ πόσιμον ἄξιον κράτος, τὴν δὲ ψυχήν ἀπολέσῃ; ἢ τί διώκεις αὑτῆς ἀντάλλαγμα;

ν. Ib. Τί συνέθες δὲ χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμοι, ὡς καὶ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν χρηστός ἐστι καὶ οἰκτίρμως καὶ

Luke vi. 36: Γέουσθε οὖν οἰκτίρμοι, καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμως ἐστι. Matt. v. 45: ... ὦ τοι}

* ἀπὸ σοῦ is wanting in D. cant. Clem. Cypr.
τὸν ἕλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνάτλητε ἐπὶ τὸν ἐκτομοῦν ἀμαρτωλοὺς καὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀγαθούς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς. (Διαλ. c. Τρ. p. 321: δικαίους καὶ δίκους.)

ε. Απολ. II. p. 63: Τῷ τύπτοντι σου τὴν σαφὸνα πάρεξε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην καὶ τὸν αἰρόντα σου τὸν χιτώνα ἐπὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον μὴ κολύσῃς.

ο. Ιβ. Παντι δὲ ἀγαρεύνοντι σοι μίλιοι, ἀκολούθησον δύο.

π. Ιβ. Λαμψάω δὲ ύμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἐργὰ ἐμπροσθέν τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ἐνα βλέποντες θαυμάζωσον τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

ρ. Ιβ. p. 95: Οδδεὶς ἵνα τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ νόος, οὐδὲ τὸν ύπόν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ οἷς ἀν ἀποκαλύψῃ ὁ νόος. (So p. 96, only at last: ὁ νόος ἀποκαλ. So also Clem. Hom., also Orig.)

σ. Διαλ. c. Τρ. p. 336: Πάντα μοι παραδόται ὑπὸ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ οὐδὲ γενοῦσαι τ. πατ. εἰ μὴ νόος, οὐδὲ τ. νόον εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ οἷς ἀν ὁ νόος ἀποκαλύψῃ.

τ. Διαλ. c. Τρ. p. 235: Γέγραπται δὲ οἶκος ὁ οἶκος τοῦ πατρὸς μου προσευχής ἐστίν ὑμεῖς δὲ πατείκατε αὐτὸν πάθει λατρευτῶν.

υ. Ιβ. p. 301: Υπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τοῦ ἐξώτερον, ὁ ἡτοιμασεν ὁ πατήρ τῷ σωτήρι καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.

* ὁ νόος ἀποκαλύψῃ Clem. sexies, Orig. quater, Iren. semel, Tertull.
† πατείκατε 1. Orig. bis.
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Matt. xxvii. 39: Πάπερ μου, εἰ παρελθὼν τὸ ποτήριον τούτο παρελθὼν ἀν' ἐμοὶ ἀν' ἐμοὶ, (p. 331: παρελθὼν, εἰ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο πλὴν σὺν σ᾽ δυνατόν, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο.) (Καὶ ὃς ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλ' ὃς σῇ, μετὰ τὸν τούτοις εὐχαριστεῖς.) μὴ ἦστε ἐγὼ θεὸς, ἀλλ' ὃς σῇ θεός.


The following quotations differ still more widely:—


(Dial. c. Tr. p. 328: Λέγοντος αὐτῷ τιμὸς: διδάσκαλε ἀγαθὲ, ἀπεκρίνατο τι μὲ λέγεις ἀγαθὸν; εἰς ἔστω τὸν ἄγαθον, ὅ πατὴρ μου ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.)

ε. a. Apol. II. p. 63: "Ὡς δ' ἄν ὁ ρήγητος, ἐνεχθὲς ἐστιν εἰς τὸ πῦρ.

Matt. v. 92: Ἡδοναὶ ὁ ὁδηγός μεν τῷ ἀδέλφῳ αὐτοῦ εἰκή, ἐνεχθές ἐσται τῇ κρίσει. Ὡς δ' ἄν ἐνεχθῇ τῷ ἀδέλφῳ αὐτῷ μακρὰ, ἐνεχθὲς ἐσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ.

β. Ib. p. 64: "Ὁ γὰρ ἀκούεις μου, καὶ ποιεῖς ὁ λέγω, ἀκούεις τοῦ ἀποστειλατός με.

Luke x. 16: Ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοὶ ἀκούεις καὶ ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοὶ ἀκούεις: ὁ δὲ ἐμὸν ἄδετον ἀδετεῖ τὸν ἀποστειλατόν με.

γ. Ib. "Ὅτι πλέον ἤδονην ὁ θεός, πλέον καὶ ἀπανθητεύεται παρ' αὐτοῦ.

Luke xii. 48: Παντὶ δὲ ὁ θεός πολὺ, πολὺ ἐκπέμπεται παρ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ παραθέτει πολὺ, περισσότερος αἰτήσεσθαι αὐτόν.


Matt. xix. 38: Παρὰ ἀνθρώπους τοῦτο ἀδύνατον ἦστιν, παρὰ δὲ θεῷ πάντα δυνατά.

* So Clem. Al. Clem. Hom. III. 55, XIX. 2; also James v. 19.
† καὶ L. 225, Mt. d. Syr. all. 
‡ ο δ' ἐμοὶ ἀκούων ἀκούεις τοῦ ἀποστειλατός με D cant. vind.
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e. Dial. c. Tr. p. 235: Ohol υμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαίοι, ὑποκρι-

tai, ὅτι ἀποδεκατότε ὑπὸ θύσισιν καὶ τὸ πίθαυν, τὴν δὲ ἀγά-

πην τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν κρίσιν οὐ κατανοεῖτε.

ζ. Ib. p. 308: ὅστε γαμήσουσιν, οὕτω
gamhèsountai, ἀλλὰ ἰσάγγελοι ἐσον-
tai, τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως

dôstes.

η. Ib. Ἐκκλ. καὶ ψευδοπροφήται

cαι ψευδόχριστοι πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ παρελεύ-

σονται, καὶ πολλοὶ πλανή-

sousoun (p. 253, ἀναστήσεις πολ-

loï ψευδοχρ. κ. ψευδαπόστολοι, k. p. τῶν πιστῶν πλ.)

θ. Ἀρων. Ἰ. p. 94: Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χρι-

stós εἶπεν, ἂν μη ἀναγέννητε,

οὐ μὴ εὐθέλησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν
tῶν υἱῶν ὅς ἂν ἓποτε ǳε καὶ αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς μισρίς τῶν τεκνων ὅπως

gennoménoi èmbhain, φανερῶς ἐστὶ πάται.

ε. Ib. p. 68: Ἡ λόγος δὲ τίνα τῶν

σαρκοποιηθέντων άνθρωπων γέ-

γονέων, ἐν τοῖς εξής ἐρούμενοι... ὁ

dέ vòς (θεοῦ) ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος
cupwos vòs, ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιμάτων, καὶ συνόν κ. γεννόμενος, ὅτι τὴν

ἀρχήν δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔπεσεν κ. ἐκνάμαι, ἤρωτος μὲν κατὰ τὸ κεχρήσαι κ.

κοσμήσαι τὰ πάντα δὲ αὐτοῦ τῶν θεοῦ, λέγεται.

δ. Ἀρων. Ἰ. p. 63: Μὴ μεριμνᾶτε

de τῇ φάγῃ, ἡ τῇ ἐνδύσῃσθαι. οὐχ

ὑμῶι τῶν πτευσιν καὶ τῶν θηρίων
diaphírète; καὶ ὁ θεὸς τρέφει αὐτὰ.

μὴ οὖν μεριμνᾶτε τῇ φάγῃ, ἡ τῇ ἐνδύσησθαι. οὐχ

ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖον ἐστὶ τῇ τροφῇ, καὶ τῷ

σώμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος; 28: ἐμβλέπων εἰς τὰ πτευτά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, δοῦς ὑπὲρ

πιστεύσων, ὁδοὶ ἄφθονος, ὁδοὶ σω-

νικῶν εἰς ἀποθέκες κ. ὁ πατὴρ

ὑμῶι οὐρανοί τρέφει αὐτά· οὐχ

* So also Clem. Hom. XI. 96.
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ἔμων. ὅπου γὰρ ὁ θησαυρὸς ἦτων, ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν; 31: ὡς καὶ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἄνθρωπον.


δ. 1b. p. 316: Οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος. ἢν γὰρ ὁ ἴσχυρότερος μου, νῦν εἰμὶ λαοὶ τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι. John i. 23: Ἐγώ φωνὴ βοῶντος.... Matt. iii. 11: οὐκ ἐπέταξα μοι ἐν τοῖς Ἰσχυρότεροι μου ἑστίν, οὐ, κ. τ. Λ.
§ 66 b.

His historical citations are much freer, and combine, in part, the statements of Matthew and Luke.* Some, however, are not to be found in our Gospels.b


p. 316: Τὰ τεκτονικά ἄργα εἰργάζοντο ἐν ἀνθρώπως ὅν, Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ζωὴ· διὰ τοῦτον καὶ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σώματα διδάσκειν καὶ ἐνεργεία βιών. — p. 296: Οἱ δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ὄρωντες γενομένα φαντασίας μαγικῆς γίνοντο ἥλεγχον· καὶ γὼ μάγον εἶμι αὐτῶν ἐτόλμων λέγειν καὶ λαοπλάσιαν. — p. 267: Χριστὸς εἶπεν· ἐν οἷς ὁ Ἰωάννης καταλύετο, ἐν τοῖς και κρινό. The passages, p. 333, 271, which Eichhorn, I. 93, 94, cites, are perhaps not peculiar accounts, but arbitrary amplifications.

§ 67 a.

Justin mentions, as the source of these sayings and accounts, writings left behind by the Apostles and their assistants, which he calls Memoirs of the Apostles, also Gospels.*

* σὺ εἷς D cant. verc.
† Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε D cant. all. Clem. all.
It is a question what we are to understand by these. The old opinion, that they mean our canonical Gospels, is by no means contradicted by the inexactness of the citations (§ 66 a, notes b — d); for it is probable, nay, is established by the repetitions that occur,* that Justin cited the Gospels, as sometimes the Old Testament writers, freely, from memory. The title, Memoirs of the Apostles, probably an allusion to Xenophon’s "Memorabilia," and the non-mention of the Evangelists’ names,* cannot be of much importance; and Gospels which were read in the assemblies of the Christians cannot well be other than our canonical Gospels, all of which (Mark and John more seldom *) he made use of.


* Creder, last-mentioned work, pp. 211, 223, 246, f., 259, labors to show, in the passages 2. b. v. Χ. i. k. (where he lays stress on the expression τι κατών), 4. d. γ. 3. c. θ. i. traces of another text found in heretical writings. (See against him Bindemann, as above, p. 441, ff.) Baur refers the passages
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3. c. 6 to a Jewish Christian Gospel (Zeller's Jb. 1844, p. 665). According to Credner, p. 251, f., 354, f., Baur, and Zeller (ib. 1846, p. 607), Justin must have borrowed his doctrine of the Logos, not from the Gospel of John, but from Philo and the then prevailing Church doctrine. "But if the Fathers who came only a little later, Clement of Alexandria, Ireneæus, and Origen, expressly refer this doctrine to the Prologue of John's Gospel, shall we believe that Justin drew it from another source?" Lücke, Comm. üb. d. Joh. 3d ed. I. 49. See also Bleek, Beitr. I. 220, f. Ritschl, Evang. Marc. p. 139, ff., endeavors to show, from the discrepancies in the history of Jesus's youth, that probably Justin used the incomplete Gospel of Marcion. But this theory is opposed by the references to passages like Luke iii. 25, xxiv. 25, 37, which unmistakably belong to the author of our third Gospel.

Justin cites other sacred authors, also, without giving their names: Apol. II. p. 86, Ps. xxiv. 7; Dial. p. 295, Ps. xix. 5, Isa. xxxv. 2; p. 315, Joel iii. 28, and elsewhere frequently.

Dial. p. 333, cf. Mark iii. 17, above, note a; p. 316, cf. John i. 23, § 66 a, note d, ε. Apol. II. p. 94, cf. John iii.ail., § 66 a, note c, θ; p. 68, cf. John i. 1, ff, § 66 a, note c, υ. Other allusions to Johannic passages are more or less uncertain.

§ 67 b.

The historical citations not found in our Gospels (§ 66 b, note b) require only this supposition,—that Justin, in addition to our Gospels, used an uncanonical gospel, as the Gospel of the Hebrews, or of Peter, to read additions taken from them in his manuscript from Matthew. The theories, that he used only the Gospel of the Hebrews; b or a harmony of the same with Luke; c or a harmony of the Gospels; d or an edition of his own of Matthew; e or an original gospel akin to Matthew's, and enriched from Luke's, f—are by no means sustained by these quotations.

Credner maintains the latter, but generally on weak grounds. Thus he finds (p. 139) it in the passage, Dial. c. Tr. p. 333 (§ 67 a, note a), by referring the pronoun in the expression ἐν τοῖς ἁπαξμενομεναῖοι αἰνεῖν to Peter. This reference is certainly supported by analogy, for elsewhere the genitive dependent on ἁπαξμεναῖοι is always the genitive of the subject; and yet it would be strange, had he known the ἁπαξμεναῖοι. Πέρου, that he should have named them here only, and in this incidental way. Cf. Bindem. p. 407, f.


* Schmidt*, Einl. ins N. T. I. 117.


§ 67 c.

The citations from evangelic works and histories in the pseudo-Clementine writings, being in their nature free and inexact, indicate very uncertainly the writing from which they were made. Some distinctly rest upon Matthew;* others on Luke;* others come from passages of both, woven together,* or differ from both;** a few others presuppose Mark* and John,* while others proceed from a different source.* Some remarkably agree with quotations of Justin Martyr;* and yet it seems hasty to conclude that such have come from a properly Jewish-Christian source.*


CERINTHUS’S AND TATIAN’S GOSPELS. § 68.


a The Johannic passage Homil. XI. 26, note c, cf. § 66 a, note c, b, θ. — Homil. III. 55, XIX. 2, the passage Matt. v. 37, cf. § 66 a, note b, χ. — Homil. XVIII. 4, the passage Matt. xii. 27, cf. § 66 a, note b, ρ. — Homil. XIX. 2, the passage Matt. xxv. 41, cf. § 66 a, note b, ν.

* Against Credn. Beitr. I. 330. Schwéger, Nachapost. Zeitalt. I. 207. Baur, and others. The first passage here is manifestly combined with Matt. xxviii. 19. Those which follow are found also in the Fathers, with their variations from our common text. Moreover, the Pseudo-Clement may have read Justin. See Bleek, Beitr. I. 221.


§ 68.

Cerinthus and Carpocrates made use of a Gospel similar to that of Matthew, which contained the genealogy, though in other respects incomplete, and was akin to the Ebionite Gospel. But the Harmony of the four Gospels which Tatian prepared, and which was called by some the Gospel of the Hebrews, has been, by moderns, with the too hasty rejection of ancient testimony, regarded as a compilation from this and other uncanonical Gospels, or as an independent Gospel. For the omission of the history of Jesus’s birth and of the genealogies is explained from his system. However, it is probable that he, like his teacher, Justin, used also the Gospel of the Hebrews.

GOSPELS.


§ 69 a.

Of the Gospel of the Egyptians (κατ' Αιγυπτίους, cf. § 63), only a few traces remain.\footnote{Clemens Rom. Ep. II. § 12: 'Επερητηθεῖς αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπὸ τινὸς, πῶς ἔχει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, εἶπεν: ὁ ὠστός ἐστιν τὸ δύο ἐν, καὶ τὸ ἕξω ὄστε τὸ ἕκω καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θελείας, οὔτε ἄρσεν, οὔτε θῆλυ.' Cf. Clemens Alex. Strom. III. p. 465: Πῶς τὸν τὸν Κασαπιανὸν φησι, πυθανομένης τῆς Σαλάμης, πῶς γυναῖκας ἔξερεν, ὁ δὲ κύριος: 'Οταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης έσθε ματήστε, καὶ ὅταν γενήσῃ τὰ δύο ἐν, καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θελείας, οὔτε ἄρρεν, οὔτε θῆλυ.' Πρόσων μὲν οὐκ ἐν τοῖς παραδεδεμένοις ἡμῖν τέταρτον εὐαγγέλιον οὐκ ἔχομεν τὸ Ῥητόν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' Αιγυπτίους. — Perhaps the following passage, found in the same letter, is also quoted from the same Gospel, § 5:}
The first quotation given above from this Gospel, and the use made of it by Sabellius, show that it had a theosophic character. The same in connection with the second, in Clement of Alexandria, proves that it supported Encratism. Indeed, the Encratite Cassian used it. As, now, Cerinthus and Carpocrates used a Gospel related to the Ebionite Gospel, and the Harmony of Tatian had, likewise, affinity with the Gospel of the Hebrews (§ 68); as, further, theosophic and Encratistic elements are found in Ebionism, especially if the Pseudo-Clementines belong to it; as, finally, the
second epistle of Clement makes reference to Ebionite opinions (§ 69 a, note a);—it is very probable that the Gospel of the Egyptians sprang from the same stock as the Gospel of the Hebrews.\(^*\)


### 5. Marcion's Gospel.

§ 70 a.

Marcion, an anti-Judaizing Gnostic, and his school, made use of a Gospel which the catholic church teachers regarded as the Gospel of Luke mutilated and corrupted by him from dogmatical views.\(^b\) Yet it did not bear this name in his writings.\(^b\)


§ 70 b.


§ 71 a.

The general assertions of Tertullian, and especially of Epiphanius, against Marcion, are passionate, and in part exaggerated. The special proofs adduced by them are not wholly satisfactory, because in quoting from Marcion's Gospel they have a dogmatic object, or at least but a secondary regard to critical considerations. Hence they quote rather what he had retained, than what he had expunged or altered.*
§ 71 b.

They therefore are quite in error who suppose, with Eichhorn, that all which Epiphanius quotes from Marcion's Gospel is quoted as varying from the genuine text of Luke, and on account of its variation. Where he does not expressly mark the variation, none existed, and the quotations are then made solely for the sake of refutation. They are often only extracts from the uncorrupted text, and hence obscure from their brevity. On the other hand, they also err who assume, with Arnett, that Epiphanius gave all the variations; for he seems to have adduced only such as seemed to him weighty in a dogmatic point of view.

Marcion's gospel. § 71 b.

Marcion's text is often shorter than that of our Luke. See Olshausen, p. 144, and often.


* The variations given and noteworthy are as follow:—


† iv. 34. τοιαύτα was omitted. Tertull. c. 7, 8. cf. v. 6.

iv. 38, f. Tertullian passes over, c. 8; iv. 38: Healing of Peter's mother-in-law, according to Hahn it was not omitted, according to Ritschl, p. 76, f., it was.

iv. 39, or 37, was followed by iv. 16 iv. 16—30: Jesus teaches in Nazareth.

iv. 29—30, with omission of vv. 24—27.

Tert. c. 8. Hahn, Ritschl.


Tert. c. 9. Epiph. Schol. I.

vi. 3, 4: Epiphanius, Schol. XXI., quotes after ix. 44, but only by mistake; Tertull. c. 19, quotes it in its proper order.

vi. 12 was, according to Tertull. c. 13, somewhat enlarged. Hahn, p. 185.

On the other side, Ritschl, p. 64.

* vi. 17: καταβας ἐν αὐτοῖς Epiph. Schol. IV.

vi. 17: καταβας μετ' αὐτῶν.

* vi. 23: πατρεῖς οικουρ, Tertull. c. 15: πατέρες ἡμῶν, Epiphani. Schol. VI.
Gospels.

Marcion.

vii. 23. Epiph. Sch. VIII.: παρακλα-
γένος τὸ· μακάρως, δε οὐ μὴ σκλ.
ἐν ἑμοί. ἐὰν γὰρ ὅσ πρὸς ἱερὰς.
But Marcion read the same. Cf.
Hahn on the passage.

† vii. 29—35 are passed over by Ter-
tullian, and were probably want-
ing.

† viii. 19: παρεγίνοντο δὲ πρὸς αὐτῶν
(τινές!). Epiph. Sch. XII.: οὐκ
εἶχεν· ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελ-
φοι αὐτοῦ. Cf. Tertull. c. Marc. iv. 19, De carne Chr. c. 7, who also
points out this omission.

† viii. 21 was interpolated from Matt.
xii. 48: τίς μοι μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελ-
φοι; Tertull. c. Marc. iv. 19.

ix. 31 was missing, according to Hahn
and Ritschl, but Tertull. c. 22,
Epiph. Sch. XVII., are not clear
on this point.

ix. 40: Epiph. Sch. XIX. obscurely
refers to some omission, probably
of the words καὶ οὐκ ἐδυνάθη-
σαν.

x. 13—15: Passed over by Tertull. c.
24, omitted according to H. and R.
† x. 21: έκχρισταὶ σω, κύριε τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ. Epiph. Sch. XXII. Ter-
tull. I. c. c. 25: gratias ago et con-
fiteor, domine coeli.

x. 22: οὐδεὶς γινώσκει, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ
πατὴρ, εἰ μὴ ὁ νόος, κ.τ.λ. Tertull.
ib. But M. read probably ἔγνω,
according to Dial. de recta fid. I.
817. d. Iren. IV. 6, 1: qui peritiores Apostolias volunt esse, sic descri-
hunt: Nemo cognovit patrem nisi filius, etc. So too Just. M. Clem.

† x. 25: τί ποιήσας λῦσθω ελπισμή-
σω; Tertull. ib. But in Cap.
XVIII. 8, Marcion had αἰώνων,
according to Tertull. and Epiph.


vii. 23: δὲ εἶν μὴ σκανδαλίσθῃ εἰς
ἐρωτ.

vii. 29: καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας,
κ.τ.λ. Note particularly v. 34: ἐλή-
λυθεν ὁ νύσ τοῦ ἀνθρ. ἔστινοι καὶ πί-
νοι, κ.τ.λ.

viii. 19: παρεγ. δ. πρὸς αὐτῶν ἡ
μήτηρ κ. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ.
ix. 31: οἱ οὕθων ἐν δόξῃ Ἰησοῦ
τὴν ἐξοδον, κ.τ.λ.

ix. 40: καὶ ἰδεῖσθην τῶν μαθητῶν
σου, ἵνα ἐκβάλωσιν αὐτὸ καὶ οὐκ ἐδυ-
νάθησαν.

x. 12—15: Cry of woe over the
cities of Chorazin and Bethsaida.

x. 22: οὐδεὶς γινώσκει, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ
νύσ, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ
πατήρ, εἰ μὴ ὁ νύσ, κ.τ.λ.

x. 25: τί ποιήσας λῦσθω αἰώνιον,
κ.τ.λ. Also Germ. 2. omits αἰώ-
nιον.

*xi. 1: προσευχόμενον τῷ πατρὶ.
Tertull. ib. c. 26.

xi. 1: προσευχόμενον.
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xi. 2: ἀγιοσθήσομαι τὸ δομομα σου. Cf. the various readings in Griesb. xi. 29: ἡ γενεα αυτῃ σημειον αντει, και σημειον ου δοθηται αυτη. Epiph. Sch. XXV. cf. with the Refut., where the text is filled out. Tertull. ib. does not quote the missing words.

xii. 6 omitted, according to Epiph. Sch. XXIX., and is also not mentioned by Tertull. c. 38. So also verse 7, connected with it.

xi. 28 was omitted, according to Epiph. Sch. XXX.; according to Tertull. c. 29, however, not.

xii. 28: εἰ δε τῶν χριστῶν .... ὁ θεος οὐτως ἀμφιέννυσι, κ. τ. λ. xii. 29: μη φοβηθω, το μικρον ποιουν, οτι ειδοσθη εκ πατήρ δοους ὑμᾶν τὴν βασιλειαν. Epiph. Sch. XXXIV.

† It is not certain that these words were omitted; Epiphanius, perhaps, quotes more freely. But they are wanting in Cod. 235.

15

xii. 33, f., not alluded to by Tertull., omitted according to Hahn, 92.

* xii. 38: καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐσπερινῇ φυλακῇ. Epiph. Sch. XXXV.

* xii. 51. Here Tertull. ib. charges on Marcion the genuine reading διαμερισμῶν as a corruption.

† xiii. 1–9 wanting, according to Epiph. Sch. XXVIII. Tertull. c. 30, also passes it over.

† xiii. 28: ἐκεῖ ἦσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, ὅταν δῆσῃ πάντας τοὺς δικαίους ἐν τῇ Βαστίλειᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡμάς δὲ ἐκβαλλόμενους καὶ κρατοῦμένους ἐξ. Epiph. Sch. XL. Tertull. ib.

† xiii. 29–35 wanting, according to Epiph. Sch. XLI. Tertull. passes it over.

* xiv. 26: καταλείπει τὸν πατέρα, κ. τ. λ. Epiph. Ref. LXX.

† xv. 11–32 wanting, according to Epiph. Sch. XLI. Tertull. c. 32, passes it over.

* xvi. 12: ὕμων. Tertull. c. 33.

† xvi. 17: εὐκοπούτερον δὲ ἐστιν τὸν οὐρανὸν κ. τ. ὦν γῆν παρελθεῖν ἃν τοῦ νόμου μιᾶν κεραίαν πε-καὶ ὁ νόμος κ. οἱ προφηταὶ σείν. ἢ τῶν λόγων μου — Hahn erroneously, after Tertull., τοῦ κυρίου — μιᾶν κεραίαν πεσείν. Tertull. l. c. The words in brackets are, according to Ritschl, p. 43, an addition by this Father.

* xvii. 2: λυπητελεί αὐτῷ, εἰ ὦκ, k. t. l. xvii. 2: λυπητ. αὐτ., εἰ μῦλος ὑπὲ-γεγεννηθη, ἢ λίθος μυλονικός, k. τ. λ.

Utilius autem fuerat (s. est) illi, ne nascereetur, aut lapia, etc. Veron. vere. and other MSS. in Griesb.

† xvii. 10 wanting, according to Epiph. Sch. XLVII. Tertull. c. δοῦλοι ἄχρεοι ἐσμεν, κ. τ. λ.
Marcion.

35. does not mention xvii. 5–10, and it seems very likely, according to Ritschl, p. 117, that only ver. 7–10 were omitted.

xvii. 12–19. Here, according to Epiph. Sch. XLVIII., Marcion cut much away. The following alteration is expressly given.


The following was then interpolated from Luke iv. 27: ὅτι πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν ἧμεραῖς Ἐλισαμοῦ τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐκ ἔκαθαρίσθη ἐκ μὴ Νεμιμὸν ὁ σύρος. Also Tertull. c. 35, read this. But Ritschl, p. 119, ff., denies it.

xviii. 19: μὴ με λέγετε ἁγαθόν· ἐστιν ἁγαθός, ὁ πατὴρ ὁ Θεός. οὐδεὶς ἁγαθός, μὴ με ὁ θεός.


Sch. L. objects only to the addition ὁ πατὴρ and οἶδα. But Tertull. c. 36, read οἶδας.

† xviii. 31–34 wanting, according to Epiph. Sch. LII. Tertull. i. c. passes it over.

† xviii. 37: ὁ ναζαραῖος was omitted, for Epiph. and Tertull. do not mention it.

† xix. 9 had not the words καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς οἶδε Αβραὰμ ἐστιν, for Tertull. c. 37, cites them not as opposed to Marcion’s system.

† xix. 29–46 wanting, according to Epiph. Sch. LIII. Tertull. ib. Jerusalem, purification of the Temple.

† xx. 9–18 missing, according to Epiph. Sch. LVI.; in Tertull. c. 38, it is not cited.

xx. 19: καὶ ἔστησεν ἐπὶ βαλκὸν ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ, καὶ ἔφθασαν. Epiph. Sch. LIV. without complaint of alteration. In Marcion this verse was connected with xx. 8, and the last words, ἐγνωσαν γὰρ, κ.τ.λ., must have been omitted, for they refer to ver. 9–18.

† xx. 37–38, missing, according to Epiph. Sch. LVI., who read it twice, for he says: δευτερώσαι τὸν σωτῆρα τὴν παραβολὴν. In Tertull. c. 38, it does not occur.


35. does not mention xvii. 5–10, and it seems very likely, according to Ritschl, p. 117, that only ver. 7–10 were omitted.

xvii. 12–19. Of the ten lepers.
Marcion.

† xxi. 1–4 Tertull. does not mention.

† xxi. 18 omitted, according to Epiph. Sch. LVIII.

† xxi. 21, f., omitted, according to Epiph. Sch. LIX. on account of the last words. Tertull. c. 39, aduces neither verse.

† xxi. 27, καὶ δόξης omitted, which Tertull. c. 39, does not quote, according to Hahn, p. 901, but not according to Ritschl, p. 43.

† xxi. 32: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἐὼς ἂν πάντα γίνηται. Tertull. 1.

c.: Adhuc ingerit, non transiaturum coelum ac terram, nisi omnia peragantur. But according to Ritschl, p. 44, Tertull. here made a mistake.

† xxi. 36 not mentioned by Tertull.

† xxi. 3 probably omitted, according to Tertull. V. 6. Epiph. Ref. LX. Hahn, 203. Ritschl, 126.

† xxi. 16 omitted, according to Epiph. Sch. LXIII. Tertull. IV. 40, does not quote it, nor ver. 17, 18, which according to R. p. 50, were really omitted.

† xxi. 30 omitted, according to Epiph. Ref. LXIII.; also Tertull. c. 41, passes over ver. 23–30. According to Ritschl, p. 32, ver. 24–30 were wanting.

† xxi. 35–46 Tertull. c. 40, does not quote; according to Epiphian. Sch. LXIV. ver. 35 was cut away; but ver. 41, according to LXV. was in existence, and probably also ver. 39–42, 45, f. Ritschl, p. 111.


xxi. 1–4. Of the widow’s mite.

xxi. 18: καὶ θρίλε ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπολθήσῃ.

xxi. 21, f.: τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ ἱουδαίᾳ φευγότωσαν . . . τοῦ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα.

xxi. 27: καὶ τότε δύναται τῶν ὕλων τοῦ ἀνθρ. ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ, μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.

xxi. 32: ἀμὴν . . . παρέλθῃ ἡ γη- νεά αὐτῆς, κ.τ.λ.

xxi. 36: ἀγνοοῦντες . . . καὶ στα- θήσαι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ οὐρ. τ. ἀνθρ.

xxii. 3: κ. εἰσῆλθε σταυρός εἰς . . .

xxii. 16: λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκ οὖν μὴ φάγω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἔως ὅτου πλη- ρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

xxii. 24–30. Dispute among the disciples.

xxii. 35, sq.: καὶ ἐστιν αὐτὸς· ὅτι ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς, κ. τ. λ. . . . κ. ἀγο- ρασάτω μάχαιραν.

37: λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐν τούτῳ τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἕμωι, τὸ καὶ μετὰ ἀνήμων ἐλπισθῆ.

42–44. Of Christ’s agony and bloody sweat in Gethsemane. The passage is wanting also in AB and other authorities. See Griesb.

xxii. 49–51 omitted, according to Epiph. Sch. LXVII. Tertull. also fails to mention it; it could hardly remain after the removal of ver. 35–38.

xxii. 49–51. Peter cuts off the ear of the high-priest’s servant.
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Marcion.

† xxiii. 2: τούτον εύρομεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος καὶ καταλύοντα ἔθνος καὶ λίγοντα καὶ ἐκτραβίζοντα καὶ μηκόνον τὸν κόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας. Ἐπιφ. Sch. LXIX. LXX. From Tertull. nothing can be gathered.


xxiii. 34 wanted the words διαμερίζομενοι, k. t. λ., according to Tertull. c. 42: Vestitum plene ejus a militibus divisum, partim sortes concessum, Marcion abest, respiciens Psalmi prophetiam. But Luke does not cite this passage, and Epiph. Sch. LXXI. quotes the objectionable words.

† xxiii. 43 omitted, according to Epiph. Sch. LXXII.; so also probably ver. 39, ff., according to Ritschl.

† xxiii. 47 - 49 Tertull. does not adduce. The passage was omitted, according to Hahn, 214, not according to Ritschl, 63.

xxiv. 25 - 27 was, according to Epiph. Sch. LXXVII., altered; but his complaint is self-contradictory. He says, first, that Marcion cut away ver. 25, 26 (ταραχαίτε συμπάθημα καὶ τὰς ἀλλὰς ... τό ἀνάθημα), and then that, in ver. 25, instead of τοις ἐδάφοις οἱ προφήται, he read οἷς ἐδάφοις· ὥσπερ οὖν. So also in Dial. c. Marc. sect. IV. p. 857. Tertull. c. 43, adduces, quae locutus est ad vos; and so must also M.'s reading have been. Accordingly, ver. 27 certainly was omitted.

xxiv. 26 - 35 Tertull. does not distinctly adduce; probably ver. 27 was omitted, as also the last words of ver. 32: καὶ ὄς διώκοντα ἠμῖν τὰς γραφὰς.

† xxiv. 37 Marc. read φάντασμα for πνεῦμα, according to Tertull., and in ver. 39 perhaps omitted φημολογησατι με καὶ τίτρα.

† xxiv. 44 - 46 passed over by Tertull. c. 43, and probably the words οἴς δὲι πληρωθῆναι, k. t. λ. were omitted.

xxiv. 47 Tertull. c. 43, adduces again. Whether the rest was wanting is not clear; but Epiph. § 11, p. 311, says that M. cut off much from the end. According to Ritschl, 129, he read ver. 50, 51. — A view of Marcion's Gospel has been given by Hahn and Thilo, Cod. Apocr. N. T. I. 401, sqq.

§ 72 a.

The variations with an asterisk (*) prefixed are simply different, and in part correct readings. Some of those indicated by an obelisk (†) are manifestly such as support the Anti-Judaistic system of the heretic, others are proved to be such by the refuters, and others naturally follow from these.
Consistency, however, does not appear in the work; and, as he did not hesitate to use forced explanations, he might easily have allowed much to remain that now is wanting.

* On the reasons not at once manifest for many omissions, see Oxhausen, p. 208, f., and Hahn on many passages; yet Ritschl now and then raises well-founded objections.

Tertull. c. 43: Marcion quaedam contraria sibi illa credo industria erat dere de Evangelio suo nobuit, ut ex his, quae eratere potuit nec erasit, illa, quae erasit, aut negetur erasisse aut merito erasisse dicatur. Nec pareit nisi eis, quae non minus alter interprerando quam defendo subvertit. Tertullian adduces such explanations, e. g. cap. 9, on Luke v. 12–16; c. 15, on vi. 23; c. 22, on ix. 28–36; c. 43, on xxiv. 39. Cf. Olsh. p. 195, ff. Hahn on all these passages.

§ 72 b.

On the other hand, it is asserted that a part of the passages which M. omitted or read differently must, on exegetical grounds, be considered interpolations; and, indeed, many of them must appear more or less objectionable to the commentator, and in a degree even to the critic (vii. 29–35, x. 12–15, xi. 42, xii. 6, xiii. 29–35, xxi. 18, xxii. 24–38, 43, f.). In regard to most of them, however, this assertion, and the hypothesis that Marcion had before him the "original Luke," are without foundation.

* The following larger passages, which M. did not read, must, according to Ritschl, p. 73, ff., have been wanting in the original Luke:— iv. 24–27. But this passage cannot be omitted without making ver. 28 incomprehensible. — iv. 38, f. The avrois referring to the disciples, whom Jesus, according to Luke, had not as yet, betrays the interpolation. But was not Simon—were not probably other guests there?—xi. 29–32. By affixing the words ἰέρεμα . . . . avrois to ver. 33, a better connection would be formed. But this even Baur, p. (462) 399, f., denies. — xi. 49–51. See against it Baur, ib. — xii. 33, f. The fitness of the connection between ver. 34 and 35 is erroneously denied. — xviii. 31–34. The allusion to prophecies is found only in interpolated—we may with equal justness say in expunged—passages. Ver. 34 is by the same author as ix. 45. — xix. 29–46. The entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem has been designedly left out by the author of the original Luke, and he has given us to understand in the parable, ver. 11, ff., that Jesus did not wish to appear as king of the Jews. But this is not the object and meaning of that entrance, and without it the reader would
never have learned how Jesus reached Jerusalem. Between ver. 30 and 47 there would be a gap. Besides, ver. 30 is in Luke’s style, cf. xxiii. 53, and ver. 43 agrees well with xxii. 20, f. Finally, Mark found this passage in Luke, and, as usual, combined the two texts.—xx. 9—18 must be an addition, as appears from ἔγρωσαν γὰρ, κ. τ. λ., ver. 19, the causal clause not referring to the immediately preceding clause κ. ἐφοβήθησαν, κ. τ. λ. But examples of a like carelessness are found in Acts xviii. 3, xxviii. 20, Mark ix. 34, and Mark, who borrowed the passage and had the whole work before his eyes, found no difficulty in this. Besides, the expression προσέβησον, ver. 11, 12, is from Luke’s pen, cf. xix. 11, Acts xii. 3—xx. 37, f. This second part of Jesus’ reply is not wanted, because in ver. 34 Jesus does not, as in Matt. xxii. 29, enter on the resurrection question, but confines himself to the difficulty urged by the Sadducees. But by ὅλον ἀνυλίγοντες, κ. τ. λ., ver. 27, the Evangelist makes reference to this question.—xxi. 21, f. is said to be at variance with the context. But the word ἐκδίηθης is from Luke’s pen, cf. xviii. 3, 5, Acts vii. 24; the thought in xix. 27 also corresponds.—xxiii. 39—43. The promise does not agree with the New Testament eschatology,—an uncertain ground. Passages like xxii. 16—18, 49—51, xiii. 1—9, xv. 11—32, xvii. 7—10, R. himself regards as uncertain, or as proving little.

In the following passages, Marcion is supposed to have the original readings:—xiii. 28. But the antithesis of the heathen is, according to ver. 26, very appropriate; and as the expression ἓκι ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμός, κ. τ. λ., is peculiar to Matthew, it is most natural to suppose that Luke borrowed the passage from him without change.—xvi. 17. τοῦ νόμου is inappropriate. But μίαν κεφαλαίαν does not correspond to τῶν λόγων μου.—viii. 21. The interpolator has struck out the words τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ, κ. τ. λ., because they might be misused in favor of Gnosticism (!). In x. 21, the interpolator has added καὶ τ. γῆς. Improbable, for Matthew has it.—Ver. 22. The transposition of the clauses in Marcion is original. But only to καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ, κ. τ. λ. does the clause καὶ ὁ λόγος ὁ νόμος, κ. τ. λ., which follows it in our canonical Luke, correspond.—xx. 35. The interpolator has erased the words ὑπὸ τ. θεοῦ. But the verb καταζωοῦν is used absolutely also in xxi. 36, Acts v. 41.—xxii. 3. The interpolator must have interpolated Satan (!).—xxiv. 25. Marcion’s reading is genuine, ἐπὶ πᾶσιν αἰς ἀδιστήρων ὡμίν, as in ver. 6, 7. But why the πᾶσις? Also πιστεύων is inappropriate.—Ver. 44—46 the interpolator must have added.

With as much correctness, it is asserted that M. cut it off (see above at xviii. 31, ff.).—Ver. 48, 49, 52, 53 are inserted by the interpolator for the sake of agreement with Acts. Marcion read ver. 50, 51, which differ from Acts. Why did not the interpolator expunge these?
§ 72 c.

The supposition that the third Evangelist did nothing but fill out and add to the older Gospel used by Marcion, does not correspond to the design which he states in his proemium, ch. i. 3. Moreover, it cannot be conceded that that original writing existed down to Marcion’s time, and that our third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles first arose after the time of this heretic. How late, on this supposition, would Mark become, who used our Luke! Marcion, besides, does not pretend that his Gospel was such an original, but professes to be merely the emendant of the (supposed) corrupt canonical Luke, with which he was acquainted. He was also acquainted with the other Gospels, or some of them. These he at first accepted; but afterwards rejected, as coming from Jewish Apostles and containing Jewish opinions.

* According to Baur, the proemium of Luke first appears in its right light on this supposition, p. (509, ff.) 516, ff.

* According to Ritschl (§ 67 c), Justin Martyr was acquainted with it. But Tertull. had no knowledge of this: Cont. Marc. iv. 5: Marcionis (Evangelium) plerisque nec notum, nullis autem notum, ut non eo damnatum. Habet plane et illud ecclesias, sed suas, tam posteras, quam adulteras. The testimony of an anonymous writer in Append. ad Tertull. de Praeesc. adv. haeret. c. 51, — (Cerdon) solum Evangelium Lucæ, nec tamen totum recipit, — rests on an error. According to Theodoret. Haeret. fab. I. 24, Cerdon had several Gospels.

* Tertull. IV. 4: Ego meum (Evang.) dico verum, Marcion suum. Ego Marcionis affirmor adulteratum, Marcion meum. Quis inter nos determinabit, nisi temporis ratio, ei praescribens auctoritatem, quod antiquius reperietur, et ei praecipitans vitiotionem, quod posterior revincetur . . . . adeo antiquius Marcione est, quod est secundum nos, ut et ipse ille Marcion aliquando crediderit . . . . Si enim id Evangelium, quod Lucæ reperitur penes nos . . . . ipsum est, quod Marcion per Antitheses suas arguit ut interpolatum a protectoribus Judæismi ad concorporationem legis et prophetarum, qua etiam Christum inde configerent, utique non potuisset arguere, nisi quod inveniret. From what follows, Marcion seems to have claimed to be the emendant of his Gospel. Emendantur sane Evangelii, a Tiberianis usque ad Antonianæ tempora eversi, Marcion solus et primus obvenit, expectatus tam diu a Christo . . . . nisi quod humanæ temeritatis, non divinae auctoritatis negotium est haeresis, quam sic semper emendat Evangelia, dum vitiat . . . . Itaque

6. Other less important Uncanonical Gospels.

§ 73 a.

The Gospel of Bartholomew, so called by Jerome* (§ 63), did not differ, according to other authorities, from that of Matthew, unless we are to regard it as a later pseudonymous production.

* It is mentioned by Gelas. in Decreto de libris apocryphis in Jure Canon. distinct. XV. can. 3, in Fabric. Cod. apocr. I. p. 137, Beda ad Luc. i. 1.


§ 73 b.

Of the Gospel of Matthias (§ 63) we have no other distinct trace.* That of Thomas, on the contrary (§ 63, and in Gelasius), which is counted among the Manichæan writings, is probably extant in the Evang. Infantiæ, which has been ascribed to Thomas.*
* Euseb. III. 25, counts it and that of Thomas among the heretical Gospels. In some codd. Gelasius also names it.


§ 73 c.

The Gospels of Apelles* and Basilides, mentioned above (§ 63), were, as it seems, arbitrary extracts and elaborations.


§ 2: ὁ τάξα γὰρ, φησιν, ἐν (ὁ Χριστὸς) ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὁ γινεσθε δόκειμαι τραπεζίται; χρῷ γὰρ, φησιν, ἀπὸ πᾶσης γραφῆς ἀναλέγων τὰ χρήσιμα. Cf. § 67 c, note f.


General Conclusions regarding the Uncanonical Gospels.

§ 74.

Of all the above-mentioned uncanonical Gospels, the Gospel of the Hebrews is that of which we have the most
complete and certain knowledge. It is the oldest; but its use is traceable no farther back than Hegesippus (about A. D. 160), nor beyond the circle of the Jewish Christians; for the orthodox Fathers, far from placing it on a par with the canonical Gospels, reckon it among the unguenuine (Origen, § 64 a, note a; Euseb. Pt. I., § 24, note a). Its character was fluctuating and uncertain, and it seems to have undergone various elaborations. Its well-known contents show that it was closely allied to, though by no means the original of, Matthew’s Gospel. All the other uncanonical Gospels are either varieties of the Gospel of the Hebrews or heretical corruptions. Accordingly, none of the Gospel essays mentioned by Luke (i. 1), unless some of the canonical Gospels are included among them, have been preserved or remained in use.

* It is remarkable that Origen does not reckon it among the πολλοὶ of Luke (§ 63, note a), from which it would seem that he did not give it any great antiquity.

Evangelic Tradition.

§ 75.

In addition to what was recorded in the canonical and uncanonical Gospels, various contributions to the evangelic history, and especially expressions of Jesus, were given by oral tradition." When church writers quote such as are not found in our Gospels, they may have drawn them in part from uncanonical Gospels, and in part from tradition."

* To these belonged Acts xx. 35: μακάριον ἐστι διδώσαι μᾶλλον ἡ λαμβάνειν.
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Very Ancient Acceptance of the Canonical Gospels.

§ 76 a.

Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian testify to the general acceptance of our canonical Gospels at the end of the second century, and even farther back.a

---


§ 76 b.

Various countries and parties in the Church also furnish testimonies which run back nearly to the Apostolic age.a — This acceptance cannot be ascribed to a formal agreement, or to a decision by a council. It seems to have grown up in the intercourse of churches and teachers with each other. b
**Their Authors. § 78.**

The titles ἔναγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαίου, κατὰ Μάρκου, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην, do not definitely indicate these men as their authors; but the opinion of all antiquity attests the commonly accepted sense. They also imply that the same subject has been treated by others.

---

Special Helps in the Exegesis of the Four Gospels.

CHAPTER II.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.

General Statement.

§ 79 a.

The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke stand undeniable in a certain kindred relation to each other. For, 1. They have the same general order and scope;* which, as a comparison with the Gospel of John shows, are not always determined by the actual history.b

* Table of Comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Preliminary History.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Peculiar.)</td>
<td>(Wanting.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. History of the Baptism.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(All three closely related.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Jesus’s Ministry in Galilee.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Related, although differently arranged, and with passages intervening.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 23 – xvi. 19.</td>
<td>vi. 45 – viii. 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 13 – xviii. 35.</td>
<td>viii. 27 – ix. 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Related even in the arrangement, though with intervening passages; in particular, Matt. and Mark contain a whole series more than Luke.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Jesus’s Journey to Jerusalem.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Omitted in this arrange-ment.)</td>
<td>(Omitted in this arrange-ment.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Related, even in the arrangement, though with intervening passages.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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V.
Jesus’s Entry into Jerusalem, and Stay there.
(Related, even in arrangement, but with intervening passages.)

VI.
Jesus’s Arrest, Crucifixion, and Burial.
(Related in their general order, but with passages intervening, and variations.)

VII.
Jesus’s Resurrection.
(All three related.)
(Peculiar.) (In part related to Matt., in part (Peculiar.)
to Luke.)

Note the arrangement: — Jesus’s Baptism, Temptation, Return to Galilee; the connection of the sections of the Paralytic and the Calling of Matthew; of the Plucking of Ears of Grain and the Withered Hand; how Herod’s Attention was fixed on Jesus, and of the Feeding of the 5,000; of the Disciples’ Confession that Jesus is the Messiah, and the following sections; of the Blind Men at Jericho, and Jesus’s Entrance into Jerusalem (cf. here especially John); Jesus’s Discourses there, which close with the Prophecy concerning Jerusalem.

§ 79 b.

2. That all three, or certainly two, often strikingly agree, not alone in their facts (although, on the other hand, they often differ), but also in their words. The ground of this, likewise, does not lie in the history itself.«

* Examples of verbal agreement between all three, in single expressions: —
Matt. iii. 3. Mark i. 3. Luke iii. 4.
Εὐδοκεῖσαν τοὺς τρίβους αὐτοῦ, differing from the LXX.: εὐδ. π. τ. τρ.
to θεου ἡμῶν, and from the Hebrew.


'Ελεύθερας δὲ ἡμέρας, Like Matt. 'Ελ. δὲ ἡμέρας, καὶ ἦν ὡς αὐτίκη ἀπ' αὐτής ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ τῶν ὑμων, καὶ τότε ἡμέρας ἐν ἕκειναι τῇ νυμφίοις, τότε ἁπατεύουσαι τὴν ἡμέραν.

... εἰσὶν τιμεῖ τῶν δικαιών; ... εἰσὶν τιμεῖ τῶν δικαιών; ... εἰσὶν τιμεῖ τῶν δικαιών; αἵτων σὺν μη ἔστιν ἠλέας, αἵτων καὶ μη ἔστιν κατὰ τὸν θεόν, τὸς ἐν τοις, κ.τ.λ. τὸς ἐν τοις, κ.τ.λ. τὸς ἐν τοις, κ.τ.λ.
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.... δυσκόλως πλοῦτι .... δυσκόλως οί τά .... δυσκόλως οί τά
σιοι εἰσελθήσατε εἰς τήν χρήματα ἔχουσιν εἰς τήν χρήματα ἔχουσιν εἰσελθή-
βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. βασ. τ. θ. εἰσελθόσαται. σοῦται εἰς τ. βασ. τ. θ.

Examples of verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke: —
Καὶ ἤστησαν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον. Καὶ ἤστησαν αὐτῶν ἐπί τὸ πτερύ-
γιον τοῦ Ιησοῦ.
Κύριον τῶν θεῶν προσκυνήσεις, κ. τ. λ. Προσκυνήσεις κύριον τῶν θεῶν σου,
κ. τ. λ.

The LXX. have: κύριον τῶν θεῶν σου φοβηθήσῃ, κ. τ. λ.
"Υποκρίνατε, ἐξαλείπτων τὴν δοκοῦν τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τάτε δια-
βλέψεις ἐξαλείπτω τὸ κάρφος ......
Matt. xi. 10. Like Matthew.
‟Ιδοὺ, ἀποστέλλω τῶν ἀγγέλων μου „Ιδού, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω, λίκως τὸ προ-
προσώπον σου, δε κατασκευάζω τὸν Ιησοῦ.
The LXX. have: ἰδοὺ ἐξαποστέλλω τῶν ἀγγέλων μου, καὶ ἐπιβλέψηται
ὁ θεός πρὸς προσώπον μου. Mark i. 2, quotes the passage in the same way as
.... ἐν γεν!ητος γυναίκαν. The same.
Να! δ ἡ μητήρ, cf. ver. 25, πάτερ.
The same, first πάτερ, then ἡ μητήρ.
Καὶ ὁ πσιῶν ἐπὶ τῶν λίθων τούτων, ἐπὶ τῶν λίθων πάντων εἰς τὸν;

Matt. xxiv. 50. Like xvi. 44.
"Εξείς ἐν κύριοι δυσκολίαν ἐν
ημέρα ἢ ὀ προσδοκά, καὶ ἐν δρας;
ημέρα ἢ ὀ γνώση, καὶ διακομήσεις
ἀποδότης, καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετά
τῶν ὑποκρίτων θίησε.

Examples of verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark:
Matt. xv. 8, f. Mark vii. 6, f.
„Ο λαὸς αὐτοῦ τοῖς χείλεσι με τιμῆ, ὁ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρῳ ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. Κατην δὲ σέβονται με, δια-
σκοντες διδασκαλίας, ἐντάλματα ἀν-
θρώπων.

Mark lvi. 9. "O λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσι με τιμῆ, ὁ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρῳ ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. Μάθην δὲ σέβονται με, δια-
σκοντες διδασκαλίας, ἐντάλματα ἀν-
θρώπων.
The relation of Mark to Matthew, and then to Luke, is equally, if not more, striking. Mark has only four passages peculiar to him: the two parables, iv. 26–29, xiii. 33–37, and the two healings, vii. 32–37, viii. 22–26, and some trifling additions and insertions: iii. 20, f., xiv. 51, f., xv. 44, f.; all the rest corresponds more or less nearly to the other narratives. Seldom holding an independent position between the other two, he follows the one or the other, and forms the middle member of the threefold accord. He has often, also, a text which seems woven out of the other two.


b Examples: —

Καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη. Καὶ ἀπήλθεν ἡ λέπρα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. Ἐκαθαρίσθη.
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Matt. viii. 4.
Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς: "Ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰσήκου ἀμφότεροι ἁπάντας.

Mark i. 44.
Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: "Ο ἐρχόμενος εἰσήκου ἀμφότεροι ἁπάντας.

Καὶ αὐτὸς παρῆγγειλεν αὐτῷ μηδείς ἐμπίπτω: ἀλλὰ ἃ ἔδειξαν δεῖξαι σεαυτοῦ τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσέγγισεν προ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου, καὶ προσέταξεν σεαυτῷ τῷ καθαρισμῷ.

ix. 9.
Καὶ παρῆγγειλεν διὰ τὸ ἱερατεύον, ἐδοθήναι ἁπάντας καθαρισμόν εἰς τὸ τελός,

ii. 3, f.
καὶ εὐθείαν ἐπὶ τῷ ἱερατεύον.

Mark v. 19.
Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς: "Ἐξελέγκου ἃ ἔχεις εἰς τὸ τελός τοῦ τελοῦν.

Luke v. 27.
Καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐξελέγκει ἃ ἔχεις εἰς τὸ τελός τοῦ τελοῦν.

ix. 17.
Οὐκ ἔχεις καθαριστήριον εἰς ἁπάντας τὰς ἁπάντας τὰς ἁπάντας.

ii. 22.
καὶ ἦσαν καθαριστήριον εἰς ἁπάντας τὰς ἁπάντας τὰς ἁπάντας.

vii. 27.
Ποιήσας ἐκεῖνος τὸν καθαρισμὸν, ἤδει νοῦν ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἁπάντας τοὺς ἁπάντας.

iv. 41.
Τίς ἄρα διακόνος τῷ δικαιοσύνῃ τῷ δικαιοσύνῃ τῷ δικαιοσύνῃ.

vii. 28.
Καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ εἰς τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁλάσσων τῶν ἁλάσσων τῶν ἁλάσσων.

v. 1, f.
Τίς ἄρα ἄνωθεν, ὅτι καὶ τῶν ἄνωθεν καὶ τῶν ἄνωθεν καὶ τῶν ἄνωθεν.

vii. 29.
Καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ εἰς τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁλάσσων τῶν ἁλάσσων τῶν ἁλάσσων.

viii. 26, f.
Τίς ἄρα καθαριστήριον εἰς τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁλάσσων τῶν ἁλάσσων τῶν ἁλάσσων.

Similar are i. 11, 32, 42, 44; ii. 11, 19, 21, f., 23, f.; iii. 2; iv. 15, 21; v. 22, f., 25–28; vi. 7, 14, f., 36; viii. 27, 30, 33, 37, f.; ix. 5, f., 18, 22, 42; x. 29–31, 33, f., 46; xi. 1–3, 15; xii. 1, 8, 11, 14, 26; xiii. 3, f.; xiv. 1, f., 12–16, 70. Refer to: Synopsis Evang. Matth. Marc. et Lucæ cum parallellis Joann. pericopis ex rec. Griesbachii cum selecta lectt. varietate consinnaverunt De Wette et Lücke. 1818. 4to. 2d ed. 1842. 5vo.
Possible Modes of Explanation.

§ 81.

The phenomenon of so singular a relationship, itself well fitted to provoke attempts at explanation, can be explained only by two kinds of suppositions, or by a combination of these: either by supposing that one Evangelist used the others; or that all three used a common source; or that, in addition to this, one Evangelist made use of the others.

I. Suppositions that one Evangelist used the Others.

§ 82 a.

In a quite off-hand way, several writers have thought to untie the knot by a supposition of this sort. In this attempt many allowed themselves to be guided by the wholly accidental order in which the Gospels stand in our Canon, and supposed that Mark used, revised, and corrected Matthew, while Luke did the same by them both. Besides this, all sorts of combinations were attempted.

Storr regarded the Gospel of Mark as the oldest; from it sprang the Gospel of Matthew, written in Syro-Chaldaic; from it Luke also drew, and the translator of Matthew used both Mark and Luke. Büsching, on the other hand, considered Luke the foundation of Matthew, and both that of Mark. Vogel regarded Luke as the source of Mark, and both as that of Matthew.

Griesbach investigated more thoroughly, and showed, by an accurate comparison, that Mark made extracts from Matthew and Luke. The complementary supposition, however, that Luke had reference to Matthew, he left somewhat undetermined.
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Evangg. Matth. et Luc. 1794. in Velthuysen, Kuinoel, et Ruperti Commentatt. theol. Vol. III. The same view in Herder, see § 84 c.


§ 82 b.

While, on the one hand, Griesbach’s view met with much opposition, on the other, it obtained considerable acceptance, and has, in the main, held its ground till the present day.* We also shall return to it (§ 94). In the most recent times, however, after the criticism of the Gospels had passed through many other phases, several writers have thought they found in Mark the original, simple form of the evangelic record.³ Some have even gone so far as to complete the unfinished combination of *Storr*, and to assert that the Gospel of Mark is the original or Protevangel, which Luke, with a pragmatism that invented freely, and in part arbitrarily, enlarged; and that Matthew, with almost greater arbitrariness, interpolated both.*


*Wilke (Der Urevangelist oder exegetisch-kritische Untersuchung üb. das Verwandtschaftsverhältnis der drei ersten Evangg. 1838) has attempted, with great industry and acuteness, to show by an exact analysis of the first three Gospels the priority of Mark. Bruno Bauer, in his Kritik d. Evang. Gesch. d. Synoptiker. I. 2. Bd. 1841, has worked over with his peculiar dialectic the results of Wilke’s inquiries. Wilke seeks to show, that what Matthew and Luke have, in common and with more or less close agreement, in addition to Mark, and what they have differing from him, is not original, but in part made by themselves, in part arbitrarily altered; and that both had the Gospel of Mark before them, although they differed from it. Matthew’s changed arrangement of the history and work of Jesus in Galilee is caused by his inserting the Sermon on the Mount in the early part of his work (so also Lachm.). On the other hand, Matthew has imitated Luke, and formed (particularly) the Sermon on the Mount from the materials offered by him. Bauer sees even in Matthew’s preliminary history nothing but an imitation of that of Luke. So too Schneckenburger (Ueber d. Urrespr. d. erst. kan. Evang. in the Stud. d. würtemb. Geistl., and printed separately, 1834, p. 69, ff.), only he supposes also the assistance of tradition, whereas B. refers the whole to the arbitrary will of the author. An examination of the hypotheses of Storr, Weisse, Wilke, Br. Bauer, in F. J. Schwarz, p. 26, ff.

§ 82 c.

The bold hypothesis that our second Gospel is the Prot-evangel condems itself by its auxiliary assumption that, in its present form, the Gospel is not free from interpolations. As certainly as the objectionable passages are genuine, are they generally (especially the narrative of the second feeding of the multitude, which most probably rests on an error of Matthew) indicative of the character of Mark as a writer. We trust, moreover, that our justification of Griesbach’s hypothesis farther on (§ 94, ff.) will not fail.

* Besides the conclusion (§ 94, f.), the following passages are reckoned as such:—viii. 1—9, the second feeding (note the characteristic feature, ver. 7, in comparison with vi. 41), with the reference to it in viii. 20; ix. 38—40; xi. 24—26; i. 2, 13 (καὶ ἔφες . . . σαραώνα); iii. 6 (μετὰ τ. Ἡρώδ.) ;
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iv. 10 (ον τ. δώδεκα); vi. 37 (διπλάρ. διακ.); ix. 6 (ὅσαν γ. ἐκρατήσκε);
x. 16 (ὑπαγελισμ. αἰνόδ.); vii. 3, f., 13 (καὶ παρώμ., κ. τ. λ.); the names,
x. 46, xv. 10, ii. 13, iii. 17. The reason: “How shall it be proved that
what belongs not to the original type is from the hand of Mark?” (Φ)

§ 83.

In attempting thus to sustain the theory of the derivation
of one Gospel from another, by resort to the supposition of
arbitrariness or party feeling in the Evangelists, the most
recent criticism necessarily runs counter to the historic sense,
and endangers the credibility of the Gospel history. Each
of the hypotheses given above labors under the difficulty of
being unable satisfactorily to explain why a later author
omitted one part of what his predecessor gave, and altered
another part of it in substance or in form. Objections of
this sort have been urged especially against Griesbach’s
hypothesis.

It is true that the history of the Old Testament and
Apocryphal literature presents similar phenomena in the
books of Chronicles, Judith, and Tobit, where changes and
corruptions, additions and omissions, have likewise been
made by later revising hands. But in the case of these
books, at least of Chronicles, certain intermediate steps, or
a gradualness of interpolation, are probable (Part I. § 192 c,
d); and it would be a great gain, if a similar process of
growth could be proved in respect of the first three Gospels.

1127, ff.

II. Theory of one or several Common Written Sources.

1. One Source.

§ 84 a.

The differing treatment of their matter by the Evangelists
would appear much less loose, and more excusable, had they drawn from a common written source, which each used
after a different fashion. Many have regarded the Gospel of the Hebrews as such, but in part without being accurately acquainted with it or having closely considered its relation to our Gospel of Matthew, in part without clearly showing the process by which the Gospels were derived from it.¹ Others considered the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew the common source.²


§ 84 b.

Eichhorn attempted a more precise explanation by the supposition of a so-called Original Gospel, which, while it contained the sections common to all three Evangelists, was used by them in different editions; so that what was common to all three came from the original work, what was common to but two from an edition used by them in common, and what was found in but one from an edition used by him only, or from another source. ² This original work he thought was written in Aramaean, and thus he explained
naturally how the three Gospels, as independent versions, agreed in similar expressions and turns of expression; but he left their striking coincidence in (to some degree) rare and peculiar Greek expressions unexplained.\footnote{Eichhorn, Allg. Biblioth. V. (1794), 759, ff. Earlier, from Eichhorn's lectures, Rushworth, in a prize essay, which, written in German, he published in the work referred to in § 83, note a. Genealogy of the Gospels, according to Eichhorn:—}

1. Original Gospel.
2. Edition A of the same, foundation of Matthew.

\footnote{The agreement in Greek words, as πειρύγων τοῦ λεροῦ, Matt. iv. 5, Luke iv. 9, ἵπτωνος, Matt. vi. 11, Luke xi. 3, and the citation of O. T. passages after the LXX. point to a Greek source. On the other hand, the supposed errors in translating, which are said to prove an Aramaean original (Bolten, Bearbeitung der drei Evang. Eichhorn, Einl. I. §§ 49, 58. Bertholdt, III. 1177), are all moonshine. E. g.: Luke iii. 21, προσευχόμενον (Matt. iii. 16, ἄμβην), confounding of ἀλήθεια with ἀληθινώς. \textit{ib.} σωματικός \textit{εἴδει} (Matt. iii. 16, ὥσις περισσεράν), Aram. וָיָּלָה. Luke xxii. 25, ἑκατέρες παλαιστὶ (Matt. καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι κατασκολοσκούμενοι αὐτῶν), confounding of κατασκολοσώμενος with κατακρίνομεν. Matt. xxvi. 17, \textit{τῇ πρώτῃ} τῶν ἄρτων, Mark xiv. 12, \textit{τῇ πρώτῃ} ἡμέρα τῶν ἄρτων, Luke xxii. 7, ἠλθεὶ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἄρτων, εν ᾧ ἤδει διάκονον τὸ πάσχα. Aram. בַּרְפַּע אֵלֶּה בְּרֶפֶס בְּרֶפֶס, i. e. on the day before the feast of unleavened bread, and, on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread.}

\section*{§ 84 c.}

To supply this want in Eichhorn's hypothesis, Marsh so remodelled it that he supposed a Greek translation of the unrevised Aramaean Original Gospel; and that Mark and Luke used this translation in composing their Gospels. He also supposed that the Greek translator of the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew used the Greek text of Mark, and partly also that of Luke.\footnote{Herder also adopted the hypothesis of the Original Gospel, and modified it. It was written in Aramaean for the use of the Evangelists, but not published. Mark, who published it in Greek with very little alteration, gives us the most exact notion of it. At an earlier period it was revised by Matthew and published in Aramaean, in a more detailed form, — the \textit{Gospel of the Hebrews}. Luke}
then wrote a Hellenistic Gospel, based on the Protevangel, but also used the more complete Gospel of Matthew and the Greek of Mark, to which he added much. Finally, the Gospel of Matthew was translated freely into Greek, and, while much was omitted, much other matter was added. This view is simple, and corresponds well with the course which the development of Christianity took, but fails to explain how, on the one hand, Matthew, and, on the other, Luke, omit or vary so much from the supposed original Gospel of Mark.


Marsh's Genealogy of the Gospels: —
1. Original document Ν.
2. Greek version of the same Ν.
3. Copy, with smaller or greater additions Ν + α + Α.
4. Copy, with other such additions Ν + β + Β.
5. Copy, with both kinds of additions — basis of Mark — Ν + α + β + Α + Β.
6. Copy, with increase of additions α + Α — basis of Matthew — Ν + α + γ + Α + Γ + 1.
8. Matthew and Luke used, besides, an auxiliary work 2, from which they inserted the elements Γ 2, which are common to both, though in different order.

* Regel der Zusammenstimmung unserer Evang. aus ihrer Entstehung und Ordnung, appended to the work: Von Gottes Sohn der Welt Heiland, nach Joh. Evang. Rig. 1797. Part XII. of his Samml. Werke z. Relig. u. Theol. It is pretty difficult to grasp Herder's meaning. According to Neudecker's account, he must have also held that the translator of Matthew used the Gospels of Mark and Luke; which would supply a more exact explanation of the verbal agreement, a point on which Herder seems not to have laid any special stress.

§ 84 d.

Hereupon, Eichhorn published a revision of his former hypothesis, in which he expressly aimed at explaining the verbal agreement. In order to do this, he likewise supposed the use of Greek versions.
Einl. ins N. T. 1 Thl. 1804. Accordingly, his Genealogy of the Gospels is as follows:

2. Greek version of the same.
3. Revised edition of the Original, used by Matthew, A.
4. Greek version of the same on the basis of the Greek version of the Original Gospel.
5. Revised edition of the Original, used by Luke, not translated into Greek, B.
6. Combination of both editions, used by Mark, also not translated into Greek, C.
7. A fourth revision of the Original, used by Matthew and Luke, D.
8. Greek version of the same, with help of the Greek version of the Original Gospel.
9. Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, from A and D combined, E.
10. Greek version of Matthew, with help of the Greek version of A and D.
11. Mark's Gospel is based on \( A + B = C \), and in translating this he used the version of \( A \); what, on the other hand, belonged to \( B \), he must himself have translated.
12. Luke's Gospel is written from \( B \) and \( D \) together = \( F \), with the insertion of the history of a journey. In translating, he used the Greek text of \( D \); but what belonged to \( B \) he must himself have translated.

The following writers have declared in favor of the Original Gospel:

Ziegler, Ideen ub. d. Urspr. d. drei ersten Evang., in Gabler's Neuest. theol. Journ. B. IV. St. 5. Hänlein, Einl. in libr. N. T. hist. I. xvi. Bertholdt, Einl. III. 1205, ff. Gratz, N. Vers. d. Entsteh. d. drei ersten Evang. zu erklären (Tüb. 1812), — this writer, however, with this modification, that he regards the Aramaean Original as the basis of Matthew only, who wrote in Aramaean, but a Greek version of the same as the source of Mark and Luke, and supposes enlargements of the original document by the individual Evangelists, with subsequent additions derived by one from the other.

Untenableness of these Theories.

§ 85.

While, in its simpler forms, the hypothesis of an Original Gospel does not explain all the phenomena that demand explanation, in its minuter development it excites distrust, from the artificial nature of the attempts to sustain it by a multitude of auxiliary hypotheses. Moreover, the supposition, not so much of several written editions of the evangelic history, as of such laborious and mechanical work as the
collecting and using of translations, is unlikely. The supposition of a written original Gospel is also improbable, especially in the meagre form supposed by Eichhorn, in which it could hardly have gained so much regard as he attributes to it; to say nothing of the fact that Christian antiquity is wholly silent in regard to its existence. These and other reasons have recently become so clear to most writers, that now we can scarcely refrain from wonder that this hypothesis could have found so much acceptance. 

* Supposed traces of it, according to Bertholdt, III. 1308, especially in the Epistles of Paul: 1 Cor. xi. 23, ff., xv. 3, ff.; Rom. ii. 16; 1 Thess. iv. 15; and several other places.


2. Hypothesis of Several Common Sources.

§ 86.

Several writers* have tried to solve the difficulty by this hypothesis; but they have either thrown it out hastily, or in stating it have not entered on the explanation of the problem in all its relations. For such an explanation it is not sufficient. It fails, especially, to explain the mutual relationship of the Gospels in their whole structure.

III. Hypothesis of one Oral Source.

§ 87 a.

They have correctly apprehended the spirit of Christian antiquity who regard the oral tradition of the Gospel (the oral Original Gospel) as the basis and source of all the Christian Gospels, and who endeavor to apprehend the history of the origin of the latter in a definite relation to the former.*


§ 87 b.

The tidings concerning Christ (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὸ κήρυγμα) were, as is well known, promulgated orally as a living word (§ 61). They were delivered partly in Aramaean for Palestinians and Syrians, partly and especially (for the reasons given in § 1) in Greek. In the latter language they obtained the most decided development, so that not only a peculiar Jewish-Greek Christian language grew up, but also a certain uniformity in the delivery of the subject-matter itself. A proof of this uniformity is found in the account of the Lord’s Supper in 1 Cor. xi. 23, ff.; for Paul can hardly have been acquainted with the Gospel of Matthew.

At the same time, however, the oral tradition must have been to a certain extent fluctuating, because,—1. Inquiry into many, and especially less important facts, led to differing results (comp. Matt. xxvii. 5 with Acts i. 18, ff.; Luke xxiv. 44, ff. with Acts i.); 2. The interest of narrators and hearers in the history, though lively, was by no means criti-
cal, for they regarded the environing circumstances of certain incidents, and particularly of the words and teachings of Jesus, as unimportant externals; 3. Quite frequently additions proceeding from the narrators' own inspiration and reflection mingled with what was historically given and handed down.

§ 87 c.

That tradition performed not merely the office of transmitting, but also, at the same time, of changing, and even of creating, is a truth which, despite its misuse through Strauss's exaggeration, must be maintained. For, apart from the fact that it has a sure foundation in the spirit of primitive Christianity, in the want of exact critical interest, and in the independent way in which the revelation through Christ or the Holy Spirit (in which Christ, as it were, a second time became flesh) was received and reproduced, only in this way can we comprehend the great diversity which sometimes occurs in the narration of the same events. For instance, Luke xix. 12, ff., comp. Matt. xxv. 14, ff.; Luke xiv. 16, cf. Matt. xxii. 1, ff.; Mark xii. 28, ff., cf. Matt. xxii. 34, ff. The independent spirit of tradition had a strong influence especially on its didactic element, and altered with freedom the discourses, especially the parables, of Jesus. It may indeed not be too bold to suppose, that in this way parables and other discourses of Jesus may have been invented; to this class probably belong several of the former in Luke (especially the strongly Paulinizing Luke xviii. 19, ff.), and the prophecy of the future coming of Christ (Matt. xxiv. and parallel passages), which was probably the work of some prophet who freely altered a declaration of Christ's.—This view is at least more historical than those of Weisse, Wilke, Br. Bauer, and Baur, which ascribe the whole to the arbitrary will of an individual; and can in no wise disturb the believer, unless with pietistic one-sidedness he attach himself to Jesus's person only, and despise his spirit.
§ 87 d.

But if we must explain, by means of oral tradition, not alone those parts of the synoptical Gospels which differ, but also those which agree, the question arises,—1. Whether the agreement of the parallel accounts, both in the general representation and diction, and in single (oftentimes rare) words (see § 97 f), and, 2. Whether the whole scope and structure of our synoptical Gospels, may thus be explained. Neither of these can be asserted as likely. The uniformity of oral delivery cannot reach so high a degree; and as regards the second point, the Apostles must, according to Herder, have fixed in a written Gospel, which was committed to the Evangelists, the bounds of their subject. According to Gieseler, the uniformity grew up of itself, without any agreement, in consequence of the similar mode of apprehending and representing the subject which frequent repetition of it among the Apostles produced. According to Paulus, the Evangelists merely united on one common train of thought. But opposed to all this stands the fact, in itself probable, and also pretty nearly demonstrable, that the Apostles and Evangelists in their preaching gave nothing more than a hasty outline of the whole evangelic history (comp. Acts xiii. 24, ff.), or single parts of the same (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 1, ff.), but not an evangelic whole, like our written Gospels. a

a Cf. Cremer, Einl. p. 192. The tradition of the rise of the second Gospel, that Mark wrote without arrangement what he heard from Peter's addresses (§ 99 b), serves as proof. D. Schultz, in Stud. u. Kr. 1892, thinks the twofold source, oral tradition and the free individuality of the Evangelists, a quite sufficient explanation. So (following him?) in regard to Mark: Knobel, De Evang. Marci origine, 1831; in respect of the relation of Matthew to Luke, Neudecker, p. 171, ff.; in general, Ebrard, Krit. d. Evang. Gesch. § 139, p. 985, ff. (Against him, Bleek, Beitr. z. Evang. Kritik, i. 68, ff.) Also Schleiermacher (Einleit.) is content with this source, except that he brings in also the Hebrew writing of Matthew (§ 97 a) as a basis for the first Gospel; and Thiersch (Standp. d. Krit. 137, ff.), for he thinks he can explain the affinity between Matthew and Luke by supposing the oral common source, and their divergence by the use of different written works.

§ 88 a.

It is therefore necessary, if we will not take refuge in generalities, to return to the hypothesis that one Evangelist used another, at least in so far as to suppose that this mutual use took place on the basis of oral tradition, and accordingly less under the influence of the arbitrary will of individuals. The way is also open for supposing one or several media of affinity between each two or all three Evangelists. From this stand-point, Credner, with help of the Church accounts, gives the origin of the synoptical Gospels as follows: — 1. The Apostle Matthew, at quite an early period, collected in the Hebrew language the discourses of the Lord. This collection formed the basis of the first edition of the evangelic history, which at a later period was undertaken by a Palestinian, who used Mark's notes, and, to lighten the labor of translation, sought the aid of oral tradition. This work was our first canonical Gospel, rightly called *katà Mavthaiov.

2. Another made these notes of Mark the basis of his written presentation of the Gospel history, while he arranged and completed their contents. 3. Luke was acquainted with and used, together with oral tradition, both our canonical Matthew and Mark, and also the ancient Hebrew work of Matthew and that of Mark. — But in this way the structure of our second Gospel, and its manifest dependence on the first, cannot be at all explained; for the pretended notes of Mark, on which it was based, are represented as being without arrangement, — whereas our canonical Mark has in general the same arrangement as Matthew.

* Einl. ins N. T. I. 203, ff.

§ 88 b.

So too Reuss. The oldest Gospel was that written by the Apostle Matthew in the Hebrew tongue (§ 97, note b).
Likewise *Mark* very early wrote down what he remembered of Peter's statements (§ 99 b, note a). This Gospel is extant in our second Gospel, the spurious beginning, i. 1–13, and end, xvi. 9–20, excepted. That first Gospel of Matthew, however, served only as the basis or chief source of that which now bears his name; and perhaps the author has drawn from *Mark*. Akin to our Matthew were the Gospels of the Jewish Christians,—the Gospel of the Hebrews, and that of Peter. As in even the earliest copies of all these Gospels discrepancies might arise, we can comprehend how, towards the end of the first century, the number of Gospels in existence might seem very great (Luke i. 1). Luke sought, by his critical work, to prevent the further corruption of the Gospel history, for he followed oral tradition to its source, and probably consulted both of the existing works, especially that of *Mark*. The first biographers of Jesus had drawn from oral tradition alone; the later writers drew from written sources, which have however been lost. None of our Evangelists had the work of the other before him in its present form. Hence, to explain their affinity is impossible.

This hypothesis shares in the mistakes of Wilke's and Credner's. Like Wilke, Reuss, in aid of his theory, supposes interpolations of the second Gospel (cf. § 94, f). Like Credner, Reuss considers our Mark independent of Matthew, and even makes the latter draw from him. But Matthew bears the stamp of originality, and Mark is a compiler (§ 94 a, ff). That no one of our Evangelists used the other, is an assertion which is contradicted by mere ocular inspection, and we must not too hastily abandon the attempt to explain their affinity.


A. From a Common Oral Source.

§ 89 a.

The writings which Luke had before him, and probably used (Luke i. 1–4), were drawn from oral tradition (ver. 2); and probably he also drew from the same source. If Matthew followed the same course, his affinity with Luke may be to a large extent explained; and, 1. In respect of the single corresponding narratives, a. as regards their general contents or their ground-form, and partly their expression. Here both Evangelists commonly agree in the main points and discourses,—in precisely that which usually makes impression on the memory; they differ partly in their mode of connecting a narrative with what precedes, partly in minor circumstances, and in a greater or less minuteness, all of which are attributable either to themselves or to the written works used by them.*

* Examples: —

Matthew. iii. 7–10. Discourse of John the Baptist.

— 11, f. Ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω υμᾶς ἐν ὀνόματι εἰς μετάνοιαν· ο δὲ ὑπάρχον ὑμᾶς ἔρχεται δὴ ὁ Ἰσχυρότερος μου, μου ἐρχόμενος ἱσχυρότερός μου ἵστην, οὐκ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ ὑποδηματά τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι αἵματος καὶ πνεύματι οἰκείων καὶ πυρί. Οὗ τὸ πτύον, αὐτῷ. k. τ. λ.

Luke. iii. 7–9.

viii. 2, ff. καὶ ἔδωκεν ἑλθὼν ἐθνῶν. v. 12, ff. . . . καὶ ἔδωκεν ἀνὴρ πλήρως προσεκομίζεαν αὐτῷ λέγων· Κύριε, ἐὰν ἔρχαται, καὶ ἔδωκεν τῷ Ἱσραήλ, θέλης, δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι. Καὶ ἐκτίνας τὴν χεῖρα ὡς αὐτοῦ ὃ λέγωνς· Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλης, δύνασαι με Ἱσραήλ λέγων· Θελω, καθαρίσητε. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λεπτα, κ. τ. λ.

viii. 5–7. The introduction different.

vii. 1–6. Middle.
MATTHEW AND LUKE. § 89 a.

Matthew.

viii. 8. . . . Κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ικανὸς, ἵνα μοι ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσῆλθην ἀλλὰ μόνον εἰπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ ιαθήσεται ὁ πάσης μου.

— 9.

— 14, ff. . . . τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβηλήμενην καὶ πυρίζουσαν. Καὶ ἤγατο τῇ ἤερσε αὐτῆς, καὶ ἄφηκεν αὐτήν ὁ πυρετὸς· καὶ ἤγερθη, καὶ διηκόνη αὐτοῖς, κ. τ. λ.

viii. 18. . . . ἔκλεισαν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

— 19 — 22. . . . Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι, ὅπως ἔως ἀπερχηθή. . . . Αἱ ἀλλήλες φιλοτικοὶ ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πεπεισματον τοῦ οἴρου κατασκεφάλωσιν. . . . Κύριε, ἐπιτρέψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθῆναι καὶ βάψας τὸν πατέρα μου.

. . . Ἀκολουθεῖ μοι, καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς βάψαι τοὺς ἐαυτῶν νεκροὺς.

— 23, ff. . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ, σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ βαλδασσῳ, διότι τὸ πλοῖον καλύπτετο ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων· αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκέθενε. . . . Κύριε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς, ἀπολλύμενα. . . . Τί δελτίο ἐστιν, ἐκλύγηστοι; Τάτε ἐγκριθεὶς ἐπετίμησε τοῖς ἀνήμοις, κ. τ. λ.

— 29. . . . Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοι, ὦ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἥξαθε δὲν πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσας ἡμᾶς;

— 32, f.

So also Matt. ix. 2, 5, 9, 12, f., 15, ff., 22, 24; xi. 3, ff., 16, ff.; xii. 9, f., 8, 13, 47, 49, f.; xiv. 15, f., 19, f.; xvi. 13—16, 21, 24—26, 28; xvii. 1, 3, ff., 17, 29; xviii. 5; and the parallel passages in Luke. Only ix. 5, f.; xi. 10, f.; xvi. 28, as well as iii. 3, iv. 5, 10 (see § 79 b), and the whole history of the Temptation, whose form is throughout too artistic for oral tradition, may indicate a written source. A similar (more or less free) parallelism or a certain similarity of type appears in the narratives of Jesus’s journey to Jerusalem and of his stay there. Comp. Matt. xix. 14, 20, f., 24, 26, ff.; xx. 18, f., 30, ff.; xxi. 1—3, 8, f., 13, 23, ff.; xxii. 18—21, 27, f., 39; and the parallel passages in Luke. On the other hand, far fewer points of agreement occur in the history of the Passion, and hardly any in that of the
Resurrection. In the former, the separate parts are not in general accurately defined, which appears manifest in the history of Jesus's work in Galilee, and clearly shows that it was the custom to narrate miracles and other important events by themselves. In the history of the Passion, a thread appears which runs through the whole; and passages occur which serve only for transition, as Matt. xxvi. 1–5, 14–16. Hence, in this section the relation between Matthew and Luke may have a written basis, on which Luke acted the more freely, as he regarded it only as a literary work, which he might alter, partly according to his own judgment, partly according to accounts received from other quarters. The accounts of the Resurrection, Matt. xxviii. 1–8, Luke xxiv. 1–9, have manifestly a common basis and accord.


Whether the basis was oral or written is difficult to decide.

§ 89 b.

b. In the connection of the single narratives, also, the mutual affinity of both Evangelists may be in part explained by a common oral source. In the history of Jesus’s work in Galilee, the sequence at the beginning is, to be sure, different; but some passages, as those of the paralytic and the calling of Matthew, of the plucking of the corn and the healing of the withered hand, of the storm on the lake and the demoniac (demoniacs), of Herod’s watching Jesus and the feeding of the five thousand, are always connected in pairs, and from Matt. xvi. 13 forth, the arrangement is the same, even in the story of the journey to Jerusalem, and the stay there. It is quite conceivable that in oral delivery many passages gained a fixed connection, on account of the affinity between their contents or of the historical sequence of the events.

§ 90.

2. As regards the didactic portion, or the longer consecutive discourses of Jesus, the parables, &c., and in general such expressions as have a more independent doctrinal meaning, we find in them likewise much verbal agreement, which, considering the earnestness with which tradition must have
striven to retain them, can appear surprising, and point to a written source, only in the case of some very rare words and turns of expression, as Matt. vii. 5, xi. 26, xxi. 44, xxiv. 50 (§ 79 b). But in regard to the connection and the position of parallel discourses, various cases occur. a. Some are presented by both Evangelists in the same definite connection (at least as regards their chief points), and in the same historical relation.* b. Others, grouped by Matthew into one mass or in one relation, are placed by Luke in various positions and relations. c. Luke has given a shorter, and, in its main points, quite a different view of the Sermon on the Mount from Matt. v. 3–vii. 27, although most of its substance is found in Matthew; other parts he gives elsewhere, and sometimes with an historic occasion. d. Discourses which have a distinct application appear in the two Evangelists in different places; and, e. Expressions of a more general character, proverbs, and sentences are interwoven by both in a different manner.* f. Some parables appear in different forms. Thus, in respect of this Gospel material, not only oral tradition, but also the written composition, whether of one or another of our two Evangelists, or of one or several earlier, had large and free scope, and we must inquire into their mutual relation, in respect of their composition in general.


vi. 20—26 = v. 3—12.
— 27, f. = — 44.
— 29, f. = — 39, 42.
— 31 = vii. 12.
— 32—36 = v. 46—48.
— 37, f. = vii. 1.
— 40 = x. 24.
— 41—42 = vii. 3—5.
— 45 = xii. 35.
— 47—49 = vii. 24—27.

Matthew.
v. 18 = xvi. 17.
— 25, f. = xii. 58, f.
— 32 (xix. 9) = xvi. 18.
vi. 9—13 (Our Father) = xi. 1—4.
— 19—21 = xii. 33, f.
— 22, f. = xi. 34—36.
— 24 = xvi. 13.
— 25—33 = xii. 29—31.
vii. 7—11 = xi. 9—13.
— 13 = xiii. 24.
— 22, f. = — 25—27.

vi. 20—26 = v. 3—12.
— 27, f. = — 44.
— 29, f. = — 39, 42.
— 31 = vii. 12.
— 32—36 = v. 46—48.
— 37, f. = vii. 1.
— 40 = x. 24.
— 41—42 = vii. 3—5.
— 45 = xii. 35.
— 47—49 = vii. 24—27.


It is worth noting, that the declarations in Matt. xiii. 17 and xviii. 8, f. (cf. v. 29), Luke x. 13, cf. Matt. xi. 21, are connected with what precedes by a merely verbal relation, without any logical connection of thought.
B. Explanation of the Relation between Matthew and Luke from Written Sources.

a. Peculiarities of both Evangelists in the Treatment of the Gospel Matter and in the Composition of a Whole.

§ 91 a.

Both Evangelists have handled the materials which they received through tradition or from Gospel writers with freedom, and in a manner peculiar to themselves. This appears, 1. In the style of the writing, which in each has considerable uniformity, although Luke, judging from his proem, would, had he been independent, have written in purer Greek.*

* Matthew writes with tolerable uniformity, Luke with greater freedom, and often forms periods: i. 1–4; ii. 42, f.; iii. 1, f., 15, f., 19, f.; vi. 13, f.; vii. 37, f.; xiv. 28, f.; xv. 4; xxiii. 11; xxiv. 19, f. Does he Hebraize less than Matthew? Schott, Isag. p. 108. Favorite words and turns of expression in Matthew: σφόδρα, ὥστε after the genitive absolute, τὰς usual transition-particles. Peculiar: ἀλλο for ἐκ, e. g. ἀλλο καρδίας, xviii. 35; ἐγερ- 

* Matthew writes with tolerable uniformity, Luke with greater freedom, and often forms periods: i. 1–4; ii. 42, f.; iii. 1, f., 15, f., 19, f.; vi. 13, f.; vii. 37, f.; xiv. 28, f.; xv. 4; xxiii. 11; xxiv. 19, f. Does he Hebraize less than Matthew? Schott, Isag. p. 108. Favorite words and turns of expression in Matthew: σφόδρα, ὥστε after the genitive absolute, τὰς usual transition-articles. Peculiar: ἀλλο for ἐκ, e. g. ἀλλο καρδίας, xviii. 35; ἐγερ- 

* Matthew writes with tolerable uniformity, Luke with greater freedom, and often forms periods: i. 1–4; ii. 42, f.; iii. 1, f., 15, f., 19, f.; vi. 13, f.; vii. 37, f.; xiv. 28, f.; xv. 4; xxiii. 11; xxiv. 19, f. Does he Hebraize less than Matthew? Schott, Isag. p. 108. Favorite words and turns of expression in Matthew: σφόδρα, ὥστε after the genitive absolute, τὰς usual transition-articles. Peculiar: ἀλλο for ἐκ, e. g. ἀλλο καρδίας, xviii. 35; ἐγερ- 

* Matthew writes with tolerable uniformity, Luke with greater freedom, and often forms periods: i. 1–4; ii. 42, f.; iii. 1, f., 15, f., 19, f.; vi. 13, f.; vii. 37, f.; xiv. 28, f.; xv. 4; xxiii. 11; xxiv. 19, f. Does he Hebraize less than Matthew? Schott, Isag. p. 108. Favorite words and turns of expression in Matthew: σφόδρα, ὥστε after the genitive absolute, τὰς usual transition-articles. Peculiar: ἀλλο for ἐκ, e. g. ἀλλο καρδίας, xviii. 35; ἐγερ- 

* Matthew writes with tolerable uniformity, Luke with greater freedom, and often forms periods: i. 1–4; ii. 42, f.; iii. 1, f., 15, f., 19, f.; vi. 13, f.; vii. 37, f.; xiv. 28, f.; xv. 4; xxiii. 11; xxiv. 19, f. Does he Hebraize less than Matthew? Schott, Isag. p. 108. Favorite words and turns of expression in Matthew: σφόδρα, ὥστε after the genitive absolute, τὰς usual transition-articles. Peculiar: ἀλλο for ἐκ, e. g. ἀλλο καρδίας, xviii. 35; ἐγερ-
twenty-one times in Acts, twice in Matt., Mark, and John; πλήθειν, πλήθεσθαι, twelve times in Luke, nine times in Acts, twice in Matt.; παραγγέλει, only twice in Matt.; παρά and ἵππος, with accusative, for comparison; συγκαλεῖν, only once in Mark; ἑπιστρέφειν, once in Mark, Paul, Heb.; the article before interrogative sentences, i. 62, ix. 46, and often (Mark ix. 23); τοῦ before the infinitive, i. 9, and often, as in Paul (Win. Gramm. § 45. 4. 3); frequent participial constructions (Win. § 46. 2. 3); frequent use of δεῖναι, ii. 4, and often. Wholly peculiar: διαπορεῖν, ix. 7, xxiv. 4, Acts ii. 12, v. 24, x. 17; ἐπιστευεῖν, i. 1, Acts ix. 29, xix. 13; ἐπισταύρεν, v. 5, viii. 94, 45, ix. 33, 49, xvii. 13; ἐπιλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέρες, ἐπιλήσθη ὁ χρόνος, i. 23, 57, ii. 6, 91, 92; καθέξις, i. 3, viii. 1, Acts iii. 94, xi. 4, xviii. 22; καθότι, i. 7, xix. 9, Acts ii. 94, 45, iv. 35; ἐδυνάσθη, ii. 48, xvi. 94, f., Acts xx. 38; ἐμείνασθαι, xxiv. 14, f., Acts xx. 11, xxiv. 26; συμβάλλειν, ii. 19, xiv. 31, Acts iv. 15, xvii. 18, xviii. 27, xx. 14; συμπληρώθη, viii. 23, ix. 15, Acts i. 1; τίθησθαι εἰς τὰ δόση, or ἐν καρδίᾳ, i. 66, ix. 44, xxi. 14, Acts v. 4, xix. 91; ὑπολαμβάνειν, vii. 43, x. 30, Acts i. 9, ii. 15. Cf. Schott, l. c. p. 83, 108. Gersdorff, Beitr. z. Sprachcharakt. p. 38, ff., 160, ff. Dav. Schub: on the Parable of the Steward, in different parts. Cred. §§ 37, 59. The author of "Die Evang." p. 264, ff., attempts to show that the style of the third Gospel is Pauline, and that Paul had therefore a share in it; but he mixes up mistakes with what is correct. Besides what has already been adduced, note especially: ἐπιστευεμένων, vi. 38, cf. ἐπιστευσετεμένων, Rom. v. 20, and more of the same sort; συνανταξεοῦσθαι, x. 40, Rom. viii. 26; ἀνεικόσθαι, xii. 17, xxi. 5, and elsewhere in Paul only; ἀνεικόσθησθαι, xiv. 6, Rom. ix. 20; διαργιανέγερ, xxiv. 27, Acts ix. 36, elsewhere in P. only; ἐξονισάζειν, xxii. 29, three times in P.; ἐξονισοῦσειν, xviii. 9, xxiii. 30, Acts iv. 14, eight times in P.; ἐκεκεῖν, xviii. 1, elsewhere in P. only; καταγγέλειν, xiii. 7, very often in P., Heb. ii. 14; ἀνάγειν, distress, xvii. 23, 1 Cor. vii. 36, and often; ἄνοιγμα, xxi. 4, eight times in P.; εἶπα, xi. 8, 18, xvii. 4, 1 Cor. vii. 8, and often, 1 Pet. iii. 4, but also Matt. xxvi. 33; μεροῦς, xi. 29, Rom. ix. 20, x. 18; γε, xi. 8, xxiv. 21, and often, elsewhere chiefly in P.; εἰ μήτε, ix. 13, 1 Cor. vii. 5, 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

§ 91 b.

2. The peculiarity of each of the two Evangelists shows itself in certain pragmatic explanatory additions, which serve for review, for resting-points, or to carry on the narrative.* Indeed, if we may follow analogy, each carries into the history something of his own.†

From the Evangelists' own hand come also the indications of time and place, and, in general, the connecting links between the separate occurrences. These must needs be different, because Matthew strung all his materials on a chronological thread, and arranged many parts in a quite different order from that of Luke. The latter seems, on the contrary, to prefer abruptness and absence of connection.

Matthew prefers also to connect the discourses of Jesus, and therefore gives them in large groups (v. 2—vii. 27, x., xiii., xxiii., xxiv., xxv.); Luke, on the other hand, prefers to isolate them, and even in grouping together several discourses he seeks as much as possible for occasions, resting-points, and new connecting links. But either his selection or his literary agency seems to have had an influence on even the import and the spirit of these sayings; for it is remarkable how much in his Gospel refers to the recommending of
poverty and beneficence, the rejection of riches, and to the later oppressed condition of the Christians. The passages, xvii. 7, ff., xviii. 9, ff., which have a Pauline coloring, and ix. 2, ff., x. 25, ff., xvii. 11, ff., which manifest mildness towards the Samaritans, are also to be noted.

* See § 90, note b, and cf. Luke xi. 1, 5, 27, 99, 37, f., 45; xii. 1, 13–16, 22, 40, 54; xiii. 1, 18, 23, f., 31; xiv. 7, 12, 15, f., 25; xv. 1–3, 11; xvi. 1, 14; xvii. 1, 5, 20, 22, 37; xviii. 1, 9.

b vi. 20, f., 24 (cf. Matt. v. 3, ff.); xi. 41; xii. 33; xvi. 1, ff., 19, ff.; xix. 8.—The Sermon on the Mount is intended, in the main, to infuse into the oppressed Christians submission, courage, and comfort, ver. 20–22, 27–29; further, xii. 33, xviii. 8, xxii. 28.—The similar expressions in Matthew (v. 11, x. 16, ff.) show also a later stand-point, but refer to the Apostles, not to the community.

§ 91 e.

3. In respect of the composition, as a whole, Matthew carried out his plan, from a Jewish-Christian stand-point, with conscious design and regular sequence. According to him, Jesus began and completed his course; proved himself, during his ministry, which was limited to Galilee, the Messiah of Old Testament prophecy (§ 91 b, note a); suffered his, likewise prophetically-determined, fate as fulfiller of the law and founder of the kingdom of heaven, which is to come in Messianic glory, in conflict with the false leaders of the people, the Pharisaic literalists and hypocrites; but rose again in the victorious fulness of his power.*

* Matt. i. ii.: preliminary history, which gives both the Davidic descent and higher nature, the destiny and future acknowledgment (cf. ii. 1–12 with viii. 11, f., xv. 21, ff., xxi. 41, xxviii. 19) of Christ, and also foreshadows his sufferings. Ch. iii. 1–iv. 11: the forerunner, consecration, temptation. Ch. iv. 12–x. 42: appearance in Galilee (cf. iv. 13–16 with xxviii. 16–20), statement of the Messianic plan, ministry, sending forth of the Twelve. Ch. xi. –xviii.: opposition and rejection, with acknowledgment; prospect of the death of Jesus; his transfiguration, the prelude to his heavenly glorification. By his journey to Jerusalem, his entrance and stay there (ch. xix. –xxv.), the breach between him and the ecclesiastical rulers is completed. In his discourse in ch. xxiii. (note especially ver. 37–39), he cuts wholly loose from them. The knot thus tied is loosed, prophetically by the predictions in ch. xxiv. and xxv., tragically by the sufferings and death of Jesus (ch. xxvi. and xxvii.), and finally by his victorious resurrection, his meeting with his disciples, and sending them forth (ch. xxviii.).
§ 91 f.

Luke followed this plan in part, but in part also deviated from it in various ways, especially by inserting ix. 51—xviii. 14, which extends the range of Jesus's labors beyond the bounds of Galilee (x. 1, 38). This accords with the non-Judaizing Pauline tendency of his Gospel, which shows itself in the preliminary history, but elsewhere partly in omissions and alterations, partly in additions. The keystone of Matthew's Gospel (ch. xxviii.) he has broken, by setting aside the last scene in Galilee, to prepare the way for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Jerusalem, Acts ii, and thus to lay an historic basis for the rich development of this spirit in the bosom of Pauline Christianity.

* The original plan is traceable from beginning to end, especially in xx. 46, f., xxii. 5, ff.; but it has been disturbed by the too early position of the polemic passages, vi. 1, ff. (Matt. xii. 1, ff.), and of the major part of the discourse in Matt. xxiii. (Luke xi. 39, ff., xiii. 34, f.), whereby its force in its proper position has been lost, and by the insertion of xxii. 1—4.

** His universalism appears in ii. 31, Paulinism in i. 20, 45 (cf. Rom. iv. 18, ff.), i. 51, ff., ii. 1—7, in opposition to Matt. ii. 1, ff., and in comparison with i Cor. i. 26, ff., 2 Cor. viii. 9. The author of "Die Evang." has very much exaggerated this, after his fashion, p. 916, ff.

b Luke does not give those passages which support the Jewish particularism (Matt. x. 5, xv. 21, ff.) and the pre-eminence of Peter (Matt. xvi. 17—19, x. 2, — the word πρώτος). Perhaps his Pauline tendency was opposed also by the passages concerning the law, Matt. v. 17, ff.; by the references to prophecies fulfilled, Matt. vii. 17, xii. 15—31, xiii. 14, ff., 35, xxii. 4, f., xxvi. 56 (to which xxii. 14—16, xxvii. 3, ff., also belong, — the account here of Judas Iscariot does not agree in other respects with Luke xxii. 3, Acts i. 18); the eschatological passages, Matt. xiii. 24—30, 36—43, 47—50, xxv. 1—12, 31—46 (also Matt. x. 23 he omits, Matt. xvi. 28 he softens [ix. 27], Matt. xxiv. 29 he cuts down [xxii. 25], and Matt. xxiv. 23—28, by his change of its position and relation, xvii. 32—37, loses in definiteness); the narratives, Matt. xvii. 94—27, xxvii. 50, ff.

* His universalism appears above all in the choosing of the seventy disciples, x. 1, which, like the twelve for the twelve tribes of Israel, correspond to the seventy peoples of the earth; and also in the passages favorable to the Samaritans, ix. 52, f., x. 33. We may hardly place under this head the parables, xv. 11, ff., xvi. 19, ff., the narratives, xxiii. 39, ff., x. 38, ff. (contrary to Schweiler, Nachap. Zeitalt. I. 47, ff., Zeller, in Jahrb. 1843, p. 81, ff.). It is also false to conclude from passages like ix. 39, f., 40, 45,
MATTHEW AND LUKE. § 92.

(‘Die Evangelien,’” etc., p. 24, f., 82, f. Ritschl, Evang. Marc. p. 188, ff. Baur, in Zeller’s Jahrb. 1846, p. 500, ff., Krit. Unter. 435, ff.,) that Luke meant to throw the Twelve into the abade. Similar passages are also found in Matt. xvi. 8–11, xvii. 16, xxvi. 40. On the other hand, it is a striking fact, that the part of the instructions in Matt. x., directed according to Luke to the Seventy, contains the more important passages, x. 12, 16, and that Jesus on their return says such weighty words, ver. 18, ff. The passages, xv. 11, ff., xvii. 7, ff., xviii. 9, ff., are manifestly Pauline.

* Excepting iii. 11, xxviii. 19, Matthew says nothing of the Holy Spirit in relation to the disciples.

§ 92.

As the peculiarities of each of our Evangelists are apparent from beginning to end, the work of each, although perhaps not wholly independent, is yet the result of his own labor. The opening history is not a later addition.* As little has Luke inserted without change certain memoranda, especially in the section ch. ix. 51–xviii. 14, a collection of sayings (Marsh, Eichhorn, and others), or an account of a journey. Still less has he adopted Marcion’s Gospel as his basis (§ 72 c).


Against the genuineness of Luke i. ii.: Edu. Eversion, The Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists and the Evidence of their re-


§ 93 a.

Everything thus far opposes the theory, maintained by many, of the dependence of Matthew on Luke (§ 92 a); particularly the fluctuating composition, resting on a foreign basis, and the Pauline bias imparted to preponderatingly Jewish-Christian matter, in connection with the later origin of the third Gospel, attested by tradition and rendered probable by internal evidence (§ 101 c). Many particulars, moreover, stamp the first Gospel with the character of originality: the account of the Temptation and of the Sermon on the Mount, whose more complete form shows them to be the first outpouring rather than a later emendation and a disjointed copy,—the narrative of the Resurrection, which not only harmonizes with the Galilean scope of the Gospel, but by its simplicity and uniqueness proves itself the oldest,—and many others.

§ 93 b.

From the point which we have reached, it seems natural to conclude that the third Gospel is an elaboration of the first. If the omissions adduced are intentional, and aim to give it a certain bias, others also may be regarded in the same light.* In the passages which Luke has in common with Matthew, arbitrary changes and transpositions may be proved;* at least, completeness and originality are on the side of Matthew (cf. xvii. 1–4 with Matt. xviii. 1, f., 6, f., 15, ff.).* In several passages Luke has endeavored, and sometimes with success, to improve upon Matthew;* in others, his pragmatism (generally incorrect) is manifest.*

* Matt. xvii. 10–19 (christological question); xiv. 3–19 (an addition of particulars, which perhaps Luke thought inappropriate); xxvii. 62–66, xxviii. 11–15 (which he perhaps considered unworthy of credit).
The assignment of the great address of instruction in Matt. x. to the
Twelve, ix. 3–5, and to the Seventy, x. 4–12, is plainly arbitrary. Be-
sides, x. 13 (Matt. xi. 21) is introduced improperly by a mistake of memory.
The Sermon on the Mount, vi. 20, ff., is a disfigured extract from that in
Matthew, which has the appropriate object of showing to Jesus's disciples
his plan and doctrine, whereas Luke makes it refer to the oppressed Chris-
tians of a later time. Thus the peroration, which, in Matt. vii. 24, ff., calls
attention to the doctrine laid down, loses its force in Luke. In vi. 37 the
connection is lost, and we see clearly how the passage Matt. vii. 1–5,
which floated before Luke's mind, is interrupted by inappropriate reminis-
cences of Matt. xv. 14, x. 24. (Also in xi. 32, ff., xii. 1, ff., 49, ff., 58, ff.,
xvi. 16, ff., sayings that in Matthew stand in good connection, or occur as
special doctrinal statements, are forced in, as it were, by violence.)

See, on the contrary, Ritschl, pp. 260, 274, and his remarks, p. 289, on
passages like vii. 39 (Matt. xxi. 32), xi. 48, ff. (Matt. xxiii. 30, ff.), which
look like unsuccessful attempts at revision.

iii. 2, 7, 19, f. (Matt. iii. 1, 7, iv. 12); iv. 5, ff. (Matt. iv. 5, ff., a se-
quence incorrectly altered); v. 17, 29, 33 (Matt. ix. 3, 10, 14); ix. 10
(Matt. xiv. 13); xix. 30, ff. (Matt. xxi. 2, ff.); xxi. 12, 25 (Matt. xxiv.
8, f., 29). See Exeg. Handb. on the passages.

The later position of the Sermon on the Mount, deemed by some a
ground of preference for the third Gospel, stands in the same category as
the account of the choosing of the Twelve, vi. 12, ff. Luke was led to both
by the considerations that Matthew addresses the discourse to disciples of
whom but four were called (iv. 18, ff.), and that he introduces, in x. 1, ff.,
twelve without due preparation (Matthew alone having been called in the
mean time, ix. 9). The introduction, ver. 12, f., to the new account framed
by Luke, is out of keeping, and the name ἄνδρονιος betrays its later stand-point.

But the Gospel of Luke cannot be regarded throughout
as only a free revision of Matthew, without the use of other
sources. The proem, i. 1–4, shows the contrary (§ 89 a).
There is a degree of probability in favor of the theory that
Luke arbitrarily undertook to assign the discourses of Jesus
— which Matthew placed together — to certain incidents
as occasions (§ 91 d, note a). When he gives a correspond-
ing equivalent for what he has not in common with Mat-
thew, it proves that he had reference to Matthew. Cautious
criticism, however, will not regard all these passages as man-
ufactured by Luke, but will also suppose the use of oral
tradition or of written sources. The same applies also to several smaller additions* and alterations.† Many of these seem to have sprung up under the influence of the Pauline tradition,‡ others under that of John the Evangelist.§ No probable ground for the absence of many passages can be found in the design and tendency of Luke,¶ and the gap between ix. 17 and 18 (cf. Matt. xiv. 22–xvi. 12), especially, makes it probable that he here followed an older and shorter edition of the first Gospel.¶ In this way might be explained, also, the absence of several passages which we have regarded as designedly omitted (§ 91 c, note b). In the same way Luke must have derived the larger passages, which he has in addition to Matthew, from a written source.§

* As Baur does, p. (574) 501, ff.
‡ These sometimes bring into the narrative more of the picturesque and stirring (v. 19, vii. 3, ff., viii. 45, ff., 49, ff., xxiii. 27, ff., 39, ff.); sometimes more of the marvellous (xxii. 8, ff., 43, 51,—the hand of Luke is, however, clearly discernible in the narrative in ver. 40, ff., which omits much); and sometimes the miracle gains thereby an important application (ix. 31). Others are introduced in other ways (iv. 42, ff., ix. 49, f.).
¶ vi. 6 (Matt. xii. 9), viii. 27 (Matt. viii. 28), xi. 39 (Matt. xii. 39), xvi. 35 (Matt. xx. 29), xxii. 54, ff. (Matt. xxvi. 57, ff.), xxiii. 2, ff. (Matt. xxvii. 11, ff.), xxiv. 2, ff. (Matt. xxviii. 2, ff.).
‖ Cf. xxii. 19, f. with 1 Cor. xi. 24, f., xxiv. 34 with 1 Cor. xv. 5, and the passages referred to in § 91 f, note c.
¶ The omission of Matt. xv. 21–31 may have had its ground in ver. 24 (§ 91 f, note b), and that of xv. 32–39, xvi. 1–4, in the fact of their being repetitions (cf. Matt. xiv. 13, ff., xii. 38, f.). Matt. xiv. 28, ff., refers to Peter, but does not tend to his advantage; on this account, also, it was unnecessary to omit the whole passage. The sayings in Luke vi. 39, xii. 1,
MARK. § 94 a.

give us reason to presuppose an acquaintance with Matt. xv. 1–20, xvi. 5–12, but why does Luke wholly omit these passages? (Cf. Baur, p. [540] 471). Probably our Matthew added from another source the whole passage xiv. 22–xvi. 19 to what precedes, and so committed the same error as before (ix. 32, f., cf. xii. 23, ff.), of narrating as a different event what a different tradition had reported in a somewhat changed form. Luke, however, followed the older and simpler work, on which our Matthew is based. Cf. Bleek, Beitr. I. 76. Ritschl, p. 291.

b We may, with Marsh and others, regard a collection of discourses as this source. This collection, however, seems to have been enriched by scattered and unarranged excerpts from Matthew before it fell into Luke’s hands; and, despite his acquaintance with Matthew, he preferred to follow it, and to give some of the discourses in less fitting connection.

2. Explanation of the Relation between Mark and the other two Evangelists by the Supposition that he used them.

§ 94 a.

From the manner in which Mark stands between Matthew and Luke, combines their text into a third, and has little of his own (§ 80), we may conclude that he is dependent on both of them; this may also be satisfactorily proved. 1. According to Church tradition, Mark wrote later than the other two (§ 100 b). His later stand-point is also manifest in his mediating tendency, and in his selections from the Gospel matter, which show comparatively little interest in the teachings of Jesus. a On this account, his notion of the “Gospel,” placed at the very beginning (i. 1), and elsewhere introduced (i. 45, viii. 35, x. 29), as denoting the compend of the historic facts concerning the manifestation of the Son of God (i. 1), seems the less apostolic. The absence of the account of the supernatural birth of Jesus in no wise proves the originality of the second Evangelist; for he has the idea of the miraculous generation (vi. 3, cf. Matt. xiii. 55), and of the divinity of Christ (i. 1, iii. 11, v. 7, xv. 39).


b And, indeed, apparently with some leaning towards Docetism. In xv. 39, 44, the view is involved that Jesus’s death was not a natural one, and, if not a merely seeming one, yet voluntary (John x. 19).
§ 94 b.

2. If the parallel passages, especially those in Matthew, be compared with it, the Gospel of Mark shows unmistakable signs of non-originality, both in the representation of the teachings of Jesus, which are given sometimes in wrong connections, sometimes more or less disfigured, and in the historic accounts, which are sometimes arbitrarily altered, sometimes amplified by more or less suspicious additions.\textsuperscript{a}


\textsuperscript{b} The correct sequence is wanting in vii. 6, f. (cf. Matt. xv. 3, ff.). The omission of κατά πάναν αἱρεῖν robs the question in x. 2 of its historic force, because among the Jews the right to dismiss a wife was not disputed. To give, in xii. 35, ff., as Jesus’s teaching to the people, what had significance, as a disputed question, only for the Pharisees, is manifestly an error. Luke here occupies the middle ground, for he abandons the interrogative turn of the passage, yet preserves the address to the Pharisees. The prayer, xiv. 36, compared with Matt. xxvi. 39, 42, is manifestly distorted. Foreign elements are intermingled in ii. 9 (ἀρὸν σου τ. κράτους), x. 21 (ἀρὰς τ. σταυροῦ), iv. 10 (τοῖς ἔξω). — Wilke, who exposes the first of these passages, seeks to justify the expression in the last one, which is manifestly connected with 1 Cor. v. 19, by referring it to the ship in which Jesus was with his disciples (!). — x. 19 is, like ver. 2, inconsistent with the Jewish system of divorce.

\textsuperscript{c} In vii. 94, a mistaken reason is given for Jesus’s mode of proceeding, the true one, in Matt. xv. 24, being omitted; xiv. 58, the words τὸν Χειροποίητον, κ. τ. λ., look like a gloss; xi. 10, the expression is weakened; xv. 8, a manifest mistake.

\textsuperscript{d} i. 13, ἢ μετὰ τῶν θηρίων; iii. 6, μετὰ τῶν Ἰρωδιακῶν; iv. 39, form of adjuration; vi. 13, oil as a medicine; xi. 16, Jesus allowed no furniture to be carried through the temple; xiv. 30, 68, 72, two crowings of the cock; xv. 39, the alleged ground for the centurion’s exclamation; ver. 44, Pilate wonders at Jesus’s speedy death (cf. § 94 a, note b). Other examples in § 94 c, note e.

§ 94 c.

3. The dependence of Mark on Matthew and Luke appears in the abridgments in i. 12, f., xvi. 12, ff. (cf. § 94 f); in the breaking of the connection by borrowing from foreign
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sources, iv. 10–34; ix. 38–48; from passages which in one way or the other presuppose the auxiliary accounts.

a Ver. 21–25 are improperly placed by Mark and Luke (Bauer, II.321), although more properly by the latter, who makes them the concluding admonition, whereas Mark, ver. 26, ff., continues (like Matthew) to make Jesus speak parables, and to the people (ver. 33); excepting that by the absurd δι' ἐγέρσα καταμάθας, ver. 10, he suggests the mistaken notion that Jesus delivered the last two to the disciples alone. Mark here manifestly vibrates between the two accounts.

b The apothegm parallel with Luke ix. 49, ff. is in the latter connected with ix. 51, ff., while Mark, on the other hand, in ver. 42, proceeds on in the connection of Matthew.

c i. 2, Mark cites Mal. iii. 1, in conformity with Matt. xi. 10, Luke vii. 27. — ix. 43, ff., he follows Matthew in a merely verbal connection of the thought, the preceding σκανδαλίζων being different from that of which the succeeding expressions treat. — viii. 34, κ. προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν δίκλον σῶν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ is a mistaken amplification of Luke ix. 25, ἠλέγχε δὲ πρὸς πάντας (sc. τοὺς μαθητὰς), for there is no δίκλος. — ix. 6, the absurd motive assigned to Peter’s expression of pleasure, ἢσαν γὰρ ἐκφοβοι, is drawn from what follows in Matthew and Luke. — xii. 34, καὶ οὐδέδει οὐκέτι ἕσομαι αὐτῶν ἐπερωτήσας, appropriate enough in Luke xx. 40, whence it is taken, is inappropriate here, for the scribe has asked in a friendly way and received a friendly answer. — xiv. 65 is clear only by the aid of Luke xxii. 64. — xiv. 12, ff., Mark follows first Matthew in making the disciples put the question, but afterwards Luke in speaking of the sending of the two disciples, so that we look in vain for an answer to the question. — vi. 14, 16 (if the common text, which is supported by preponderating authority, be correct), Mark, by using both of his authorities, has been misled into an unthinking repetition. — xiii. 4, the πᾶντα is best explained by a side glance at Matthew, who makes the disciples inquire the time, not only of the destruction of the temple, but also of the future coming of Christ. — xiii. 10, Mark has been misled by the word μαρτύριον, occurring in both Luke xxii. 13 and Matt. xxiv. 14, into adopting this verse, which has its proper position in Matthew only. — iv. 19, like Luke viii. 10, can be explained only from Matt. xiii. 13, ff., and presupposes the connection there given. Moreover, the blame in Mark iv. 13 is wholly out of place. — iii. 16, ff., seems from the interrupted construction to be an elaboration of Luke vi. 14, ff. and in ver. 15 a false connection of the thought occurs, which may be explained by Matt. x. 1. — v. 15, ἡμετέρωμι can be explained only by the omitted point in Luke vii. 27: κ. ἡμέραν ὡς ἐνεδίδοκεν. — vi. 6, διὰ τὴν ἀπειθίαν incorrectly combined, cf. Matt. xiii. 58. — vi. 8, vii. 27, Mark introduces unsuitable softenings, in the latter case from a later stand-point.
§ 94 d.

If the theory seem very natural, that a Gospel, which is almost wholly composed of fragments of the other two Gospels, and in other respects bears marks of dependence on these, is a compilation from them (§ 82 a), we can with internal probability trace, step by step, the author's method, and especially the way in which, in arranging Jesus's work in Galilee, he takes a middle course between the accounts in Matthew and Luke, on the supposition that he subordinated the doctrinal element of the Gospel to the miraculous, and avoided the long discourses, and perhaps, at the same time, used a certain degree of critical judgment on the ground of general tradition.*

* Statement of the Course pursued by Mark in the Arrangement of Jesus's Work in Galilee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>= i. 14, 15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 17.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jesus's Appearance in Galilee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follows Matthew.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>= i. 16 – 20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 22.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calling of the Four Apostles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likewise follows Matthew.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Now, however, he forsakes M., because M. gives the long Sermon on the Mount, and passes over to Luke, omitting the section Luke iv. 16 – 30, which was opposed to the prevailing tradition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii.</td>
<td></td>
<td>i. 21 – 28 =</td>
<td>iv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28, 29.)</td>
<td>The Demonic at Capernaum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 – 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Ver. 22, an echo of Matt. vii. 28, f.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>iv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td></td>
<td>i. 29 – 39 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – 17.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter's Wife's Mother.</td>
<td>38 – 44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In his arrangement he follows Luke, although in Matthew also the section is placed near the omitted Sermon on the Mount. His text follows both, excepting that he takes ver. 35 – 39 from Luke.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td></td>
<td>= i. 40 – 45 =</td>
<td>v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Leper.</td>
<td>12 – 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He passes over Luke v. 1 – 11, because this section excludes the earlier i. 16 – 20, and repeats Matt. vii. 1 – 4, the first section after the Sermon on the Mount, which yet is not very unlike Luke v. 12 – 16. In the text he follows both, and ver. 45 Luke alone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark.</td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>1-19 =</td>
<td>v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>1-6 =</td>
<td>vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-14.</td>
<td>= iii.</td>
<td>7-12.</td>
<td>vii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>15, 16.</td>
<td>Thronging of the People.</td>
<td>17-19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>13-19 =</td>
<td>vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4.</td>
<td>= iii.</td>
<td>20-35.</td>
<td>xi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>= iv.</td>
<td>1-34.</td>
<td>viii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-34.</td>
<td>= iv.</td>
<td>1-34.</td>
<td>viii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>= iv.</td>
<td>1-34.</td>
<td>viii.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arrangement follows Luke, the text follows both, though Luke more closely.

This section in Matthew also is connected with the foregoing. The text follows both.

The arrangement follows Luke, the text both.

This section is also connected in Matthew with the preceding. The text follows Luke principally.

Compiled from passages in Matthew and Luke, lying near the preceding.

The arrangement and narrative follow Luke; ver. 18, however, is an echo of Matt. x. 3.

The text passes over the Sermon on the Mount in Luke, and proposes to follow Matthew; but instead of turning back to Matt. viii. 5, or viii. 18, he takes up xii. 24, because he had previously touched Matt. xii. 14. He works up this passage with Matt. xii. 46, ff., for, according to his wont, he passes over the longer discourses in Matt. xii. 33-45.

He follows Matthew in the section of the Sower, but incorporates also the inappropriate addition in Luke viii. 16-18, as well as Matt. xiii. 31, f. The last words in ver. 34 point to the omitted Matt. xiii. 36, ff.
GOSPELS.

Matt.  

Mark.  


The sequence is the same in M. and L.; but Mark follows the latter more closely in the text.  

viii.  

vii.  

viii.  

26 – 29.  

The Demoniac among the Gadarenes.  

28 – 34.  

The sequence is the same in M. and L.; but Mark follows the latter more closely in the text.  

ix.  

v. 21 – 43  

ix.  

vii.  

18 – 26.  

Jairus's Daughter.  

He follows Luke; but as Matt. ix. 1 is manifestly echoed in v. 21, and Matt. ix. 2 – 17 is given above in ii. 1 – 22, the course of the combination leads to Matt. ix. 18 – 26. The text follows chiefly Luke.  

xiii.  

v. 1 – 6.  

54 – 58.  

Jesus teaches in Nazareth.  

Matthew, after the parable of the Sower,—the point where Mark left him,—introduces a paragraph which seemed to Mark important. Mark, therefore, adopts it, and the more because he had omitted the similar one in Luke iv. 16 – 30.  

(x.)  

vi. 7 – 13  

ix.  

1 – 6.  

x.  

Sending forth of the Twelve.  

He returns to Luke’s arrangement, which places this after the above section, Mark v. 21 – 43. His text also follows Luke the more closely.  

xiv.  

vi. 14 – 29  

ix.  

7 – 9.  

xiv.  

Herod Antipas.  

The sequence is that of Luke; but M. also places this section after that in Mark vi. 1 – 6, and thus from this side also the course of the combination leads to this point. His text follows both, but in the narrative of John’s beheading he follows Matthew.  

xiv.  

= vi. 30 – 44  

ix.  

10 – 17.  

xiv.  

13 – 21.  

Feeding of the Five Thousand.  

Sequence the same in M. and L. The text follows both, though chiefly M.  

xiv.  

= vi. 45 – 56.  

xiv.  

22 – 36.  

Jesus walks on the Water.  

Follows M., also in the text, but with omission of the circumstance in ver. 28 – 31.  

xv.  

= vii. 1 – 23.  

xv.  

1 – 20.  

Of the Washing of Hands.  

Follows M., though with divergences in the text.
MARK. § 94 e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Deaf and Dumb Man.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>viii. 1–10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii. 11–21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follows Matthew.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii. 29–26.</td>
<td>ix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Blind Man.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii. 27–ix. 1 =</td>
<td>ix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>Peter’s Confession.</td>
<td>18–27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sequence is M.’s, but L.’s also falls in with it, and his influence is perceptible in the text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 2–13 =</td>
<td>ix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sequence is now in general the same in all three.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>ix. 14–29 =</td>
<td>ix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14–21. The Demonic.</td>
<td>37–43.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>ix. 30–32 =</td>
<td>ix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 23. Announcement of Jesus’s Death.</td>
<td>43–45.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii.</td>
<td>ix. 33–50 =</td>
<td>ix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–9. The Dispute about Rank.</td>
<td>46–50.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In ver. 33 there is an echo of Matt. xvi. 24. The peculiar passage, Matt. xvii. 24–27, Mark dropped, because not found in the current Gospel tradition.

Besides this table, compare also Griesbach’s and Saunier’s essays, referred to in § 82 a, note e, § 82 b, note a. Schwarz, N. Unt. p. 284, ff. Baur, Krit. Unt. p. 541, ff.

§ 94 e.

The Evangelist’s course ceases to excite surprise or objection (§ 83), when we consider,—1. that he had no conception of our historical criticism and art, and that both the written and the oral Gospel tradition were at that time regarded as common property, which any one might deal with at pleasure, especially as its import was religious rather than historical; 2. that oral tradition, from which his au-
thorities and their predecessors had drawn, being not yet closed, stood as much at his command as at theirs, whether as a source of information or as a standard of judgment and selection (§ 87 a); and, 3. — a consideration that especially bears upon what seems to us the petty and tedious course of combining the text of the two Evangelists,— that he did this undesignedly, his exact acquaintance with his prototypes leading him to imitate their very expressions.

* Formerly I regarded Mark's whole use of the two Evangelists, as well as Luke's use of Matthew, as mnemonic. This, however, seems needless.

§ 94 f.

If this be the true account of the origin of Mark's Gospel, the integrity of the same admits of defence. As regards the account of the resurrection, xvi. 9, ff., which has been questioned, the difficulty, that ver. 7 has no sequence, and that the narrative is again taken up in ver. 9 and connected with ver. 1, is explained partly by the alteration made by Luke in Matthew's narrative in omitting the promised meeting in Galilee (§ 91 f.), and partly by the influence of the Evangelist John, to which Mark here yielded. The grounds which have been thought to lie in the style are in no case sufficiently decisive. Besides, an interpolator would have avoided such inequalities, as well as the singular representation (i. 13) in the preliminary history, which has also (§ 88 b) been called in question, though we find in it an unmistakable peculiarity of Mark (i. 7).

* Against the genuineness are: Griesbach, Gratz, Bertholdt, Schultze, Paulus (Exeg. Hdb.), Dav. Schulz, Fritzsche, Schott (Isag.), Credner, Reuss. For it: R. Simon, Mill, Wolf, Storr, Matthai, Paulus (Comment.), Kuinoel, Eichhorn, Hug, Feilmoser, Schott (Opusc.), Vater, Saunier, Guerike (Einl. § 34), Schwarz (p. 327, ff.), Baur (as it seems), p. 574.

* Cf. ver. 9 with John xx. 14, f. Also elsewhere are found references to John: ii. 9, 12, cf. John v. 8, f.; vi. 37, 39, cf. John vi. 7, 10; xi. 9, cf. John xii. 13; xiv. 3, 5, 6, cf. John xii. 3, 5, 7; xiv. 54, 65, cf. John xviii. 16, 22; xv. 8, f., cf. John xviii. 39. Against Baur, who, pp. 244, 253, 258, 261, 279, regards these and the like passages in Luke (§ 93 b, note e) as original and used by John, we appeal to the character of originality which our fourth Gospel bears, and to that of compilations which marks our second and third. Cf. Bleeck, Beitr. I. 83, 200.
What Schullness, in the Analecten, Bd. III. St. 3, and Schott, Isagog. § 30, note 2, have stated, Friztsche, ad Marc. xvi. 9, has found for the most part inconclusive. Even his suspicion is excited by ver. 9: ὅσαστας δὲ πρὸς πρώτης σαββατών, instead of which Mark would have written ἀναστάς δὲ ἕβαρον; the words δὲ ἕβαρον, ἐκεῖνα ἐκτὸς διαμόνα, as inappropriate here (!); the frequent ἐκεῖνος, instead of ὅ δέ; ver. 10, πορευθῆσαι, instead of ἀπελθοῦσα (Mark xi. 4), cf. ver. 12, 15; τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενεύμονα, which does not elsewhere occur in the Gospels; ver. 13, οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνος ἐπίστευσαν, in which there is a confounding of Luke xxiv. 34, f. with ver. 41 (which, however, might be the mistake of M. himself); the same holds of ver. 14, καὶ ἀνείδος, κ. τ. λ., cf. Luke xxiv. 25–27, 41–46, John xx. 24–29. Friztsche thinks suspicious, in ver. 17, f., the too great hankering after the miraculous, the extension of the gift of miracles to all Christians, the γλώσσας λαλῶν καναὶ, borrowed from Acts, and the not elsewhere attested miracle, καὶ τα- σάμων ἔν πιστεῖ, κ. τ. λ.; ver. 19, the sitting at God's right hand; ver. 20, trace of the post-apostolic age in the παρατῦχος (!). Cf. my Exeg. Hdb. on these passages.—The external grounds against the genuineness of the passage (Griechsch, Not. crit., Comment. crit. Friztsche, Comment. Schott, Isag. l. c.) amount to little.

§ 95 a.

The connecting links and transitions between sections chosen in this way cannot fail to be at times very arbitrary. Mark inserts, also, many minute particulars, which come in part from the connection (xi. 27), but are generally his own additions.

I. Transitions, which have suffered little or no change in themselves, but whose meaning is altered by their change of position.

Mark i. 91. Luke iv. 31.

Καλ εἰσηρέτου ἐκ τας Καπερναούμ. Καλ κατηγορειν εἰς Καπερναούμ, πόλιν

Καλ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθοῦν τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἔν δικαίως συνετὰ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν.


Matt. xiii. 54. Mark vi. 1.

Καλ διδων εἰς τῆν παρῆδα αὐτοῦ. Καλ ἔξηλθεν εἰκδίκην, καὶ ἠλθεν εἰς τὴν παρὴδα αὐτοῦ.

Cf. xiii. 1–53. Cf. v. 21–43.

II. Transitions which have arisen from arbitrarily connecting both Evangelists.


Καλ ἐμβαίνει εἰς τὸ πλοῦτον Καλ πολλοί εἰσήλθεν εἰς καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν δικαίων, καὶ ἠλθεν εἰς Καπερναούμ δι' ἡμέραν, ἡμέραν, κ. τ. λ.

τὴν ἱδίαν πολλίν. καὶ ἠκούοντο, ότι εἰς ὁθ. κόν ἐστι.

Mark here follows Luke's arrangement.
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iii. 7 - 13 is compounded of Matt. xii. 15, 16, and Luke vi. 17. But Mark here follows Luke, and what he draws from Matthew belongs in the latter to a different connection.

III. Transitions of his own.

Καὶ παράγον ὁ Καὶ ἔξηλθε πᾶλιν παρὰ τὴν διάστασιν· Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ιησοῦς ἐκείθεν, καὶ πᾶς ὁ δύσλος ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐξῆλθε, κ. τ. λ.
κ. ἑκάστους αὐτοῦς. Καὶ παράγον, κ. τ. λ.

Totally unlike. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον. Καὶ συνέρχεται Καὶ συνέρχεται Τotally unlike.
πᾶλιν δύσλος, ὅστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοῖς μὴ δύνασθαι φαγεῖν.

Mark iv. 35. Luke viii. 29.
Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ημέρᾳ. Καὶ ἔγενετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ ὁφιᾶς γεγομένη. Διήλθωμεν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸς ἐντύθεν εἰς πλοῖον καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ πέραν.
Mark here has given greater pre-


'Ἐλθὼν δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς Καπερνα- Nothing similar.

Καπερναοῦ· ἔπειτα Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γε-

καὶ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἱησοῦ, κ. τ. λ.

Besides the favorite word πᾶλιν (ii. 1, 13, iii. 1, iv. 1, v. 21, vii. 31 [cf. iii. 20, viii. 13, x. 1, 24, 39], xi. 27 [cf. xiv. 61, 69, f., xv. 4, 19, 13]), he adds ἐνδύμω (i. 29, vi. 45), an exact (iv. 35, vi. 19) or inexact specification of time (ii. 1, viii. 1), or a specification of place (iii. 20, ix. 30, x. 17). His misplacement of the scene on the sea-shore is peculiar to him: ii. 13, iii. 7, iv. 1 (this according to Matthew), v. 91; he likes the expressions καὶ ἔξηλθεν ἐκείθεν, vi. 1, καὶ ἔξηλθεν, viii. 27, xi. 1, καὶ ἐκείθεν ἐξῆλθον, ix. 30.

§ 95 b.

His numerous additions or divergences in the discourses of persons concerned, and in the narrative, are to be attributed to the same arbitrariness.\(^a\)

specifications in numbers and the like: i. 21, v. 13, vi. 30, 37, vii. 1, 30, viii. 14, xii. 41, xiii. 3, xiv. 5. More exact statements concerning persons: ii. 14, 17, vii. 26, x. 46, xv. 21, xvi. 1. Pragmatical explanations: vi. 52, ix. 6, xi. 13, xv. 39, xvi. 4. Clearer statements: v. 16, 23, x. 1, xiv. 58. Remarks to soften and moderate: vi. 8, f., vii. 27. — Much is plainly false, as the mingling in of the Herodians and of Herod (iii. 6, viii. 15); others are liable to suspicion through their uniformity, as that Jesus wished to remain unknown (vii. 24 [in connection with the dropping of Matt. xv. 24], ix. 30), the pictorial additions of ἐναγκαλισάμενος (ix. 26, x. 16), and the like. The pragmatical remarks, ix. 6, xi. 13, are absurd; so also ἀντεκαλεῖτο τοῦ Ἰησοῦ with λαόν προτι, xvi. 2. Cf. § 82 c.

§ 96.

Even where Mark gives a representation apparently independent of the parallel accounts, iii. 20, f., 31, ff., vi. 17, ff., xii. 11, ff., xii. 28, ff., he probably had them before him and made use of them. He is by no means a mere abbreviator, for he does not spare words, and indeed is sometimes diffuse (ii. 15, v. 3–5, vi. 55, f., vii. 3, f., 13, 21, f., x. 29, f., xiii. 35). His style of writing is peculiar. He likes to introduce Hebrew words (v. 41, vii. 11, 34, xiv. 36), which, like other things, he explains (vii. 3, ff., xv. 16, 42). By setting aside what is characteristic in Matthew (v. 17, x. 5, xv. 24, xvi. 17–19, xix. 28);* and in Luke (the choice of the seventy disciples, the parables, xv. 11, ff., xvii. 7, ff., xviii. 9, ff., &c. cf. § 91 f), Mark has secured a neutral stand-point. The peculiar turn given to the story of the visit of Jesus's mother and brethren, by stating its moving cause (iii. 21), seems to rest on Matt. xii. 24, cf. Mark iii. 22. The peculiar treatment of the cursing of the fig-tree, xi. 11, ff., has a certain analogy with the accounts of miracles that are peculiar to this Gospel, cf. my Exeg. Hdb. on this passage and on vi. 13. Bau, p. 558, ff. Only in xii. 28, ff. are we unable to trace the hand of a reviser. In this he comes nearer Matthew than Luke. He has forty-five words in common with the former, only eighteen with the latter. He is fond of the present tense (iv. 37, v. 15, 22, vi. 7, 30, 48, vii. 39, viii. 1, 29, x. 1, 35, 46, xi. 1, f., 15, 21, f., 27, f., 33, xii. 13, 18, xiii. 1, xiv. 19, 17, 66, xv. 21, f., xvi. 2, 4, 6); the finite verb (iii. 24, f., vi. 17, 28, viii. 11, 36, xi. 4, xii. 20); questions (iv. 21, v. 35, 39, viii. 12, x. 17, xii. 24); direct addresses (iv. 39, v. 8, f., 12, vi. 23, 31, ix. 25, 33, xii. 5, cf. on the contrary v. 30, vi. 49, vii. 25, and other passages); repetition of the substantive (i. 34, ii. 18, iii. 17, 24, f., v. 9, vi. 41, vi. 17, x. 46, xiii. 15, xiv. 4, f., 67); introduction of the antithesis (i. 22, 45, ii. 27, iii. 29, v. 26, vii. 19,
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ix. 37, xi. 23, xii. 32, xiv. 61); multiplying of negations (i. 44, vi. 8, vii. 12, ix. 8, &c., also xiv. 15); of the diminutive (v. 23, 41, vi. 28, vii. 25, 27, f., viii. 7, xiv. 47); pleonasms (vii. 13, xii. 23, xiii. 19, f., xiv. 68); the relative ὅ (vi. 36, xiv. 36); the elliptical ἦν (v. 23, xiv. 50); the verb ἀρέχασθαι, more almost than Luke; ἔρχασθαι, and other similar verbs in the participle with other verbs, oftener than in the other Evangelists (vi. 21, 25, xii. 28, 42, xiv. 12, xvi. 1, &c.); more frequent use of Latin words: κατηχομαι xv. 39, 44, f., ἕστης vii. 4, 8, στεκομένωρ vi. 27; the favorite word ἐπερωτῶν twenty-five times (in Matthew eight, in Luke eighteen times). He alone has the words ἄλωθεν, ἐθαμβεῖν, ἐπιβάλλειν (intrans.), πολλά (adverb.), συμβολίων συνείν. Cf. Dan. Scholz, in the Analecten, B. II. St. 3, 4. Schott, Issag. § 29. Credn. § 49.

* He avoids also prophetic parallels, excepting in the probably unguenuine passage xv. 28, and softens down the eschatological passages ix. 1 (Matt. xvi. 28), xiii. 4 (Matt. xxiv. 3). Baur, p. 565, explains the omission of the Sermon on the Mount by its character as a statement of principles, and by the Evangelist's caution in avoiding the dispute concerning the validity of the Mosaic law.

4 He has omitted even the anti-Jewish parts of Matthew (viii. 10—12, xxi. 43). On the other hand, universalism shows itself in xi. 17 (ῥωσι νοις ἕθεσι), and xvi. 20 (παραφεύ). For his omission of the preliminary history we may, with Baur, p. 564, give the reason, that Mark meant to set forth neither the natural nor the supernatural origin of Jesus. Schweigel gives this omission a Docetic meaning.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS SEPARATELY.

I. Author, Original Language, and Date of the First Gospel.

§ 97 a.

The author of our first Gospel has given neither his name nor any other indication of himself; but antiquity describes him as the Apostle Matthew, who is one and the same with Levi, son of Alpheus (Matt. ix. 9, Mark ii. 14, Luke v. 27).* According to an old and often repeated authority, Matthew wrote a work of this sort in Hebrew (i. e. in the current lan-
guage of Palestine) for the Hebrew Christians. Several writers, who acknowledge the Greek origin of the Gospel, follow the lead of Erasmus in questioning this Church tradition, while others have built on it untenable theories concerning the connection of our Greek Gospel of Matthew with that original (§§ 84, 97 b).


Jesus crediderant ex Judaeis. De vir. ill. c. 3: M. . . . primus in Judaea propter eos, qui ex circumcisione crediderant, Evangelium Christi Hebraicum literis verbisque compositum: quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est.

* Erasm. ad Matth. viii. Matth. Flac. (N. T. ex vers. D. Erasm. c. gloss. comp. Bas. 1570. p. 1, in Credn. p. 80), Calvin. Bex. Calov., and many others. Schröder, De ling. Matth. auth. Vitel. 1699. Wetzstein, N. T. I. 224. Masch, Von d. Grundsprache d. Matth. 1755. The dogmatic interest of the older Protestants in this assertion opposed to that of the Catholics (Baron., R. Simon, and others). Hug (Einl. II. 16, ff.) doubts the credibility of Papias, from the judgment of Euseb. (III. 39) upon him in regard to his Chiliasm: σφόδρα συμκρός ἀν τῶν νοῶν. He is supposed to have derived his account from the Ebionites, whose Gospel he used, though this does not clearly appear from Eusebius's words: ἐκτίθεντι δὲ καὶ ἀληθὴν ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναῖκος ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἀμφισβητήσεις ἐτί τοῦ Κυρίου, ἥν το καθ᾽ Ἑβραίον εὐαγγέλιον περίτεχε (§ 64 a, note a). It is asserted that all the subsequent testimonies rest on that of Papias. That of Pantænus, however, is independent (see above, § 73 a, note b). According to Bleek, Beitr. 1. 68, the Hebrew Gospel with which Papias was acquainted was not an original apostolic work, but a recast, in Aramaic, prepared for the use of the Hebrew Christians, of a Greek writing, viz. our first canonical Gospel, which quite early acquired canonical acceptance in the Church. Probably the Aramaic editor of the work had already given it the form which it subsequently had (see Epiphanius. III. 13, and Hieron. Cont. Pelag. III. 2, above, § 64), and it thereupon claimed to be an apostolic writing, and by Matthew; and here first arose this opinion in the Church in regard to the Greek original likewise. In opposition to this view, H. A. W. Meyer, Comm. üb. d. Evang. Matth. Einl. § 2, lays great stress on the Church tradition.

§ 97 b.

The agreement of our canonical Matthew with the other Synoptists, in quoting Old Testament passages from the Septuagint version, is opposed to the theory of its being a translation of that Hebrew original, and favors that of its being originally written in Greek. The theory that Matthew wrote the Gospel twice, in the Hebrew and in the Greek, is a pure invention.

* * * The Old Testament citations in Matthew are of two kinds: in part those in which the Evangelist gives pragmatical proofs of the fulfilment of Old Testament predictions, as, i. 23, ii. 6, 15, 18, iv. 15, ff., viii. 17–18, xii. 18–21, xiii. 32, xxi. 5 (xxvii. 9); in part such as in the course of the narrative appropriately occur or are used in the discourse of the speaker, as, iii. 3, iv. 4, 6, 7, 10, v. 5, 21, 27, (31, 33,) 39, 43, ix. 13, xi. 10, xii. 7,
xiii. 14, f., xv. 4, 8, f., xix. 4, f., 18, f., xxi. 13, 16, 42, xxii. (24.) 39, 37, 39, 44, xxi. 39, xxiv. 15, xxvi. 31. There is, however, this difference, that the latter class of passages are adduced according to the Septuagint version, sometimes literally, and even in cases where this version differs from the Hebrew text (as iii. 3, xiii. 14, f., &c.), sometimes more freely, but not so as to countenance the supposition that the variation is caused by a reference to the Hebrew text (except perhaps xi. 10, xxvi. 31); the passages of the former class, on the other hand, are given according to his own translation of the Hebrew text, and differ in part, not only from the words, but also from the meaning of the Septuagint, so that its expressions are rarely visible. This relation is such as, leaving out of view a comparison with the other Synoptists, cannot in our opinion be naturally explained by the twofold theory that the Gospel is an entirely independent work, and that this work, originally written in Aramaic, lies before us in a translation. For, as regards the passages of the second class, those contained in the discourses of Christ and others, of which by far the largest part were certainly delivered in Aramaic, it is altogether unlikely that, if these narratives were originally conceived in Aramaic, the passages would be given in a form corresponding to the Septuagint text, and at variance with the Hebrew. This form must have been the work of a Greek translator, who handled his subject freely, and was accustomed to the Septuagint. Its origin would, even then, be with difficulty apprehended; yet more difficult is it to apprehend how the translator refrained from using the same freedom with passages of the first class. From this we deduce the following conclusions regarding the origin of our first Gospel:—1. That its author, to whom these pragmatical illustrations belong, was a learned believing Jew, probably a Palestinian, who was better acquainted with the Old Testament in the original than in the Septuagint version; 2. That he wrote the Gospel in Greek; and, 3. That he made use of one or more earlier evangelic writings, which, being likewise written in Greek, contained those accounts of events and discourses that comprehend the citations of the second class."

— _Bleek_, Beitr. I. 57, f. It is to be noted, in passing, that the citations of the second class belong to the substance of the Gospel, those of the first class to only the pragmatical accessory work peculiar to the first Evangelist. _Baur_, p. 578, to be sure, concludes from the citations of the first class that another Hebrew Gospel was the basis of our canonical Gospel. (?)

The following writers also hold that the Gospel was originally written in Greek (see § 97 a, note c): _Hug_, _Fritzsche_, _Theile_ in _Win._ u. _Engelh._ _Journ._ II. _Schott_, _Isag._ § 22. _Creain_, Einl. § 46. _Neudecker_, Einl. § 24. _Reuss_, _Gesch._ d. _N. T._ § 97. _Baumgärt. Crus._ Comm. p. 23. _Harless_, _Lucubratt_. _Thiersch_, and others.

b So, recently, following _Bolten_, _Eichhorn_, and others, _Ehrard_, Krit. d. evang. _Gesch._ p. 946, ff., who conjectures, moreover, that this translation was made in the lifetime of the Apostle, and perhaps under his own supervision; he also supposes that the language of _Papias_ or _John the presbyter_
implies that it was already well known and in general use. To make this
out, he (as also Thiersch, Standp. d. Krit. p. 193) perverts the meaning of
the words, takes συνετάγματα as used in the sense of the pluperfect, and refers
the ἡμώνων, κ. τ. λ. to the interval between the publication of the Hebrew

to Orelli, Select. patr. eccles. capp. p. 10, two of Matthew’s disciples
wrote, the one in Aramaic, the other in Greek.

§ 97 c.

The opinion that Matthew wrote first of all the Evangelists prevailed in the ancient Church;* and, in fact, he is the
oldest of the Evangelists known to us (for the greater age of the Gospel of the Hebrews is more than doubtful,
§ 65 b), save that he probably based his Gospel on an older,
though also Greek Gospel (§ 93 c, note g). In regard to the
date of the composition of his Gospel, we have but one
precise testimony, which brings it down to a tolerably late
period.† Indeed, the Evangelist’s stand-point is one pretty
remote from the history he narrates (xxvii, 8, xxviii, 15). It
must, however, have been written before the destruction of
Jerusalem, for he hopes for the return of Christ shortly after
that event (xxiv, 29).* Cf. § 101 c.

* Euseb. VI. 14, of Clemens Alex.: Προγέγραφα τας ευαγγελιαν
tα περιεχοντα τας γενεαλογιας. And VI. 25, of Origen (cf. note b): ....
δευτερον δι τα κατα Μαρκου. Euseb. III. 24 (note b): .... οθη δι Μαρκου
και Λουκα των και αυτων ευαγγελιαν την εκδοσιν πεποθμηνυν, 'Ιωαννου
φων των παντων θρονον γραφην εκχρισμον εκρηγματι, τολος και χιλι την 
grαφην ελθείν, κ. τ. λ. How much here may depend on tradition and on the es-
tablished arrangement of the canon! Arrangement of the Gospels in the MSS.

† Iren. III. 1 (§ 97 a, note d): .... τον Πέτρου και του Παυλου ευ ευαγ
ευαγγελιαν και θεμελιων την εκκλησιαν. The opinions of the later
writers (Nicerphorus, Cosmas Indicople., Theophyl., Euthym. Zigab.) adduced
by Eichhorn, I. 505, Bertholdt, III. 1265, cannot be taken into account.

* Quite contrary to exegetical probability, Credner (Einl. p. 207) says
that the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem in all three Evangelists pre-
supposes that event. In the passage xxiii. 35, cf. Luke xi. 50, τ., Hug., II.
10, Eichhorn, I. 510, Bertholdt, II. 1269, Credner, as above, discover a re-
ference to the murder of Zacharias, Baruch’s son, in Josephus, B. J. IV. 6. 4,
and consequently a trace of the date; but even granting that the participle
MATTHEW. § 98 a.

ἐκχυμόμενον seems to sustain this, yet the aorist ἐφονεύτατε is opposed to it, and the correct conclusion remains, that the Zacharias of 2 Chron. xxiv. 19—24 is meant, and the name Jehoiada exchanged for Barachias. (The reading of the Evang. sec. Hebr. [in Hieron. Quaest. in Matth. ad h. I.], Jojada for Berechja, is probably an emendation.) The passage in xxvii. 15, also, does not prove that the Jewish state had already come to an end. According to Baur, Krit. Unterna. p. 605, ff., note, the Gospel of Matthew must have been written during the Jewish insurrection, because ἐβδόμητα τὸ ἐπι-
μονέως, Matt. xxiv. 15, cannot be anything but the statue of Jupiter erected by Hadrian. (!)

Doubts regarding its Apostolic Genuineness.

§ 98 a.

The doubts urged by several critics against the apostolic origin of our first Gospel* are in many respects of uncertain weight, because based on more or less disputed assumptions; as, for instance, on the genuineness and credibility of the fourth Gospel, which have since been called in question, on the supposed superior credibility of the third, and on subjective notions as to what an eyewitness and Apostle would be likely to narrate.

§ 98 b.

The following grounds of doubt may be regarded as tolerably independent of all assumptions, and certain. They obtain pretty general assent. 1. The Gospel itself gives no occasion, especially in the account in ix. 9, ff., for referring its composition to the Apostle Matthew. 2. An eyewitness and Apostle would not have passed over in silence Jesus's ministry in Judæa, which, in itself probable, is recorded in John, and presupposed by Matthew (§ 110 b, note f). 3. The chronologic arrangement seems arbitrary (in xiv. 13 it is plainly absurd), and to have in part grown out of an original arrangement according to subjects (xii. 9, cf. Luke vi. 6). The crucifixion of Jesus is erroneously placed on the first Passover-day (§ 110 b, note f). 4. Well-founded doubts may be urged against the historical character of whole narratives and of particular facts.a 5. The narrative everywhere, and especially ix. 9, ff., and in the account of the crucifixion, lacks vividness. 6. Jesus's discourses are in part out of their true historic connection, b in part incorrectly given.c

a The appointment and bribery of the watch is an improbable legend; see the commentators on xxvii. 63, ff., xxviii. 11, ff. The resurrection of several dead persons is apocryphal, xxvii. 52, f. The account of the baptism in iii. 13 ff. is mythical, when compared with John i. 32, f. The temptation, iv. 1, ff., is a symbolic representation, but given as historical. The miracle, xvii. 24, ff., tries one's faith in miracles too severely. Two narratives have been doubled by an oversight of the author in the use of his materials (§ 93 c, note g). Ch. xxvii. 3 - 10 has been affected by regard to prophecy; so also, perhaps, xxii. 7, 39, ff.
b The discourses in x. 19, ff., go beyond the historical horizon of that time. (Perhaps they belong to an eschatologic source, which presupposes a stand-point different from that of ch. xxiv.) Here, as in chh. v. - vii. (where the assumption that Jesus is the Messiah appears too early), xiii., xviii., xxiii., xxiv., xxv., the Evangelist has followed an arrangement according to subjects rather than to chronology.
c xii., 39, f., xiii. 11, ff., xxviii. 19, f. (see the remarks in my Exeg. Hdb.). This is especially applicable to the eschatological discourses, x. 23, xvi. 27, f., xxiv., which cannot be harmonized with other expressions of Jesus, especially in John (Bibl. Dogm. §§ 216 - 218).
II. Mark, Author of the Second Gospel.

§ 99 a.

By Mark, to whom Church tradition ascribes our second Gospel, is unquestionably meant John (Acts xiii. 5, 13), or John Mark (Acts xii. 12, 25, xv. 37), or Mark (Acts xv. 39, Col. iv. 10, Phil. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 11, 1 Pet. v. 13?), son of Mary (Acts xii. 12), cousin of Barnabas (Col. iv. 10), who accompanied him and Paul on their journeys (Acts xii. 25, xiii. 5, xv. 36-39), aided the latter during his imprisonment in Rome (Col. iv. 10, Phil. 24, cf. 2 Tim. iv. 11), and appears also as Peter’s assistant (1 Pet. v. 13?), whose interpreter he was, according to the statements of Church writers. Little is known of his later history.*


§ 99 b.

All the Church writers, Papias here also at the head, agree in stating that he wrote his Gospel at the dictation of the Apostle Peter. They differ, however, in details.*

Papias's statement, which alone has weight, has been variously understood. Most writers, and of late those who regard Mark's Gospel as the first, follow the ancient authorities, and refer it directly to this in its present form; others, on the other hand, have discovered that Papias's language does not apply to our present Gospel of Mark, and have...
supposed that he refers to a Gospel no longer extant, which however, according to Credner, must have been the basis of our second canonical Gospel. The negative conclusion is the most certain, that, in view of the structure of our so-called Gospel of Mark, it being dependent on Matthew and Luke, Papias's statement has neither application nor meaning in regard to it.

* Weisse, Evang. Gesch. I. 41, ff. Reuss (§ 88, b). From a quite different stand-point, Schott, § 97, note 3, finds in our Mark traces of Peter's influence, especially in the frequent mention of this Apostle, i. 36, xi. 21, xiii. 3, xvi. 7. According to Bertholdt, III. 1280, Peter left Mark his copy of the Aramaic original Gospel, to be re-edited in Greek.

* Especially οἱ μὲν τοῖς ταξίας, for Mark is not inferior to the others in arrangement. — Thiersch, as before cited, p. 183, supposes that what was at first written down without any order, Mark subsequently arranged after Luke, and thinks he finds this even in Papias's account, by acutely referring the last words of the Presbyter, διὸ συνεδριασθε, εἰς τ. λ., to the finished work of Mark; so that the want of arrangement is not mentioned, but the fact that Mark wrote only "some things," i. e. a Gospel which, compared with his predecessors, was incomplete.


§ 100 b.

As regards the date of its composition, Irenæus (§ 99 b, note a) places it after the death of Peter and Paul;* Clement of Alexandria, on the other hand (ib.), during the lifetime of the latter, although he considers the first and third Gospels earlier in date, which agrees with the character of this Gospel. From its numerous Latinisms, and the passage x. 12, Rome seems to have been the place where it was written.°

* μετὰ τὴν ἔλεον does not mean after the departure (contrary to Ebrard, Krit. p. 967).

° In Euseb. VI. 14: προγεγραμμένη ἤλεγχον τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιήχουτα τῆς γενεαλογίας.


§ 101 a.

Luke, the accredited author of the third Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles, is the assistant and friend of the Apostle Paul mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 11, Col. iv. 14, Philem. 24; but not the same person as Lucius of Cyrene, Acts xiii. 1, and Lucius, Rom. xvi. 21, because Luke is equivalent to Lucan or Lucilius. — Whether the Church authors are correct in calling him an inhabitant of Antioch must remain undecided; that he was born a heathen we may conclude from comparing Col. iv. 14 with ver. 11, and from his Greek style of writing. — From Acts xvi. 10—17, xx. 5—15, xxi. 1—17, xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16, it is usually thought (see, however, § 114) that the author of the Gospel and of the Acts accompanied Paul on his journeys and to Rome. Col. iv. 14 accords with this view. The New Testament is silent and tradition fluctuating in regard to the closing events of his life.


b Euseb. H. E. III. 4. Hieron. Praef. in Matth., De vir. ill. c. 7. Does this account rest on Acts xiii. 1?

* He was a disciple of Paul, according to Jerome, Praef. in Matth.; one of the seventy disciples, according to Origen, Dial. de rect. fide. I. 806. Epiph. Haeres. Ll. p. 433; the companion of Cleopas mentioned Luke xxiv. 13, according to Theophylact in loc. His calling, according to Col. iv. 14. Traces of his medical knowledge, Luke iv. 38, Acts xiii. 11, according to Michaelis, Einl. II. 1078 (!). According to Nicephorus, H. E. II. 43, he was at the same time a painter.


§ 101 b.

He also is said to have written under the direction of an Apostle, namely, Paul. But in his preface (i. 2, f.) the author himself gives no hint of such a relation, but refers rather to the tradition of the eyewitnesses of and participa-
tors in the history which he narrates, and to its documents written by others. His dependence on evangelic tradition and on Matthew (§ 93), as well as the character of the narratives in the Acts (§ 114), supports this view rather than that of the Church. Thus much, however, is correct, that the author was of Paul's school (cf. §§ 91, f., 93 c).

§ 102.

The author of the third Gospel wrote his evangelical narrative for one Theophilus (Luke i. 3, Acts i. 1), who was a Christian or a friend of Christianity, perhaps a man of distinction, and probably a Roman or an Italian.\footnote{b}

\footnote{a} The adjective καρπάστωρ seems, according to Acts xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3, xxvi. 25, to indicate this.


CHAPTER IV.

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

Comparison of the Same with the First Three Gospels.

1. In respect of its Style of Narrative and Writing.

§ 103.

Some of the narratives in this Gospel are parallel with the synoptical accounts, or closely resemble the synoptical style of narration.\footnote{a} Parallel expressions also occur.\footnote{b} In other respects the Evangelist seems to presuppose in his readers acquaintance with the evangelical tradition (i. 32, f. 45, ii. 1, iii. 24, xi. 2).

Matt. xxvi. 33–35. The healing of the blind man, ix. 6, similar to Mark viii. 23.


§ 104.

As, on the one hand, much important matter belonging to the very substance of the evangelic history (e.g. the establishment of the Lord's Supper) has been omitted, and, on the other, much narrated which is not found in the Synoptics; as, too, in the narratives or series of narratives which give the same events discrepancies occur, and once, iii. 24, an erroneous statement seems to be expressly corrected; — it has been supposed that our Evangelist meant to fill out and correct the other three Gospels.*

But granting it to be not incredible that the Evangelist was acquainted with earlier Gospels, and perhaps even with our Matthew,* he has neither in xx. 30, f., nor elsewhere, mentioned this design; nor can it be presupposed, in the face of narratives which repeat, without completing or correcting, the parallel narratives, e. g. vi. 1, ff., xii. 1, ff. In more or less important divergences, as ii. 13–22, cf. Matt. xxi. 12, ff.; i. 35–52, cf. Matt. iv. 18, ff.; vii. — xii., cf. Matt. xix. — xxi.; xviii. 28, xix. 31, cf. Matt. xxvi. 17, ff., which do not present any so express contradiction as iii. 24, the design of correcting must have been very dimly present to his mind.

b Bleek, Beitr. I. 268. According to Lücke, I. 198, f., he was acquainted with only the oral Gospel tradition.

§ 105 a.

The manner of narration differs from that of the Synoptists (who give the tradition wholly free from admixture of their own personality, excepting that Luke introduces himself as compiler):—1. In the circumstance that here an eyewitness appears (i. 14, xix. 35, cf. 1 John i. 1, f., iv. 14), and proves himself such by historical vividness and originality (i. 35, ff., xiii. 22, ff., xviii. 15, ff., xix. 4, ff., 26, f., 34), or at least one who has obtained accurate information (i. 31, ff., v. 10, ff., vii. 1, ff., ix., xi., xii., xviii. 28, ff., and other passages). It must be admitted, on the other hand, that traces occur of a view of facts and relations formed at a distance both of time and place. This, and the conjoining of circumstances chronologically separate (vii. 21, cf. v. 1—16; x. 26, cf. x. 1—18; xii. 34, cf. iii. 14), seem to betray an author in whose non-original view of the history intervals of time became confounded, rather than an eyewitness.

* Even obscurities in the representation, as ii. 3—5, xi. 4, 6, xii. 23, seem deducible from his own apprehension and recollection. On the contrary, the more correct apprehension, we must own, is found in Matt. xiv. 15, as compared with John vi. 5. Cf. Exeg. Hdb. on the passages, Struense, Leben Jesu, II. 919, f., 1st ed. As here and in the following verse the narrative of the miracle has the appearance of being developed and worked over, it seems natural to ascribe iv. 43—53 also to a later tradition, because of ver. 50, f., and likewise the manner of healing in ix. 6.

b In the numerous vague statements that "the Jews" persecuted Jesus and sought to destroy him (v. 16, 18, vii. 1, 19, 25, viii. 37, 40, xi. 8, cf. vii. 30, viii. 20); in the position of the Evangelist in relation to the Jews, their ritual system, and their customs (ii. 6, 13, v. 1, vi. 4, vii. 2, xi. 49, xix. 40), and which he even ascribes to Jesus (viii. 17, x. 34, xv. 25, cf. Fischer, Ueb. d. Ausdruck of 'iouðnaí im Ev. Joh., in the Tüb. Zeitschr. 1840, II.); in the relation of Jesus to Judas Iscariot and his treachery, betraying rather a view of his fate adopted subsequently than a genuine historical pragmatism (vi. 64, 70, f., xiii. 11, 18, 26, f.); in the evident reference of iv. 36—38 to Acts viii. 4, ff.; in geographic-topographic and archaeological difficulties (iii. 23, iv. 7 [*], 52, v. 2, xviii. 1 [*], xi. 49, xvii. 13).

* On the other hand, in vi. 36, x. 25, f., are found false back-references concerning sayings of Jesus. The remarks in x. 1, ff., xv. 1, ff., seem with-
out connection. The sayings in xiii. 20, xiv. 31, may be regarded as reminiscences inappropriately worked into the narrative.

§ 105 b.

2. This Gospel is distinguished by conversations given in a sort of dialectic form, whereas the first three Gospels give Jesus's utterances usually in fragments, as proverbs, or arranged consecutively as doctrinal discourses (iii., iv., vi. 26, ff., vii., and other passages; cf. Matt. viii. 19, ff., ix. 12, ff., xi. 4, ff., v. - vii., x., xiii., xxiv., Luke xii., xv.-xviii.). This dialectic form of discourse is not, like the proverbial form, capable of being easily remembered and reproduced in its original shape; its retention and reproduction can therefore, if it is authenticated as true and reliable, be expected only from an eyewitness. But in this case grave doubts arise against its correctness and reliableness, and the candid critic must admit that the Evangelist has given a free representation of Christ's discourses.

* As they sometimes record dialogues (Matt. xii. 22, ff., xix. 16, ff., Luke x. 25, ff.), so in John we find also proverbial maxims and parables (xii. 24 - 26, xiii. 16, 20, x. 1, ff., xv. 1, ff.). The latter, however, are broadly distinguished from those of the Synoptists by their want of historical foundation, and by a certain dialectic flow. Comp. E. A. Borger, De constanti et equabili J. C. indole, doctrina et docendi ratione, sive comment. de Ev. Joan. c. Matth. Marci et Lucae Evang. comparato. P. I. 1816.

* The discourses of Jesus, as well as of John the Baptist, iii. 27, ff., are closely allied to the prologue, and to the First Epist. of John. In iii. 16, ff., 31, ff., the previous free reproduction passes over into the language of the Evangelist himself. The discourse xii. 44, ff. is manifestly a free composition. Much in Jesus's discourses may be called in question as not to the purpose (iii. 14, iv. 21, ff., vi. 51, ff., xi. 42), and harsh (viii. 44, x. 8); his habit of causing misunderstanding and objection, by his strong and striking expressions, rather than of removing them (iii. 3, 5, ff., 14, vi. 51), as not becoming his wisdom as a teacher; their mystico-allegorical (iii. 14) and enigmatical (viii. 33, f.) character, as unworthy of his simple mode of teaching. The notion of the Logos is, to be sure, not stated in Jesus's discourses, but it substantially appears in viii. 58, x. 30, xvii. 5. The replies and objections of spectators, which serve to carry out and prolong Jesus's discourses, are too uniform, and often so intrinsically improbable as to tempt one to regard them as added by the Evangelist (iii. 4, 9, iv. 11, f., 15, 33, vi. 34, 42, 52, viii. 19, 22, 33, 39, 41, 52, f., [cf. iv. 19.] 57, x. 33, xi. 19, xiv. 5, 8, 92, xvi. 17, f.). Cf. Bretschneider, Probabilita, pp. 31, sq., 45, 48, 52, 54, 55, 57, 59.
§ 105 c.

The unquestionably original Greek style of the writing has also a certain Hebrew cast, although more smoothness and flow than in the Synoptics. It has also a remarkable peculiarity, less in its phraseology and grammatical turns, than in the artless simplicity of the structure and connection of the sentences, in the quiet and even, though sometimes unconnected and merely sketchy, character of the discourse, in its easy statement of the weightiest and most comprehensive truths in figurative abstract language, in a profound clearness and pregnant brevity, and in an inexpressible charm of discourse, by which the mind of the reader, gently drawn and firmly held, is at once deeply moved and soothed.  


b Seyffarth, Beitr. z. Specialcharakteristik d. johann. Schriften. 1823. Dan. Schulze, Der schriftl. Char. u. Werth des Joh. 1803. Tholuck, Einl. z. Comment. § 4. Eichhorn, as above, p. 269, ff. Schott, § 41. Credner, p. 293, ff. Particular peculiarities of the style of writing: — Expressions wholly peculiar: ἀληθεια, ἑπιθυμία ποιεῖν; ἀνάστασις ζωῆς, κρίσεως; ἀμαρτίαν ἔχειν; ἀπερχόμεναι εἰς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα; ἄρχον τοῦ κόσμου τούτου; καταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ ὑψώματος; γεννηθῆναι ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ἐκ θεοῦ, ἐκ πνεύματος; εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἐκ τῶν ἄνω; ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἁγίατη ἡμέρα; κράτειν (of the teaching); μαρτυρίαν, δοξάζων λαμβάνειν; μεταβαίνειν (trop.); δὸς; παράλογον; τιρεῖν τὸν λόγον; ψυχὴν τιθεῖναι, &c. Favorite and technical expressions: κόσμος, ἀμαρτία, σκοτία, φῶς, ἀληθεία, δόξα, δοξάζων, ζωὴ, μέτωπον ἐν τῷ, μαρτυρία (ποὺ μαρτύρων), ἐξέρχομαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἄμετρι, ἀμήρι, &c.  

Continuing the narrative by ὥσπερ, and also by unconnected clauses, as e. g. i. 26, 40–42, 46–51; peculiar use of the conj. ἵνα, iv. 34, vi. 50; very frequent use of the pronouns ἕκαστος, ὅς, &c., of the present in the narrative; repetition by negation or affirmation (i. 3, 20, [cf. 1 John ii. 27.] vi. 53, f.); antitheses (i. 13, iii. 6, i. 17, iii. 18, 20, f., 36, v. 19, 31); propositions apparently generally, but referring to particular individuals (iii. 27, 29, 31, 34, vii. 18); extended development of the thought by taking up again the same idea or sentence (i. 1, 4, f., 10, f., 33, iii. 5, 7, 17, f., vi. 48, ff., 53, ff.).
2. In respect of its Contents and Stand-point.

§ 106.

In respect of its contents, this Gospel differs from the others,—1. by enriching the stock of Gospel matter with many new narratives, especially of miracles, which leave those of the Synoptists far behind them, and by its extending the sphere of Jesus's ministry to Judæa, and lengthening it beyond one year; 2. by a more spiritual, comprehensive, and profound statement of his doctrine and his work, since the theocratico-messianic and other doctrinal conceptions of the Jews, which in the Synoptics have almost entire validity, serve here merely as the foundation of a new and living development of thought (see iii. 17, v. 21, ff., xi. 25, xiv. 2); since the popular restriction of the messianic work is wholly broken down (x. 16), and the new life of "grace and truth" (i. 17) and "love" (xiii. 34) entirely severed from the ancient Jewish legalism; and since the idea of this new life, apprehended morally, as in the Synoptics, only far deeper (cf. iii. 3 with Matt. iv. 7, v. 20), is at the same time connected with the ideas peculiar to the Christian faith, it being represented especially as mediated by the person of Jesus alone, which, one with God, manifested God in a living form, and by his sacrificial death,—and as maintained by the community of brotherly love founded by him and by the independent Spirit of Truth which should come in place of his personal presence. The consciousness of Jesus concerning himself and his relation to God and the world which he is to save and to rule, is expressed in this Gospel (as is but seldom the case in the Synoptics, cf. Matt. xi. 27, ff., xxvi. 64) purposely (most of his discourses refer to it), decidedly, and in so comprehensive a manner, that the bounds of individual human consciousness are passed (viii. 58, xvii. 5). At the same time, the Gospel reflects the consciousness of a perfect disciple, assured of communion with him, and of the possession of his spirit, who, by dogmatic speculation, after the manner of the Alexandrine-Jewish theosophy, had raised
his faith in him into knowledge (i. 1, ff.), and who in a similar mystico-allegoric fashion handles the Old Testament (iii. 14, viii. 56, 58, xii. 41). While the person and the work of Christ are thus set forth in clear light, in so much the stronger contrast therewith stands the dark mass of the unbelieving "world," especially of Judaism. Thus the standpoint of the Evangelist is distinctly polemic, for he, even more than the Synoptists, places Jesus in a polemic attitude, and frequently mentions the hostility of the "Jews."

* When Clem. Alex. in Euseb. H. E. VI. 14, says: Τὸν μὲν ζωον ἔχατον ζωὴν καὶ μαζί ου καταλήψαται, οτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς ἐσαγγελίοις δεδηλοῦται, προτραπένα ὑπὸ τῶν γυρισμῶν, πνεύματι θεοφαρηθέντα, πνευματικὸν ποιήσας εἰς ἀγγέλιον,—his meaning probably is that the first three Evangelists portray the external glory of Jesus, his miraculous birth, miracle-working, transfiguration on the mount, resurrection, and ascension, while John shows his internal glory, oneness with the Father, and eternal glory.—Jesus declares himself to be the Messiah more clearly than in the first three Gospels, iv. 26, v. 17, ff., viii. 28, 36, 56, ix. 35, ff., x. 7, 9, 25, 35, f.—For a more exact comparison of this Gospel with the others, designed to show both the differences and affinities, see Schott, § 38, note 4. Cf. J. W. Rotthberg, An Joannes in exhibenda Jesu natura reliquis canoniciis scriptis vere repugnet, Göttingen. 1826. 8vo.

3. In respect of Arrangement.

§ 107 a.

The arrangement is somewhat like that of the first Gospel, and it is probable that this formed its basis.*

* Table of Comparison:—

Chap. i. Introductory, in a measure parallel to . . . . Matt. i. — iv. 29.
i. 1 — 18. Prologue, general view and sum of the whole.
Ver. 1 — 5. Ante-mundane and ante-messianic existence and influence of the "Word," in a measure —

— i. Genealogy and divine origina of Jesus.

Ver. 19 — 34. Testimony of John the Baptist.
Ver. 35 — 52. Some attach themselves as disciples to Jesus.

— i. 25; ii. Jesus's birth.

— iii.

— iv. 18 — 22.
John. § 107 b.


ii.—vi. First Subdivision. Jesus’s work in Galilee and Judea. — iv. 23—xviii. 35. Jesus’s work in Galilee.


xiv.—xvii. First Subdivision. Jesus glorified in the circle of his disciples. — xxiv. 1—xxvi. 35.


xxi. Supplement.

Comp. on the division by other writers Lüke, Comm. 1. 177, ff.

4. In respect of the Object.

§ 107 b.

The object of the Gospel is solely to prove the Messianic and divine dignity of Jesus, and the necessity of faith in him to produce true life (cf. xx. 31). It is accordingly in part apologetic, in part, as opposed to a hostile unbelief, confutatory, in part confirmatory to the faithful. The historic aim is, as in the other Gospels (§ 61), comparatively secondary, though not to such a degree that the Evangelist could transform the historic reality of Jesus’s person into an idealistic phantom, and, knowingly leaving evangelic tradition, give himself up to inventive fancy, as Baur asserts. The author draws his proofs partly, as do the Synoptics, from the testimony of John the Baptist, from Jesus’s miracles and manifestations of higher knowledge (i. 49, ii. 24, f., iv. 17, f., vi. 64, xiii. 11, 18, f.), and from Old Testament prophecies (i. 46, ii. 17, v. 39, 46, xii. 14, 38, xiii. 18, xvii. 12, xix. 24, 36); in part, and chiefly, from Jesus’s discourses and declarations regarding himself; partly, in fine, from the speculative principles of the Evangelist. These are so adduced as to place
Jesus's work and person in a very high and pure light, as the founder of a kingdom of Truth (xviii. 36), as the Light of the World (viii. 12), as the Bearer of Truth and Grace (i. 17), as one with God (x. 30), as he who alone can lead to the Father (xiv. 6). Such a delineation could in general be apprehended only by readers of very high capacity for receiving truth, power of thought, and of extended comprehensiveness of vision. Hence we must suppose that the Evangelist wrote especially for Greek and Graeco-Jewish readers.

* Hauff, in St. u. Kr. 1846, pp. 550, ff., makes good objections to Baur's view, the foundation of which is destroyed in the very beginning by his false apprehension of i. 9, ff., p. 574, ff. — While no precise dogmatic aim can be ascribed to narratives like vi. 16–21, xii. 1–8, chap. ix. shows how carefully the Evangelist respects reality, and in i. 14, xix. 35, he appeals to his own experience (not, as Baur thinks, to his idealistic apprehension).

b Hence the explanations in i. 38, 41, f., iv. 25, 9, ii. 6, v. 9, xi. 18, which for Palestinian Jews would be superfluous, and the manner in which the Jews are spoken of (§ 105 a).

§ 107 c.

The supposed special polemical designs are either foreign to the Evangelist, or at most find in isolated passages only a feeble confirmation. This applies to the theory that the Evangelist wrote against the Gnostics.* At the utmost, it is probable that he designed to give a better direction to the already awakening speculation concerning the connection between the Old and the New Testament revelations, and the relation of the hidden God to the revelation of Him in Christ. It is, however, more correct to regard all that bears upon Gnosticism as the untrammelled statement of his own view.

* Iren. Cont. haeres. i. III. c. 11, § 1: Hanc sitem annuntians Ioannes Domini discipulus, volens per Evangelii annuntiationem aevorum suum, qui s Cerinthe inseminatus est hominibus, errorem, et multo prius ab his, qui dicitur Nicolaitae, qui sunt vulgus ejus, quae falsa cognominatur scientia, ut confuderet eos et suaderet, quoniam unus Deus, qui omnia fecit per verbum suum, et non, quemadmodum illi dicunt, alterum quidem fabricatorem, alium autem patrem Domini; et alium quidem fabricatoris filium, alterum vero de superioribus, Christum, quem et impassibilem perseverasse, decoramentem in Jesum filium fabricatoris, et iterum revolasse in suum
pleroma; et initium quidem esse Monogenem, Logon autem verum filium Unigenitum; et eam conditionem, qua est secundum no, non a primo Deo factum, sed a virtute aliqua valde deorum subjecta et adeo una ab eorum communicione, qua sunt invisibilia et inominabila: omnia igitur tali circumscripte volens discipulus Domini et regulam veritatis constituisse in Ecclesia, quia est unus Deus omnipotens, qui per verbum suum omnia fecit et visibilia et invisibilia: significans quoque, quoniam per Verbum, per quod Deus perfect conditionem, in hoc et salutem his, qui in conditione sunt, praestitit hominibus, sic inchoavit, etc. (That Ireneus here refers also to the Valentinians, who came much later, is shown by Storr, Ueber Iren. III. 11, in Eichhorn's Rep. XIV. p. 127, ff.) Hieron. De vir. ill. c. 9: . . . adversus Cerinthum aliosque haereticos et maxime tunc Eblionitarum dogma consurgens, qui asserunt Christum ante Mariam non fuisse: unde et pulchrum est divinam ejus nativitatem edicere. But the doctrine of Cerinthus, — . . . Et post baptismum descendisse in eum (Jesus) ab ea principalitate, qua est super omnia, Christum figura columbae, et tunc annuntiasset incognitum Patrem, et virtutes perfectionem: in fine autem revolassa iterum Christum de Jesu et Jesum passum esse, etc. (Iren. I. 30), — is, if not favored by John i. 32, f., not distinctly contradicted. Epiphan. Haeres. I. § 3, of the Alogi: λέγουσιν μὴ ἐμα τινὰ (the Johannic writings) Ἰωάννου, διὰλ νεφειν-θου. — In favor of this theory, see Michaelis, Einl. II. 1135, ff. Storr, Zweck d. ev. Gesch., &c., p. 180, ff. Hug, Einl. II. § 51. Schött, § 40, not. 7. Schneckenburger, Beiträge, p. 60, ff., who by means of this polemic design explains certain omissions, e. g. that of the agony. On the contrary, Eichhorn, Einl. II. 192, ff. Schmidt, Einl. I. 148, and against Schneckenb. in special Lücke, Comm. I. 219, ff., who however supposes the above conciliatory design. Kleuker, Joh. Petr. Paul. als Christologen, p. 36, ff., stands by the Gnostics (Theosophic) simply.

§ 107 d.

There appears also no distinct opposition to Docetism, although some passages might be used in refuting it (i. 14, xii. 34, xx. 20, 27), while the First Epistle of John seems directed against such an error (§ 179).*

§ 107 e.

The theory that the Evangelist wrote against Ebionitism, and against the Nomism which Paul also attacked, is certainly countenanced by the tenor and spirit of the Gospel (i. 13, 17, iii. 3, iv. 21, v. 9, ff., vi. 32, x. 16); but designed and express opposition of this sort is wanting, and even that against the Jewish law is far behind the stand-point of the Evangelist (i. 17).


§ 107 f.

Finally, the theory that he is opposing the disciples of John must first be freed from its false reference to the Zabians or Mendecans, who stand in no historic connection with John's disciples, and to other later disciples of John. The Evangelist could refer to only such disciples of John as are mentioned in Acts xviii. 24, xix. 1, ff. These, however, did not acknowledge John as the Messiah, but were merely ignorant concerning Jesus. He therefore could not so much oppose them as seek to win them.


b Recognit. Clement. I. 54, in Cotelier. Patr. apost. I. 500: Et ex discipulis Johannis, qui videbantur esse magni, segregarunt se a populo et magistrum suum veluti Christum praedicarunt. c. 60: Et ecce unus ex
JOHN. § 108 a.

discipulis Johannis affirmabat, Christum Johannem fuisset et non Jesum: in tantum, inquit, ut et ipso Jesus (Matth. xi. 11) omnibus hominibus et prophetae majorem pronuntiaverit Johannem. Si ergo, inquit, major est omnibus, sine dubio et Moyses, et ipso Jesu major habendus est. Quodsi omnium major est, ipse est Christus.

* With Herder (Von Gottes Sohne, &c., p. 24), a peaceful, conciliatory reference to the disciples of John seems to me admissible. Lücke rejects every reference.

5. In respect of the Date of Composition.

§ 107 g.

If we put all these circumstances together, viz. that the fourth Gospel presupposes an evangelic tradition and probably also our first Gospel (§§ 104, 107 a), that it is written from a higher stand-point, which has in view a further development of Christianity (§ 106), and for Greek and Graeco-Jewish readers (§ 107 b);* the opinion of the ancient Church, that it was written after the other three Gospels (§ 104, note a, § 106, note a, § 111, note a), is confirmed, at least in so far that we must date it later than the first Gospel and other lost Gospels.®

* Perhaps also with polemic designs (§ 107 c, d), which refer to a later time and to Greek environments.

® According to Semler, Paraphr. in Ev. Joh. i. 11. Tittmann, Meletem. p. 13, and even according to Schleiermacher, Einl. p. 331, it is the oldest Gospel.

Is John the Author? Accounts of him.

§ 108 a.

The current opinion in the Church is, that the author of the fourth Gospel is the Apostle John, son of Zebedee, brother of James the Elder, son of Salome (cf. Matt. xxvii. 56 with Mark xv. 40, xvi. 1), the most intimate disciple of Jesus, formerly a fisherman on the Lake of Gennesaret (Matt. iv. 21, Mark i. 19, Luke v. 10), but also previously, as it seems, a follower of John the Baptist (John i. 35). After Jesus's ascension, he remained some time in Jerusalem (Acts iii. 1, viii. 1, 14, 25, Gal. ii. 9), and, according to Church tradition,
went thence to Asia Minor, settled at Ephesus, and there died. And yet in Paul’s time he could hardly have made that city his abode, else had Paul not sought a sphere of labor there (cf. Rom. xv. 20, 2 Cor. x. 16, Gal. ii. 7, 8); moreover, neither the speech in Acts xx. 18, nor any of the letters written to that region (those to the Ephes., Coloss., Tim.), presupposes John’s presence there. He probably did not leave Jerusalem before the breaking out of the Jewish war.

Nicetian. H. E. II. 42: ἤστασα τοὺς ἱερατεύματα ἐκ τῆς εἰς ὑπάρχουσιν ἱεροῖς Ἰσραήλ οὐκ ἤστασα τῇ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. See also 1 Kings 19:18, where Elijah is depicted as being sent to Horeb to escape the wrath of Ahab and Jezebel. In both cases, the angel speaks to the prophet, not to the Lord. The reference to the New Testament is to the call of John the Baptist, who is sent to预备 people for the coming of the Lord (John 1:23).


It has been erroneously concluded (Lucké, Credner), from the silence regarding him of Acts xxi. 17, ff., that he at that time was no longer in Jerusalem; for Acts xv. also is silent concerning him; cf. on the other hand Gal. ii. 9. Bleek, Beitr. I. 194.

§ 108 b.

The saying, that John was banished to the Isle of Patmos, refers to the doubtful passage Rev. i. 9 (§ 190, note b), and, being contradicted by the earlier date of the Apocalypse (§ 190), appears very questionable. On the other hand, the
tradition seems reliable that the Apostle reached a great age, and lived to the beginning of the second century. For Polycarp, who, in his eighty-sixth year (about A. D. 170), and Papias, who (A. D. 164) suffered martyrdom, saw and heard him; he was also a contemporary of Cerinthus. The external history of the Apostle makes the composition of the fourth Gospel possible, from his stand-point and character (§ 107 g).


c Iren. Ep. ad Florin. in Euseb. V. 20; also in the same, V. 24.

Controversy concerning the Apostolic Genuineness.

1. On External Grounds.

§ 109 a.

The attacks on the Apostolic genuineness of the fourth Gospel* have been aimed first at its external attestation, the existing testimonies having been viewed with doubting eyes and unfavorably judged, and older and more precise proof demanded than can rightly be expected. In this respect our Gospel stands, not in a worse, but in a better position than either the first three Gospels or the writings of Paul.

§ 109 b.

The oldest, although indirect, witnesses in favor of the great age of our Gospel, are Luke and Mark, who have referred to it (§§ 93 c, 94 f).* No distinct trace of it is found in the Apostolic Fathers,** the testimony of Polycarp and Papias especially being wanting, — but both were acquainted with 1 John,† and the absence of their testimony is in part supplied by Irenaeus, Polycarp’s friend and disciple, who regarded the genuineness of the fourth Gospel as unquestionable (III. 1, § 108 a, note a), although it must be confessed that he does not appeal directly to Polycarp, and that he has erred in regard to the Apocalypse (§ 191). Before his time our Gospel was known and used by Justin Martyr (§ 66 a, notes c, d), Tatian (§ 68), and probably Celsus.* Theophilus of Antioch distinctly quotes it.*

* Cf. Bleek, Beitr. I. 83. According to his and the common opinion, 9 Pet. i. 14 also contains a reference to John xxi. 18; see however Exeg. Hdb. on the passage.

---

Gospels.


* Euseb. III. 39: Κίρχηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς (ὁ Παύλος) μαρτυρίας ἀπὸ τῆς προ- τέρας Ἰωάννου ἐκστολῆς. This testimony is without reason rejected by Zeller, p. 584. Credner, Einl. p. 286, considers the silence of P. ominous, if he wrote about A. D. 140. He therefore assumes A. D. 110. Zeller, p. 653, denies totally that Papias was acquainted with it. Polycarp, Ep. ad Philipp. c. 7: Πάντα γὰρ, δὲ ἡ μὴ ὀρθολογία Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ λιπαθέ- ναι, ἀντίχριστος ἔστη (cf. 1 John iv. 3). This letter, also, Zeller considers spurious.


* Ad Autolyco. lib. II. p. 100: Ὡθὲν διδάσκοντι ἡμᾶς οἱ εἰρεῖ τὴν γραφήν καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, ἐξ δὲ Ἰωάννης λέγει· ἐν ἁρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, κ. τ. λ.

§ 109 c.

We may infer a fixed and long-established acceptance of our Gospel by the Church from the fact, that, in the controversies which took place about the middle of the second century, it was acknowledged by both the opposing parties. Johannic formulas are found in the Gnostic system of Valentinus (about A. D. 140), and his followers made use of the Gospel of John. One of them, Heracleon, wrote a commentary upon it, and another, Ptolemy, quotes John i. 3 (§ 76 b, note a). Montanus (about A. D. 150) and his party borrowed from it the idea of the Paraclete. That, on the other hand, the Alogi rejected the Johannic writings, is accounted for by their opposition to the Montanists, and shows that the latter from the first had used this Gospel. Moreover, they adduced against its genuineness no historical grounds, and their critical objections were in part dogmatic, in part drawn
from a comparison of it with the first three Gospels. The Easter controversy, and the manner in which reference was made during it to the Gospels, have been improperly used by the opponents of John’s Gospel. The testimony of Claud. Apollinaris in favor of its acceptance at that time (about A. D. 170) is certain.\footnote{Against Bretschneider’s (Probab. p. 212) objections, see Olshausen, p. 388; against those of Baur’s school, see Bleek, Beitr. I. 214, ff. \footnote{Cf. Bretschneider, p. 205, sqq. Olshausen, p. 283, ff. Lücke, Comm. I. 60. The first tries, erroneously, to prove that the Montanists had rejected the Gospel of John, especially from the passage in Iren. III. 11. 9, which has been improperly applied to them: Alii vero ut donum spiritus frustretur, quod in novissimis temporibus secundum placitum Patris effusum est in humanum genus, illum speciem non admittunt, quae est secundum Ioannis Evangelium, in qua Paracleteum se missurum Dominus promisit; sed simul et Evangelium et propheticum repellunt spiritum. Zeller, p. 637, asserts that Tertullian first introduced the Paraclete into the Montanistic system.\footnote{Epiphan. Haeres. II. de Alogis, c. 3: ... Elçon gar tihn airmen kai-
loymen, epoðalouvan Ioanov tais biblous. 'Epete deu tòn logoson ou deçontai tòn parà Ioanov ekkrateiçen, Alcogon eklieçonta... Légonai gar më elnav aitìa Ioanov, alla Khrisov, kai ou deç exa aitìa faivn elnav en iklieçia. c. 4: Fóskousi gar kath' einaiv, ou gar eipousi kath' tìn al-
thêia, òti ou sumofwnet àtov biblia tois loposoi àpoustdkou (cf. John i., Matt. iii. iv.). c. 18: To di éaggeleioi to ei dòmov Ioanov, faivn, pevè-
}detai. Metà gar to eipiv, òti ò logos sarèj egèneto kai ekpinoan en ërmi, kai áliva alla, eivôs légei, òti òmos egèneto en Kaiv tìn Galalaios. c. 22: Katagorofuèi di pàloj ou autòtou tòi ògioi ìaggeleistou, ìalhiov di tòi autòtou ìaggeleioi, òti, faivn, ò Ioanov ìèf peri òdòv pasiqon tòn Zaniras pe-
pourketai, oui di álloj ìaggeleistanti peri pàscha enos. The above passage of Irenæus also belongs here. Cf. Olshausen, p. 254, ff.\footnote{The Christians of Asia Minor (Quartodeciman) celebrated the Passover according to the Jewish custom, on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, on which, according to the Synoptics, Jesus celebrated it. The Western Christians, on the other hand, who were joined by Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Clement of Alexandria, and others, and whose view subsequently triumphed in the Council of Nice, always celebrated it on a Friday, in memory of the death of Jesus as the Christian paschal Lamb. They interpreted the Synoptics according to John, and assumed that Jesus held, not a Jewish, but a typical paschal feast, and was himself sacrificed on the 14th of Nisan. Apollinaris in the Chron. pasch. p. 6, ed. Du Cang. ... légonai (the opponents), òti òj'
tò proktovon metà tòw maðhèwv ëfarev ò kýros, òj' ò megàlè hìrèv tòw 
ìzwow autòt òpavon, kai diwhýwtaí Maðhèwv ouílo légon, òs nekòksw-
}ètov ìatìmenwv to ðòmor ò nómos auìtw, kai stwswèin dòkai kai auìtw tò
eἰαγγέλια. According to Schwegler (Der Montanismus, etc., p. 191, ff.) and Baur (p. 353), the Johannic Gospel is not the subject here mentioned; but they explain σταυρίζειν wrongly by oppose the law, whereas Wieseler, Chronol. Synopsis, p. 370, and Ebrard, p. 124, f., understand it rightly in the absolute sense to be at variance, so that its sense is, that the Gospel of John does not agree with the Synoptics, because it (as Apollinaris correctly viewed it) placed the day of Jesus’s death on the 14th of Nisan. Cf. Reitberg, Der Paschastreit, in Illgen’s Zschr. II. 2. 117, f. Zeller, in his Jahrb. 1846. p. 622, f. Hauff, in St. u. Kr. 1846. p. 647, f. Apollinaris’s opinion becomes clear from the fragment of Clement of Alexandria, Ib. p. 7: Ταύς μὲν οὖν παρελθόντας ἔτεσι (in the earlier years of his life) τῷ θυόμενον πρὸς Ιουδαίοις ἐσχίνετο λοφάζων οὐ κύριος πάσχα; ἵππη δὲ ἐκκήρυξεν αὐτόν ἃν τὸ πάσχα ἢ ἄρμος τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ πρόβατον ἢ τὰ σφαγῆν ἁγίμων, αὐτίκα ἐδίδαξε μὲν τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῦ τύπου τὸ μυστήριον τῆς Ἦ’, ἐν θλίψει ἐγκόλμασεν τῷ πάσχα φαγεῖν; Further on he appeals to John xviii. 28, and adds as follows: ταύτῃ τῶν ἡμέρας τῇ ἀκριβείᾳ καὶ αἱ γραφαὶ πάσαι συμφωνοῦσι, καὶ τὰ εἰαγγέλια συνώδη. Also in the other fragment of Apollinaris, Ib. p. 6, is a reference to the Gospel of John: ... ἐκεῖν τε ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτοῦ τὸ δύο πάλιν καθάρισα ὁ δαρ καὶ ἅμα; and it is a miserable evasion to go back to a tradition which is older than the Gospel of John (Baur, p. 356). On the other hand, it is remarkable that, both earlier (about A. D. 169) and later (about A. D. 190), the Christians of Lesser Asia appeal to the apostolic tradition and to the example of the Apostle John. Iren. in Euseb. H. E. V. 24: οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Ἀπόστολος τῶν Πολίκαρπον πεῖται ἐνδύματο μὴ τηρεῖν, ἢ τὸ καί ἱερόν τοῦ μνημήν τοῦ κυρίου ἤμων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἁπάντων οἷς συνέτριψαν, οἱ τετεροποιήθης κ. τ. λ. Polycrates, Ib.: Ἦμεις οὖν ἀραδείπνησαν ἄγωμεν τῆν ἡμέραν μὴ κατατίθεντες μὴ τῷ ἀφανεύμενοι. καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν μεγάλα στοιχεῖα ἐκεῖνοι ἤμεν τί θαύμα τοῦ κυρίου ἀνασυστήζ. ... οὖσαν ἐν Ἐφραίμ ἐκείνοις ... οὗτοι πάντες ἐντήρωσαν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς γενεαλογίας κατὰ τὸ εἰαγγέλλων. How could John observe with them a custom which was in contradiction with his Gospel! This has been asked, from, however, a quite false stand-point, so that the answers given by Ebrard, Wieseler, Thiersch, must also be erroneous. According to the correct view of the case, which Bleek, Beiträge, 157, ff., has luminously stated, the Passover controversy did not concern itself at first about the day of the month on which Jesus died, but about the co-celebration of the Jewish Passover, which probably originated with the first Jewish Christians, and which the Apostle John, as well as Paul (Acts xviii. 21), could well take part in, although he knew that Jesus did not hold the Jewish Passover with his disciples, but was crucified on the 14th of Nisan. The conclusion stated by Zeller, p. 646, is, that the fourth Gospel was in use from about A. D. 170; and as they who quote it and defend it, e. g. Irenæus, do not appeal to tradition απὸ τούτων, it may have first come to light a few decades earlier. — On the historic grounds for the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, see Grimm, Allg. Encycl., quoted above, p. 18, ff.
2. On Internal Grounds.

§ 110 a.

1. The Evangelist designates himself indirectly as the "beloved disciple" of Jesus, i. 35, ff., xiii. 23, xix. 26, 35, xx. 2, and expressly as an eyewitness, i. 14, xix. 35 (§ 105 a). The postscript (xxi. 24, f.), whose unknown author appears to have been a younger contemporary, also testifies to the same disciple as the author. We must either allow this testimony its due weight, or declare the author a forger, who artfully aimed to pass for the Apostle John.

* He is generally regarded as John; Lützelberger thinks he is Andrew. It is remarkable, in this connection, that he never gives John the Baptist the surname of ὁ βαπτιστής, as the Synoptics do. Credner, I. 209, f. Bleek, Beitr. p. 178.

§ 110 b.

2. The style of the writing and the whole spirit of the work show incontrovertibly that the Gospel is the work of the same author as the First Epistle of John. Though the genuineness of the latter is a matter of dispute, it claims by the spiritual character and depth of its contents, and by the statement in i. 1, to be at least the work of an eyewitness, and an apostolic man thoroughly permeated with the spirit of Jesus Christ.

§ 110 c.

3. The historic matter offers to opponents many convenient points of attack: a. in the indications of a view formed at a distance from the historic facts and relations (§ 105 a); which, however, is to be explained by the fact that John wrote in the later part of his life, and in wholly different environments, when his original view had died out, and he had cut completely loose from Judaism, and that the bias of his mind led him to set little store by historic pragmatism;* b. in his variations from the Synoptics (§ 104), both in respect of additions and omissions, and of contradictions.
According as writers set out from the unfounded assumption of the unqualified or preponderating credibility of the first three Gospels, or from the view that they present the older series of Gospel myths, they beheld in the fourth Gospel only a web spun arbitrarily out of few actual materials by an author far removed from the history (Weisse, Br. Bauer, Baur), or the creations of a later myth-development (Strauss). Decisive however against this are the vividness and originalness of many of the narrations (§ 105 a), (although a one-sided critical dialectic has sought to reason these away;*) and the demonstrable correctness of its deviation in essential points. 

* Reuss, Ideen z. Einl. in d. Evang. Joh., in Denkschr. d. theolog. Gesellsch. z. Strasb. (1840.) p. 51, ff. Lücke, I. 138, ff. That the anti-Jewish position of the Evangelist shows him to be neither a Jew nor a Palestinian, is refuted by Bleek, Beitr. I. 244, ff. He was acquainted with the Old Testament in the original text, as appears from the quotations which differ from the LXX., e. g. xiii. 18, xix. 37. He believed in the divine revelation in the Old Testament, and in its prophecies. 

v The miracle of the raising of Lazarus, especially, has been called in question, on the ground that the Synoptics, if they had known of it, would not have passed it by in silence. Grotius, Herder, Schulthess, and Olshausen explain this silence by the desire to spare Lazarus or his family; Meyer, from their Galilean stand-point. Lücke, II. 475, supposes that the Synoptics were unacquainted with it, partly because the Galilean tradition which they followed came from those who were not eyewitnesses, partly because from a want of pragmatism they failed to see the vast importance of the miracle. That they must have regarded it as the greatest of all the miracles (Strauss, Weisse, Baur) is denied by Ebrard (Kritik d. Evang. Gesch. 565. das Evang. Joh. 39), because to them one raising of the dead was as good as another. 

* So Bretschneider, Weisse (from his preference for Mark), Br. Bauer (in his work on John, although in his subsequent work on the Synoptics he subjects them to the same dissolving process), Baur (who regards Matthew as the basis of all the other Gospels). 

* According to the last-mentioned writer, the fourth Gospel has no historic aim (§ 107 b) or significance: the author, who knew nothing of evangelic tradition save what the Synoptics gave him, invented everything new or discrepant in his account, with the dogmatical design of representing Jesus as the incarnate Logos.

* Al. Schweizer, Das Evang. Joh. nach a. innern Werthe kritisch untersucht (1841), strikingly remarks, p. 239, ff., that, where this vividness and
originalness appear, the ἀλος μεθήρε (cf. § 105 a) usually has a hand in it. That rationalizing method, awaking suspicion by its very narrowness, for the most part refutes itself, as when Baur, p. (431) 268, finds in the statement (xviii. 13), that Jesus was first led to Annas and tried by him, a pure fiction, which aimed to strengthen, by a double condemnation, the proof given by the Jews of their own unbelief,—because Annas did not condemn Jesus; or when, p. (438) 279, he deduces all that John says of Pilate's desire to acquit Jesus, from his desire to lay the whole burden of Jesus's death on the Jews,—this is done by Matthew! or when the difference between John and the Synoptics in regard to the day of Jesus's death is explained by John's desire to remove the improbability which is found in the Synoptics' account,—elsewhere he argues against John from the very ground of improbability; or when his extension of Jesus's ministry to Judea is ascribed to the design of setting in stronger light the unbelief of the Jews (see note f); or when, p. (415) 252, he argues thus: It is clear that, if the Synoptics represent Jesus as making a long address before the supper, such cannot also have taken place after the supper, as in John. What must we think of a critic who, p. (438) 279, asserts that Jesus alludes to his public teaching in the temple in Luke xxii. 53 only (cf. Matt. xxvi. 55, Mark xiv. 49); who, pp. (164, ff.) 215, ff., understands allegorically the "water" in John xix. 34; and, pp. (445, ff.) 285, ff., tries to persuade us that John, in vii. 10, 15, viii. 59, speaks of a magical transformation and disappearance of Jesus! Farther, comp. Bleek, I. 272, f.

2 That Jesus had previously been in Judea and Jerusalem the Synoptics themselves imply (Matt. xxiii. 37, Luke xiii. 34; Matt. xxvii. 57; Luke x. 38, ff., cf. Matt. xxvi. 6; Matt. iv. 25), and it is also in itself probable, cf. Ehrard, p. 22, f. Bleek, Beitr. p. 94, ff. The discrepancy between John and the Synoptics, in regard to the day of the month on which Jesus was crucified, — a discrepancy which must exegetically be acknowledged, and cannot be explained away, as by Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Ehrard (Das Evang. Joh.; differently in his Krit. d. Evang. Gesch.), Wieseler, Chronol. Synops., — must be decided in favor of the former, as the 15th of Nisan, the first day of the Passover festival, and which the Synoptics assert, is opposed by the strongest probabilities. See Bleek's exhaustive remarks, in the above work, p. 107, ff.

§ 110 d.

4. The discourses and doctrinal contents of the Gospel offer, in their obviously subjective presentation, the most tempting point of attack. It is an unsettled question, how far this subjectiveness extends. The impression is different which our Evangelist's narrative makes on different minds. But, setting aside particulars, it must be regarded as con-
ceivable that an Apostle, to whom the strictly historic was of comparatively small moment, should allow himself a certain freedom of representation, and that John had so deep an insight into the consciousness of Jesus as to be able to express, if not exactly in the Master's own words, yet in regular development, the truth which was, and still is, of moment to every believer; and also as possible, that this distinguished disciple had not only reached that standpoint, which, independent of Judaism, was the peculiarly Christian standpoint; but also that, amid Hellenistic influences, he had made the Hellenistic style of writing and philosophy his own. If this Apostle be not regarded as the author, we should be compelled, by the profoundly spiritual apprehension and development of Christian truth, to select a man of no less rank than the Apostle Paul or the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The certainly genuine substratum of the freely-narrated discourses, and the originality stamped on many isolated declarations, which, like similar utterances in the Synoptics, come from genuine tradition (i. 52, ii. 16, 19, iv. 21, ff., 48, ix. 3–5, vii. 37, viii. 12, xviii. 36, f., xx. 23, 29, and many others*), require an author not too far removed from the original source.

* While Baur and others ascribe everything, without discrimination, to the author of the Gospel, Schweizer, above work, p. 30, ff., estimates quite differently what is ascribed to the "Johannic manner," and endeavors, p. 188, ff., to show in the testimony of John the Baptist genuine historical foundations.

b As he appears in Gal. ii. 9 as the Apostle of the circumcision, Baur, p. (633, ff.) 399, ff., thinks that at that time John could not have had the conviction that the heathen were also entitled to share the Messianic salvation. But as he with Peter and James approved of the ministry of Paul, he must also have approved of his principles. Cf. Ehrard, p. 99, f. Bleek, Beitr. i. 249, ff. According to Baur, p. (619, ff.) 314, ff., John’s standpoint presupposes that of Paul, even when we apply to it the common standard. But could he not learn from Paul, and yet surpass him? Might we not expect something extraordinary from the disciple who was especially dear to Jesus? To be sure, with such a character (Luke ix. 54) and such a disposition (Matt. xx. 20, f.), he would have needed most of all to experience the "birth from above." But is this so impossible?

c Nothing, in truth, can be more unreasonable than, with Baur and oth-
ers, to ascribe this wonderful production to the second century, and to place it, accordingly, in the same category with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and of the Christian Pseudepigraphists.

4 Though Strauss, Leben Jesu, I. 675, f., 1st ed., asserted that the discourses in our Gospel are arbitrary creations out of little actual material, and give rather a few fundamental ideas, developed in the spirit of the Alexandrian school, than precise utterances of Jesus, he subsequently doubted the correctness of this assertion. Weisse here is on our side.

* The Evangelist so entirely regards certain expressions of Jesus as fixed historic data, that he sometimes assigns them a double sense (xviii. 9, 32), sometimes illustrates their meaning (ii. 19, ff.). The manner, too, in which he gives the utterances in xiii. 20, xiv. 31, secures him from the suspicion of having invented Jesus’s discourses. Cf. Bleek, p. 228, ff. The predictions of Jesus’s death in vii. 33, f., viii. 21, x. 12, 17, f., xii. 23, f., xiv. 1, ff., xvi. 16, are more original than those in the Synoptics. Grimm, Allg. Encycl., as above, p. 50.

§ 110 e.

To explain the (apparent or real) diversity in the character and contents of our Gospel, several writers have supposed that it contains Johannic elements, which have been worked over by a disciple of the Apostle.* On this supposition, the passages which refer to the Apostle John retain a certain amount of force (§ 110 a). In a similar way, Weisse discriminated between a Johannic nucleus and a later envelopment, and found the former in the didactic portion of the discourses of Jesus and of the Baptist, which the Apostle wrote down as studies (so to speak), without any historical design, but for the purpose of presenting his Master’s doctrine in a connected form. After John’s death, it occurred to John’s followers and disciples to combine these studies, together with his oral teachings and the materials afforded by tradition, into a Gospel history. But to separate this nucleus from its envelopments, — which Weisse did not attempt, — involves the gravest difficulties, both from the closely woven connection and especially from the similarity of the style. Schenkel, who carried out this idea farther, attempted merely to show the more or less probable incongruity of several passages (the most probable is vi. 27).*
Eckermann and Vogel had previously made a similar assertion. Especially Ammon, Progr. quo docetur, Joannev Evang. autorem ab editore hujus libri fuisset diversum. 1811. Paulus, in his review of Bretschneider's Probabil., Heidelb. Jahrb. 1831. No. VII. - IX., and of Lücke's Comment. No. XV. Rettig, Ephemerid. exeg. theol. I. 63, sqq.: ... de hoc Evangeli statuerim: compositum esse et digestum a seriori Christiano, Joannis auditore, forsan Gnosticae dedito philosophiae. Qui quum in ecclesiæ Ephesinæ scriniis ecclesiasticis vel alioc loco privatæ plura Jesu vitæ capita per Joannem descripta reperisset, vel a Joanne ipso accepiisset, iis compositis et ordinatis suam de λόγῳ philosophiam praefixit. Reuss, as above, p. 57, lays down this alternative: "Either John himself is the author, or he delivered to the author ample and sufficiently attested materials."


§ 110 f.

Alex. Schweizer likewise finds in our Gospel incongruous and discordant matter, but not in the didactic portions (§ 110 d, note a), nor even in all the historical sections, but only in some "which stand quite apart and alone, woven into no discourses, containing no important expression of Jesus, presenting an essentially different estimate and idea of miracle, without vividness of narrative, and indeed different from each other in style, although they agree in narrating Galilean occurrences." He thinks, by separating these, to restore the simple unity of the plan, which was restricted to the ministry of Jesus in Judæa, and admitted miracles only with important additions in shape of discourses and other results. Besides the small interpolations xix. 35–37, xviii. 9, xvi. 30, ii. 21, f., he indicates the following as to be struck out: the miracle at Cana, ii. 1–12, the healing of the nobleman's son at Capernaum, iv. 46–54, and the story of the feeding, vi. 1–26, in which he recognizes the hand which wrote the legendary supplement (chap. xxi.), itself referring likewise to Galilee. In fact, two of these sections relieve us from the striking synoptical parallelisms, and from several of the critic's crosses (ii. 1, iv. 44, 48, 54, vi. 30); and
he points out with uncommon acuteness several apparent incongruities in the connection of these sections with what precedes, and several singularities in the style. But of these special local grounds of proof several are incorrect or not quite convincing;* the original connection as restored, especially in vi. 27, ff., is unsatisfactory; b and the main argument is untenable, that these Galilæan miracles are distinguished by their magical character from the others in the Gospel, and that greater value is meant to be ascribed to them than is elsewhere ascribed to miracles. c Finally, the preservation of the rest from all attack could hardly succeed. Consequently this hypothesis would be for many unsatisfactory.

* Certainly non-Johannic is ἀναθετώς, xix. 35, and the address to the reader is unusual; difficult, τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς τρίτης, ii. 1, and singular, η δόρα μου, ii. 4; both however (with ii. 4, cf. xvi. 21) are not exactly to be rejected; the believing expectation of Jesus’s mother (cf. vii. 3–10, Mark iii. 21) is obscure and difficult; the un-Johannic σημεία καὶ νέρα, iv. 48, is however in this (certainly obscure) relation not inapt; the narrative of the miracle, iv. 54, in comparison with ii. 23, iii. 2, and even with ver. 48, is out of keeping. The greatest inconcinnity is found in vi. 1, ff., ἀπελευθέρω, κ. τ. λ., without any account of the return; τὸ δόρος (?) (the words ὅτι ἔφευρεν, κ. τ. λ. are misinterpreted by Schov., because he overlooks the imperfect); the known difficulties in ver. 26, 30, f.; the ὕσσων, ver. 41, 52, which does not apply to Galilæans; in the style of writing, ver. 1, ff., certainly similar to that of the Synoptics, yet the Johannic ὅσον is not wanting, and the strange ἐδ. ver. 9, is omitted by various codd.

b To render the junction of vi. 27, ff. to chap. v. possible, something must previously be cut away. Moreover, the pragmatic reason assigned, in accordance with the proposed connection, for the words οὗτος ἔφευρεν αὐτῶν οἱ ἤσσων (vii. 1), viz. the supposed exasperating (?) tendency of the discourse in vi. 27–71, is not evident; it is also needless, for v. 16 (especially in the common reading) is enough. — The striking out of ii. 1–11 seems to make a sensible gap, and ii. 12, although purified from additions, will not fitly join i. 52.

c The healing of him that was born blind (cf. ver. 6 with Mark viii. 23) is magical, and chap. xi. taxes in the highest degree our belief in miracles. In ix. 16, 31, ff., xi. 15, 41, f., a high value is set on the proof from miracles, and the καὶ ἔστωσαν, κ. τ. λ., ii. 11, which has been called in question, is completely justified by xi. 15, xiv. 29. Cf. Schweigler, in Zeller’s Theol. Jahrb. I. 1. 158, f., all of whose objections I cannot approve, least of all that against ii. 1.
§ 110 g.

A critical conclusion which denies to the Apostle John all share in this Gospel, and declares the same to be of later origin, not only involves the odious but inevitable confession that the author was a forger, but is opposed by the improbability that Christian antiquity accepted a Gospel which differed in important points from the evangelic tradition, without having found a sure and satisfactory ground in its apostolic authority.

* Grimm, Allg. Encycl., as before referred to, p. 51.

Time and Place of Composition.

§ 111.

According to the Church tradition, which is confirmed by the character of the Gospel itself (§ 107 g), it was composed later than the first three Gospels, and therefore about the close of the apostolic age. The circumstances of John's life point in the same direction (§ 108 a). For, if he be the author, he must have written it on Greek ground, whither he came probably at a very late period. There are no precise internal grounds for determining the date of the composition. The passages xi. 18, xviii. 18, xix. 41, by no means presuppose the desolating of the country around Jerusalem; none presuppose the destruction of the city.

In regard to the place of composition, the opinions of the ancients vary, some naming Ephesus (Irenæus, III. 1, § 108 a, note a), others Patmos.


b The determination of the date given by Eichkorn, Einl. II. 156, rests on the genuiness of the Apocalypse, which we cannot acknowledge.

c Against Böckh, p. 287; but we cannot, either, with Lampe and others, fix it, from v. 2, in the time while Jerusalem was still standing.
Of the last Chapter.

§ 112.

As chapter xx. manifestly ends the work, a chapter xxi. must undeniably be regarded as a supplement. It is a question, however, whether it comes from John or from another.

Important objections may be urged against the former view, which is held by several critics. a The close, xxi. 24, 25, is acknowledged, even by several defenders of the whole chapter, b to be un-Johannic, because of its allusion to the author of the Gospel, the expression ὁδαμεν (ver. 24), and the hyperbole (ver. 25). But these verses are so closely connected with what precede, that with their genuineness that also of the whole chapter falls. The mention of John in ver. 20 does not tend to show him as the author. Although the style is in many respects Johannic, c in others it excites more or less suspicion. d The whole style of narration is less clear and vivid than in the rest of the Gospel (see especially ver. 20, &c.). Verse 23 seems to have been written after John's death, and verse 19 after Peter's, and the whole to belong to an uncertain, obscure tradition.

a According to Baur, p. (188, 8*) 236, 8*, this conclusion is by the author of the supplement. See, against him, Bleeck, p. 179, 8.

b Gerh. Joh. Vossius, Harm. evang. l. III. c. 4. § 8. Richard Simon, Michaelis, Hug, Eichhorn, Tholuck, H. A. W. Meyer, &c. Older writers, as Wolf, Cur. phil. ad h. l., regard even this supposition as untenable, on account of its inconsistency with the doctrine of inspiration.

Conjunctionless sentences: ver. 3, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13 (!), 15, 16, 17, 22; frequent use of οὕτω, ver. 5, 6, 7, 9, 13 (!), 15, 23; μετὰ ταύτα, ver. 1, cf. iii. 22, v. 1, 14, vi. 1, &c.; οὕτως, placed after the verb, ver. 3, cf. iii. 27, v. 10, 30, viii. 28, ix. 33, &c.; οὐ μέντοι, ver. 4, cf. iv. 27, vii. 13, xx. 5; ἐπιστάμενος, ver. 9, 10, 13, cf. vi. 9, 11; διαζέωμαι, ver. 7, cf. xiii. 4, 5; φανεροῦ ἐνυφάντω, ver. 1; cf. vii. 4 (!), cf. Mark xvi. 14.

εἰς τὴν βαθάσσην, ver. 1, for εἰς τῇ β., cf. iv. 6, v. 2; the turn ἐφανερώσεις δὲ οὖν, ver. 1; ἐκεῖνος, ver. 12, for ἐρωτών; φέρειν, ver. 19; εἰς-στράφεσιν, ver. 20, for στραφείς, i. 38, xx. 16; ἔρχομαι, ver. 23; the d. λ. ἐπεξεργάτης, ver. 7.


CHAPTER V.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.


Plan and Object of the Book.

§ 113 a.

Thus is the second part of the evangelic history written for Theophilus (i. 1, cf. Luke i. 1–3), and really contains the continuation. It is not, as the title, πράξεως τῶν ἀποστόλων, added by a later hand, leads us to expect, the history of all or even of the two chief Apostles, but of the rise, growth, and extension of the Christian community, for which, as chiefly instrumental thereto, the careers of these two Apostles offer the most materials (Peter, chap. ii. — xii.; Paul, chap. xiii.—xxviii.). That the author meant to give such a history of the Church appears as well from the passages and narratives* referring to the progress of the Gospel and the development of the Church, as from the whole structure of the work.b


b
The words of the Lord: λήφσενθε δόναμιν ἐπελθόντος τού ἀγ. πνεύματος ἐφ' ἑαυτή καὶ ἵνα βοηθήσῃ μοι μάρτυρις ἐν τῇ Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Ιουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ τῆς γῆς, i. 8, contain both the life-problem of the Apostles, and the subject of the work. After the completion of the number of the Apostles, i. 15–26, the fulfilment of that promise takes place in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the beginning of the Apostles' ministry in the first preaching and conversion by Peter, through which the little knot of believers in Christ grew to a "community," chap. ii. How the Apostles, in the power of the Spirit, bear farther testimony in Jerusalem despite the commencing persecution, and what form the community took, iii. 1–vi. 7. The martyr-testimony of Stephen brings honor to Christ's cause, vi. 8–viii. 3, and becomes the occasion of the spread of the Gospel to Samaria and elsewhere, viii. 4–40. The conversion of Saul, the "chosen instrument" for the proclamation of Christ's name, ix. 1–31, paves the way for the chief part of the apostolic work, the conversion of the heathen, which Peter, after having worked in various parts of Judaea, ix. 32–43, begins by converting the centurion Cornelius and his family. He justifies this step before the Apostles in Jerusalem, x. 1–xi. 18. Exiles preach the Gospel to the heathen at Antioch also, and Barnabas brings Paul upon the stage of his ministry, xi. 19–30. After a narrative of miracles, which, so far as this book is concerned, closes the ministry of Peter, and throws a glory on the cause of the Gospel, xii. 1–23 (vs. 24, f. serve as a connection), Paul is introduced, at first in connection with Barnabas, as missionary to the heathen, xiii., xiv. The admission of the heathen is again justified by the Apostles in Jerusalem, xiv. 1–35. Paul now, without Barnabas, pushes his ministry among the heathen yet farther, to Macedonia and Greece, and founds several communities. He designs, and is promised permission, to preach at Rome (xix. 21, xxiii. 11), but is arrested in Jerusalem, and after a protracted trial carried a prisoner to Rome; and thus his design and promise are fulfilled, though not as he expected, and he is permitted to preach in Rome (xvi. –xxviii.). The word of the Lord (i. 8) being thus fulfilled, the history closes. Were Paul but the second of the chief subjects of the history, it must necessarily have told his farther fate. Cf. the similar views of Ziegler, Ueber den Zweck, die Quellen u. Interpolationen d. AG. in Gabler's Journ. 1801. I. 2. Heinrichs, Prolegg. in Acta App. p. 10, sqq. Kuinoel, Prolegg. in Acta App. p. xvii. Eichhorn, Einl. II. 19, ff. Schott, Isag. § 45. Credner, p. 288, ff. Neudecker, p. 344. The error of finding too little plan in the work is committed chiefly by Hug, § 80. Bertholdt, III. 1334, ff. It is also a mistake to limit the scope of the work by the measure of the materials at command of the author.

§ 113 b.

The work falls very naturally, though without any obvious design of the author, into two parts, chap. i.–xii. and xiii.–
xxviii. Resting-points and transitions, dividing these into sections, also occur, especially in the first part: ii. 42–47; iv. 32–37; v. 12–16; v. 42; vi. 7; viii. 1–3; ix. 31; xii. 24, f.; xiv. 27; xv. 35. In the second part, the narrative is generally continuous, because its subject is the Apostle Paul. As regards the chronology of this part, whose historical matter was more at hand, the author has done no more than arrange it nearly in the order of time, giving here and there days and years (xviii. 11, xix. 10, xx. 6, xxiv. 27, xxvii. 9, xxviii. 11). Points from which to reckon the time are accidentally and undesignedly given in facts whose chronology is otherwise determinable (xii. 23, xviii. 1, xxiv. 27, xxv. 1). Cf. § 118.

§ 113 c.

One, although a secondary, pragmatic point from which the historic narrative may be regarded, is that of an apology for the Pauline Christianity; i.e. to justify, in opposition to the narrow views of the Jewish Christians, on the one hand, the proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles, and their reception, without being bound by the Mosaic law as commanded by God and approved by the collective Apostles; and, on the other, the calling, ministry, doctrine, and course of conduct pursued by Paul, the Apostle to the heathen. To regard the whole work as an apology for the Apostle Paul, so that even the first part shall have the same design, and, by placing all Peter's work here in parallelism with Paul's in the second part, aim to justify the latter by the former, is a one-sided view.*

The Author.

§ 114.

The work was written by the author of the third Gospel, according to tradition, Luke, the assistant of the Apostle Paul (§ 101 a), whom he is said to have accompanied after Paul left Troas, and, on this account, to speak in xvi. 10–17, xx. 5–15, xxi. 1–18, xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16, also as an eyewitness. But such an origin is disproved in part by the statements which contradict Paul's Epistles (ix. 19, 23, 25–28, cf. Gal. i. 17–19; xvi. 16, f., xviii. 5, cf. 1 Thess. iii. 1, f.), and those which are unsatisfactory (xvi. 6, cf. the Epistle to the Galatians, Acts xviii. 22, f.; especially xxviii. 30, f.), as well as by the omission of several facts and circumstances (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 32, 2 Cor. i. 8, xi. 25, f., Rom. xv. 19, xvi. 3, f.); partly by the accounts in the first part, which (especially ii. 5–11, cf. x. 46, xix. 6, 1 Cor. xiv. 2, f.), by their unhistoric character, betray an author distant from the history, and seem, from the analogy of the Gospel and from certain indications (§ 115 c), to have been drawn from written sources. But even the accounts given by an eyewitness are, on various grounds, inconsistent with Luke's being author of the whole work.  

a At xvi. 10, where 'we' begins to be used, Luke is supposed to have joined company with the Apostle; at xvi. 18, where the 'we' ceases, to have left him, and remained in Philippi; and in xx. 5, with the 'we,' to make his appearance again.  
b The silence in regard to the Jewish-Christian and other opponents of the Apostle in Galatia and Corinth, is explained by the apologetic aim of the author, and by his slight attention to the internal development of Christianity.  

c According to Oecdoter, Luke incorporated oral statements of John Mark, according to Feilmoser and Schneckenburger, of the Evangelist Philip.  
d 1. The companions of the Apostle are named elsewhere (xiii. 2, 5, xv. 2, 40, xvi. 3, xviii. 18, xx. 4), but Luke neither in chap. xvi. nor later.  
2. The close connection between xvi. 10 and the preceding, and the circumstance that the unknown person included in the 'we' is represented as acting with Paul, are inconsistent with the supposition that he makes his first appearance in xvi. 10.  
3. The hypothesis that Luke was at that time
assistant to the Apostle, and remained behind in Philippi, is without proof from the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Philippians; and, as he is first mentioned in the Roman Epistles, he probably joined the Apostle first at Rome. 4. Not only does the narrator included in the "we," but also Timothy, disappear in xvi. 17, and we must suppose a double negligence on the part of the author. Cf. Schwanbeck, Ueber die Quellen der Schriften des Luc. (1847.) p. 125, ff.

Sources, and the Use made of them.

§ 115 a.

We must, therefore, suppose that those sections in which an eyewitness speaks came from a memoir by another writer, one of those written documents which the author, according to a pretty general opinion, used in this work as in the Gospel. It is indeed a matter of question who the author of this memoir is, where it begins, and whether and how it is used where the eyewitness does not speak as such. A great difficulty is, that the style of the writing throughout the whole work is very uniform and closely related to that of the Gospel; the Old Testament is used in the same way; and, with few exceptions, the parts of the work are connected and mutually dependent, and consequently the sources have been freely worked over.


* 1. In the grammatic arrangement and formation of the sentences: the optative, rare in the New Testament, nine times, cf. Luke i. 29, iii. 15, &c.; the connection of sentences by υς, more than twenty times before xvi. 12, almost unknown in the other Evangelists; μην ς ἐρατεῖα twenty-four times; δεῖ ten times; καὶ τὰ μοναστήρια, iv. 29, v. 38, xiiii. 30, xx. 32, xxvii. 29; καὶ εἰςedere, vii. 4, xiii. 21, xiv. 26, xvi. 12, xx. 15, xxi. 1, xxvii. 4, 12, xxviii. 15; καὶ εἰς τὴν, εἰς τὸ δή, with accusative and infinitive, iv. 5, ix. 32, 37, x. 25, xi. 26, xiv. 1, xvi. 16, xix. 1, xxi. 1, 5, (xxii. 6, 17 with dative, accusative, and infinitive,) xxviii. 8, 17. 2. In characteristic words: ἐπίθεται in the Gospel seven, in Acts twenty-six times; ἀναντία, i. 10, xxii. 1, and eight times more, in the Gospel twice, elsewhere only in Paul; ἐπιλαυβάσσωσθαι
seven times, in the Gospel five times; διαμαρτύρεσθαι nine times, in the Gospel once; διέρχεσθαι twenty-one times, in the Gospel eleven times; ἀποδύχεσθαι five times, in the Gospel twice, nowhere else in the New Testament; καταλαμβάνοντας, iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25; ἐπικαλέσθαι τ. δομα, ix. 14, 21, xii. 16, and elsewhere as to call on, seven times; ἐπικλητεῖν, viii. 16, xix. 17, and four times more, as in Luke i. 12; διασπίζειν, xii. 19, xcv. 6, 14, and five times more; μαρτυρεῖσθαι, to have a good repute, vi. 3, x. 22, xvi. 9, xxii. 12; ἀποφθέγγονται, ii. 4, 14, xcv. 25 (nowhere else); μεγαλώνει, v. 13, x. 46, xix. 17, Luke i. 46; ἀνακρίνεις, iv. 9, xii. 19, xvii. 11, xcv. 8, xcviii. 18, Luke xcvii. 14; καταστεῖν ὑψι, xii. 17, xiiii. 16, xix. 33, xxi. 40; προφέρεις, viii. 6, 10, 11, xvi. 14; συνήχεις, συνήχεσαι, ii. 6, xix. 32, xxi. 27, 31; σύγκρονος, xix. 29; διαπονεῖσθαι, iv. 2, xvi. 18; βουλή τ. θεοῦ, ii. 23, iv. 28, xiii. 36, xx. 27, Luke viii. 27; ομηρεία κ. τείροτα eight times, elsewhere rarely; ἰδίων διαινάρων, xcviii. 29, and three times more, Luke xcvii. 15; ἱεραρχός, numerus, very often; ἰσαμυραίον eleven times before xii. 29; καθέξον, iii. 24, xi. 4, xvii. 23, Luke i. 3, vii. 1.

Habitual quotation after the Alexandrian version sometimes literal, ii. 34, f., iv. 25, f., vii. 32, f., xii. 33, 35; sometimes free, from memory, i. 20, ii. 17, ff., 25, ff., iii. 22, f., 25, vii. 3, 6, f., 39, 42, f., 49, f.; xiii. 34, 47, xv. 16, f., xcvii. 26, f.; even when it does not correctly represent the Hebrew text, ii. 25, 28, vii. 42, f., xiii. 41, xv. 16, f.

§ 115 b.

Some writers have with great probability regarded Timothy as one of the eyewitneses included in the "we," in xvi. 10. The Silas hypothesis has less probability. This source begins, at least, in the extract xvi. 1, is also traceable where the "we" does not occur, in the minuteness of the narrative, and probably is continued (even though not unchanged) to the end of the work.

* Mayerhoff, Einl. in d. petrin. Schr. p. 6, f. (he makes Timothy sole author of the whole work). Bleeck, St. u. Kr. 1836, p. 1028, ff. Ulrich,
St. u. Kr. 1837. p. 369, ff., 1840. p. 1003, ff. Reasons: 1. Timothy, from his introduction in xvi. 3, is demonstrably in Paul's company; so also from xx. 5 forth. That he accompanied Paul to Rome is indeed not presupposed by the spurious Second Epistle to Timothy, but agrees with Col. i. 1, Phil. i. 1. 2. In chap. xvi. 18 the "we" is silent, but Timothy also had no share in these transactions, which is not contradicted by the "we" in 1 Thess. ii. 2. On the supposition that the editor omitted what concerned him, Timothy may have written xvi. 18-40; so also xvii. 1-13. Perhaps he came to Thessalonica and also to Berea at a later period. In xvii. 14 a "we" or an "I" was probably altered. The Apostle's speech, xvii. 21, ff., we owe to his recording. His arrival at Athens, and his mission thence (1 Thess. iii. 2), the editor omitted. After his and Silas's arrival at Corinth (xviii. 5), the narrative becomes more vivid. He followed the Apostle to Ephesus also, xviii. 18 (subsequently, at least), whence he was sent, xix. 22; and hence a good deal of vividness and definiteness comes into the narrative, xviii. 18-xx. 40. (After ver. 22 Timothy may have soon returned.) 3. Into the list of names in xx. 4 the editor introduced Timothy's, who in ver. 5 (where ὃς applies to only the last-mentioned two) again speaks in the first person, and, with Trophimus (xxi. 29), accompanies the Apostle to Jerusalem (for ἥσυχος ὁ δείκτης, xx. 4, is only the first terminus of the journey, xx. 15).

Schwenke, as above, p. 168, ff. Silas is supposed to continue the narrative from chap. xv. on. This, however, makes the introduction of the "we," xvi. 10, more singular. In xvi. 19, the editor, forgetting Timothy, is supposed to have changed the "we" into Silas. This improbable assumption is required, not by the participation of the former in the imprisonment,—this cannot be shown from 1 Thess. ii. 2,—but by the difficulty of understanding the silence in regard to him. After xvii. 16, Silas simply forgot to mention Timothy's arrival at Athens and his mission thence. He did not give the address in xvii. 21, ff., as an ear-witness. In xviii. 18 he tarried in Corinth, and narrated what follows, ver. 24, ff., from hearsay, out of a special interest in the Corinthian community. In xx. 4, ff., this hypothesis has freer play, and admits of setting ὃς, in ver. 5, in contrast with all those mentioned in ver. 4. Thenceforward Silas is included in the "we," and regarded as a companion of the Apostle, not only to Jerusalem but even to Rome. The abruptness of the conclusion, xxviii. 30, ff., may be explained on the theory that he had himself departed immediately, and therefore is not mentioned even in the Epistles from Rome. However, the mention of Timothy in these allows us to suppose that his departure was only a little later.

§ 115 c.

Besides the narrative of an eyewitness in the second part, from xvi. 10 forth, other traces of the use of various sources
appear;* just as, on the other hand, the first part has peculiarities* indicating certain sources peculiar to it. The prominent account of Peter, and the twelfth chapter, which does not clearly fall into the pragmatical connection, seem to have come from a work on this Apostle.⁵ Chapters xiii. and xiv. are perhaps from a special missionary narrative, and chap. vii. from a memoir of Stephen."⁶

* After xii. 25: Βαρνάβας δε καὶ Σαῦλος ἑπιστρέφειν, κ. τ. λ., one and the same hand could not have written xiii. 1. Ἡσαυ δὲ τινες ἐπ’ Ἀρμοχέα ..., προφητει καὶ διδασκαλον δ., τε Βαρσ. κ. Συμεών ... κ. Σαῦλος. The same applies to Ἡρώδου τ. τετράχον and chap. xxv., xxvi. Ἀγρίππας δ. βασιλέως, after Ἡρ. δ. βασιλέως, xii. 1, f.—xix. 16, Lachm.'s reading refers to something that is omitted.—xxi. 10 does not presuppose xi. 28. Peculiarities in the language of the second part: διάλεγονθα ten times; ἐπιστασθα nine times, elsewhere only x. 28, not in the Gospel; ἔγκυλα six times; ἔγγυλημα twice; καταντα, from xvi. 1 forth, nine times; ἤπει, expressing continuance of time, twelve times, elsewhere only in x. 16, xi. 10; ἐδος, of the Christian religion, xix. 9, 23, xxiv. 29, elsewhere only ix. 2. In general, fewer Hebrewisms, although phrases with χουρ, xv. 23, xxi. 27, and often; with στόμα, xv. 7, xviii. 14; with αἴμα, xviii. 6, xx. 26, and often; with μέσον, xvii. 33, xxiii. 10, xxvii. 21; with πρόσωπον, xvii. 26; with φόβος, xix. 17. Precise, although only comparative, chronology. Little miracle, no angels except in dreaming.

* More Hebrew (although this is in itself the appropriate mode of speech for miracle histories and apostolic discourses): Ἦσαυ, v. 21; ὁ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης, iii. 25; ὁ διδάσκαλος, xiii. 10; ἐνόμισεν, in the metaphorical sense, iv. 19, vi. 5, and often; βασιλέας ἐνόμισεν, ix. 15; ἐπὶ ταῦτα ὁ θεός, ii. 5, iv. 19; τὰ περὶ τ. θεοῦ, x. 13, xi. 6. Other kinds of peculiarities: παῖς θεοῦ, iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30; ὁ λευκὸς, v. 24; ἡ γνωσία, v. 21; ἡμὶ τὸ αὐτό, i. 15, and four more times; προκεκαρπηθέντα, six times; ἐξιστάνθη, ἐξιστασθέν, six times; ὁσος, in the first ten chapters, thirteen times, less often in chap. xiii.—xv, afterwards not at all. Mistakes in translation, ii. 24, 33, v. 31, miracles, appearances of angels; chap. ix. 39—42, like Mark v. 38—43.

* We may not, with many, assume the εἰργαμα Πίτρου (Clem. Alex. Strom. VI. 636), for this was an apocryphal work. Euseb. H. E. III. 3.

⁴ Schoenbeek, p. 211, f., observes, in addition to the Petrine source:—1. Fragments of a biography of Barnabas, iv. 36, f., ix. 1—30 (or rather ver. 8—30, for the first verses must be formed upon Paul's two speeches in chap. xxii. and xxvi.), xi. 19—30, xii. 25, xiii. 1—xiv. 27 (originally a missionary narrative), xv. 1—4 (where Silas's memoir have probably been introduced). But the main reason for supposing such a biography of Barnabas that Paul, ix. 27, xi. 25, appears in a measure dependent on him, is not apparent. The chief interest still centres in Paul, who, according to
the history and plan of the Acts, only by degrees arrives at apostolic independence. 2. Schen. draws chap. vi. 8—vii. 59, viii. 2, from a work on Stephen. But the phrases ἐπιστάμεται συμπίπτειν αὐτῶν, vi. 12, recalls iv. 1, xiv. 29, xxii. 27; verse 10, Luke xxi. 10; vii. 1 recalls xvi. 11; the verb παίσταναι, vi. 13, is found in Luke alone, of all the New Testament historians; ὀνείρεσθαι, ver. 15, is one of his favorite words; the verbs ἀκαρδεύειν in vii. 54 (cf. v. 33), ἀπόρρητος in ver. 55, and ὄμοσμακαν in ver. 57, are characteristic of him.

§ 115 d.

If Luke used written sources, it is probable that the letters and discourses of the Apostles and others are not a free composition of his own;* although it must be acknowledged that the use of the Old Testament,♭ and the style of the writing,* are throughout the same, and that similar thoughts and turns occur in the discourses of different persons.♭ It is likely, too, that while not only detached thoughts (xx. 33, ff.), but in a measure also the drift and structure (vii. 2, ff., xvii. 22, ff.), are peculiar and appropriate to the persons and circumstances,* infelicities also occur (i. 18, f., v. 36, x. 28, 37, xiii. 39, xxvi. 20).

* Eichhorn, Einl. II. 28, f. Frisch, Diss. utrumque Luc. comment. ... non tam hist. simplicitatis quam artificiosae tractationis indolem habere, (Frib. 1817.) p. 20, sqq.
♭ The citation of Am. ix. 12, in the speech of James, xv. 16, f., according to the incorrect translation of the LXX., befits neither the speaker nor the hearers.
* Besides the passages mentioned in § 115, a, note b, observe προχειρίζεσθαι, iii. 90, xii. 14, xxvi. 16; μύημα, ii. 29, vii. 16, like Luke viii. 27, xxi. 35, xxiv. 1; ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, iv. 27, x. 34, like Luke iv. 25, xx. 31, 59.
♭ Cf. ii. 25, ff. with xiii. 34, ff.; ii. 39, iii. 25, with xiii. 36; iii. 18 with xiii. 27; iii. 22 with vii. 37; iii. 17, ff. with xvii. 30; x. 40, ff. with xiii. 30, ff. The solemn addresses: i. 10, 16, ii. 14, 22, iii. 12, v. 35, vii. 2, xiii. 16, 26, xv. 13, xvii. 35, xxii. 1.
* According to Ehrard, Krit. d. ev. Gesch. p. 889, both the Petrine and the Pauline discourses have many resemblances both to each other and to the Epistles of these Apostles; but his proofs require a close sifting. Supposed peculiarities of the Petrine addresses: οὐλόσεως ὁ θεός, ii. 31, iii. 21 (not 24, not xi. 14), cf. however Hebr. i. 1, iv. 8, v. 5; μετανοήσατε καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε, iii. 19, viii. 22 (only μετανόησαν); διὰ στόματος θεοῦ (erroneously for διὰ θεοῦ), τῶν προφητῶν, i. 16, iii. 18 (also 21), iv. 25; ἀσφαλέως γνωσκέτω, ii. 36 (ἐπ. λέγ.), kai νῦν οἶδα ἄλληθε, iii. 17 (only καὶ νῦν οἶδα), x.
34 (ἐν τῷ ἀληθίας καταλαμβάνομαι); xii. 11, τῇ ὄρμαιμῇ βουλή is peculiar to Luke, see § 115 a, note b, Luke xxxii. 22; πρόφασεν, ii. 23 (also 1 Pet. i. 2; προφανώσεως, 1 Pet. i. 20), cannot be regarded as peculiar to Peter, cf. Rom. viii. 29, xi. 2. The antithesis of Jesus’s execution and resurrection, ii. 23, ff., iii. 13, ff., iv. 10, v. 30, (not vi. 10,) x. 39, is essentially the same as xiii. 27, ff. Ehrard finds it also in 1 Pet. i. 19, ff., again (!) πάσιν θεοί, iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30. ἰδοὺ ἔχρισεν Ἰησοῦν, iv. 27, x. 38. The turn in ii. 38, f., iii. 19, v. 31, is similar to that in xviii. 30, f. The passage, Psalms cxviii. 29, is cited in Acts iv. 11 and 1 Pet. ii. 7, and by Christ himself. Faith through Jesus Christ, iii. 16, (not v. 31,) 1 Pet. i. 21, unto repentance, blessedness from repentance, iii. 19, v. 31, 1 Pet. ii. 21 (?), iv. 1, ff. (!). πίστεν τοῦ δεόματος Ἰησοῦ, iii. 16, iv. 12 (only δεόμα), 30 (the same), x. 49 (the same), cf. ix. 15, f., 21, 27, xxii. 16, xxvi. 9. ἀνακατάστασις, iii. 21, is, when compared with i. 6, διάβησις, Heb. ix. 11, nothing peculiar. Cf. besides, Seyler, Uber die Reden u. Briefe des Ap. Petr. in Stud. u. Krit. 1839. p. 53, ff.: “Paul’s discourses are given more in Luke’s than in Paul’s language” (Tholuck, Reden des Ap. Paul. in d. AG. ib. 1839. p. 306, ff.) and therefore the lingual peculiarities adduced by Ehrard are for the most part not sustained: ώς, ἀπεχθάληκα κ. οἱ φθορομένοι τοῦ θεοῦ, xiii. 16, 26, cf. x. 9, 22; γενέα, an age, xiii. 36, xiv. 16, cf. xv. 21; ὁ θεός δὲ ἐπέστη τοῦ ὀφραυκοῦ τοῦ τουτου, v. r. λ., xiv. 15, xvii. 24 (!); πάσης, xviii. 21, xxviii. 4, cf. xxii. 22. Luke iv. 23; ἔγω γὰρ οἶδα, xx. 25 (λόγος ἔγω οἶδα), 29 (ACD. 15. all Vulg. all. ἐγώ οἶδα); μετὰ δακρύων, xx. 19 (μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφορίας κ. δακρύων κ. πετρασμόν), 31, cf. Mark ix. 24; πεποιθοῦμαι τῷ θεῷ, xxii. 1, cf. Phil. i. 27; ὁδὸς, religion, xiv. 16 (τὰ ὁδὸς αὐτῶν is different), xxii. 4, xxiv. 14, cf. ix. 2, xix. 9, 23, xxiv. 22. Introduction of short, pregnant, established expressions of Paul by ὅτι, xiv. 22, xvii. 3 (prat. var., as i. 4). The frequent καὶ νῦν, καὶ ταῦτα, xiii. 11, xvii. 30 (merely ταῦτα), xx. 25, 32, (also xxii. 16, xxvi. 6, ) xxviii. 22. The simple ταῦτα without καὶ in Peter only, iv. 29 (καὶ ταῦτα). But καὶ νῦν also iii. 17, x. 5, xvi. 37, xxiii. 21; καὶ ταῦτα also v. 38. καθαρὸς ἔγω — post-position of ἔγω without κόπω — xx. 26 (ὅτι καθαρὸς — BCDE eiµ). That some accordance with Paul is to be expected from the Paulinian Luke is manifest. Much, however, that is adduced is erroneous, or proves nothing, e. g. χαρίζεται, to compassionate, in God’s relation to man, xxv. (not xxvi.) 16 (also 11), xxiv. 24 (not 23), cf. Rom. viii. 32, 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10 (not 12), xiii. 13, Gal. iii. 16, &c.; for there it is used exactly like iii. 14 (in xv. 16 it does not occur). ἀποβολὴ πυρηνίων, xxvii. 29, and Rom. xi. 15 (only ἀποβολή). ἀποφασίας, xiv. 16, and 1 Cor. x. 39 (different), Phil. i. 10. The use of ὡς in xiii. 10, xx. 19, xxiii. 1, but also in xvii. 11, xxiv. 3, xxvii. 31, Jas. i. 2, 1 Pet. ii. 18. τὸ στῆριμα κατ᾽ ἐπιγγέλσιαν (these do not belong together) xxii. 23, also 32 (τὸ ἐπιγγέλσιαν), is a purely Pauline thought (Rom. ix.). The time before Christ a time of ἄγνωστον, xiii. 27 (is parallel with iii. 17), xvii. 30, Rom. ii. 4 (!), x. 3 (!), and many others.
Credibility.

§ 115 e.

If it be correct to derive the chief part of the historic matter of the book from written sources, its credibility is secured from the suspicion of one-sided arbitrariness. However, the demonstrable mistakes (§ 114) show that examination is not superfluous; and, as regards the narratives of miracles, suspicion cannot fail of being excited by the circumstance that some contain what is inconceivable (ii. 5, ff.), some what shocks our moral sense (v. 1, ff.), and some vary on being repeated (cf. ix. 7 with xxii. 9; ver. 29, f. with xxii. 17, f.). Ignorance of Jewish history and customs appears in v. 36, f., x. 28.

* Baur's suspicions, expressed in his Abh. üb. Zweck u. Veranlassung des Röm. Br. (cf. Küng, in Stud. u. Kr. 1837, p. 290, ff.), detailed more fully in his work, Paulus der Ap. J. Chr. 1845, have little critical worth, for he pays no regard to the sources used, even where the eyewitness speaks, Acts xvi. 16, ff., and leaves his readers in the dark on this point. "... By this, however, the possibility (?) must not be excluded of its being based on previous works, collections, narratives, journals, as for instance that from Luke's hand of Paul's last journey. That it (the Acts) bears on its front the name of Luke (?) presupposes, first, merely the opinion that ... (it) can have originated only in the Apostle's vicinity. But it must also be considered that the author himself, to whom we ascribe the Acts in its present form, must have shared this opinion, for only thus can we explain why, in passages in whose connection Luke is mentioned by name, (where are these passages?) he used the communicative form of address." Paulus, etc., p. 19.

The assertion, that the Paul of the Acts is another than that of the Pauline Epistles (p. 10, cf. Schneckenb. p. 150), is an exaggeration, and it is too bold to doubt the truth of facts attested by an eyewitness, xxii. 20, ff. Paul himself attests his high regard for the Jewish nation and law, Rom. ix. 3, ff.; that he would not do away the essence of the law, Rom. iii. 31; the priority of the Jews in respect of the Gospel, Rom. i. 16, iii. 1, ff.; his spirit of accommodation, 1 Cor. ix. 20.

Date of Composition.

§ 116.

As the narrative closes in the second year of Paul's imprisonment (xxviii. 30), and makes no mention of his death,
the composition is usually supposed to have taken place in that year, and the work to be incomplete. Both are incorrect. The Gospel was probably written after the destruction of Jerusalem (§ 101 c); the Acts still later;* and therefore the farther history of the Apostle cannot have been unknown to the author. The ground of his silence lay in the work from which he drew, which, while it extended only so far, yet led him to the end that he had in view (§ 113 a). That the author designed adding yet a third part is an arbitrary assumption (Heinrichs, Credner).

* The passage viii. 26, even if it refer to the destruction of Gaza shortly before the Jewish war, mentioned by Josephus, B. J. II. 18. 1 (Hug, Einl. I. 23), does not serve to fix the date of the composition. The silence regarding the destruction of Jerusalem can also prove nothing.

Acceptance in the Church.

§ 117 a.

Before Irenæus we find, at the utmost, allusions to Acts, but no distinct quotation from it.* But in this Father (after 177) the proofs of its acceptance are numerous and certain enough. The book seems to have been less read than the Gospels, and therefore less known.6


nium virum Macedonem, dicentem: Veniens in Macedoniam opitulare nobis, Pauli, statim, ait, quasivimus profisceri in Macedoniam, intelligentes, quan-
niam provocavit nos Dominus evangelizare eis. Navigantes igitur a Troade, 
direxit navi in Samothracem (Act. xvi. 8, sqq.): et deinceps reliquum
onnum ipsorum usque ad Philippus adventum diligentur significat, et quem-
admodum primum sermonem loquuti sunt: Sedentes enim, inquit, loquuti
sumus mulieriis quae contenerant (ver. 13); et quinam crediderunt, et quam
multi. Et iterum ait: Nos autem navigavimus post dies axyrom a Phi-
llipis, et venimus Troadem, ubi et commorati sumus diebus septem (Act. xx. 6).
Et reliqua omnia ex ordine cum Paulo refert, etc. Ibid. § 2. . . . In Mileto
convocatis episcopis et presbyteris, qui erant ab Epheso . . . . multa testifi-
cans eis et dicens quae oportet ei Hierosolymis evenire, adjecit (Paulus):
scio quoniam jam non videbitis faciem meam, etc. (Act. xx. 17, sqq.). —
Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons to those in Asia and Phry-
gia, in Eccli. H. E. V. 2: . . . . Kαὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τῷ δεύτερῳ 
Παυλοῦ προστάτου, 
καθάρρις Στέφανος ὁ τῆς κοινῆς προστάτης. 
Καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸν τοῦ ἰδίου τοῦ 
τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἄνδρων 
τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, κ. τ. λ. (Acts xxvii. 29). Tertull. De baptismo, c. 10: Adeo post-
ea in Actis Apostolorum invenimus, quoniam qui Joannis baptismum 
habebant, non accipient Spiritum sanctum, quem ne auditu quidem niver-
rant. De jejun. c. 10: Porro cum in eodem commentario Lucae et tertia
hora orationis demonstretur, sub qua Spiritu s. initiati pro ebris habebant,
et sexta, qua Petrus ascendit in superiorem, etc.

Some heretics rejected the Acts, but on arbitrary and dog-
matic grounds. By the Catholic Church it has never been
doubted, and it therefore belongs to the universally accepted
books. There appears, however, a slight difference of opin-
ion regarding the author.

Augustin. De util. cred. c. 2. n. 7: Nosti autem, quod auctorius sui
Manichaei personam in apostolorum numerum inducere molientes, dicunt
Spiritum s., quem Dominus discipulis suis se missurum esse promisit, per
ipsam ad nos venisse. Itaque si illus Actus Apostolorum accipierent, in
quibus adventus s. Spiritus predicatur, non invenirent, quomodo id immis-
sum esse dicerent. Augustin. Ep. 237. (al.253.) n. 2: Nam quidam Mani-
chaei canonice librum, cujus titulus est Actus Apostolorum, repudiunt.
Timent enim evidentissimam veritatem, ubi apparat s. Spiritus missus, qui
est a Domino Jesu Christo in evangelica veritate promissus. Sub ejus
quippe Spiritus nomine, a quo penitus alieni sunt, indecta hominum corda
decipiunt, mira caecitate asserentes, eandem Domini promissionem in suo haeresiarcha Manichaeo esse completam. Quod et illi haeretici faciunt, qui vocantur Cataphryges, dicentes per nescio quos insanos, Montanum scilicet et Priscillam, quos et proprios suos prophetas habent, venisse Spiritum s., quem Dominus missurum se esse promisit. — Euseb. H. E. IV. 29, on the Severians: Χρώνα τε μὲν ὅν οὗτοι νόμο καὶ προφήται καὶ εὐαγγελιούς, ἵνα ἐµπνεύσοντες τῶν λευκῶν τὰ νόημα γραφῶν ἐλαφθοῦντες δὲ Παῦλον τῶν ἀπόστολον, ἀποτεύσων αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς, μηδὲ τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων καταδεχόμενοι.


c Photius, Amphiloch. quesest. 145, in Galland, Bibl. patr. XIII. 722:


CHAPTER VI.

OF PAUL AND HIS WRITINGS IN GENERAL.

Chronology of his Life.

§ 118.

Only towards the end of his life do we find pretty well-established points for determining the chronology. From these we must go backwards, but without always expecting entire accuracy.

Chronological Table.

A. D.

64. In the middle of this year the persecution of the Christians broke out under Nero. Paul must therefore have gone to Rome not later than A. D. 62; otherwise he could not have lived and preached there two years. Therefore,

61 or 62, in the Spring, he arrived at Rome (Acts xxviii. 11–16), and

60 – 61, in the Autumn, began his journey towards Rome (Acts xxvii. 1, 9).

Porcius Festus entered on the government of Judæa. Joseph. An-
CHRONOLOGY OF HIS LIFE. § 118.

A. D.


58 or 59. Two years before P. Festus’s induction Paul was imprisoned at Jerusalem (Acts xxv. 27). At that time Felix had already been procurator many years (Acts xxiv. 10); he entered upon his office, however, A. D. 53 (Joseph. Antiq. XX. 7. 1. B. Jud. II. 12. 8, in opposition to which Tacitus, Ann. XII. 54, . . . jam pridem Judaeae impositus . . . ., is in error), about the same time with Agrippa’s transference from Chalcis to the tetrarchate of Philip, after the twelfth year of Claudius.

— — — — After Easter of this year Paul departs from Philippi and arrives at Jerusalem, at Pentecost (Acts xx. 6, 16, xxi. 17). He had previously tarried three months in Achasia (Acts xx. 3).

57 or 58. Journey from Ephesus to Macedonia (Acts xx. 1), probably at the close of the year.

He had previously dwelt about three years at Ephesus (Acts xix. 8, 10, xx. 31); therefore,

54—55. Arrived at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1).

Before this, a journey through Galatia and Phrygia (Acts xviii. 23), and

Stay in Antioch (Acts xviii. 22), which must have consumed about a year.


A.D.

Before this, a stay of a year and a half at Corinth (Acts xvii. 11); hence,

52–53. Arrival at Corinth about contemporaneously with the expulsion of the Jews from Rome (Sueton. In Claud. c. 25, Acts xvii. 1), which took place in the period from A. D. 48 to 54. Wurm, as above, p. 49. Anger, l. c. 116, sqq.

Before this,

50–51. The third journey to Jerusalem, to the assembly of the Apostles (Acts xv. 2, ff.)
Previously:—

(†) The first missionary journey (Acts xiii. and xiv.).

Before this, at the time

44–45. The second journey to Jerusalem (Acts xi. 30), after 43 or 44. A stay of one year at Antioch (Acts xi. 25, ff.), and,
41–42 (or 42–43). An undetermined, perhaps two years’, stay at Tarsus (Acts ix. 30).
40 or 41 (41 or 49). First journey to Jerusalem, three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18, Acts ix. 26).
37 or 38 (38 or 39). His conversion, fourteen years (Gal. ii. 1) before his journey to Jerusalem, A. D. 50 or 51 (Acts xv).

But the interval between the last two events is too great. That especially between A. D. 44 or 45 and 51 or 52 is not sufficiently filled up. Hence, the change in the reading of Gal. ii. 1 from διὰ δεξαμενοῦν to διὰ αναστάσεως, proposed by Grotius, Capellus, &c., and lately adopted by Guérin (Beitr. p. 85), Küchler (De anno quo P. conversus est L. 1838), Wurm (as above, p. 59, ff.), may appear probable. We must then, however, set the data in Acts xv. 2, xv. 36–xvii. 1, farther back, and reckon the four years from the first journey to Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18), so that the conversion would fall about A. D. 40, and the journey in Acts xv. 2 about A. D. 47. But this calculation is again disturbed by the journey in Acts xi. 30, A. D. 44 or 45, because the time between the first journey to Jerusalem (which took place A. D. 43) and the second (A. D. 44 or 45) is too short to include Paul’s stay at Tarsus and Antioch (Küchler considers the stay in Tarsus as of several years’ duration; while Schrader [Der Ap. Paulus, i Th. L. 1830. p. 60] considers it quite short). According to Keil (De defin. temp. itineris P. Hierosolym. Gal. ii. 1, commemorati in Pott, Syllog. III. 68), Hünlein, Bertholdt, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Fritzsch (Fritsch. Opusc. p. 294, sqq.), Böttger (Beitr. III. 19, ff.), and others, the journey in Acts xi. 30 is one and the same with that mentioned in Gal. ii. 1. They reckon it, however,
different: Hünlein fourteen years after the conversion, Berthold and Kuinoel four years after the same (manifestly too early). Heinrichs four years after the first journey. J. E. Chr. Schmidt (Chronol. d. AG. in Keil's and Tzschirner's Anal. III. 137) sets this journey wholly aside, regarding it as identical with that in Gal. i. 18. Schrader, I. 72, ff., 120, II. 299, ff., places the journey in Gal. ii. 1 before Acts xx. 2.

If we retain the reading δια δεικτηρογιαυω, we must assume a pretty early date for the conversion; that above given, A. D. 37 or 38 (or, if the year of the journey be included in the fourteen years, A. D. 38 or 39), the fourth or fifth after Jesus's death, would be the earliest possible. The circumstance, that when Paul escaped from Damascus (2 Cor. xi. 32, Acts ix. 25) the ethnarch of Aretas, king of Arabia, was in command at Damascus, contributes very little to the determination of the year of Paul's conversion, as it is not yet proved that this resulted from an invasion (Wurm, p. 27, Anger, p. 180; on the other side, Win. Art. Art., Guerike, Einf. 336, who considers this invasion as a fact, about the time of the Roman expedition against A. in A. D. 37, and finds in it a settled point for the calculation of the Apostle's chronology). The passage 2 Cor. xii. 2 can also contribute nothing to the determination of the year of Paul's conversion, for it is not likely that Paul meant here the vision narrated in Acts ix.

The different determinations of the year of Paul's conversion given by chronologists are: Eusebius, A. D. 33, the year of Christ's death; Baronius, A. D. 34, two years after Jesus's death; Usserius, Pearson, Hug, A. D. 35, two years after; Calvisius, A. D. 34, one year after; Spanheim, A. D. 39 or 40; Bengel, A. D. 31, one year after; Vogel (Ver. ü. chronol. Standpunkte, &c., in Gabler's Journ. f. ausserl. theol. Litt. I. 9), A. D. 33, two years after; Siucke, as above, A. D. 32, that of Jesus's death; Eichhorn, A. D. 37 or 38, five years after; Schmidt, A. D. 41; Hünlein, between 36 and 38 (Jesus's death A. D. 33); Berthold, A. D. 40; Heinrichs, A. D. 37, four years after; Kuinoel, A. D. 40, seven years after; Schrader, A. D. 39, four years after; Hensel (D. Ap. Paulus, Gött. 1830), A. D. 35; Schott (Isag.), A. D. 40 or 41; (Erörterung.), A. D. 37 – 39 (year of Jesus's death, 33). Meyer (Comm. ü. d. AG.), A. D. 35 (Jesus's death, A. D. 31). Cf. the tables drawn up by Gütchen, Anger, as above, Olsenhagen, Comm. II. 550, ff.

Several dissenting and paradoxical views presented by Köhler (Ver. üb. d. Abfassungs. d. epistol. Schriften im N. T. u. d. Apokal. L. 1830) and Schrader, are examined by Schott (Erörterung., &c.), Wurm, Anger, as above.

History of Paul's Life. — His Descent and Culture.

§ 119 a.

Paul — so called as missionary of the faith to the heathen (Acts xiii. 9 – xxviii., 1 Thess. i. 1, and often), his original
name being *Saul* (Acts vii. 58—xiii. 9) — was born at Tarsus in Cilicia (Acts ix. 11, xxi. 39, xxiii. 3), of Jewish parents of the tribe of Benjamin (Phil. iii. 5), and with the rights of a Roman citizen (Acts xvi. 37, xxii. 27, f.).

*Jerome*, Catal. c. 5: Quumque primum ad praelectionem ejus Sergius Paulus proconsul Cypri credidisset, ab eo, quod eum Christi fidei subegerat, sortitus est nomen Paulus (!). This double nomenclature is best explained by the custom of the Jews, especially of such as were Roman citizens, to bear double (Roman) names (cf. Acts xii. 12, 25, xiii. 1, Col. iv. 11). That is the Acts he is at first called Saul, and afterwards Paul, comes from his being known by the latter name as Apostle among the heathen Christians; and the introducing it in xiii. 9 is occasioned by the first act of apostolic power on the part of him who had hitherto been but a missionary. *Win. RBW*. II. 350. *Neand*. Gesch. d. Pflanzung, etc., I. 135. For other opinions, see *Wits*. Meletem. Leid. p. 47. *Kuinoel*, Ad Acta, xiii. 9.

*b* The statement in *Jerome*, l. c.: . . . . . de tribu Benjamin et oppido Judeae Giscalis fuit, quo a Romane capita, cum parentibus suis Tarsum Ciliciæ commigravit, — contradicts the Apostle's own statement, Acts xxii. 3.


§ 119 b.

Paul in his youth did not profit by the Greek culture which flourished at Tarsus. He went early to Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 3),* where he received, under Gamaliel, a pharisaico-rabbinic training, the stamp of which his writings bear. He seems, however, to have subsequently, perhaps during his stay at Tarsus (Acts ix. 30), become acquainted with Graeco-Jewish learning.† Although destined, as it seems, for a scholar, he acquired, according to the Jewish custom, a trade, that of tent-maker (σκηνοποιοὺς.)* He was never married (1 Cor. vii. 7).†


† *Thalemann*, De eruditione Pauli jud., non Graec. Lips. 1769. 4to., against the exaggerated opinions of the older writers, e. g. *Strobach*, De eruditione Pauli Apostoli. Lips. 1708. 8vo. *Schramm*, De stupenda erudizione

* Cf. Hug, Einl. II. 338, Eichhorn, III. 8, who, however, erroneously limit his trade to Cilician haircloth.

4 On the other hand, the opinion that he was married, based on Phil. iv. 3, 1 Cor. ix. 5. Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 448. Euseb. H. E. III. 20.

Paul's Entrance into Christian History.

§ 120.

In consequence of his pharisaic culture, he appeared on the stage as a zealot for the law of his fathers and as a persecutor of the young Christian Church (Acts vii. 58—viii. 3, ix. 2). But a mysterious occurrence on the road to Damascus (Acts ix. 3, ff., xxi. 6, ff., xxvi. 13, ff., 1 Cor. xv. 8, ix. 1),\(^a\) in conjunction with an internal revelation (Gal. i. 15, f.), converted him into a confessor and proclaimer of Christ; so that when, after spending some time in Arabia, he returned to Damascus (Gal. i. 17), he drew persecution on himself (Acts ix. 23—25, 2 Cor. xi. 32, f.). After a brief interview with two Apostles in Jerusalem he withdrew to Cilicia (Acts ix. 26—30, Gal. i. 18—21),\(^b\) where Barnabas sought him out and took him to Antioch, there to work in company with himself (Acts xi. 25).

The sudden revolution in his mode of thinking is at first view the more remarkable, as the formerly strict Pharisee apprehended Christianity with a freer spirit than almost any other disciple, and loosed it from all the bands of Judaism excepting the rabbinic mode of using Scripture, and the eschatology. However, many psychologic reasons may be shown;\(^c\) and the passionate aberration to which his zeal for the Law drove him explains how, when he once acknowledged the truth, he acknowledged the whole truth, and placed himself in the distinctest opposition to Judaism.


\(^b\) 30

* Schrader, II. 161, f., and others, suppose that he preached in Cilicia. Cf. Acts xv. 23, 41.


**Paul's Missionary Journeys.**

§ 121 a.

The church at Antioch, where he labored with other Hellenistic teachers, became the mother-church of that Christianity which was to embrace the world and comprehend all men. She sent him and Barnabas forth on a missionary journey to Cyprus, Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia. At first they addressed the Jews, but on being rejected by them, turned to the heathen. They established mixed churches of Jews and Gentiles (Acts xiii., xiv.). As a counter action subsequently arose on the part of the Judaistic Christians in Judæa, some of whom excited opposition to Paul and Barnabas in Antioch, they went to Jerusalem to obtain the countenance of the church there. Their mission was successful (Acts xv., Gal. ii. 1—10).*

Hereupon Paul, without Barnabas, took his second missionary journey, through Syria, Cilicia, Lycaonia, Phrygia, Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia. In Achaia he made a lengthened stay, thence journeyed to Jerusalem, to a festival, and returned to Antioch (Acts xv. 36—xviii. 22). During this journey he established churches in Galatia (Acts xvi. 6), Thessalonica, Philippi, and Corinth; and in the last-mentioned city wrote his Epistles to the Thessalonians.

* Keil (p. 214) and others regard this journey as the one mentioned in Acts xi. 30. The majority, however, accept the above theory (see Winer, Exc. II. ad ep. ad Gal., Meyer, on Gal. ii. 1, my Exeg. Hdb. ib.), and either suppose the Apostle to pass over that journey in silence, or regard it as not having taken place.
Luke is silent on this point; however, the words, καλωδίως ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος λαλήσαν τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ (Asia proconsulari) do not contradict it.

§ 121 b.

After a stay in Antioch, Paul took a third journey, to Galatia and Phrygia, to strengthen the churches which he had founded there (Acts xviii. 23), and then took up his abode at Ephesus, where he remained more than two years (Acts xix.). Here probably he wrote his Epistle to the Galatians, and, towards the close of his residence, the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Hereupon he went to Macedonia and Achaia, and remained three months at Corinth (Acts xx. 1, 2). Before his arrival there he wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and at Corinth the Epistle to the Romans. During this period he exerted himself greatly to raise a contribution in aid of the Christians at Jerusalem (Acts xxiv. 17, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, ff., 2 Cor. viii. f., Rom. xv. 25, ff.).

* In regard to the journey to Corinth, which the Acts has not mentioned, and some writers have supplied, see § 139 a, note a.

Paul's Arrest.

§ 121 c.

In the spring of this year he went from Philippi by way of Troas to Miletus, and thence through Tyre, Ptolemais, and Cæsarea to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 3—xxi. 16), where, in spite of a precautionary measure and of his defence before his countrymen, he incurred the hatred of the Jews, and was imprisoned (Acts xxii. 17—xxii. 29). In vain he defended himself before the Sanhedrim and the procurator Felix, who kept him in prison two years at Cæsarea (Acts xxii. 30—xxiv. 27). Receiving no justice even from Festus, the successor of Felix, he found himself compelled to appeal to the Emperor, and was accordingly carried a prisoner to Rome, where he remained two years before his case was decided (Acts xxv. xxvii. xxviii.). Here he wrote his Epistles to Philemon, the Colossians, and the Philippians, and it is commonly supposed also the Epistle to the Ephesians.
Paul's Second Imprisonment at Rome, and Execution.

§ 122 a.

Several Church Fathers, and even Eusebius, represent the Apostle as suffering martyrdom in Nero's persecution of the Christians. * Eusebius asserts, on the authority of a Church tradition, that before this time he was liberated from the imprisonment at Rome, mentioned in Acts, under Nero.

* Euseb. H. E. II. 25: Κρατασματικής δ' ἦν τῇ Νεώτης τῆς ἅρχης .... κατ' αὐτής ὑπόλειτο τῆς εἰς τῶν ἄλων θεῖαν ἑυσέβεια .... Τούτου δὲ πάλιν ὁ Ῥωμαίος Τερτυλλιανός .... μημονεῖ. .... Ταύτη γεων οὔτε θορώκες ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα πρῶτοι ἀνασκομβίην, ἐπὶ τὰ κατὰ τῶν ἀνεοτῶν ἐπάθρον σφαγάς. Παύλου δὲ οὖν ἐπὶ αὐτῆς Ὁμήρης τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνεπαρθήρηκε, καὶ Πέτρος ὁσίος ἀνασκομβίην ἐπὶ αὐτὸν ἑπαρθήρανη. Καὶ πιστοὶ γε τῇ ἤστατοι ἡ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου εἰς δεύορον κατήμασαν εἰς τῶν αὐτῶν καρπωτριών πρόσφημοι. Όμοι δὲ ήπτον καὶ ἐκθλησιαστικός ἁγίω Γέιτων ὁσίω, κατὰ Ζεσφύριον Ῥωμαίων γεγόνος ἐπίσκοπον (about A.D. 196), δὲ δὴ Πρόκλω τῆς κατὰ Φρύγας προϊσταμένης γυναῖκος ἐγγράφος διαλεγόμεθα, αὐτὰ δὴ ταύτα περὶ τῶν τόσων ἔνθα τῶν εἰρημένων ἀποστόλων τὰ ἱερὰ σεμνάτα ἐπισκεπτόμεθα, φησιν: "Εὐγε δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ἀποστόλων ἦχυ δείκτω." Εἰ δ' ζηλωθῆς ἀπελευθή ταὐτό τῷ Βασιλείῳ, ἡ ἐπὶ τὴν ὅλην τὴν Ὀστίαν, εὐφήγη τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταύτην ἄνθρωπον τῆν ἐκθλησίαν." ("Strictly speaking, this is only a proof that the Apostle suffered here during this persecution; the place of martyrdom is the Christian's token of victory, even although it was not his burial-place." Description of Rome by Plauter, Bunsen, etc., II. 1. 52.

"This is the more probable, as according to other accounts, the bones of the Apostle, pretended to have been found in the Catacombs, were first transferred to his grave between A.D. 260 and 330, when the Constantinian Basilica enclosed it. Eusebius, however, manifestly understood the words of Caius to refer to the graves of the Apostles." Baur, Paul., etc., p. 237.) Ὅμω δὲ κατὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἠμισθ. καίρων ἐμαρτύρησαν, Κορυφίων ἐπίσκοποι Διονύσιος (about A.D. 170) ἐγγράφος Ῥωμαίοις ὁμολόγοις, ὁδεῖ ποιεί γράφειν. "Ταύτα (ταύτης) καὶ ὡμείς, διὰ τῆς τοιάτου νουθεσίας, τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτείαν γενῆσας Ῥωμαίοις τε καὶ Κορυφίων συνεκρατήσατε. Καὶ γὰρ ἠμισθ. καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόμνου φυτεύσαστε ἡμᾶς, ὡμοίος ἐδίδαχαν. ὡμοίος δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἱγιαλίτες ὁμοίος διδάχατες, ἐμαρτύρησατε κατὰ τῶν αὐτῶν καίρων." Tertull. Scorpiane, c. 15: Orientem sedem Romanus primus Nero creuntavit. Tunc Petrus ab alto cingitur, quam cruci adstringitur. Tunc Paulus civitatis Romanæ consequeitur nativitatem, quum illic martyri renascitur generositate. De praescript. c. 36: Habes Romanam .... ubi Petrus passioni dominicae adaequatur, Paulus Johannis exitu coronatur. Euseb. Chron. ed. Maj. et Zohrab. p. 375: Néro ad cetera scelerà persecu-


§ 122 b.

But if the Apostle perished in the persecution under Nero, the chronology (§ 118) allows no interval for his re-
lease from the first imprisonment and for a second. As we find, before the time of Eusebius, but one, and that a very uncertain, support, in *Clement* of Rome, for this supposed tradition; as *Origen* is totally ignorant of it; as, moreover, Eusebius, in support of his statement, appeals quite too emphatically to 2 Timothy,—we seem constrained to regard it as a supposition of his own, made after the example of some other Father.  

— Ep. 1. ad Corinth. c. 5: Πέτρος διὰ ζηλον ἄλλων οὐχ ἔναι ὀδὴ δύο, ἀλλὰ πλέον τὸν τόπον θύμος, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δοξῆς. Διὰ ζηλον ὁ Παῦλος ὑπομνήσῃ βραβεῖον ἀπόσχεν, ἐπίτηδε δειμαρ φορεῖς, ῥαβδίσθεις, λαθασθεῖς· κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δυστε, τῷ γενναίῳ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἔλαβεν. Διεκκατοστήσας διδάξει διὸν τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τίμημα τῆς δύστες λάβον, καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν υἱομένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπορεύθη, ὑπομνήσῃ γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑπογραμμός. Περὶ τίμημα τῆς Σπαίνας is understood, and by ὑγιομένως the administrators of the empire, Helios and Polycletos, appointed during Nero's absence; and thus Paul's death is fixed in the latest part of Nero's reign (*Heidenreich*, Pastoral. II. 15). The latter expression is understood more correctly by *Neander*, AG. I. 390, Schott, Erörterung. p. 129, as a general expression for the mighty of the earth (Matt. x. 19); and that τὸ τίμημα τῆς δύστες cannot refer to Spain is shown by the connection; for the three clauses, ὑπομνήσῃ... ἀπόσχεν, τὸ γεν. ἔλαβεν, ἀπηλλάγη, κ.τ.λ., are co-ordinated, and the participles belonging to them all refer to the same factum. Consequently, ἐν τῇ δυστε and ἐπὶ τὸ τίμημα τῆς δύστες λάβον indicate the same thing, while the relative τίμημα may without difficulty be regarded as a strong rhetorical expression for the far-east terminus of the Apostle's course (cf. Rom. xv. 19). See *Schenkel*, Ueb. d. zweite Gefangensch. d. Ap. Paul. in Stud. u. Krit. 1841. p. 77 (with whom I cannot quite agree in taking the expression in its subjective sense), cf. Schrader, I. 235. Baur, Tüb. Zeitschr. 1831. IV. 148, ff. *Clement* wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem (Schenkel, p. 65), and cannot, therefore, mention Paul's martyrdom as later than in Nero's persecution; but for that very reason it is not probable that he, like later writers (Athenasius ad Dracont. ep. T. I. p. 956. *Cyrill.* Hieros. catech. XVII. 3), refers to and rests on Rom. xv. 24, because of the Apostle's journey to Spain. On the other hand, Dionysius's assertion, that Peter preached in Corinth, may well have originated in 1 Cor. i. 19.—In *MuraTorri's* Fragm. on the Canon (Part I. § 21), another trace of the journey to Spain is found: Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt Lucas optime Theophilum comprehendit, qui sub praesentia ejus singula gerebantur, sicut et semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat, sed profec tionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam profiscantur. *Cf. Hug*, I. 124.
Paul's Epistles. § 123 a.

The letters of the Apostle are the most important monuments of the early Christian times, although almost all refer to subjects of special, and in part ephemeral, interest. They are the true expression of a great mind, and both in their contents and style of writing bear a distinct literary stamp;* hence the theory of Bollten and Bertholdt, that they were composed in Aramaic, has not the slightest likelihood. The genuineness of the most important of them is beyond all dispute, and they form the solid kernel of the collected writings of the New Testament. Antiquity, with one consent, accepted thirteen Epistles of Paul as genuine; only the fourteenth, that to the Hebrews, was disputed.\(^b\) Modern criticism has started doubts against but a few of them, the strongest against the so-called pastoral letters and that to
the Ephesians. Their arrangement in the manuscripts and editions of the New Testament rests on an arbitrary disposition of the rank of the communities and persons to whom they are addressed. We prefer to arrange them according to the chronology of their composition.

* Wholly, or in the main, peculiar ideas, words, and idioms: ἐγκάθωσθή, ἐγκαθωσθή, δικαίωσθε, δικαιώμα, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνα, καταλλάσσεσθαι, καταλλαγή, μετίθη, νοοθεία, ἀνθρωπος παλαιός, ἄνδρ. καινός, κτίσις καυή, χειρομα, contrast of πίστις and νόμος, of σάρξ and πνεῦμα, ἐκδίκεσθαι, εἰςδίκεσθαι in the tropical sense, κεφαλή of Christ, κλῆσις, οἰκοδομή, μυστήριον, σε βία υμᾶς ἄγνοιαν, βία υμᾶς εἴδεται, γινόμενοι ὁμ. βούλουμα, γενομένως ὁμ. τούτο δέ φημι, οὐδα γάρ, τί ἐροῦμεν; ἄλλ' ἐρεῖς, ή ἄγνοιε; μή γένουσα, τί oû; τί γάρ; Cf. § 161 a, note b. The style of the Apostle is distinguished by parenthases, anacolutha, and rapid turns.

b See the testimony of Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alex., and Eusebius, in Part I. §§ 21, 23, 24.

§ 123 b.

Probably one of Paul's Epistles is lost, that which preceded our First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 9).a We have in Armenian a pretended Third Epistle following the other two to the Corinthians, and an earlier letter from the Corinthians to Paul. Both, however, are spurious. Col. iv. 16⁰ refers to a lost letter to the Laodiceans. On the other hand, we have a spurious interchange of letters between Seneca and Paul.a

* But Chrysost. and others understand ἐν τῇ ἐνσυνολογῇ to mean the First Ep. to the Corinthians itself. They do not admit that letters have been lost. So also J. G. Müller, De tribis Pauli itineribus Corinthum suscepsit de epistolisque ad eodem non deperditis. Bas. 1831. p. 23, sqq. Stosch, De epistolis App. non deperditis. Gron. 1753. Bleck’s theory of a letter to the Corinthians written between our two canonical epistles, see § 133, note a.

thios, quae dicitur periiase, ex cod. ms. Armen. nunc primum editae separa-
Svo. Complete according to several Armenian MSS. in Pasqual Aucher,
Grammar Armenian and English. Venice, 1819. p. 117. W. F. Rink, Das
Pauli an die Corinth. in arm. Uebers. erhalten, und verdeutscht u. mit
einer Einl. üb. d. Aechth. begleiteten. Heidelberg. 1823. Against the genuine-
ness maintained by him, see Ullmann, in the Heidelb. Jahrb. 1823. No. 34.

* Erroneous explanation of Theodoret and others, that a letter from the
Laodiceans to Paul is meant. Many vainly try to prove the Epistle to the
Ephesians to be this (§ 145). Stein (Anh. z. a. Comm. z. Ev. Luc.), rest-
ing on an ambiguous passage in Philast. Haeres. LXXXVIII., considers
it the Epistle to the Hebrews. Cf. Schneckenburger, Beitr. z. Einl. ins N.
T. p. 153, ff. Following several older writers (Egin, Affeimann, Zellner),
Wiesseler (Progr. de ep. Laodicens. Gott. 1844) seeks it in the Epistle to
Philemon. Text. Comm. ad Coloss. iv. 16: Tisus ἐπιλά-
βου καὶ πρὸς λαοδικίας αὐτῶν γεγραφέναι, αὐτίκα τοῖς καὶ προσφέροντι πε-
πλησμένην ἐπιστολήν. 'O δὲ θεός ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἔφη, καὶ τὴν πρὸς λαοδικίας
ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἐκ λαοδικίας: ἀκούσας γὰρ πρὸς αὐτῶν περὶ τῶν ἔργων. Εἰ-
κώς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἢ ἃ ἐν Καλλονίσσα γενόμενα αὐτίκασθαι, ἢ τὰ αὐτά τοῖς
πεπλησμένοις. Διὸ καὶ ταύτῃ εἰς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν κακίους ἀναγιγμοῦραι. Cf.
Fabric. Cod. apocr. N. T. II. 866, sqq., where, and in p. 873, sqq., the
letter itself is translated into Latin and Greek (according to Hutter, in his N. T.
XII. Lingg.-Norimb. 1699), and printed. It is found also in Reineck.

* Hieron. De vir. ill. c. 12: Lucius Annaeus Seneca Cordubensis . . .
quem non ponerem in catalogo Sanctorum, nisi me illae epistola evocare-
nt, quae leguntur a plurimis, Pauli ad Senecam et Senecae ad Paulum.
Augustin. Ep. 153 (al. 54) ad Macedonium, § 14: Merito ait Seneca, qui
temporibus Apostolorum fuit, cujus etiam quasdam ad Paulum Apost.
leguntur epistolas: omnes edit, qui malos edit. The letters are found in

Aids to the Exegetes of the Epistles of Paul.

Svo. — Henr. Bullinger, Comm. in omnes epp. apost. Tig. 1537. fol. —
Wolfg. Mastic Comm. in epp. ad Rom. (Bas. 1555. fol.), ad Corinth. (1559),
PAUL'S EPISTLES.


CHAPTER VII.

PAUL'S EPISTLES WRITTEN BEFORE HIS IMPRISONMENT.

I. Epistles to the Thessalonians.


Founding of the Church at Thessalonica.

§ 124.

Thessalonica (Θεσσαλονίκη), formerly Thermæ, situated on the Bay of Thermæ, newly built by Cassander and named in honor of his wife Thessalonica, daughter of Philip the Elder, in the time of the Romans capital of the second district of Macedonia, and a very populous commer-
cial city, was visited by Paul in company with Silas,* on his second missionary journey. He soon gained adherents there, especially among the Proselytes, but was compelled in a short time to leave the city on account of a tumult raised by the Jews (Acts xvii. 1—9). His preaching of the Gospel, which, on account of the shortness of the time, was incomplete (1 Thess. iii. 10, iv. 13), seems to have had a prevailingly apocalyptic tendency (hence the political charges of the Jews, Acts xvii. 7), and to have made a profound impression on the susceptible minds of the Thessalonians. —Thence he went to Berea, whence also he was driven, and compelled to go to Athens; but he left his companions behind with instructions soon to follow him (Acts xvii. 10—15). Meanwhile he went to Corinth, where they rejoined him (Acts xviii. 5).

* According to Acts xvii. 1, Timothy seems to have remained at Philippi, and subsequently to have followed him. Acts xvii. 14 shows him at Berea. According to 1 Thess. i. 1, ii. 1, Timothy also stood in close connection with the church at Thessalonica, although this may rest on his journey thither, iii. 1, f. It is, however, possible that he went from Philippi to Thessalonica.

First Epistle.

§ 125 a.

According to the indications contained in the Epistle, Paul wrote it in the company of Silvanus (Silas) and Timothy (i. 1), while yet full of the recollection of his visit to Thessalonica (i. 9, ii. 1, ff.); he longed to see the Christians there once more (iii. 10), and was filled with anxiety about them (iii. 5). On this account he had twice purposed to revisit them (ii. 17, f.), and had sent Timothy to them (iii. 1, ff.). In their depressed condition they needed strengthening (iii. 2, f., 13, cf. ii. 14) and further improvement (iii. 10). The accounts brought by Timothy were quieting; the community was firm in faith and active in its love (iii. 6—9, iv. 10). It suffered, however, from some immoralities, which the Apostle had already orally rebuked (iv. 3—6, 11, f., v. 14), and needed, in general, moral admonition. Instruc-
tion regarding the fate of the dead at Christ’s coming was also necessary (iv. 13 – v. 11). — The whole burden of the Epistle thus indicates that it was composed soon after the founding of the Church, in the first part of Paul’s residence at Corinth, after the return of Silas and Timothy from Macedonia, about A.D. 52 or 53.


§ 125 b.

The supposition of a later origin is in no wise required by the fact that overseers are presupposed (v. 12, f.), that disorders had crept in (iv. 11, f., cf. 2 Thess. iii. 10), that deaths had occurred (iv. 13), in Thessalonica, nor by the warning in 2 Thess. ii. 2, and the precautionary statement in 2 Thess. iii. 17. Nor does i. 8 constrain us to suppose that the Apostle in the mean time went beyond Macedonia and Achaia.

b The greatest difficulty lies in the impossibility of harmonizing the mission of Timothy from Athens to Thessalonica and his return thence (iii. 1, f.) with Acts xvii. 15, xviii. 5. This can be removed only by an hypothesis which shall fill out and correct the account in Acts, namely, that Timothy had returned to Athens alone, or with Silas, and, sent thence to Thessalonica, met Paul in Corinth.

* On these and other grounds, Schrader, I. 90, f., 164, places the Epistles to the Thessalonians during Paul’s stay in Greece, and especially in Athens, Acts xx. 2; at the same time he supposes a visit of the Apostle to Thessalonica before Acts xx. 2, which is not mentioned in Acts, during a journey to Macedonia, that must be inserted before Acts xix. 91. See Schneckenburger, Beitr. z. Einl. ins N. T. p. 165, ff., who, among other objections to this theory, forcibly adduces 1 Thess. iv. 10, cf. 2 Cor. viii. 1. Anger, De temp. in Actis App. ratione, p. 67, sqq. Schott, Prolagg. p. 6, sq., 14, sqq.

b As Calov, and Büttinger, Beitr. II. 92, suppose, he took a journey from Corinth to Athens. Michaelis, Einl. p. 1306, dated the composition later on this account, and Köhler, Vers. üb. d. Abfass. Zeit., &c., p. 68, f., 112, ff., places it, on this account and because of ii. 14 – 16, in the time of the Jewish war.

* For this reason Wurm, Tüb. Zeitschr. 1833. I. 78, dates the composition during the Apostle’s residence at Athens, after a supposed journey from Antioch (Acts xviii. 23) to Macedonia and Greece.

a So Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Schneckenburger, and others.

* So Michaelis and Schott, who sends Silas to Berea. Hug and Hensen
suppose that neither Silas nor Timothy went to Athens, but that the latter went from Berea to Thessalonica, contrary to iii. 1, f.

This supposition is far easier than that of a journey of the Apostle not mentioned in Acts. — Cf. Burgerhoudt, De coetus Christianorum Thessalon. ortu fatisque et prioris Pauli iis scriptae ep. consilio atque argum. L. B. 1825.

§ 125 c.

The contents of the Epistle are in two parts. I. Outpourings of the Apostle's heart to the church at Thessalonica; its condition, its circumstances, his reception there, his anxieties on its behalf, and the consolation he had received (chap. i. — iii.). II. Moral warnings (iv. 1—12); consolation in regard to the fate of the dead at the expected speedy return of Christ (iv. 13—17); admonition to be constantly prepared for that event (v. 1—11); other admonitions and conclusion (v. 12—28).

Second Epistle.

§ 126.

After sending his First Epistle, the Apostle must have again received intelligence from Thessalonica. He learned that the community had remained steadfast under fresh persecutions (i. 4), but, at the same time, that it was disturbed by its impatient expectation of Christ's coming (ii. 1, ff.), and that the immoralities gently rebuked in 1 Thess. iv. 11 continued (iii. 6—15). To remove these errors is the aim of the Second Epistle, which, in other respects, presupposes the same circumstances as the First (i. 1), save that iii. 2 perhaps contains a reference to the complaints urged by the Jews against the Apostle (Acts xviii. 12, ff.). Accordingly, the date of the Epistle falls in perhaps the latest period of Paul's stay at Corinth (about A. D. 53 or 54).

Contents: — Commendation, promises, and benedictions in view of the sufferings of the community (i. 3—12). Instruction with reference to the coming of the Lord, not extremely near, since it must be preceded by the appearance of Antichrist (ii. 1—12); to this a warning is appended (ii. 13
PAUL’S EPISTLES.

17). Repeated exhortations, especially to an orderly, industrious life, and conclusion (iii.).

* So Eichhorn; Grotius supposes that this is the First Epistle.

Genuineness of these Epistles.

§ 127 a.

Before Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, the references to these Epistles are in the highest degree uncertain.* By these Fathers, however, they are distinctly quoted, and both belong to the universally accepted writings.


b Irenæus, Cont. haeres. V. 8. 1: Et propter hoc Apostolus se ipsum exponens . . . in prima epist ad Thess. dicens sic: Deus autem pacis sanctificet vos perfectos, et integer vester spiritus et anima et corpus sine queralis in adventum Domini Jesu Christi averteret. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 23. Ib. iii. 7, 2: Et iterum in secunda ad Thess. de Antichristo dicens, aut: Et tunc revelabitur iniquus, quem Dominus Jesu Christus interficiet spiritu oris sui. Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 8.—Clemens Alex. Paedag. I. p. 88, sqq. ed. Syll.: Τούτῳ τοῖς αὐτῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ μακάρου Παύλου ἰσοτιμήσαντι εἰτύρων, "δυνάμεις ἐν βαφῆς εἰμι ὡς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολος ἔγνωθην ἐκεῖνος εἰς ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, ὡς δὲ τροφῆς ἀθάνατος κατ' ἐναντίον τέκνα." Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 7. Strom. V. 554: ὡς ἐν πάσι, ηγεῖται ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἡ γνώσις· προσεύχεσθε δὲ ὑμῖν μυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπόστολον καὶ ποιημῶν ἀκρότριτων, ποιήσων πάντων ἡ πίστις. Cf. 2 Thess. iii. 2.—Tertullian, De resurrect. carn. c. 24: Et ideo majestas Spiritus sancti perspicax ejusmodi sensuum et in ipsa ad Thess. epistola suggestit: "De temporibus autem et temporum spatiis, fratres, non est necessitas scribendi vobis," etc. (cf. 1 Thess. v. 1), et in secunda, pleniora sollicitudine ad coeodem: "Obserco autem vos, fratres, per adventum D. N. Jes. Christi et congregationem nostram ad illum, ne cito commovesmini animo," etc. (cf. 2 Thess. ii. 1, ff.).
\section*{Epistles to the Thessalonians. § 127 b.}

The genuineness of both Epistles, especially of the Second, has however, in modern times, been disputed, chiefly on account of ii. 1–12, where the coming of Jesus is postponed yet farther by the doctrine of Antichrist,—a doctrine nowhere shown to be Pauline,—in opposition to the expectation of his speedy return expressed in 1 Thess. iv. 15, 1 Cor. xv. 52. This is said to contradict the First Epistle, and to betray a time of composition when this coming had been long expected in vain. Moreover, by the caution against false epistles (ii.2), and the token of genuineness at the end (iii. 17), suspicion is thrown on the genuineness of the First Epistle. Further, in the Second Epistle various special allusions are copied from the First, while the Second itself is not in harmony with historically ascertained relations.\textsuperscript{a} But it is no contradiction of the First Epistle, that Paul, after exhorting them (1 Thess. iv. 15) to steadfastly await the second coming of Christ, felt himself bound to moderate their too excited expectation; and 2 Thess. ii. 1, ff. is written completely in the spirit of primitive Christianity (cf. v. 1). The measure of precaution, iii. 17, could raise no suspicion against the First Epistle, if the latter, as is probable, was sufficiently authenticated by the manner of its sending. Against the last objection, see § 126.\textsuperscript{b} — The doubt of the genuineness of the Second Epistle raised by Kern, on his explanation, from a later historical stand-point,\textsuperscript{c} of the prophecy in iii. 3, ff., falls with this to the ground.

\textsuperscript{a} J. E. Chr. Schmidt, Vermuth. üb. d. beiden Briefe an. d. Thessal. in his Bibl. f. Krit. Exeg. u. KG. II. 380, ff. Einl. ins N. T. II. 256, ff. (In the earlier editions of this work, these doubts were strengthened.)\textsuperscript{b} Baur, Paul. etc. p. 485, ff.


\textsuperscript{c} Tübing. Ztschr. 1839. II. Heft. Other grounds: the Second Epistle imitates the First Epistle in many passages, and its style of writing is not Pauline. See, against this, Exeg. Hdb. II. 3. Einl. z. 2 Thess. No. 3.
§ 127 c.

Against the genuineness of the First Epistle, it has been urged,—1. that it contains in the main merely a detailed account of the historic course of the conversion of the Thessalonians, given in Acts, with allusions to other Epistles, especially those to the Corinthians; 2. that ii. 14–16 is not by Paul, because of its sweeping attack on the Jews and of the Apostle’s mode of connecting his sufferings with those of Christ and the Prophets, but, as appears from the conclusion, was written after the destruction of Jerusalem; 3. that the language of i. 7, f., 17, ii. 10, iv. 9, 11, f., does not consist with the alleged early date of the composition; 4. that such a thorough apocalypticism as appears in iv. 13, ff., 2 Thess. ii. 1, ff., is not Pauline. But the first objection is invalidated by the contradiction in iii. 1, f. to the Acts; and the rest, although in part based on actual exegetical difficulties, spring from subjective opinions, which may be counterbalanced by others.

* Baur, as above, p. 481, ff.

II. Epistle to the Galatians.
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Founding of Christian Churches in Galatia.

§ 128 a.

Galatia, or Gallologræcia, a region of Lesser Asia, bounded on the north by Bithynia and Paphlagonia, east by Pontus and Cappadocia (the boundary stream was the Halys), south by Cappadocia (Lycaonia) and Phrygia, west by Phrygia and Bithynia, was seized about 250 B. C. by Celtic and Germanic immigrants (among whom were also Tectosages) and called after them, but 189 B. C. was conquered by the Romans, and 26 B. C. changed into a Roman province. In the cities, especially the flourishing commercial city of Pessinus, many Jews dwelt, whom Augustus had taken under his protection.


§ 128 b.

Paul was unquestionably founder of the churches there (Gal. i. 8, iv. 13, 19). He came thither for the first time on his second missionary journey, Acts xvi. 6; the second time, Acts xviii. 23, when he only strengthened the Christians there. He had, therefore, preached the Gospel there on his first journey.* The churches there, as elsewhere, consisted in part of Jewish (Gal. iii. 2, 13, iv. 3, 21), in part, and perhaps chiefly, of heathen Christians (Gal. iv. 8, v. 2, vi. 12).

* Acts xvi. 6 does not say that Paul had not preached in Galatia, cf. Schmidt, Einl. II. 244. From Gal. ii. 13, where Paul mentions Barnabas,
it does not follow that Barnabas was personally known to the Galatians; nor can εἰς τὴν πρεπίασμον, Acts xiv. 6, mean a journey to Galatia; hence the conversion of the Galatians cannot be placed in this period. (This is opposed to Koppe, Prolegg. in ep. ad Gal., and Keil, Ueb. d. Zeit. d. Abfass. d. Brief an d. Gal., in Keil and Tisch. Anal. III. 66. Ulrich, in Theol. St. u. Kr. 1836. p. 456.) Mynster, p. 60, tries to show that, according to a broader idiom, Galatia includes Lycaonia and Pisidia. He supposes that the Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to the Christians in these provinces also, and consequently places the conversion of the Galatians in the time of Acts xiii. 14–xiv. 23. (See, on the contrary, Winer, Prolegg. in ep. ad Galat. p. 6. RWB.) According to C. W. Niemeyer (De temp. quo ep. ad Galat. conscripta sit. Gott. 1827), Paulus (Heidelb. Jahrb. 1837, and in appendix to his translation), Brüger (Beitr. z. Einl. in d. paul. Br. III. 1, ff.), the Galatians whom Paul addressed are the inhabitants of the region around Derbe and Lystra. But Luke, Acts xiv. 6, xvi. 1, 6, expressly distinguishes these cities from Galatia, and places them in Lycaonia; indeed, all the writers of that time separate the latter region from Galatia, e.g. Plin. V. 25. See Rückert, p. 297. Magaz. f. Exeg., &c., I. No. III. Usteri, p. 219, f. According to Schneckenburger (previous §, note 3), cf. Baur, p. 253, f., merely heathen Christians.

Occasion, Date, and Contents of the Epistle.

§ 129 a.

After Paul’s departure, Judaizing teachers (cf. Acts xv. 1, 5, Gal. ii. 12) came to Galatia, who sought to diminish his authority (i. 1, 11, ff.), condemned his doctrine, and asserted the necessity of circumcision (v. 2, f., 11, f.), so that a portion of the Galatians went astray, and inclined to abandon Paul (i. 6, iii. 1, 3, iv. 9, ff., 21, v. 2, ff., 7), while others remained true to him (v. 13, vi. 1). Our Epistle is intended to counteract these hostile agencies. It is, however, a question when these hostile agencies made their appearance, and whether the Epistle was written after Paul’s first or his second journey. On the first supposition, it was written either at Troas (Acts xvi. 8), or at Corinth (Acts xviii. 11). In neither of these cases, however, would the false teachers have had time enough to effect anything against the Apostle, or the Galatian church to develop so far as is assumed in iii. 2–5, v. 7, vi. 6. The date of the composition, therefore, is necessarily subsequent to the second journey, to which also
iv. 16, v. 21, vi. 13 (?), seem to refer. The appearance of the false teachers must be placed in this period, and not, with Rückert, Hemsen, Schott, Credner, Neudecker, before the second journey.\(^4\) After this journey the Apostle resided at Ephesus for a long time, during which the above-mentioned events might take place in Galatia, and the tidings of them reach Paul. Here also he wrote this letter with his own hand,\(^5\) probably not very long after his return thence (cf. i. 6), about A. D. 55 or 56.

\(^*\) But they seem not to have been born Jews, vi. 13, cf. v. 19.

\(^\#\) Quite outside of this circle is Kiel’s theory, which places the conversion of the Galatians (Acts xiv. 6), and the composition of the Epistle, which took place soon after, before Acts xv., on the ground that he regards the journey to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal. ii. as the same with that in Acts xi. 30.

\(^\#\) This Schmidt supposes, Einl. I. 945. Michaelis, II. 1195, has a similar view.

\(^*\) This is Mynster’s theory, p. 72, Koppe’s also, pretty nearly. Both, however, assume an earlier journey to Galatia.

\(^\#\) That Paul had nothing to do with these opponents on the occasion of a second stay appears from the surprise attested by i. 6, iii. 1 (hence also Credner and Neudecker suppose they had found new acceptance after the second journey), from the indefinite way in which Paul apprehends them (see remarks on v. 7), and, finally, from iv. 19, f. rightly understood (see remarks on the passage). Cf. Neander, AG. I. 356, f.

\(^*\) So Hübner, Hug, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Schott, Credner, Winer, Rückert, Neander, and others; of the older writers, Claud. Antissiod. ἐν Ἐφεσίων. The prevailing opinion among the ancients (Hieron., Ps. Athan., Oecum., and others) since Theodoret, and accepted even by Baron., Calov., Hamm., Schrad., Köhler, is expressed in the subscription: ἐν Ὀραμα. τῆς Ἐφέσου.

\(§\ 129\ b.\)

The Epistle falls naturally into two parts, of which the first (chap. i., ii.) aims to defend the Apostle’s authority. The second refutes the doctrine that the Mosaic Law is necessary, by the great truth of the saving power of faith, and that of the spiritual freedom of Christians (chap. iii. – v. 12), and contains a warning not to abuse this freedom (v. 13 – 25), with other moral admonitions and precepts (v. 26 – vi. 10). Finally, the conclusion (vi. 11 – 18).
Genuineness of the Epistle.

§ 130.

This Epistle agrees so closely with the Apostle's history (certain variations from the Acts excepted), and bears so distinctly the impress of his spirit, that not the least doubt can be raised against the church tradition which ascribes it to him, although this tradition is first attested by those Fathers who flourished at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. The allusions found by Lardner in the Apostolic and other very early Fathers, are too uncertain.


III. Epistles to the Corinthians.


Founding and State of the Church at Corinth.

§ 131 a.

Corinth, the capital of the province of Achaia, a wealthy commercial city, seat of the worship of Venus and of luxury, but also of learning and eloquence,* was visited by Paul on his second missionary journey (about A. D. 52 or 53). He dwelt there a year and a half, and subsequently, under the mild rule of the Proconsul Gallio, perhaps longer (Acts xviii. 12–17), actively propagating the Gospel, while working at his trade with Aquila and Priscilla (ib. ver. 3, 11). Although he soon met with opposition from the Jews (Acts xviii. 6), while the Gentiles, corrupted by the sophists and orators, took offence at the artless simplicity of the Gospel (1 Cor. i. 22), he gained many adherents to the faith (Acts xviii. 8), — among the Gentiles, however, chiefly of the humbler and uneducated sort (ver. 26, ff.), — and, at his departure with Aquila and Priscilla, left behind him a large church.

§ 131 b.

As he subsequently took a missionary journey through Phrygia and Galatia (about A. D. 54 or 55), Apollos (Apol- lonius), an Alexandrian scholar whom Aquila and Priscilla had instructed more fully in Christianity at Ephesus, came to Corinth, and labored for the Gospel with much accept-
ance (Acts xviii. 24–28). As he probably shared Paul's views, he simply carried on Paul's work (1 Cor. iii. 6). Cer-
tain teachers of Jewish origin, on the other hand (2 Cor. xi.
22), came to Corinth furnished with letters of introduction
(2 Cor. iii. 1), who, boastfully claiming apostolic authority
(2 Cor. v. 12, xi. 18, 22, xii. 11), forced themselves into
Paul's sphere of labor (2 Cor. x. 13, ff.), detracted from his
authority (1 Cor. ix. 2), placed themselves above him (2 Cor.
xi. 5), and led to disobedience towards him (2 Cor. x. 5, f.).
Their doctrine was different from that of the Apostle (2 Cor.
xi. 4), and indeed they seem, in the presumption of an arro-
gant pride (1 Cor. iv. 6–8), to have perverted the essence of historic Christianity in the service of a false philosophy
(1 Cor. i. 17–ii. 5).

§ 131 c.

These "false apostles" (2 Cor. xi. 13), who sought to under-
mine Paul's authority, probably occasioned the formation of four* different parties in Corinth (1 Cor. i. 12), which named
themselves respectively after Paul, Apollos, Peter, and Christ.
The first was undoubtedly composed of those who owed
their conversion to Paul, and acknowledged his authority.
Apollos's adherents are commonly supposed to be they who
preferred him to Paul, on account of his greater knowledge
and eloquence; but the attack on worldly wisdom in 1 Cor.
i. 17, ff., on which this opinion rests, cannot be aimed at the
method of a teacher who certainly used no such wisdom.
The most natural theory is, that they who had been con-
verted and instructed by Apollos took his name. Equally
common and equally erroneous is it to regard the Petrinians
as Christians who held Judaizing, anti-Pauline doctrines.
In no part of the Epistles is a trace of this opposition perceptible, not even in 2 Cor. v. 16. We have no option, therefore, save to regard those Christians as members of the Petrine party, who, in the vexed question concerning the partaking of meat offered to idols (cf. 1 Cor. viii. – x.), accepted the authority and the decision of the first of the twelve Apostles (Acts xv. 29). Some have attempted to show that the fourth, the Christine, party, as well as the above opponents of Paul, was composed of Jewish Christians; but the most probable hypothesis is, that they professed (like the Apostle Paul himself) to stand in immediate connection with Christ (through visions and inspiration), and therefore rejected the authority of all Apostles. This view alone makes certain polemical and apologetic passages in the Epistles (1 Cor. ix. 2, 2 Cor. x. 5, ff., xii. 1, ff.) clear. The separation of the parties was by no means so complete, as Eichhorn supposed, as to prevent their assembling in the same place (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 18, xiv. 23). — Besides these divisions, the church suffered also from the licentiousness prevailing at Corinth (1 Cor. v. 1, 9, vi. 12, ff., x. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 21).

* Not three, as Chrysost. and others, Rüdiger, Krit. Unters. üb. den Inhalt d. beiden Brüd. an d. Cor. (1847) p. 37, ff., erroneously explain 1 Cor. i. 12.

* According to Storr (Notitiae histor. epistolarum P. ad Cor. interpretationi servientes, § 4, Opusc. II. 553, sqq.), the latter were disciples of James, the brother of the Lord, and therefore boasted of being in nearer connection with him; according to Baur (Tüb. Ztschr. 1831. IV. 61, ff., Paul. etc. p. 961, ff.), they named themselves after Christ, as disciples of Peter, one of the genuine disciples of Christ. But no trace appears of an appeal to the authority of either James or Peter. According to Fr. Becker (Die Parteien in d. Gemeinde zu Corinth. Alt. 1842. p. 45, f.), the Petrianians were foreign Christians, who had emigrated to Corinth (!). The Jewish Christians there adopted their doctrine and tendency, but were unwilling to oppose with them the disciples of Paul and Apollos, having been themselves converted by these Apostles. They therefore adopted a higher and middle position, and called themselves after Christ.

* Thus Schenkel, Diss. de eccles. Corinth. primaeva factionibus turbata. Bas. 1838. Before Schenkel, H. Jäger (Erkl. d. beiden Brü. d. Ap. Paul. nach Corinth aus dem Gesichtspunkte der v.tr Parteien das. Tüb. 1838) regarded them, in a similar way, as those who opposed the other three parties, which over-estimated the apostolic authority, and rejected both
the apostolic authority and the ἐπιρρυμα. Schenkel's hypothesis was adopted, in the main, also by D. H. Goldhorn in Ilgen's Ztschr. 1840. II. 121, ff., although he contradicts both in some points, and differs in his apprehensions of various passages; by Dühne (Die Christus-Partei in der apostol. Kirche z. Korinth. Halle, 1841); also by Knievel (Eccles. Corinth. vetust. dissec- siones et turbae. Danz. 1841. 4to), according to whom the Christians re- jected the authority of all the Apostles, and professed to know and be united to Christ through their own insight (p. 46). Neander, AG. L 388, ff., adopts the negative part of the hypothesis, namely, that the Christianians professed to be independent of the Apostles, but thinks that some among them were philosophizing Christians. — Our former theory, that the Christ- tine party asserted a neutral position (with Eichhorn, Pott, Schott, Rückert, Meyer), is unsatisfactory.


First Epistle.

§ 132 a.

Such may have been the position of Corinthian affairs* when Paul came from Galatia to Ephesus (about A.D. 55 or 56). Here probably he heard, for the first time, of the irregularities there prevailing, and warned them against these in a letter now lost (1 Cor. v. 9).

Subsequently receiving through Chloë’s servants (1 Cor. i. 11) still more disquieting accounts, especially of the di- visions in Corinth, he sent Timothy thither (1 Cor. iv. 17), who, however, first went through Macedonia with Erastus (Acts xix. 22, cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 10). About this time, also, messengers came from Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 17, f.) with a letter containing certain questions (1 Cor. vii. 1, cf. viii. 1, xii. 1, xvi. 1), perhaps in answer to his letter. Besides these divisions, and the tendency to licentiousness which had come to light in one melancholy instance, the church at Corinth suffered from several other disorders and improper practices, and was on some points undecided or divided in opinion.b

a On account of certain passages in the Second Epistle, especially xii. 14, xiii. 1, xii. 21, ii. 1, Bleek (Theol. St. u. Kr. 1830. III. 614, ff.), follow-
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ing Chrysost. on 2 Cor. xii. 14, Michaelis, J. E. Chr. Schmidt, and others, and in accord with Schrader (I. 95, ff.), Köhler (p. 74, ff.), — who reached the same point independently of him, — Müller, in his Diss. p. 6, sqq., adduced in § 123 b, note a, Neander (p. 413), Schott (Erörert. p. 51, ff.), Wurm (Tüb. Zeitschr. 1833. I. 67), Anger, De temp. in Act. App. rat. p. 71, ff., Billroth, Credner, and others, assumes an intervening journey of the Apostle to Corinth. But although the passages cited may be more naturally explained in this way, this theory is open to great objection. If the position of the Corinthian church at the time of this journey caused anxiety to the Apostle (as we conclude from 2 Cor. xii. 21, ii. 1), it is incomprehensible how he can so speak of it in the First Epistle as to pass over in silence his visit there, and what without doubt he had said and done against the abuses that had crept in (cf. Neander, p. 416). If the condition of the church was not yet disordered, the explanation of these passages fails, and we cannot comprehend how, as the journey of the Apostle cannot be supposed to have taken place long before the First Epistle, the church could in so short a time have fallen into so bad a condition. We have left unnoticed the difficulty of establishing the period of this journey. If we assume, with Michaelis, Schott, Anger, and others, that this journey was only a return from an excursion during his first residence at Corinth, the theory loses all historic meaning.

*It is not probable that all these disorders and doubts are to be referred to one source, namely, party feeling, as is done by Storr and others, and recently also by Rübiger. Under this theory, it was the Apollonians who excused licentiousness (vi. 12), the Paulinians who despised marriage (chap. vii.), the Petrinians who overestimated speaking with tongues, the Apollonians who denied the resurrection.

§ 132 b.

To remove these evils and restore his authority, to instruct on disputed points, and also to promote the collection of a contribution for the Christians at Jerusalem, the Apostle wrote our First Epistle. Its contents, according to their various occasions, fall into several larger and smaller sections.

I. Against party spirit and to restore the personal authority of the Apostle (i.–iv.), especially also to defend his unstudied preaching (i. 17 – iii. 2). II. Against the scandal of forbidden intercourse with one’s step-mother (v. 1–8), and in correction of a previous warning against intercourse with the unchaste (v. 9–13). III. Against the abuse of seeking justice in the Roman courts (vi. 1–11), and renewed warning against licentiousness (vi. 12–20). IV. Reply to
the question, whether it is better to remain unmarried (vii.).

V. Instruction as to the proper course in regard to eating meat offered to idols (viii.—xi. 1), with a digression on his own disinterested, self-denying conduct (ix.). VI. Rebutte of an impropriety, prevalent among the Corinthian female Christians, in regard to the covering of the head (xi. 2—16). VII. Rebutte of the far more important disorders of the celebration of the Lord's Supper (xi. 17—34). VIII. Instruction regarding spiritual gifts, to which love alone lends worth (xii., xiii.), and that prophesying is preferable to speaking with tongues (xiv.). IX. Instruction concerning the resurrection of the dead, a doctrine which some denied (xv.).

X. Finally, directions regarding the contribution of alms to be made, together with matters of personal interest and greetings (xvi.).

* On the character of those who denied the resurrection, see Exeg. Hdb. chap. xv. They could hardly have been Sadducees (Storr and others), or heathen Christians of philosophic culture (Neander), or Apollonians (Mey., Rübig.), but were tainted with Greek prejudices against this doctrine (cf. Acts xvii. 32).

§ 132 c.

This Epistle was written in the last part of Paul's residence at Ephesus (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 19), after he had sent away Timothy and Erastus (Acts xix. 22, cf. 1 Cor. iv. 17), and decided on going to Achaia (Acts xix. 21, cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 3, ff.), some time before Pentecost (xvi. 8) of A.D. 57 or 58, about one year before his journey from Philippi to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 6), begun after Easter A.D. 58 or 59. Probably Paul dictated (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 21) it to Sosthenes (1 Cor. i. 1, cf. Acts xviii. 17?), and sent it by the above three messengers. It is, according to its greeting and contents, addressed to the whole church, and not (as Eichhorn asserts) exclusively to one party.
SECOND EPISODE TO THE CORINTHIANS. § 133 b. 259

Second Epistle.

§ 133 a.

When Paul wrote this letter, he was with Timothy (i. 1) in Macedonia (ii. 13, vii. 5, ix. 2, cf. Acts xx. 1), after having narrowly escaped death in Asia Minor (i. 8, not Acts xix. 23, ff.). Here he met Titus (vii. 6), who was returning from Corinth, and whom he had in vain looked for at Troas (ii. 12). The Apostle had probably sent this assistant thither, on account of his anxiety to know the impression made on the Corinthians by his First Epistle (ii. 4, vii. 5, ff.).* The accounts brought by Titus, and his solicitude about the alms to be collected, occasioned this letter, to carry which and collect the contribution he commissioned Titus and two other brethren (viii. 6–23, ix. 3, 5). The Apostle intended soon to follow (ix. 4, x. 11, xiii. 1), as he also did (Acts xx. 2). The place of its composition was in Macedonia (according to the subscription Philippi), and the time probably the autumn after the composition of the First Epistle.

* On the contrary, no result appears from the sending of Timothy to Corinth, and therefore Schmidt, Einl. i. 240, Bertholdt, VI. 3558, and Neander, AG. I. 332, each in his own way, suppose he did not go at all. Bleek, on the other hand (Theol. Stud. u. Kr. 1830. III. 656, ff.), supposes that, before Paul's departure, he had returned to Ephesus, and Paul, on account of the tidings brought by him, had sent Titus to Corinth with a letter now lost. He understands 2 Cor. ii. 3, f., vii. 12, cf. ii. 5; i. 15, f., ii. 1, ff., x. 9, ff.; iii. 14, v. 15, xi. 16, to refer to this Epistle. See, in opposition to him, J. G. Müller, De tribus Pauli itineribus, etc., p. 34, sqq. Neander, as above, p. 333. Wurm, Tüb. Zschcr. 1833. I. 66, ff. Baur, Paulus, p. 328. — Schrader, I. 135, f., supposes, and Müller and Billroth support him, that Titus had already gone to Corinth, on account of the collection, some time previous, before the sending of the First Epistle, cf. 2 Cor. viii. 6, 10. This has but one difficulty, that in 1 Cor. xvi. 1, ff. he is not spoken of.

§ 133 b.

In the first part of the Epistle (chap. i.—vii.), Paul pours out his heart in regard to what he had experienced and felt
during the interval between the sending of his First Epistle
and the return of Titus, and especially on receiving the in-
telligence brought by the latter. The effect of his First
Epistle had been in part what he had desired (ii. 6, f., vii.
8, ff.). Paul, however, still found cause for warnings and
threatenings (vi. 14, ff., xii. 20, f., xiii. 2, 7), even for self-
defence against objections and misapprehensions (i. 15, ff.,
iii. 1, v. 12), and for apologetic or polemic references to op-
ponents (ii. 17, iii. 1, v. 12). Even the expressions of the
apostolic consciousness (iii. 4 – v. 12) take an apologetic turn
(v. 11 – vi. 10), and elsewhere, also, misgivings are indicated
(vi. 11 – vii. 1, f.). In the second part, chap. viii., ix., con-
cerning the contribution in aid of the Jerusalem Christians,
the Apostle rests, as it were, from the excitation of his
mind. But in the third part, chap. x. – xiii., where he asserts
his apostolic power in threats against rebellion and disobe-
dience, speaks against arrogant intermeddlers, false apostles,
and deceitful laborers, and is constrained to set forth his
merits and superiority as an Apostle, he falls into a some-
what irritated tone. We must, hence, conclude that a por-
tion of the community, and especially the Christine
party (according to others, that of Peter), stimulated by
their embittered leaders, still opposed the Apostle.

Style of this Epistle.

§ 134.

The unusual roughness, embarrassment, and irregularity
of style in this Epistle are explained by the Apostle’s ap-
parent excitement and want of composure during its com-
position. The same explains the very different tone of the
section chap. x. – xiii., and forbids our dividing the Epistle
into several.\footnote{H. J. Royards, De altera Pauli ad Corinth. ep. et observanda in illa
Apostoli indole et oratione. Traj. 1818. 8vo.}
\footnote{As Semler has done, Diss. de duplici appendice ep. ad Rom. Hal. 1784.
4to: also in his Paraphr. ep. ad Rom. p. 277, cf. his Paraphr. ep. post. ad
Corinth., preface, and on chap. ix. and xii. Refuted by Gabler, Diss. crit.
Genuineness of both Epistles.

§ 135.

Their tenor and spirit attest their genuineness beyond dispute. This is also sustained by early external evidence, although tradition first begins to be quite certain in Irenaeus.\(^a\)

\(^a\) Clemens Rom. In 1. ep. ad Corinth. c. 47, f. Part I. § 18, note δ. Ignat. Ad Ephes. c. 2. Polycarp. Ad Phil. c. 5, see ib. note c ; c. 11: An nesciimus, quia sancti mundum judicabunt, sicut Paulus docet! cf. 1 Cor. vi. 2. The allusions in Justin Martyr are uncertain, Dial. p. 253: Καὶ (εἰπεν ὁ Χριστός) ἐστωναι σχηματα καὶ αἰρέσεις, cf. 1 Cor. xi. 19 ; p. 338: Ἡν γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ὁ Χριστός, ὁ τυφεὶς υἱὸς θεόν, cf. 1 Cor. v. 7 ; p. 258, cf. 1 Cor. xii. 8−10.

IV. Epistle to the Romans.


Origin of the Church at Rome.

§ 136 a.

The church at Rome had no proper founder. Christianity was probably carried thither by the intercourse that necessarily arose between the numerous Jewish population there and the churches in Greece, Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Palestine. The expulsion of the Jews from Rome must especially have served to make them acquainted with Christianity. This was the case with Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 2, f., 18, f., 26), who returned to Rome, and a church assembled in their house (Rom. xvi. 3, f.). To them, therefore, is chiefly due the merit of having carried Christianity to Rome. The persons mentioned in xvi. 7, 9, 12, may also have shared in the work.
When once Christianity became known to Roman Jews, it attracted also, without doubt, the attention of their numerous countrymen and friends in Rome. Hence the church there was, like others, mixed, being composed of Jews and Gentiles (xv. 7, ff.). The majority (cf. i. 6, 13, vi. 14) was probably not composed of Jews, who are addressed but once (vii. 1–6), and in common with the former proselytes, but of Gentiles, who are more frequently addressed (vi. 17, ff., xi. 13, 25, 28, 30), and in xiv. 1, ff. are enjoined forbearance towards Jewish-Christian prejudices. As Paul feels drawn towards the Roman Christians, seeks a sphere of labor among them, is in general content with their Christian life (i. 8, xv. 14), regards his gospel as theirs (ii. 16, vi. 17, xvi. 17, 25), has among them many friends, and does not oppose Jewish-Christian false teachers, it is not probable that Judaism had the upper hand among
them. The majority seem rather to have shared the Apostle’s tendencies, as was certainly the case with Aquila and Priscilla. Whether the church was formally organized is exceedingly uncertain, as Luke scarcely mentions its existence.

* Juvenal, Sat. XIV. ver. 96, sqq.: —
  Quidam soriti metuentem sabbatha patrem,
  Nil praeter nubes et coeli numenadorant,
  Nee distare putant humana carne suillum,
  Qua pater abstinuit, mox et praeputia ponunt.
  Romanas autem solitì contemnere leges,
  Judaeicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt jus,
  Tradidit areano quocunque volumine Moses.


* Acts xxviii. 15. How ver. 17, ff. are to be understood, which record the ignorance manifested by the Roman Jews regarding Paul, and their but distant acquaintance with the Christian sect, is a disputed exegetical question. See my Exeg. Hdb. on the passage. Tholuck, Einl. z. Röm. Br. p. 12, ff.

Date of the Epistle.

§ 137.

When Paul wrote this Epistle, he was about going to Jerusalem with a contribution that he had gathered in Macedonia and Achaia (xv. 25, f.). He feared danger from the Jews there (xv. 30, f.). This indicates his last residence at Corinth (cf. Acts xxiv. 17, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, ff., 2 Cor. viii., ix., Acts xx. 22, f.). He desired at that time to visit Rome (i. 13, xv. 23, cf. Acts xix. 21). The persons whose greetings he sends (xvi. 21) are, at least in part, mentioned as his then companions (Acts xx. 4). His host at that time (xvi. 23) was a Corinthian (1 Cor. i. 14), and Eratus (xvi. 23) also seems to belong to Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20). Finally, the recommendation of a Christian woman of Cenchreae (xvi. 1) indicates his stay in that city. That Aquila and Priscilla (xvi. 3) were at that time living in Rome again is possible,
from Acts xviii. 19–26, 1 Cor. xvi. 19. Accordingly, the
date of the composition falls about A. D. 58 or 59.*

* J. F. Flatt, De tempore, quo Pauli ad Rom. ep. scripta sit, in Pott,
Sylloge, Vol. II., chiefly against Tobler’s (Theol. Aufsätze, p. 41, f.) opinion,
3285, f. — Tertius wrote the Epistle from the Apostle’s dictation (xvi. 22).

Occasion, Design, Contents.

§ 138 a.

The Apostle might easily be induced to write to the
church in the chief city in the Roman world, whose establish-
ment was mediately at least and in part his work, and
to preach to which was part of his great missionary plan, by
the tidings he received, perhaps in Corinth or Ephesus, of
their circumstances (perhaps from letters of Aquila and
Priscilla), especially as an opportunity presented itself in
Phoebe’s journey to Rome (xvi, 1).

He aimed to contribute by a letter, before he could in
person, to the triumph of Christianity in Rome over Jude-
anism and heathenism. A secondary object was to counteract
the influence which the turbulent spirit of the Roman Jews
might or did exert on the Christians, and to prevent dissension
between the scrupulous and the free-minded Christians
in regard to abstinence from meat and the observing of days.b

* Eichhorn (Einl. III. 217) is correct in not finding in this Epistle, as in
that to the Galatians, the dogmatical antagonism to Jewish Christians. A
certain regard to their dogmatic prejudices is supposed, on the other hand,
by Schmid (Tüb. Progr. 1830) and Tholuck (Röm. Br. p. 19, 4th ed.), on
account of chap. xiv.—xvi. In consequence of his supposition of a pre-
vailing Judaizing tendency in the Roman church, Baur misapprehends the
whole bearing of the Epistle, and sees in chap. ix.—xi. its proper nucleus.
Cf. Exeg. Hdb. II. 1. p. 3. Kling agree, to a certain extent, with him
(St. u. Kr. 1837. p. 287, ff., 314). Olshausen strongly opposes him (ib.
1838. p. 922, ff.).

b Neither the theory of merely ascetic abstinence (Koppe, Eichhorn,
Meyer), nor that of abstinence merely from meat offered to idols (Neander),
meet the exegetical requirements of chap. xiv.; but we must combine the
latter kind of abstinence with the observance of the Levitical prohibitions
in regard to food. Exeg. Hdb. on chap. xiv.
§ 138 b.

The contents of the Epistle fall into two main divisions, a didactic and a hortatory. I. A representation of the Gospel as the revelation which brings to all believers blessedness and righteousness. These the Jews need, as well as the Gentiles, because all — and the Jews according to their very Law — are liable to punishment before God (i. 16—iii. 30). Faith in Christ alone brings righteousness before God, as even Abraham and David were justified through faith (iii. 21—iv. 25). The result of this justification is peace and joy; through Christ, the reconciler, a new life is begun for mankind (v.). But sanctification, also, must be connected with reconciliation, a living morality independent of the Law, because the Law could not inspire to goodness, but rather excited to sin (vi., vii.). In the spirit of Christ we overcome sin and the flesh, and thus, also, all earthly sufferings through a blessed hope. The reconciled man is blessed even here (viii.). Complaint and comfort regarding the obstinacy of a large part of the Jews, and their exclusion from salvation (ix.—xi.). II. Moral exhortations of various kinds, among others even to civil obedience (xii., xiii.), to patience with those weak in the faith (xiv., xv. 1—13), together with an epilogue (xv. 14—33), and an appendix (xvi.).

On Chapters XV., XVI.

§ 139 a.

The opinion, that chap. xvi. is not addressed to the Roman Christians, is supported by the improbability that all the persons whom the Apostle greets, some of them near acquaintances and friends, were living at Rome. We should rather expect to find them at Ephesus (xvi. 3, 4, cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 19; ver. 5). It is, however, easier to suppose that the intercourse of the Eastern provinces with Rome had, for the time being, drawn all these Christians thither, than that this chapter does not belong to our Epistle.
§ 139 b.

Semler would detach chap. xv. also from our Epistle, and Paulus regards it as an appendix; for xv. 1–13 belongs to chap. xiv., and xv. 14–33 forms the conclusion. It is unnecessary, on account of the various benedictions and of the different position of the doxology, xvi. 25, ff., in the MSS., to suppose that chap. xv., xvi. were written on supplementary sheets. The genuineness of both chapters has recently been questioned, but on grounds which rest in part on a mistaken view of the Epistle, in part on an erroneous interpretation of various passages.


Genuineness of the Epistle.

§ 140.

The genuineness of the Epistle is beyond all doubt. The testimonies of the ancient Fathers also support it.

CHAPTER VIII.

PAUL'S EPISTLES DURING HIS IMPRISONMENT.

Which Imprisonment?

§ 141 a.

The three Epistles to Philemon, the Colossians, and the Ephesians, were written by the Apostle during his imprisonment (Phil. 9; Col. iv. 3, 10, 19; Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20). This is commonly understood as the imprisonment at Rome. No distinct trace of this, however, appears. The friends mentioned — Timothy, Aristarchus, Luke, Mark, Demas, Epaphras, Tychicus, Onesimus, Jesus Justus — may certainly have been with Paul at Rome (on the first three, see Acts xxvii. 2, Phil. i. 1), but also at Cæsarea (Acts
xx. 4), where several writers suppose these letters to have been written. It is more probable that the others were with him there than at Rome, especially, that Onesimus fled thither to him. It seems, also, more natural that the Apostle should manifest his anxiety from this place for the near communities at Colosse and in Asia Minor by written exhortation. Paul's writing about his labors in behalf of the Gospel (Col. iv. 3, 11, Eph. vi. 19, f.) is in favor of Rome, where he had opportunity for such labors (Acts xxviii. 31), which in Cæsarea does not seem to have been the case (Acts xxiv. 23).


b The ground adduced by Schultz, that, on the common supposition, Phil. 29 does not accord with Rom. xv. 24, is not valid, as we may suppose that in Cæsarea the Apostle adhered to his plan of the Spanish journey more firmly than at Rome, where he perhaps found reasons for giving it up. According to Schrader (as above), Acts xxiii. 11 does not accord with Phil. 29. "While in Cæsarea he was looking towards Rome." The reason found by Wiggers, in the non-mention of Onesimus in the Epistle to the Ephesians and in Eph. vii. 22, that Tychicus, the bearer of the three Epistles, did not come from Rome, and hence of course through Ephesus, but from Cæsarea, by the land-route, to Colosse, rests on his mistaken view of the Epistle to the Ephesians (§ 145).

I. Epistle to Philemon.

§ 141 b.

Philemon, a convert of Paul (ver. 19), — perhaps while at Ephesus, — was a respected and worthy man among the Christians at Colosse, in Phrygia (Philem. 1, 2, 4–7, cf. Col. iv. 9).* Paul, at that time a prisoner (ver. 9), sends to him, by the hands of his assistant Tychicus (Col. iv. 7–9), his escaped or disobedient slave, converted by Paul in his captivity, with this letter written by his own hand (Philem. 19), in which he begs Philemon to pardon and give a fraternal Christian reception to Onesimus, and announces at the same time his visit (ver. 22). The letter is wholly a letter of friendship, not at all doctrinal, written with a genial delicacy, and even with a spice of pleasantry (ver. 11, 19). Its spirit, however, is thoroughly religious. Its genuineness is not to be doubted.† Though Tertullian first mentions it, he testifies that Marcius’s collection contained it.*

* According to Wieseler and others (§ 132 b, note c), he was a Laodicean, because Archippus belonged to Laodicea, for Col. iv. 17 speaks of him in connection with the community there, and is supported by the church tradition (Constitut. App. VII. 46). From the fact that his slave Onesimus was of Colosse (Col. iv. 9), Wieseler thinks we are not authorized to deduce the dwelling-place of the master. But Onesimus must certainly be sent to the dwelling-place of his master.

† Baur (Paulus, p. 478), however, has done so; but only to show the possibility of the letter being the embryo of a Christian romance, after the fashion of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies.


II. Epistle to the Colossians.


Occasion.

§ 142.

Paul sent by Tychicus (Col. iv. 7—9), together with the foregoing Epistle, a letter to the community of Christians at Colossae, in Phrygia Pacatiana. He had never been there (iii. 1), although he had twice travelled through Phrygia (Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23). He was, however, acquainted with members of the church there (Epistle to Philemon), which was devoted to him (i. 7, f.); and Epaphras, their teacher, was at just that time with the Apostle (i. 7, f., iv. 12; Philem. 23). His presence, and the tidings which he gave the Apostle concerning the church (i. 3, 8), were, beyond dispute, the occasion of the Epistle.

* On the situation and history of the city, see Böhmer, Isagoge in ep. ad Coloss. 1829. p. 21, sqq. Different mode of writing Κολοσσαί and Κολοσσαï; the most numerous and the best critical authorities favor the latter; the former, on the other hand, is supported by the old historians and geographers and the coins of the city. Eichbel, Doctr. numm. vet. P. I. Vol. III. p. 147, cf. Bertholdt, Einl. VI. p. 3441.


\[\text{c} \] In what sense is he called, Philem. 23, fellow-prisoner? Cf. Col. iv. 10.

Design and Contents.

§ 143.

On receipt of the glad intelligence of the Christian faith and love pervading the church at Colossæ, Paul desires
to strengthen them, and especially to warn them against certain false teachers, who combined narrowness in the holding of Jewish principles and strict asceticism with a mystical philosophy (ii. 16–23). A

With this view, after an introduction expressive of his gratitude and his prayers (i. 3–12), he represents to the Colossians the high dignity of the Redeemer, and the blessings of the reconciliation effected by him (i. 13–23), and testifies to the gladness with which he suffers for their salvation (i. 24–29), in order thereby more impressively to warn them against being deceived by the human wisdom that leads away from Christ (ii.). He closes with moral admonitions and salutations (iii. iv.).

* The different opinions of interpreters (who so often pretend to know more than lies in the text) on these false teachers are set forth and weighed by Bertholdt, VI. 3448, f. Neudecker, p. 518, f. Böhmer, Isag. p. 56, sqq. Huther, Einl., p. 27, ff. The opinion that they were Jews — (Eichhorn, Einl. III. 1. p. 387, f. Junker, Comment. p. 43, ff. Schnellenburger, Anh. to his work on the Proselytetentäufe, p. 213, cf. Beitr. p. 146, ff., Stud. u. Kr. 1832. p. 840, ff., according to the last-mentioned writer, theosophic Jews, who, without directly opposing the Christian faith, placed it in a subordinate position [Col. ii. 19], brought in a higher wisdom [ver. 18], and insisted on the ascetic practices of Judaism [ver. 8, 20–23]) — is rightly rejected by Böhmer, p. 56, sqq., Rheinwald, De Pseudodoctor. Coloss. (Bonn, 1834), and others. There were theosophic Jewish Christians (Neander, AG. I. 507, ff.), but whether their theosophy was Essene (Storr, Rheims., Credner, &c.), or Cabalistic (Osiander, Tüb. Zischr. 1834. III.), or of some other sort, it is difficult precisely to ascertain; but there is no positive ground for regarding it as Cerinthian (Neand., Mayerhoff).

Genuineness.

§ 144.

The Epistle has always belonged to those universally accepted. A Only in the most modern times has it been doubted, but on insufficient grounds. B


Mayerhoff (Der Brief an die Col. mit vornehm. Berucksichtigung d. Pastoralbriefe krit. geprüft. Berl. 1838) and Schwегler (Nachap. Zeitalt. II. 326, f.) find something un-Pauline, (1.) in the use of language and the style. Τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ is certainly singular. But the absence of favorite expressions of Paul, such as δικαιοσύνη, δικαίωμα, and kindred expressions, σωτηρία, σωτηρία, and others, is a ground which may be urged against other unquestionably genuine Epistles. Δικαιοσύνη occurs only once in the long First Epistle to the Corinthians, and not at all in those to the Thessalonians; δικαίωμα not once in the whole Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and those to the Thessalonians and the Philippians; nor σωτηρία in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. As little can the positive peculiarity in the selection of words prove, e. g. φανεροῖν, iii. 4 (according to the connection), applied to the return of Christ; the repeated use of ἐπάνω λεγόμενα, as πιθανολογία, ἐπιλογία, and others. On the other hand, ἐπίληψιν κ. ισόβασιον, iii. 11, for ἰδιότα ἐκλεκτικοῦ, is remarkable. The omission or rare use of illative and causal particles (ἅρα, διό, γάρ), and the prevailing connection by the relative pronoun and the participle, constitute a prominent peculiarity of our Epistle. But ἅρα is wanting also in Phil., διό in Gal. and 2 Thess., διότι in Eph. and 2 Thess., which Mayerhoff considers genuine; and the generally slighter dialectic movement, as well as the want of anacolutha, is accounted for by the special object of the Epistle, and by the mood of the Apostle.

(2.) The mode of treating subjects is un-Pauline; in contrast with the other Pauline Epistles, the logical arrangement is wanting in the first, dogmatic portion, while in the second part, on the contrary, the admonitions are given in groups (cf. Rom. xii. 3-8, xiii.). It is not (with Huther) to be denied, that there the flow of the thought is rendered somewhat heavy and difficult by various repetitions (Mayerhoff, p. 45, ff.); but how different is the manner of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians from that of the First! “Poverty of thought,” at least, is not the reason. (3.) Mayerhoff finds no essential difference in the dogmatic statements, but merely variations in subordinate points, although incorrectly in i. 13, 20, f., ii. 13, f. (cf. 2 Cor. v. 18), ii. 22, and elsewhere; only the extension of the redeeming work of Christ, i. 20, is singular. This it is, moreover, which Baur, Paulus, p. 417, ff., especially urges against the Epistle. Schwегler (as above, p. 327) remarks that love is placed in the foreground, while justification through faith, and the contrast between faith and the Law, retire to the background, and the false teachers are not opposed in the well-known Pauline fashion. Much weight is laid, also, as in the pastoral Epistles, upon the ἐπιγνώσεως. The Epistle indicates a first step towards Johanne Christianity. (4.) In its composition, the Epistle to the Ephesians served as a basis. — But the Epistle to the Ephesians much rather presupposes that to the Colossians (§ 146 a).

(5.) The erroneous doctrine must, according to Mayerhoff, have been Corin-
thian, and therefore post-apostolic;according to Baur, on the other hand, Gnostic-Ebionite. The latter also makes the Christology of the Epistle Gnostic. But there is a great difference between this and Gnosticism proper. Moreover, even Meyerhoff acknowledges so much that is Pauline in the language, and the style of the writing and of thought, that even striking peculiarities in their presence vanish like thin shadows. Cf. Huther, p. 418, ff.

III. Epistle to the Ephesians.


Destination.

§ 145 a.

The Epistle is addressed to the Ephesians, not only in the (spurious) super- and sub-scriptions, but also in the text (i. 1).* Judging from its contents, however, it is addressed to Gentile Christians (ii. 11, ff., 19, ff., iii. 1, ff., iv. 17, 22), who stood in no near relation to Paul, but of whom he and those with him had merely "heard" (i. 15, iii. 2), and contains no reference to any such near relation (cf. vi. 21, f.). And yet the church at Ephesus was composed of Jews and Gentiles (Acts xix. 8–10, 17), and the Apostle stood in most intimate connection with it (Acts xx. 17, f.). The Epistle contains, moreover, no greeting from Timothy, from whom it might reasonably be expected, on account of his acquaintance with the church at Ephesus, and of the great probability that the Epistle was written at the same time as that to the Colossians (cf. Col. i. 1).b

---

* i. 1: Τοῖς ἄγιοις τοῖς ὁσίων ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Ἡρωδίᾳ.

b Rink, Sondchr. d. Korinth., &c., p. 56, ff. Wiggers, in Stud. u. Krit. 1841. p. 439, try to explain the passage so that it may apply to the Ephesians, but in vain. On the contrary, Lünemann, De ep. ad Eph. au-
EPISODE TO THE EPHESIANS. § 145 b.

thent. (Gott. 1842.) p. 29. — Neudecker (p. 503) finds in i. 15–23, iii. 2, 13–21, on unbiased, unprejudiced (?) examination, references to the formerly intimate relation between the Apostle and the church which he had founded there. Wurm, Tüb. Ztschr. 1833. I. 98, supposes that the Apostle wished to avoid all allusion to their earlier relations, on account of his painful experiences at Ephesus (?).

The somewhat different object of the sending of Tychicus, mentioned in both Epistles (Eph. vi. 21, f., Col. iv. 7, f.), affords no satisfactory objection against this contemporaneousness. Schneckenburger, Beitr. p. 139, lays too much stress on it. Cf. § 147, note b.

§ 145 b.

Hence, some historical indications of a different destination of the Epistle have been welcomed by many. It has been thought, especially from an expression of Tertullian, that neither Marcion, who superscribes the Epistle To the Laodiceans, nor himself, who seems to ascribe to the former merely the falsification of its title, read in the text i. 1 the place of destination. Moreover, manuscripts existed in ancient times, in which the address ran: τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χρ. 'I.; and such still exist.\(^b\) On these data, and the passage Col. iv. 16, many suppose that the Epistle was addressed to the Laodiceans; others,\(^a\) that it was a circular letter to several communities.


\(^b\) Basilius M., c. Euon. Opp. I. 394. ed. Garn.: . . . . αὐτά καὶ τοῖς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γνωσίας ἡμοιόνοις τῷ διὶ δι' ἐπιγνώσεως δότας αὐτοῖς ἑαυτῶν ὑμῖν οἰκομένην, εἰπών: "Τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ ὕποπτον;" οὗτο γάρ καὶ οἱ πρὸς ἡμᾶς παραδέδοται, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς πολιοίσιν τῶν ἀντιγράφων εἰρήκαμεν. Jerome speaks less decidedly in its favor, Comment. ad h. l.: Quidam curiosius, quam necessae est, putant ex eo, quod Mosi dictum sit: Haec dices filiis Israel, qui est, missi me, etiam
eos qui Ephesi sunt, sancti et fideles, essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos, ut ... ab eo qui est, hi qui sunt appellentur. Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos qui sunt, sed qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sunt, scriptum arbitrantur. The Cod. Vat. has ἐν ἕπειρῳ on the margin only, and indeed, according to Tischendorf., by a second hand; Cod. 47. ex emend. omits it.


§ 145 c.

But Tertullian probably charges Marcion, and justly, with arbitrary alteration, not only of the title, but also of the address, i. 1, itself (cf. § 34). Thus the historical basis of the former hypothesis vanishes. It is also at variance with Col. iv. 15, for, as the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians are contemporaneous, Paul would not in the former send greetings to Laodicea. The second hypothesis has likewise an untenable ground in that reading, i. 1; for this, on the whole impossible, owes its origin to arbitrary choice, and cannot be admitted in the face of all the critical authorities and of church tradition. This hypothesis is, however, in itself invalid, as the Epistle presupposes a certain circle of readers, and vi. 21, f. is opposed to the circular character of the Epistle. They who, on the ground of the common reading i. 1, recognized as genuine, accept Ephesus as the destination of the Epistle, but combine with this the encyclical character, load themselves with double difficulties, and quite pervert the bearing of the work. Nor
can we, without great arbitrariness, substitute for the church at Ephesus another in its neighborhood (Lünemann).

* The expression titulus is urged; also that Tertullian does not speak expressly of falsification of the text, and refers, not to manuscripts, but to the "veritas Ecclesiae." See, on the contrary, Harless, Einl. p. xxi. ff. Lünemann, p. 37.

* The supposed filling out of blanks would be an untruth, in relation to i. 15, f., ii. 11; yet, without the blank, these words have no sense.

* According to Rink, p. 33, and others, on the dogmatic ground alleged by Basil. and Hieron., on which Cod. Boern. omits ἐν Ῥώμῃ (Rom. i. 7), cf. Schol. cod. 47; more probably on a critical ground, namely, the perception that this address does not correspond with the contents of the Epistle, cf. in Synopsis script. in Athanas. Opp. III. 194. Bened.: Ταύτην (πρὸτ 'Ἑφεσίους) ἐπιστέλλει ἀπὸ Ῥώμης, ὡς μὴ δώσῃ ἐναόρως, ἀκούςας δὲ μόνον περὶ αὐτῶν; According to Mill, Proleg. § 73, Anger, p. 129, because the encyclical destination was guessed at.

4 Hammond, Flatt, Schott, Harless, Wiggers, Anger. "The Epistle is addressed to one particular church, the Ephesian (especially to those Gentile Christians there who were acquainted with Paul personally, but without excluding the other Ephesian Christians, Ang.). But while Paul addressed his words to them, he enlarges the sphere of his vision, this community becomes to him the type of many similar communities, and thus he addresses under one community all Asiatic Christendom, of which Ephesus was the starting-point and the centre." (Wigg.) "If we suppose that his readers were daughter churches of that at Ephesus, or single Christians scattered over the country, who had first become acquainted with the Gospel from Ephesus, and intelligence of whom the Apostle had received through the Ephesians, it is natural that he should send the Epistle to them by means of those who had introduced them to him" (also that he should address the Epistle to the latter?). Harless.

Doubts of its Genuineness.

§ 146 a.

To what does not agree with Ephesus as its destination may be added, that the Epistle has no peculiarity either of aim or relations, and stands in such dependence on the Epistle to the Colossians as to be scarcely more than a verbose amplification of the same; for the reference to false teachers alone is omitted, and thereby the keeping of the whole lost.*
Table of Comparison.

Epistle to the Ephesians.
Greeting, i. 1, f., without Timothy.

First, dogmatic Part, i.—iii.

1.) General thanksgiving for the blessings of Christianity, i. 3—14.

Ver. 4: Καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς... εἰναὶ ἡμᾶς ἁγίους κ. ἀμώμους κατευθύνοντος αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 7: Ἔν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Χριστοῦ, πάντες κ. ἀμώμους κατευθύνοντος αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 10: ... ἀνακεφαλαίωσαν τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, πάντες κ. ἀμώμους κ. ἁγίους εἰς τὸ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτοῦ.

2.) Thanksgiving in regard to his readers, and prayers that they may apprehend what God has done for their salvation, and for the glory of Christ, the highly-exalted one, how he has awakened them from the death of sin, &c., i. 15—ii. 10.

Ver. 15—17: Ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καταδείκνυται τοὺς ἁγίους τοὺς ἀμώμους καταδείκτηκεν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ...

Ver. 18: ... καὶ τῇ ἀποκάλυψε τῷ μεταβάσεως αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἁγίου...
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Ver. 21: . . . ὑπεράνω πᾶσης ἀρχῆς καὶ εξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος, καὶ πάντως ὁνόματος, κ. τ. λ.

Ver. 22, f.: . . . καὶ αὐτῶν ἡθη κεφαλὴ ἐνῷ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἢτε ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσι πληρομένου.

i. 1: Καὶ ὅμως, διότι οὐκ ἦν παραπτώματι καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις . . . .

Ver. 5: . . . καὶ δειδαμαίνεις τοῖς παραπτώμασι συνεσώφορης τῷ Χριστῷ.

3.) Reminds the Gentile Christians of what they owe to Christ, ii. 11 - 23.

Ver. 11: . . . τὴς περιποίησιν ἐν σαρκί χειροποίητην.

Ver. 12: . . . δι' ἑνὸς . . . ἀπελλογιμούν τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ . . . .

Ver. 15: . . . ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ τῶν κόμων τῶν ἑγερών ἐν δόξασι καταργήσεις . . . .

Ver. 16: . . . καὶ ἀποκαταλάβη τοὺς ἀμφιθέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῇ θεότητι . . . .

4.) Of Paul's apostolic office, and suffering for the proclamation of the redemption; prayer for his readers, chap. iii.

Ver. 1: Τούτῳ χάριν ἐγὼ Παῦλος, ὁ διός τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὕπερ ἐνῶν τῶν ἠθῶν . . . .

Ver. 2: Εἴτε ἡκούσατε τῆς οἰκουμένης τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ, τῆς δοξάσεως μοι εἰς ὅμως .

Ver. 3: Ὁτι κατὰ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐγέρθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον . . . .

Ver. 4: Νῦν χάριν ἐν τοῖς παντελεμονισμοῖς ὑπὲρ ὅμως . . . .

Ver. 5: Ἡ οἰκουμένη ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην τοῦ θεοῦ, τῆς δοξάσεως μοι εἰς ὅμως, πληρώσω τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ . . . .

Ver. 6: Τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ ἀποκαλύψεως μοι ἐνῶν τῶν αἵματος καὶ ἐν τοῖς
Ephes.

Ver. 5: "O ἐπάρασα γενεὰς οὐκ ἐγραφήτη τοῖς υἱῶι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἢν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποτύλουσε αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταιε ἐν πνεύματι....

Ver. 7: Οὗ ἐγενόμην διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δυναμέν τῆς χριστίν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὴν δοθείσαν μοι....

Ver. 8, f.: .... ἐν τοῖς ἑδοναῖς ἐστὶν γεγολίσσασα τῶν ἀνεξιχνίαστων πλούτων τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ φωτίζει πάντας, τίς ἡ αἰκονιμα τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεφαλίμου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰωνῶν ἐν τῷ θεῷ.

Ver. 10 reminds of

Ver. 18, f. reminds of

Omitted.
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Second, moral Part, iv.–vi.

1 ) Exhortation to union, iv. i.–16.

Ver. 1: .... ἄξιος περιπατήσαι τῆς κλησάσεως, ὃς ἐκλήθητε,

Ver. 2: Μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ προφήτευσε, μετὰ μακροθυμίας, ἀνεχόμενοι ἄλληλοι ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

Ver. 3: Σπουδάζωντες τηρεῖν τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν τῷ συνδέον τῆς εἰρήνης.

Ver. 4: .... ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα, καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μᾶλλον ἐπιτίμη τῆς κλησάσεως ὑμῶν.

Ver. 15, f.: .... ὡς ἦσαν ἡ κεφαλή, ὁ Χριστός· ἦς ὁ πάν το ἱερατεία, συναφολογούμενοι καὶ συμβιβαζόμενοι διὰ πάσης ἀφής τῆς ἐπιχειρησίας εἰς ἐνέργειαν, ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνθὸς ἐκάστων μίρος τῆς ἀφελχής τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται, εἰς αἰκονιμα ἐναυτῶν ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

2 ) Exhortation to a renewed Christian life, iv. 17.–v. 21.

Second, moral Part, iii., iv.

1.) Exhortation to a renewed Christian life, iii. 1.–17.

Ver. 10: .... περιπατήσαι ἄξιος τοῦ κυρίου....

Ver. 12, f.: Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς ἐκλητοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄγιοι καὶ ἐνεχηρισμοί, σπλάγχνα ἀιτείμοι, χριστοτήτα, ἀπαινοφροσύνη, προφητεία, μακροθυμίας, ἀνεχόμενοι ἄλληλοι....

Ver. 14, f.: Ἑπὶ πάσης δὲ τούτου τῆς ἀγάπης, ὅτι ἐστιν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος, καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβευέτα τοῖς καρδιάς ὑμῶν, εἰς ὃν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνία σώματι.
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iv. 19: ἀκαδαμασίας πάσης ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ.

Ver. 22, ff.: ἀποδέσθαι υμῖς, καὶ τὰ τὴν προτείναν ἀναστροφὴν, τὸν πολέμον ἀνθρωπον, τὸν φθερόμενον κατὰ τὸς ἐπιθύμημα τῆς ἀπάτης, ἀναιμυνθήσετα πρὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐνέσφατον τὸν καινὸν ἀνθρωπόν, τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὀσιότητι τῆς ἄληθείας.

Ver. 25: Διὸ ἀποδέσθαι τὸ ἔντεκος, λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος μετὰ τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 28: Ὁργῆσθε, καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε.

Ver. 29: Πᾶς λόγος σαπρός ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἄπειρονεύθη, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὰς αἰσχρὰς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας, ἢν δῷ χάριν τοῖς ακούοντες.

Ver. 31: Πᾶσα πιερία καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ κραυγὴ καὶ βλασφημία ....

Ver. 32: Γίνεσθαι δὲ εἰς ἀλλήλοις χρηστοὶ, εὐποροῦντες, χαριζόμενοι ἕκαστος, καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν.

Ver. 3: Πορεία δὲ καὶ πᾶσα ἀκαδαμασία ἡ πλεονεξία.

Ver. 4: Καὶ αἰσχρότητι, καὶ μυρολογίᾳ ἡ εὐπρεπελία ....

Ver. 5: ἡ ἀκαθαρσία ἡ πλεονεξία, δε ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρεια ....

Ver. 6: .... διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς κλάσματας τῆς ἀπειθείας.

Ver. 15, f.: Βλέπετε οὖν, πῶς ἀφίζεσθαι περιπατεῖτε, μὴ δὲ ἄσωμοι, ἀλλ' ἐν ψυχήν εἰς τῷ καθορισμῷ τῶν καιρῶν, ὅτε αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦρα εἰσί.

Ver. 19, f.: .... λαλοῦντες ἐναυῶς ψυχικὸς καὶ ὄμοιοι καὶ φίλοις πνευμ.
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iii. 5: .... ἀκαδαμασίαν .... καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ....

iii. 8, ff.: Νυνὶ δὲ ἀποδέσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργὴν .... ἀπειρονευθεῖσαν τῶν πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνεσφάτον τῶν ἀνακαιμήσεων εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 8, f.: Νυνὶ δὲ ἀποδέσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς .... ὑμῖν ψευδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους.

Ver. 8: .... ὀργὴν ....

Ver. 8: .... αἰσχρολογίαν ....

iv. 6: ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντως ἐν χάριτι ....

iii. 8: .... ὀργὴν, θυμὸν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν ....

Ver. 12, f.: ἐνδοσασθε .... σπλάγχνα .... χριστοτοπία .... χαρίζομεν εὖνατος .... καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐξαρίστη ὑμῖν, αὐτῷ καὶ ὑμῖς.

iii. 5: .... πορείαν, ἀκαδαμασίαν .... καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἡττῶ ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία.

Ver. 8: .... αἰσχρολογίαν ....

Ver. 5: (See above.)

Ver. 6: .... διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς κλάσματας τῆς ἀπειθείας.

Ver. 5: .... διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς κλάσματας τῆς ἀπειθείας.

iv. 5: ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω, τοὺς καιροὺς ἐξεγερσίμουσαν τὸν καιρόν, ὅτε αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦρα εἰσί.
3.) Exhortation to the performance of family duties, v. 22 – vi. 9.

v. 21: Αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἱδίοις ἁθροίζων ὑποτάσσεσθε, ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ.

Ver. 25: Οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναίκας ἐαυτῶν . . .

vi. 1: Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῖσιν ὑμῶν ἐν κυρίῳ· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι δίκαιον.

Ver. 4: Καὶ οἱ πατέρες, μὴ παραργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ ἐκτρέψετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ πνεείᾳ κυρίου.

Ver. 5, 6: Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα, μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου, ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ· μὴ κατ᾽ ὀρθόλογον ὑποτάσσετε ὑμᾶς αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ’ ὡς δοῦλοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς, μετ’ εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες, ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ὑμῶν ἀδερφοῖς· ἐλθείτε, ὅτι τί ἐκάστου ποιήσασθε ἁγιάζω, τούτο κομητεύεται παρὰ κυρίον, εἰτε δουλοῖς, εἰτε ελεήμονας.

Ver. 9: Καὶ οἱ κύριοι, τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς, ἀνένες τὴν ἀπειλήν· εἰπότε, ὅτι καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ὁ κύριος ἐστιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ προσωπολογία οὐκ ἔστι παρὰ αὐτὸς (cf. Col. iii. 25).

4.) Exhortation to the spiritual warfare and to prayer, vi. 10 – 20.

Ver. 18, 19: . . . διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς καὶ δεήσεως προσευχῆς ἐν πάσιν καιρῷ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἀγνοούντες ἐν πάσῃ προσκαρτέρησατε καὶ δεήσει περὶ πάντων τῶν ἀγίων, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἢμῶν, ἵνα

3.) Exhortation to prayer and to Christian prudence, iv. 2 – 6.

Ver. 2, 3: Ἡ προσευχή προσκαρτερεῖται, γρηγοροῦντες εἰς αὐτὴν, ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ· προσευχήματα διὰ καθὲ ἡμῶν, ἵνα ὁ θεὸς ἄνοιξη ἢμῶν ἄνοιξην τοῦ λόγου, λαλῆσαι τῷ μητρίμῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ ὑμᾶς ἐκ

Coloss.

ψαλμοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ φθαίνει πνευματικά, ἐν χάριτι ἄκουστες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν τῷ θεῷ . . . . εὐχαριστοῦτε τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί δ’ αὐτοῦ.
This relation excites surprise. Such a transcription of himself is unworthy of an Apostle, and must therefore be the work of an imitator. The style, also, compared with that of the Epistle to the Colossians and other Pauline letters, is un-Pauline, being diffuse, loaded with parenthetic and secondary clauses, somewhat disconnected (ii. 1, 5, iii. 1, 13), verbose, and wanting in new thoughts. It differs from these Epistles in single particulars, and frequently in the thoughts, doctrines, and mode of teaching.

* The passage iv. 32–v. 1 is parallel with Col. iii. 19, f., but ταπανοφόρος, μακροθ. ἄνευ, δ. is omitted, as already used in ver. 2. Only an imitator is wont to be so economical.

b Frequent ἄπαξ λέγ.: τοῖς ἑπταευρετίοις, i. 3, 20; τὰ πνευματικά, vi. 12; διάδοχος, iv. 27, vi. 11 (elsewhere only in First and Second Timothy); κοσμοκράτωρ, vi. 12; σωτήρ, vi. 16. Words otherwise used: οἰκονομία, i. 10, iii. 9, 9 (οἰκονομοῦ μυστηρίων θεοῦ is differently used in 1 Cor. iv. 1); μυστήριον, v. 32 (as Rev. i. 20, xvii. 5, 7); πληρώμα, i. 23 (of Col. i. 19, ii. 9); εὐλογία, i. 3; οἶνον, ii. 2; περιποίησις, i. 14; ἁθαρσία, vi. 24; κανάδες, ii. 10; φωτίζων, iii. 9; πληροῦσθαι ἐν, v. 18; πλ. εἰς, iii. 19. The collocations βασιλεία τ. θεοῦ κ. Χριστοῦ, v. 5; τ. θέλημα τ. θεοῦ, v. 17. Interruption and resumption of the construction, iii. 2–14; the constructions ἴτε γαρ γινώσκοντες, v. 5; ἴτο φοβηθήτω, v. 33; ἴτα with Opt., i. 17, iii. 16. The frequent omission of the article before qualifying clauses, i. 3, 15, ii. 7, 11, 15, 21, f., and often. Expansion and pleonasm, i. 19, vi. 10, iii. 18; ii. 6, f., 21 (ἐν Χριστῷ ἱπτ.), and many other passages.

c Inappropriate appeal of the Apostle to his knowledge, iii. 4; collocation
of the apostles and prophets, ii. 20, iii. 5; arbitrary use of the passage from Psalms, iv. 8; citation of a non-biblical passage, v. 14; demonological representations, ii. 2, vi. 12; the characteristics of God, i. 17, iii. 9, 15; the insisting on the Old Testament promise, vi. 2, f.; the warning against theft, iv. 28; un-Pauline greeting, vi. 23, f.

§ 146 c.

Against these grounds of doubt the recognition of the Epistle by the Church has great weight, together with the opposite judgment of most investigators. The Epistle, if not by the Apostle himself, was at least written by a gifted disciple of his, belongs to the Apostolic age, and, unlike the spurious pastoral epistles, has no reference to later times.


Date, Occasion, and Design.

§ 147.

If the Epistle be genuine, the Apostle wrote it during his captivity (iii. 1, iv. 1), contemporaneously with the Epistle to the Colossians, but a little later, and with that in mind (whence the similarity between the two), and sent it likewise by Tychicus (vi. 21, f.). Tychicus’s journey might occasion the Apostle to write a similar letter to one or sev-
eral neighboring churches. The peculiar design of the letter may lie in the ironic section, iv. 1 - 16.

* The earlier composition of the Epistle to the Colossians is advocated by Schott, Neander, Schneckenburger (who, p. 141, even supposes that the Apostle, in composing the Ephesian Epistle, used a copy of the earlier Epistle to the Colossians. Against this, Wurm, p. 97), Harless, Wiggers, Meyer (the last mentioned on account of the kai, vi. 21, referring to the Colossians). The opposite view is maintained by Corn. a Lepide, Böhmer (Isag. p. 169), Credner (§ 86), Neudecker (p. 592), Anger (p. 135, sq.), and others (next note). According to MayerhöfF, the Epistle to the Colossians is modelled after ours. It seems to me, with Schleierm. in Stud. u. Krit. 1892. p. 501, that the more definite character and object, and the closer connection, of the Epistle to the Colossians, prove its originality.

* The absence of a greeting from Timothy alone opposes this. On this account, Hug, II. 402, 410, thinks it was the earlier, both in composition and in sending; Hensen, p. 632, in composition only. Eichhorn, Ill. 1. 279, explains this circumstance by the supposition that Timothy wrote the Epistle to the Colossians, but not that to the Ephesians. At any rate, we cannot assume that Tychicus was sent twice.

* Schneckenburger supposes (p. 135, ff.) that the Epistle refers to the theosophic system of Asia Minor, by which he aims to justify much of what was adduced as singular in § 146 b, notes b, c.

IV. Epistle to the Philippians.


The Church at Philippi.

§ 148.

In Philippi, a city of Macedonia, Paul first preached the gospel in Europe (Acts xvi. 12, ff.). On his second journey he revisited it (Acts xx. 2, 6). He seems to have stood in relations of perfect harmony and friendship with this old and well-regulated church (i. 1), composed probably alto-
gather, at least chiefly, of Gentile Christians, as he praises it so highly, shows so much love for it (i. 3–8, iv. 1), and received support from it (iv. 10–18, cf. 2 Cor. xi. 9). Notwithstanding, some have felt compelled to suppose that Judaizing teachers had gained a foothold there, or that Jewish Christians of their own body had led them astray (Phil. iii. 2 f.). But it seems to have been free from faults of that kind (iv. 1); it suffered from spiritual pride and dissension (i. 27–ii. 16, iv. 2).


* According to Eichhorn and Rheinwald, there were two parties at Philipp., a Jewish-Christian and a Gentile-Christian. Bertholdt, VI. 3403, opposes this, but thinks that Sadducaic teachers had made their appearance. This does not appear from Phil. iii. 18, ff. Against this whole view, W. H. Schinz, Die christl. Gemeinde z. Phil. 1833. p. 48, ff.

**Occasion, Contents, and Date of the Epistle.**

§ 149 a.

The mission of Epaphroditus to Rome, with pecuniary aid to the Apostle during his imprisonment (iv. 10, 18, ii. 25), afforded the occasion of this letter. Paul learned from him the circumstances of the church, and on his return felt moved to send with him this Epistle, which is more like a letter and more genial than any other of his letters to churches. After an affectionate introduction (i. 3–11), and details regarding his situation at Rome (i. 12–26), he exults to union and humility (i. 27–ii. 16), and gives further details (ii. 17–30). Then follow a reference to his enemies among the Jewish Christians, an exhortation to heavenly-mindedness (iii. 1–iv. 1), and various other appeals (iv. 2–9). Finally, thanks for the gifts which he has received (iv. 10–20), and greetings (iv. 21–23).

§ 149 b.

All the references (as well as the subscription) point to the imprisonment at Rome (i. 7, 12–14, 20, ii. 17, iv. 22),
where we can portray to ourselves the situation of the Apostle, in Acts xxviii.16, ff., exactly as it is here assumed. But the date of the composition belongs incontestably to the later period of his imprisonment, when Timothy (i. 1), but no longer Luke, was with the Apostle (Phil. iv. 21, cf. Col. iv. 14).

a Through the mention of the Praetorium, i. 13, and the imperial house, iv. 22, and on other grounds, the theories that the Epistle was written at Corinth (Oeder, Progr. de temp. et loco scriptae ep. ad Philipp. Onoldi, 1791, 4to, cf. Wolf, Cur Philol. IV. 168, sqq.), or at Cesarea (Paulus, Progr. de temp. scriptae prioris ad Timoth. atque ad Philipp. ep. Paul. Jen. 1799, 4to), are rendered wholly improbable.

b Phil. i. 12, ff., ii. 26, ff., presuppose a considerable length of time.

Unity and Genuineness of the Same.

§ 150 a.

Two writings have been supposed to be combined in our Epistle,—one addressed to the whole church, i. 1–iii. 1, χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ, with the greetings in iv. 21–23, and another to the Apostle’s more intimate friends at Philippi, iii. 1, from the words τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν to iv. 20; because iii. 1 begins anew, and the contents of ch. iii., iv., especially the exhortation iv. 2, ff., would not apply to the whole church. But this supposed difference between the exoteric and the esoteric parts of the Epistle is unworthy of the Apostle, and we find nothing which might not be written to the church. The abruptness of iii. 1 is easily explained by supposing that the Apostle hastened to his conclusion, but afterwards added a warning (iii. 2–iv. 1), and an appeal to certain persons (iv. 2, f.).


c The words τὸ λοιπόν, διδάσκοις, χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ, indicate, according to iv. 4, 8, 2 Cor. xiii. 11, Eph. vi. 10, 2 Thess. iii. 1, a near approach to the conclusion (Grotius). On the contrary, Schinz, as above, p. 79, ff. Van Heng. p. 12.
§ 150 b.

The genuineness of the Epistle, which is supported by very early testimonies, and seemed to be beyond all doubt, certain parts only being questioned, has in recent times been seriously assailed, but on untenable grounds.

* Polycarp, Ep. ad Philipp. c. 3, see Part I. § 18, note b. (According to this, Paul had written several Epistles to the Philippians, an idea which some (even Mey.) think is sustained by Phil. iii. 1, 18. But ἐκατολαί may, like litterae, refer to a single letter, see Cotelier. on the passage.) Cap. 11: Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis vel audivi, in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus, qui estis (laudati) in principio epistole ejus. Epist. eccles. Vienne. et Lugd. apud Euseb. V. 2: Οί καὶ ἐκ τοσούτων ζηλωταὶ καὶ μιμοῦται Χριστοῦ ἐγκύνητο, διʼ εἰκὸν μορφῆς θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐκ ἀραγιμόν ἡγήσατο τὸ ἐκεῖ ἴσως θεός, cf. Phil. ii. 6. Iren. IV. 18. 4: Quemadmodum et Paulus Philippensibus ait: repletus sum acceptis ab Ἑραπρόδιτο, etc., cf. Phil. iv. 18. Clemens Alex. Paedag. I. 107: .... αὐτοῦ ὀμολογούντος τοῦ Παύλου περὶ ἅμαρτου ὁ οἷς ὁ θεὸς ἀληθεύει, ἕ καὶ ἐπιστρεφόμενι, κ. τ. λ., cf. Phil. iii. 12, ff. Tertullian, De resurrect. carnis, c. 23: .... quum Philippensibus scribit, si qua, inquit, concurram in resurrectionem, quae est a mortuis: non quia jam accepi, etc., cf. Phil. iii. 11, f.


* According to Baur, Paulus, etc. p. 458, ff. and Schweigler, Nachap. Zeitalter, II. 133, ff., the (wrongly explained and misapplied) passage ii. 6, ff. contains Gnostic ideas and even Docetism, the Epistle suffers from poverty of thought and bears marks of imitation (iii. 1, ff., cf. 2 Cor. xi. 13, 18, 21, f.). Its polemics are indefinite and forced. Even the historic occasion, iv. 15, f., is doubted. What is said of the beneficial effects of the Apostle's imprisonment, i. 19, ff., is coupled with the mention of Clement, iv. 3, well known as Clement of Rome, and is regarded as legendary. See, on the contrary, Meyer, on iii. 11. Lünemann, P. ad Phil. ep. defendit. Gott. 1847.
CHAPTER IX.

PAUL'S PASTORAL EPISTLES.


I. First Epistle to Timothy.

Notices of Timothy in the Bible.

§ 151.

TIMOTHY, a Lycaonian, and probably from Lystra (Acts xvi. 1), son of a Gentile father and a Jewish mother (cf. 2 Tim. i. 5), probably converted by Paul (Acts xiv. 6, xvi. 1), became his assistant (Acts xvi. 3), and rendered him from that time forth important service; first, on the journey through Macedonia and Achaia, as his agent at Thessalonica and his assistant at Corinth (Acts xvii. 14, 1 Thess. iii. 2–5; Acts xviii. 5, 1 Thess. i. 1); then, before his second journey from Ephesus to Macedonia and Achaia, as his messenger thither (Acts xix. 22, cf. 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10, 2 Cor. i. 1), whence he accompanied Paul to Asia (Acts xx. 4, f.), and probably to Jerusalem and Rome (§ 115 b). In Paul’s letters during his imprisonment Timothy appears at his side (Col. i. 1, Philem. 1, Phil. i. 1, ii. 19).*  

* The datum given in Hebr. xiii. 23 is difficult to place in the chronological order. Later Church tradition makes Timothy the first Bishop of Ephesus.
Occasion, Design, and Contents of the First Epistle to Timothy.

§ 152 a.

Paul writes to Timothy, whom, on his departure for Macedonia, with the design of soon returning, he had left in charge at Ephesus (i. 3, iii. 14, f.). But this in no way agrees with the historic conditions of Paul's journey from Ephesus to Macedonia (Acts xx. 1), — which, according to the common supposition (Baron., Petav., Grot., Lightfoot, Michaelis, Haenl., and others), here first comes in question, — whither Timothy preceded him (Acts xix. 22), and where they met again after a few months (2 Cor. i. 1). Though it be possible that Timothy, who probably did not go to Corinth (§ 133 a), returned before Paul's departure, it is quite improbable that he would have so soon left the posts to which the Apostle had appointed him, and, immediately after, met him again in Macedonia. Besides, it can in no case have been the Apostle's purpose to return soon to Ephesus (1 Tim. iii. 14, iv. 13; cf. Acts xix. 21, xx. 16).*  

* Schmidt, Einl. I. 257. Schleiermacher, Ueb. d. sogen. ersten Br. d. Paulos an d. Timotheos. Ein krit. Sendeschreiben an J. C. Gass (1807), p. 115, ff. Eichhorn, Einl. III. 337, ff. A non lìquet is expressed by Wits. Meist. p. 100, and Wolf, Cur. p. 408. The attempts of Planck (see § 155, note e), Hug (Einl. II. § 109, 110), Curtius (De tempore, quo prior Paulus ant Timoth., ep. exarata sit. Berol. 1728), Hemsen (Der Ap. Paul. p. 340, ff.), to show the appropriateness of this historical relation, necessarily failed. Berthold, VI. 3571, finds 1 Tim. iii. 14, iv. 13, especially out of place. His own theory (p. 3574), however, that Paul wrote the Epistle somewhat later, on the journey from Corinth by Macedonia to Jerusalem, to Timothy, who had gone before him to Ephesus (Acts xx. 6, ff.), contradicts the statements in Acts (xx. 4, 5, 17, ff.), as well as all probability, and is at variance with 1 Tim. i. 3. Matthies tries to prop up this hypothesis by a monstrous explanation of 1 Tim. i. 3. He connects πορευόμενος with προσέμενα τος Ἐφ., making the sense as follows: Timothy must remain in Ephesus, first journeying to Macedonia, or as he was about going to Macedonia, which, according to p. 452, means that he must wait at Ephesus as the terminus of his journey to Macedonia. Mosheim's theory (Erklär. p. 45, ff.), that Paul, during the first part of his stay at Ephesus, took a journey to Macedonia, is too contradictory to Acts (cf. especially, xx. 31). The same applies to the journey supposed by Schrader (I. 86, II. 287, ff.), from Ephesus to Maco-
FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. § 152 c.

donia, Corinth, Crete, Nicopolis, Jerusalem, Antioch, and back to Ephesus. According to Schneckenburger's (Beitr. p. 183) and Büttger's (Beitr. IV. 15, ff.) conjecture in regard to 1 Tim. i. 3, Ἰαθὼς παρεκάλεσά σε προσενε-νας εν Ἐφέσῳ, πορεύομενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἵνα παραγγείλης, κ. τ. λ., or πορεύομεν, the whole journey and the difficulty growing out of it would vanish. Cf. Cremer, § 165. Neudeker, p. 551.

§ 152 b.

The church at Ephesus is presupposed as an organization of long standing. The offices of elders and other church servants, even of female elders and servants, were in existence and were sought after (iii. 11, 15, v. 9, 17, 19). False teachers also had made their appearance (i. 3). The last-mentioned fact contradicts the assumption in Acts xx. 29, f.; the first-mentioned, the supposition of a church of but a few years' growth.

§ 152 c.

The design of the Epistle is to give Timothy directions, not for the organizing of the church at Ephesus, but for countering the false teachers (i. 3), and in general for the superintendence of the church until the Apostle's return (iii. 15). But the contents of the Epistle, excepting chap. v., ill agree with the aim proposed. The author does not adhere closely to his theme, but wanders away into irrelevant matters. Besides, reference to the Apostle's relations to the Ephesian church is wholly wanting.

* Schleiermacher, p. 117, f. Hence Mosheim's theory of the earlier composition of the Epistle, at the beginning of the Apostle's stay at Ephesus, is also untenable, both on internal and external grounds. Cf. Berthold, VI. 3558, f.

* Chap. i. indeed commences with false teachers, but as early as ver. 12 wanders away from them. Subsequently, it is true, false teachers are repeatedly mentioned, but also in a cursory way. The direction for public prayer and intercession, ii. 1-7, and in regard to the relation of women to the church, ver. 8-15, as well as the trivial directions concerning the induction of bishops and deacons, chap. iii., are of little consequence to the administration of the church. The prediction of future false teachers, iv. 1-5, and the admonitions to Timothy, partly in reference to such (already existing?) false teachers, and partly of a general nature, ver. 6-16, have
no point. The directions for the government of the church, especially for
the support of widows and their appointment as female elders, chap. v.,
have most distinctness and applicability. Chap. vi. treats of various matters:
ver. 1, ff., moral rules for slaves; ver. 3–5, warning against false teachers,
especially on account of their covetousness; ver. 6–10, warning against
avarice; ver. 11–16, admonitions to Timothy; ver. 17–19, good instruc-
tion for the rich; ver. 20, f., against false teachers. The inappropria-
te character of the contents appears also in the admonitions to Timothy, some
of which demean this assistant of the Apostle (i. 18, f., iv. 7, ff., 12, ff., vi.
11, ff.), while others are too general and trivial for even ordinary Christians
(iv. 7, ff., 12, ff., v. 23, vi. 11).

§ 152 d.

To avoid the historic difficulties, others place the Epistle
in the time after the first imprisonment of the Apostle,*
when, they think, he took a journey to Asia Minor (cf. Phi-
lem. 22) and Macedonia (cf. Phil. ii. 24). Against this we
must not object that the Epistle assumes a yet unregulated
condition of the Ephesian church, for it does not; but we
may urge that Paul at Rome designed sending Timothy
to Macedonia (Phil. ii. 19), (which indeed he may have given
up, b) that Timothy was at that time no longer a youth
(1 Tim. iv. 12), and that the Epistle contains no reference to
the imprisonment, as to other earlier experiences of the
Apostle. c This whole theory, moreover, is uncertain, and
the offspring of critical embarrassment; nor does it remove
the difficulties that lie in the inappropriateness of the con-
tents and their total want of distinct allusion. The hypo-
thesis that the Epistle was written during the imprisonment
at Cesarea, and contains commissions for Timothy to
Macedonia, is too forced to deserve particular refutation.d

The Epistle is, consequently, neither historically nor ex-
getically comprehensible.

* Uehle, Mill, Pearson, Clericus, Paley, Wegscheider, Mynster (Kl. theol.
Schr. p. 230), Heydenreich (1. 12), Mack, Leo, Guerike, Beitr. p. 134, Ein-
an Tim. u. Tit. (Berl. 1829), p. 204 (cf. Kling in Flatt, p. 566, ff.), Neun-
der, Wurm, &c. This is indicated also by the subscription, ἀπὸ Λαοδίκειας.

Acts xx. 25 may be so broadly interpreted as to include an expression
of the narrator’s opinion that Paul never returned to Ephesus.
II. Second Epistle to Timothy.

Occasion, Design, and Contents.

§ 153 a.

Paul writes from Rome, where he is a prisoner (i. 8, 12, 16, f., ii. 9, iv. 6, 16), to Timothy, who, according to the common view, is supposed to be at Ephesus (i. 15, 18, iv. 19, cf. to the contrary iv. 12), and invites him to come to Rome and bring Mark with him (iv. 9, 11, 21). If now, with Baronius, Petavius, Estius, Lightfoot, Hammond, Witsius, Cave, Lardner, Heinrichs, J. E. Chr. Schmidt, Hug, Schrader, Hemsen, Matthies, and others, we assume the imprisonment recorded in Acts, the letter must have been written before the other letters from Rome; for, when they were written, Timothy and Mark were already with the Apostle (Col. i. 1, Philem. 1, Phil. i. 1, Col. iv. 10). But this does not accord well with the mission of Tychicus (iv. 12, cf. Col. iv. 7, ff.), the departure of Demas (iv. 10, cf. Col. iv. 14), the already far-advanced trial of the Apostle (iv. 16, f.), and his expectation of a speedy execution (iv. 6, cf. Phil. ii. 24), although these difficulties may be removed. But it is more difficult, nay, almost impossible, to harmonize iv. 13, 20, with Acts. For although we assume the Apostle’s journey presupposed in these passages to be that recorded in Acts xx. 4, ff., yet the statement in iv. 20, that the Apostle left Trophimus behind sick at Miletus, contradicts Acts xxii. 29, where he appears in the company of the Apostle. Moreover, iv. 19, compared with Rom. xvi. 3, is a difficulty, as also that, in iv. 11, the presence of Aristarchus (cf. Acts xxvii. 2, Col. iv. 10, Philem. 24) is not presupposed.

* The uncertainty of this supposition is shown by Heydenreich, II. 65, ff. Schrader, I. 199, f., on the contrary, insists on it strongly.
As Schmidt, Einl. I. 199, f., and Schrader, I. 193, ff., set them aside, each in his own way. Henssen, on the contrary, (p. 713, ff.,) dates the composition later than the other Epistles, but must, on that account, assume an earlier visit of Timothy and Mark to Rome.

The reading of the Arabic version, ἐν Μιλήσῳ for ἐν Μιλήσῳ, which Rink, Serschreiben d. Korinth. p. 51, following Baronius, Beza, and Grotius, recommends, probably arose from critical embarrassment, like Hug's (Einl. II. 419), approved by Henssen, and Schrader's (I. 191, f.), and Matthiae's still more artificial explanations of the passage.


§ 153 b.

The contents of this (in general better-written) letter correspond more closely to its design than those of the First Epistle. It is intended to invite Timothy to Rome. That the writer does not reach this point before iv. 9, 21, but prepares Timothy by admonitions and information concerning his own situation in Rome, cannot be considered inappropriate. However, much that is manifestly irrelevant is introduced.

The admonition to fearlessness and to taking part in suffering for the Gospel, with mention of his situation in Rome, and of the various relations of Christian brethren towards him, i. 6 – 18; and the admonitions, ii. 1, 3 – 13, iii. 10 – 12, iv. 5, together with the allusion to the Apostle's near end, iv. 6 – 8, may be regarded as appropriate. Not so, however, the remaining exhortations, ii. 2, 14 – 26, iii. 14 – iv. 2; still less the prophetic glances into the future, iii. 1 – 5, iv. 3, and the polemical outbursts, ii. 16 – 21, 23, iii. 6 – 9, 13. To this may be added that the admonitions are, for the most part, inappropriate to an assistant who had stood the test of ten years (i. 5, ff., 13, ii. 1, ff., 7, 22, iii. 14, f., iv. 5). The reference in iii. 11 to Acts xiii. 50, xiv. 2, 7, 19, is out of place, and betrays the interpolator.

§ 153 c.

On account of these historic difficulties, several writers have returned to the old theory (Euseb., Chrysost., Theodoret,
Jerome, Anselm, Corn. a Lap., L. Cappell, Grot., Usher, &c.), expressed in the subscription, that the Epistle was written during Paul's second imprisonment.* But at that time (twelve to fifteen years after his conversion) Timothy could still less be treated as a young man (cf. ii. 22), and the Apostle would surely have reminded him that he had already aided him once in captivity. It is, moreover, improbable that in a second imprisonment so much should be repeated, — that Paul should a second time have undergone an examination and received mild treatment (ii. 9, cf. Acts xxviii. 31).b The theory that the Epistle was written during the imprisonment at Caesarea stands in open contradiction to the Epistle (i. 17).c

This Epistle also, therefore, is neither historically nor exegetically comprehensible.d

a Mosheim, Michaelis, Bertholdt, Mynster (Kl. theol. Schr. p. 208, ff.), Heydenreich (who lays stress on the silence regarding the persons mentioned in Rom. xvi. 5, 15), Flatt, Mack, Guericke, Böhl, Neander, and others. Some, following Euseb. H. E. II. 22 (§ 129 a, note b), lay stress on iv. 16. But ἀναλογία means simply a response before the court, not the whole judicial process and the whole imprisonment.

b Hug, II. 415, ff. Rink, p. 43, ff. Matthes, p. 576, ff. The supposition that Paul, on his second imprisonment, would receive a wholly different treatment from his first, and a speedy death, is certainly a very probable one.


III. Epistle to Titus.

Destination and Contents.

§ 154 a.

Titus (not mentioned in Acts), an assistant of Paul, was born a Greek (Gal. ii. 3). We meet with him as Paul’s companion on the journey to Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 1, 3), as his agent at Corinth (2 Cor. vii. 6, 13, 14, viii. 6, 16, f., 23, xii.
18), and finally, apparently, on his way from Rome to Dal-
matia (2 Tim. iv. 10). Paul, having left him at Crete, in
the discharge of certain commissions connected with the
church (Tit. i. 5, f.);\(^a\) writes to him and gives directions for
his guidance. Especially in regard to the appointment of
elders (i. 5–9), with a side glance at certain false teachers
(i. 10–16); then in regard to the moral guidance of the
church as respects the various ranks in society (chap. ii.),
together with general moral precepts and motives (iii. 1–8),
and a warning against dissensions (iii. 9–11). He closes
with personal remarks (iii. 12–15).

\(^a\) According to Euseb. H. E. III. 4, he was first Bishop of Crete. Hieron.
Cat. vir. ill. Tit. Thodoret. ad 1 Tim. iii. Theophylact. Proem. ad Tit.,
and others. Heydenreich, II. 230, calls this an established and generally
acknowledged fact.

§ 154 b.

But there is no period in the known history of his life to
which we can with any probability assign the Apostle’s
journey to Crete, and Titus’s stay there (i. 5), as well as
Paul’s residence at Nicopolis (iii. 12), and, consequently,
the composition of this letter.\(^a\) Many refer all this to
the short time of his stay in Greece and return through
Macedonia (Acts xx. 2, 3);\(^b\) others to the Apostle’s first resi-
dence at Corinth, where certainly there is more space for
it;\(^c\) others connect the journey to Crete with that from
Corinth to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 18), and suppose the Epistle
to have been written there;\(^d\) others place the whole in Paul’s
three years’ stay there (Acts xix.);\(^e\) others, finally, suppose
that the Apostle took the journey to Crete at the same time
as the supposed intermediate journey to Corinth between
Acts xviii. 23 and xix. 1, and wrote our Epistle from Greece.\(^f\)
But as all these theories are improbable, and the designed
stay at Nicopolis, especially, raises difficulty,\(^g\) others resort
here also to the time between the first and the second im-
prisonment.\(^h\) This opinion seems to have the advantage of
being able to explain the affinity between all three Epistles
by their composition in the same period. This advantage,
however, vanishes on examination, because the different circumstances assumed demand a considerable space, and the individual Epistles thus become separated. Moreover, to this hypothesis the broad region of possible theories seems to stand open; but it is greatly limited by the fact that 2 Tim. must have been written during an imprisonment. And that it, according to ii. 17, f., cf. 1 Tim. i. 20, was written earlier than this Epistle, utterly overthrows the hypothesis.

* Acts certainly has gaps, cf. Gal. i. 17, f., Rom. xv. 19, 2 Cor. xi. 23.

* Baronius, Lightfoot, Schmid, Hist. ant. Can. p. 635; Heinrichs, Proleg. in ep. ad Tit. p. 106; Matthiæs, p. 192, ff.; Blau, De genuina eorum verborum indole, quibus Paulus ep. ad Tit. scriptam præfatur (1846), p. 33, sq.; but they differ in the nearer determination of the point of time when Paul went to Crete, as well as in the situation of Nicopolis (in Epirus or Thrace). At that time Titus (2 Cor. viii. 17, xiii. 18, preceding §) and Tychicus (Acts xx. 4) were in the Apostle’s company. The stay at Nicopolis would thus fall into the return journey through Macedonia; but this, being occasioned by an ambuscade, was doubtless hasty. Moreover, the three months’ stay in Greece probably took place in late autumn and winter (see note on 9 Cor. viii. 10). But little time remains, therefore, for the stay in Epirus.

* Michaelis, Einl. II. 1315. Paul at that time was not acquainted with Apollos (Tit. iii. 13). According to Böttger (Beitr. IV. I, ff.), Paul founded the church in Crete at that time, revisited it at the time mentioned in Acts xix. 22, 23, and on his flight, recorded in Acts xx. 3, left Titus in Crete, or rather sent him back thither.


* Schmidt, Einl. I. 265. Schrader, I. 103, II. 283. Anger, p. 76, — for by Nicopolis they understand the Cilician Nicopolis. Anger, however, does not make the Apostle actually come thither. This hypothesis is contradicted distinctly by the Apostle’s declaration in Acts xx. 31.


* See Böhl, p. 426, ff.; — moreover, the defender of the one hypothesis always overthrows the other. Credner’s hypothesis is opposed particularly by this circumstance, that at the time supposed Paul was not yet acquainted with Apollos (Tit. iii. 13); and, with every other, by the fact that the time between the conversion of the Cretans and the composition of the letter is too short to admit of occasion for the Apostle’s warning against false teachers.

* Mill, Clericus, Bertholdt, Mynster, Guerike, Heydenreich, Böhl, Neander, Wurm. Schott also inclines that way.
§ 154 c.

Moreover, the Epistle does not accord with the presupposed condition of affairs, or with its object. 1. Many false teachers (i. 10, f.) are represented as present and working in churches not yet organized, and destitute of elders (i. 5). 2. Information concerning these is given, not by Titus, remaining on the island, to Paul absent, but by Paul absent to Titus present. 3. The expression i. 12, f. would be unjust towards a church in which Paul found so much readiness to receive the Gospel, and the absence of all grateful acknowledgments is singular (cf. 1 Thess. i. 2, ff.). 4. The existence of Christianity in the island for a considerable time is presupposed (i. 6). 5. The directions in i. 6 – 9 are trivial, and the argumentation against the false teachers, as well as their characterization, i. 10 – 16, iii. 9, wholly vague. The moral rules, ii. 1 – 10, iii. i. f., are superficial and trivial. The character of its contents would render the Epistle superfluous for Titus, and from i. 12, f. unfit for communication to the church. Here also, therefore, we have the same historical and exegetical incomprehensibility as before.

Doubts of the Genuineness of these Three Epistles.

§ 155 a.

Since Schleiermacher's attacks on 1 Tim.,* the other so-called Pastoral Epistles have been wholly or in part doubted and their genuineness denied. Consistent criticism must certainly group all three together in the investigation; for sometimes all three, sometimes two, have many peculiarities in common, which distinguish them from the other Epistles,— 1. In language and ideas.α

Doubts of Their Genuineness. § 155 a.


*Χάρις, Ἑλεος, εἰρήνη, 1 Tim. i. 2, 2 Tim. i. 2, Tit. i. 4 (elsewhere χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη); πιστός ὁ λόγος, 1 Tim. i. 15, iii. 1, iv. 9, 2 Tim. ii. 11, Tit. iii. 8; *διαδασαλία ἐγγινοῦσα, 1 Tim. i. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 3, Tit. i. 9, ii. 1; *λόγος ἐγγινοῦσας, 1 Tim. vi. 3, 2 Tim. i. 13; *λόγος ἴσης, Tit. ii. 8; *ἐγνώσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει, Tit. i. 13, ii. 2; on the other hand, νοσεῖν περὶ ἐγνώσεως, 1 Tim. vi. 4, γάνγραμαι, 2 Tim. ii. 17; *εἰσῆξε, 1 Tim. ii. 2, iii. 16, iv. 7, vi. 3, 6, 11, 2 Tim. iii. 5, Tit. i. 1, εἰσῆξεν ἤμι, 2 Tim. iii. 12, Tit. ii. 12; *μόδιον, 1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7, 2 Tim. iv. 4, Tit. i. 14; *ζητήσεις, 1 Tim. i. 4, vi. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 9; *γενεαλογία, 1 Tim. i. 4, Tit. ii. 9; *ματαιολογία, 1 Tim. i. 6, ματαιολόγος, Tit. i. 10; λογομαξία, 1 Tim. vi. 4, λογομαξίας, 2 Tim. ii. 14; *κεινοφιάσας, 1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 16; ἐπιφάνεια, 1 Tim. vi. 14, 2 Tim. iv. i. 8, Tit. ii. 13 (instead of Paul’s usual word, παρουσία; but cf. 2 Thess. ii. 8); *σωτήρ, of God, 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 13, iv. 10, Tit. i. 3, ii. 10; *παραθέτης, 1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. i. 19, 14; *σωφρονεμισις, 2 Tim. i. 7; *σωφρόνεσις, Tit. ii. 12; *σωφρόν, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 6, ii. 2, 5; *σωφρονεμεῖ, Tit. ii. 6 (cf. Rom. xii. 3, 2 Cor. v. 13); παρατείνοισιν, 1 Tim. iv. 7, vi. 11, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 10; περιοντοσθαι, 2 Tim. ii. 16, Tit. iii. 9: ἀστροχεῖν, 1 Tim. i. 6, vi. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 19; the use of κατὰ, 2 Tim. i. 1, Tit. i. 1; ὑπομιμήσεως, 2 Tim. ii. 14, Tit. iii. 1; προσέχειν, 1 Tim. i. 4, iii. 8, iv. 1, 13, Tit. i. 14. Cf. Eichhorn, Einl.

* The words marked with an asterisk indicate peculiar ideas.
III. 319, ff. Schott, p. 320, sqq., who adds much, among the rest the following, worthy of note: ἀρνέσθαι, 1 Tim. v. 8, 2 Tim. ii. 12, f., iii. 5, Tit. i. 16, ii. 12 ἁμαρτόντας (for κύριος), 1 Tim. vi. 1, f., 2 Tim. ii. 21, Tit. ii. 9. Mayerhoff, p. 18, f., who calls attention to καλὰ ἐργα, 1 Tim. v. 10, 25, vi. 18, Tit. ii. 14, iii. 8, 14.

§ 155 b.

2. All three Epistles have this common peculiarity, namely, that the writer readily digresses from the subject of his letter to general truths or common sayings (1 Tim. i. 15, ii. 4—6, iii. 16, iv. 8—10; 2 Tim. i. 9, f., ii. 11—13, 19—21, iii. 12, 16; Tit. ii. 11—14, iii. 3—7), and that, even what he urges in refutation or encouragement appears in this form (1 Tim. i. 8—10, iv. 4, f., vi. 6—10; 2 Tim. ii. 4—6; Tit. i. 15). After such digressions or general instructions, he commonly seeks a return or a conclusion and resting-point in a special admonition or direction (1 Tim. iii. 14, f., iv. 6, 11, vi. 2, 5, 11; 2 Tim. ii. 7, 14, iii. 5; Tit. ii. 15, iii. 8).

3. In all three Epistles the moral view of life preponderates (1 Tim. ii. 10, v. 10, 25, vi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 21, f., iii. 17; Tit. i. 16, ii. 7, 14, iii. 1, 8, 14), combined with the assertion of moral desert (1 Tim. ii. 15, iii. 13, iv. 8, vi. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 8), and an abstract or doctrinal apprehension of Christianity (as διδασκαλία, Tit. ii. 10, and elsewhere, cf. 2 Tim. iii. 15, f.).

* The διδασκαλία ἐγκαύουσα is the doctrine of morality (cf. Tit. ii. 1, 1 Tim. i. 10), and εὐσεβία, practical piety (2 Tim. iii. 12, Tit. ii. 19). The author of these letters stands at the mediating point between Paulinism and Nomism, cf. 1 Tim. i. 8, f. His universalism, unlike Paul's, is not polemic (1 Tim. ii. 4, iv. 10, Tit. ii. 11).

§ 155 c.

The special characteristic of the three Epistles is their polemics against certain false teachers, who, although not always the same, are yet alike, namely, sometimes Judaizing Gnostics (Tit. i. 10, 14; 2 Tim. ii. 23, iv. 4; 1 Tim. i. 4, 7), sometimes anti-Judaizing (2 Tim. ii. 18; 1 Tim. iv. 3). Now it is not impossible that the Apostle had discovered and opposed the beginnings of the Gnostic tendency, as in the Epistle to
the Colossians he actually combated similar opponents; and it is probable that Gnosticism had run through a first stadium before that of the second century. The passages 1 Tim. vi. 20, Tit. iii. 10, however, point to a time when Gnosticism had attained a certain development, and the notion of heresy was familiar. Other passages and sections also indicate circumstances belonging to a late period (1 Tim. iii. 1, v. 9, vi. 17).


* According to Baur, these polemics refer to Marcion and other Gnostics well known in the history of the second century, after whose appearance, therefore, the Epistles were written. This hypothesis we cannot accept, cf. § 158, note b.

§ 155 d.

One acquainted with Paul's style of writing will find much, aside from the difference in vocabulary, &c., already remarked upon, that betrays an imitator, who writes not from the living fullness of the Apostle's mind, and scarcely knows how to exhaust a single topic.*

* We frequently miss (1 Tim. ii. 1, iii. 15, iv. 8; 2 Tim. i. 3–5, iv. 6, cf. ver. 5, 7, iv. 18; iii. 9, cf. ver. 1, ff., 13, ii. 17) the good logical connection. Matter borrowed from Pauline Epistles, and commonly ill placed, appears in 1 Tim. ii. 5 (cf. Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24), 7, 2 Tim. i. 3, 7, ii. 20, iv. 6, f. Even church formulas seem to be used, 1 Tim. iii. 16, vi. 13, 15, f., 2 Tim. ii. 8. Probably in 1 Tim. v. 18 the Gospel of Luke is cited as yapaf. (Baur and Schweiger err in finding it mentioned in 2 Tim. ii. 8). Especially foreign to the Apostle's style of thought and teaching are (apart from what is adduced in § 155 b, no. 3) the remarks on marriage, 1 Tim. ii. 15, iv. 3, v. 14, cf. iii. 4, 12, v. 10 (see, on the contrary, 1 Cor. vii. 8, f., 25, ff.) the designation of Christ as the Mediator, 1 Tim. ii. 5; the self-exculpation, 1 Tim. i. 13 (an inappropriate passage, at any rate, cf. Schleiermacher, p. 165, ff.), and the self-exaltation, 2 Tim. iv. 8.

§ 156.

The emphasis laid on the "sound, authentic," doctrine received from the Apostle (Tit. i. 9, 14, ii. 1, 7, 15, iii. 8, f., 2 Tim. i. 13, ii. 2, 11, 14, ff., iii. 10, 14, ff., iv. 1, ff., 1 Tim. i.
3, ff., iii. 15, f., iv. 6, ff., 12, ff., vi. 3, ff., 12, 20), and the injunctions (Tit. i. 5, ff., 1 Tim. iii. 1, ff., v. 17—19), which tend to strengthen and develop the hierarchy, serve to further the design especially of the First Epistle to Timothy, namely, to oppose the false teaching of Gnosticism; and are in harmony with the action of the Catholic Church against these movements, which threatened danger to her unity.

* 2 Tim. ii. 2, the advice to educate teachers of the Gospel.

§ 157.

Schleiermacher regarded only the First Epistle to Timothy as spurious. It seemed to him a copy and compilation of the other two, from its sometimes literal resemblance to them, from the singular relation of 1 Tim. i. 20 to 2 Tim. ii. 17, iv. 14, and from the (by him overestimated) abruptness of the style of writing and the composition. Credner also thought that these Epistles, which he regards as in part genuine (§ 155 a, note b), served as a model to the author of 1 Tim. But all three have the same author and the same object, although the latter appears most distinctly in 1 Tim. The Epistle to Titus and the Second Epistle to Timothy were written first, and in writing 1 Tim. the author repeated himself somewhat.* He committed also the error of assuming in this letter, written later but treating of an earlier period (that of the Apostle’s journey in Acts xx. 1), the expulsion of Hymeneus and Alexander, who appear in a different connection in 2 Tim., — which, though written earlier, is laid in a later period (that of the Roman imprisonment).

* Eichhorn also regards 1 Tim. as later than the Epistle to Titus, and as assuming a later constitution of the Church; also as worse written, p. 339, ff. The last circumstance he explains in a most singular way, p. 404. Baur acknowledges the dependence of 1 Tim. on the other two Epistles.
Church Acceptance of the Three Epistles.

§ 158.

It was probably on dogmatic grounds that Marcion excluded these Epistles from his collection, and that other heretics also rejected them either wholly or in part. In other respects they are as strongly supported by external testimonies as other Pauline Epistles. Hence, we must not assign them too late a date. Although not written by Paul himself, nor pure fountains of the Pauline doctrine, they are yet important documents for the later development of Paulinism, especially in its fusion with Nomism.


b The allusions to Tit. iii. 11, 1 Tim. ii. 8, found by Lardner in Clemens Rom. Ep. 1. c. 2. 39, are very doubtful. The same is true of that in Ignat. Ad Ephes. c. 2, to 2 Tim. i. 16. More certain is that in Polycarp, c. 4: Ἄρχη δὲ πῶς ἡμῖν ἡ καταγεννησία. Εἶδόν τιν οὐδὲ ἐπηρεγμένον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἔνεγκαν τι ἐχωμεν, cf. 1 Tim. vi. 7, 10. See however, in opposition, Schleiermacher, as above, p. 16, ff: Baur, Past. Br. p. 137, f., who regards Polycarp's letter as older than 1 Tim. Theophil. Ad Autolyc. III. 14, appeals to 1 Tim. ii. 2 (Part I. § 18). Hegesipp. in Euseb. H. E. III. 32: ... ὅς δὲ ὁ λεπί τῶν ἀποστόλων χόρος διάφορος εἰλήφει τοῦ βίου τέλος, παρελθέντες τε τῇ γενέτει ἐκείνη ... την καθα τής
CHAPTER X.

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The design of the Epistle to the Hebrews is to show apologetically, not polemically, the superiority of the Christian revelation, as complete and archetypal, over that of the Old Testament, as merely preparatory and typical; and to confirm in the faith those Christians who yet adhered to the Old Testament views and usages. The style advances from that of discussion to that of exhortation, and the latter is interwoven with the former. The relation between the old and the new revelation is like that between the prophets and the Son of God (i. 1–3); the superiority of the latter to the former, like that of Christ to the angels (the proclaimers of the Mosaic Law), although for the redemption of men he was for a time humbled below them (i. 4–ii. 18), and to Moses, who was but a servant, whereas Christ is a Son (iii. 1–6). So much the more must they beware of apostasy (iii. 7–iv. 13). Christ is also a better High-Priest than that of the Old Testament (iv. 14–v. 10). Exhortation to lay hold on these higher truths (v. 11–vi. 20). Christ is Priest after the order of Melchisedec, superior to the Aaronite priests (vii.). He is Priest of a higher, a heavenly sanctuary, Mediator of a better covenant, of a better reconciliation, of which the Old Testament contains only indications and types (viii. 1–x. 18). Exhortation to the believing use of these benefits, warning against falling away, encouragement to faith by the exhibition of Old Testament examples, and to steadfastness in suffering (x. 19–xii. 11). Supplement containing moral exhortations, with personal references and greetings (xii. 12–xiii. 25).

The author has set forth with great acuteness and depth both the difference between the old and the new revelation,
and the germs and indications of the latter contained in the former; and thus raised his readers from the old to the new, without declaring the latter contradictory to the former. He has completely solved the problem of a genuine adaptation, so as to spare the weak without affording any assistance to error.

Is Paul the Author? External Grounds.

§ 160 a.

The opinion that Paul is the author is very ancient, but at the same time accompanied with doubts. The oldest Alexandrian Fathers advocate its acceptance by the Church, but are sensible of the difficulty of ascribing it to the Apostle, and do not seem to appeal to any precise tradition. Origen, although quoting the Epistle as Pauline, is yet aware of doubts against it. He admits that Paul did not write it, but ascribes the contents to him. Only the later Dionysius (A. D. 247) accepts the Epistle without remark as Pauline; and is followed by the later Alexandrians.

* Euseb. H. E. VI. 14, from the lost Hypotyposes of Clemens Alex.: Kai tēn prōs 'Ebraíous de ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου μέν εἶναι φήσαι, γεγράφθαι δὲ 'Eβραϊκῇ φωνῇ, λουκᾶν δὲ φιλοτίμως αὐτὴν μεθερμηνεύσαντα ἐκδοῦναι τοῖς Ἐλλησι ποῖν τὸν αὐτὸν χρώτα εὐρίσκεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ταύτης τό τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν πράξεων ὑπὲρ ἔγχρωμα βασικά τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν πράξεων. 'Eβραίους γὰρ φήσων ἐπιστέλλων προσελήφθαι εὐλόγησαι καὶ ἀποπνεύσωσιν αὐτῶν, συνιτῶν πάνω οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτούς, τὸ δομα βίας.

.... Ἡδή δὲ ὃς ὁ μακάρως ἔλεγε πρεσβύτερος (his teacher, Pantænus, about A. D. 150), ἐπὶ δὲ κύριος, ἀπόστολος ἄν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἀπεστάλη πρὸς 'Εβραίους, διὰ μετριότητα ὁ Παύλος, ὡς δὲ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀποσταλμένος, ὁπός ἐγράφη ἐκαίν Ἐβραίων ἀπόστολον, διὰ τῆς τῶν πρὸς τὸν κύριον τιμῆς, διὰ τὸ ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τοῖς Ἐβραίοις ἐπιστέλλων, ἐδωκών κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ ἀπόστολον. Cf. the quotation from Heb. xi. 1, ff. in Strom. II. 362, 364, and other passages.


* In Euseb. H. E. VI. 25, see Part I. § 23, note b. If he speaks of a church tradition, he means probably only the Alexandrian.
§ 160 b.

In the Western Church, the Pauline origin of the Epistle was at first denied. In the Eastern Church, it obtained apostolic authority after the middle of the third century, in which position Eusebius found it well established, although the doubts regarding its genuineness were known.

In the second half of the fourth century, however, its acceptance among the Greeks was universal (Part I. § 26, note a).

Euseb. H. E. VI. 20 : Ἡλθε δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ Γαίου, λογωτάτον ἀνδρός, διάλογος, ἐπὶ Ρώμης κατὰ Ζεφύρων πρὸς Πρόλον τῆς κατὰ Ψρύγας αἰρέσεως ὑπερμαχότας κεκυρώνῳ. Eν χὶ τῶν δὲ ἔκαστος τῆς περὶ τὸ συνάττευν καινὸς γραφάς προπετειάς τε καὶ τόμων ἑπιστομίων, τῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἁποστολὸς διαμαρτυρῶν μόνων ἑπιστολῶν μνημονεύει, τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους μὴ συναρμολογοῦσα ταῖς λοιπῶν. Irenæus was certainly acquainted with the Epistle to the Hebrews.

EPISODE TO THE HEBREWS.

"Writing of the Synod at Antioch, A.D. 264, in Mansi, Collect. concil. I. 1039: 'O δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα, κατὰ τὸν ἄποστολον (2 Cor. iii. 17) κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν ἦπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς πέτρας, κ.τ.λ. (1 Cor. x. 4): ... ἐκ περὶ Μωϋσέως: μείζονα πλοῦτον ἡγγασάμενος, κ.τ.λ. (Heb. xi. 26.) Whether Methodius (A.D. 290) cites the Epistle as a writing of Paul, Convir. p. 96: εἰ δὲ νόμος, κατὰ τὸν ἄποστολον, πνευματικὸς ἐστιν, τὰς εἰκόνας ἐμπεριέχων τῶν μελλόντων, is doubtful, for the κατὰ τὸν ἄποστολον can refer to the first only (cf. Rom. vii. 14). In the writings of Jacob of Nisibis (about A.D. 325) in Galland, Bibl. Patr. V. p. xvi., lxiii., lxxxviii., lxxix., there are several citations of the Epistle as a work by the Apostle.


§ 160 c.

Subsequently, in the fourth century, the Epistle obtained canonical acceptance also in the West.* To this, the study of the Greek commentators, especially of Origen, the Arian controversy, in which use was made of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the repute of Jerome and Augustine contributed. These Fathers accepted the Epistle, after the example of the Eastern Church, without being exactly convinced of its genuineness. Many, not only in the second half of the fourth century, but even later, doubted the genuineness of the Epistle, and refrained from using it.*

According to all these authorities, the tradition that Paul is author of this Epistle, if it be in general a tradition, is very far from reliable.*


testimonia Apostolus Paulus, sive quis alius scriptam epistolam, usus est ad Hebraeos. In Tit. i. : Si quis vult recipere eam epistolam, qua sub nomine Pauli, sive cujuscunquie alterius eam esse putas, quia jam inter ecclesiasticas est recepta. De vir. ill. c. 5 : Epistola autem, qua fertur ad Hebraeos, non ejus creditur propter stili sermonisque dissonantium, sed vel Barnabae juxta Tertullianum, vel Lucae Evangeliae juxta quosdam, vel Clementis, Romanae postea Ecclesiae episcopi, quem ajunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermonem. Vel certe Paulus, quia scrib BAT ad Hebraeos et propter invidiam sui apud eos nominis, titulum in principio salutationis amputaverit. Scripserat ut Hebraeos Hebraci, id est, suo eloquio disertissime, ut ea quae eloquentius scripta fuerant in Hebraeo, eloquentius verterentur in Graecum, et hanc causam esse, quod a caeteris Pauli epistolis discrepare videatur. Augustine, De peccator. merit. et remissa. I. 27: Ad Hebraeos quoque epistola, quamquam nonnullis incerta sit, tamen quoniam legi, quosdam huic nostrae de baptismo puellorum sententiae contraria sentientes, eam quibusdam opinionibus suis testem adhibere voluisse, magisque me movet sutoritiae ecclesiarii orientalium, quae hanc quoque in canoniciis habent, quanta pro nobis testimonia contineat, advertendum est. Inchoat. exposit. ep. ad Rom. § 11: . . . nonnulli eam in canonem scripturae recipere timuereant. Sed quoquo modo se habeat ista quaestio. . . . He cites the Epistle usually as Epistola ad Hebr., Epistola, quae inscribatur ad Hebr., and the like. Bleek, p. 294, ff.


Paulus, Einl. VI. ff., decides from the authorities in favor of the Pauline composition, for he supposes that a real tradition existed in Alexandria, and lays stress on the use of the Epistle to the Hebr. in the letters of Clement of Rome and others.
§ 161 a.

The theory that Paul wrote this Epistle is opposed also by many very strong internal grounds. 1. The Epistle, contrary to the Apostle’s practice, neither opens with greetings nor has his name, contains but few personal references, and in its form approximates so closely to the character of a treatise that some, although erroneously, deny that it is an Epistle. The references in xiii. 19, 23, f. may certainly apply to the Apostle’s situation during his imprisonment at Rome; they do not, however, necessarily, nor even with probability. On the contrary, the author betrays himself as only mediately a disciple of Jesus (ii. 3, cf. Luke i. 2), who wrote after the Apostle’s death (xiii. 7). Paul, moreover, would hardly have written to Hebrew Christians, it not being his custom to force himself into spheres of labor occupied by others (1 Cor. x. 13, ff., Rom. xv. 20).

* The manner in which Pantænus, Clement of Alex. (see § 160 a, note a), Hug., II. 489, and others, seek to remove this difficulty, is unsatisfactory. So also Steudel’s (Bengel’s Archiv. IV. 87).


* Bleck, p. 275, ff. The reading τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου, Heb. x. 34, would be the most decided reference to Paul.


§ 161 b.

2. The language is very different from the Apostle’s, being purer Greek, more periodic, and more oratorical.

Different formulas of citation: λέγει, μαρτυρεί τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, or ὁ θεός, or simply λέγει, εἴρηκε, μαρτυρεί, φησί, i. 5, 6, ff., 13, iii. 7, 15, iv. 3, 4, ff., 7, v. 5, f., vi. 14, viii. 14, 17, 21, viii. 5, 8, 13, x. 5, 8, 9, 15, ff., 30, xi. 18, xii. 5, 20, 26. (Paul, on the contrary: γέγραπται, καθὼς γέγραπται, ἡ γραφῆ ἔγραψε, ἔγραφη, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, Rom. i. 17, ii. 24, iii. 4, 10, iv. 3, 17, 23, viii. 36, ix. 13, 17, 23, x. 11, 15, xi. 2, 8, 19, 26, xiv. 3, 9, 21, 24; 1 Cor. i. 19, 31, ii. 9, ix. 9, x. 7, xiv. 21, xv. 45; 2 Cor. ix. 13, viii. 15, ix. 9; Gal. iii. 8, 10, 13, iv. 22, 27, 30, or οὕτως γράφει, ἀδιαφόρητο λέγει, ὁ κύριος λέγει, and the like, in Rom. iv. 6, vii. 7, ix. 25, 27, 29, x. 5, 19, 20, f., xi. 9, xv. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 9, xiv. 21, 34. Only Eph. iv. 8, v. 14, agree with the Ep. to the Heb.; Rom. xv. 10, 2 Cor. vi. 2, Gal. iii. 16, are similar.) Instead of the formulas ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Ἰησοῦς Χρ., Ἰησοῦς Χρ., ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ὁ κύριος. Xp., we have here only ὁ κύριος, ii. 3, vii. 14; ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ii. 9, iii. 1, iv. 14, iv. 20, vii. 22, x. 19, xii. 2, 24, xii. 12, or Χριστός, iii. 6, 14, v. 5, vi. 1, ix. 11, 14, 24, 28, xi. 26; only x. 10, xiii. 8, 21, Ἰησοῦς Χρ., and xiii. 20, ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς.—Ἀπόστολος of Christ, iii. 1; μαθησιακά, i. 2, x. 35, xi. 26 (in Paul, μαθησία); ἀρκομενία, vii. 20, 21; αἰματευχησία, ix. 22. — Words compounded with εἰς and ἀνά, ὡς εἰσαρπέσαν, εἰσοπτέρατος, ἀναλογίζεσθαί, ἀναδίχεσθαι.—Οἰκουμένη μέλλονα, i. 5; τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά, ix. 11, x. 1; μέταχος εἶναι, γίνεσθαι, i. 14, iv. 4, xii. 8 (in Paul, κοινωνών, συγκοινώνων εἶναι, κοινωνίαν, συγκοινωνίαν); ἐκάθεν [ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλοπρεπείας ἐν ψυφίοις, i. 3, εἰς δεξιὰ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλοπρεπείας ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, vii. 1, εἰς δεξιά τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ, xii. 2, εἰς δεξιά τοῦ θεοῦ, x. 12 (Ephes. i. 20: ἐκάθεν [αὐτοῦ θεοῦ] εἰς δεξιὰ αὐτοῦ εἰς τοῦ ἐπουρανίου, Col. iii. 1: εἰς δεξιά τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος] ἡγούμενος, xiii. 7, 17, 24; κακοκύνησαι, xi. 37, xiii. 2; συγκακοκύνησαι, xii. 25; θρόνος τῆς μεγαλοπρεπείας, viii. 1; βρ. τῆς χάριτος, iv. 18; τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐν θυρήματί, τὸν θρόνον τοῦ θεοῦ καταπτάειν, x. 29. — Several feminine substantives derived from verbs: αἴτησις, vii. 18, ix. 20; μετάθεσις, vi. 12, ix. 5, xi. 27; κατάπτασις, iii. 11, 18, iv. 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, and several others; τελειώνω, ii. 10, v. 9, vii. 19, 28, ix. 9, x. 1, 14, xi. 30, xii. 23; τελειώσις, vii. 11; προσφέρω, προσφέρσεις, very often; λαμβάνω, often, sometimes singularly used, as πείρα, ἀρρήν λαμβάνων; προσφέρεσθαι τῷ θεῷ, iv. 16, vii. 25, x. 1, 22, xi. 6; κρείττων, sometimes quite peculiar, i. 4, vi. 9, vii. 17, 22, viii. 6, ix. 23, x. 34, xi. 10, 35, 40; αἰώναι, v. 9, xi. 2, ix. 12, 14, 15, xiii. 20; εἰς τὸ διήκεσθαι, vii. 3, x. 1, 19, 14, εἰς τὸ πατριλέγει, vii. 25, διαπατρίς, ix. 6, xiii. 15; ωτόν, in the sense of eternal, spiritually powerful; θεός ὡτόν, iii. 12, ix. 14, x. 31, xiii. 20; λόγος ὡτός, iv. 12; ἄδων ὡτός, x. 20; εἶπα, iii. 6, 14, vi. 3; the frequent ὡθεῖν, ὡθεῖς, τοσοῦτον, ἀδώνατον; παρά, after the comparativa, i. 4, ix. 23, x. 4, xii. 24; the frequent use of the singular of πάς. — On the other hand, the Pauline turns are wanting: στὸ θέλωμα ἐρᾶσι σημαίνειν, and several others (§ 123 a, note a). There are, undoubtedly, resemblances to the Pauline style of writing (Bleek, p. 316). Particularly striking is the similar quotation of Deut. xxxii. 35, chap. x. 30 and Rom. xii. 19. But
the author may have known and used Paul's writings. In xiii. 5 he also cites a passage in accordance with Philo, De confus. ling. p. 344.

§ 161 c.

3. There is an entire absence of polemics in this Epistle, as well as of Paul's peculiar ideas and views; instead of which it has others peculiar to itself. The prevailing comparison and figurative use of Old Testament passages and ordinances is foreign to Paul, and reminds us of Philo's mode of using the Old Testament. Paul would hardly represent Christianity in general as so nearly parallel to Judaism, nor Christ as High-Priest, which could have force for Jews only, and not for Gentiles. Nor would he have omitted to mention his calling as Apostle to the Gentiles, nor to dwell upon the fact that Christianity was a new revelation for Jews and Gentiles.

* Schultz, p. 102, ff. The proper contrast between πίστις and νόμος, and Ἰργα νόμου, is wanting; πίστις in Hebrews is different from that in Paul. There is no mention of justifying faith (only an allusion, xi. 7); none of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκανῶν; none of Satan's kingdom; none of the Gospel of Christ; no emphasis on the fact of the resurrection. The ideas regarding the perfecting of Christ are peculiar, as also those of the Christian τελείωσε in general, of continued atonement (vii. 24, ff.).


* Schultz, pp. 74, ff., 102; cf. the remarks to the contrary in my article in the Theol. Zeitschr. III. 5, ff. The general views given in the Epistle to the Hebrews are not essentially different from Paul's. To the latter, however, belongs, according to the external position of the Apostle, the admission that the Law has no force beyond the limits of the Jewish people, and has lost its power as a means of salvation. This admission is wanting in the Epistle.

§ 161 d.

4. In citing the Old Testament, Paul nowhere appears so dependent on the Septuagint version as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who betrays total ignorance of the Hebrew original; nor does he, as in Heb. i. 6, ii. 7, x. 5,
xii. 27, found his argument upon the words of the Septuagint, or attach it only to them.*

* Bleek, p. 338, ff. Although Paul, in Rom. ii. 24, iii. 4, xv. 10, and other passages, follows the LXX. in its departures from the Hebrew, the variations are of little moment. Bleek observes (p. 369, ff.) that Paul cites the LXX. according to Cod. Vatic., the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews according to Cod. Alex.; but the passage Deut. xxxii. 35 is cited in Heb. x. 30 as in Rom. xii. 19.


To whom is the Epistle addressed?

§ 162 a.

The Epistle presupposes as its readers unmixed Jewish Christians, who still adhered to their ancestral temple and sacrificial worship (xiii. 9), and in part, at least, inclined to apostasy [from Christ] (x. 25, vi. 6, xii. 15, f.). There is no material objection* against our following the superscription,* — understood in the sense of the Church idiom (Acts vi. 1), — and the most ancient opinion (cf. § 160 a, note a), in regarding these as Jewish Christians of Palestine;* excepting the improbability that a Paulinian, like the author

40
and his friend Timothy, stood in very near relations to them, and that this Epistle, with its Hellenistic knowledge of Scripture based on the use of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, was addressed to such Christians.

* According to x. 32, xii. 4, they to whom the Epistle was addressed had suffered persecution, though not unto blood; this does not contradict Acts viii. 1–3, xii. 1, for the writer had the then existing generation in view. That they had learned the Gospel from ear-witnesse, according to ii. 3, is in this connection likewise appropriate. That they had practised beneficence and should do so yet farther (vi. 10, x. 23, f., xiii. 16) is not absolutely irreconcilable with Rom. xv. 25, ff., I Cor. xvi. 1–3, Gal. ii. 10; for even in Paul's time there were not wanting wealthy and beneficent persons among the Christians of Jerusalem. But it is nevertheless true, that precise references to the Jewish Christians of Palestine are wanting. Cf. Mynster, in Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1829. p. 338, who brings forward additional opposing arguments, among others v. 12, that the readers, as regards the time, might be teachers, which is at variance with the idea of Jewish Christians in Jerusalem (although not of those in the country). For the rest, see the remarks on the passage. The objection, that the Epistle must have been written in Aramaic, amounts to little, as the Greek language was widely diffused in Palestine.

b Which Credner, § 208, considers original.

c Phil. iii. 5, 2 Cor. xi. 22, doubtless contain a broader meaning of Ἐβραῖος; but the Church expression εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἐβραῖος is decisive. In Euseb. H. E. III. 4, the Jewish Christians of Asia Minor are called εξ Ἐβραίων δικτες. According to Credner, p. 564, the choice of this name points to an earlier time, when the difference between Judaizing and non-Judaizing Christians had not grown so great (!). — According to Hase, in Wiener and Engelhardt's Journ. der theolog. Litt. II. 3. p. 265, ff., the Epistle was addressed to such Jewish Christians as were afterwards Ebionites, because in the Epistle allusions appear to the Ebionite doctrine. Cf. Epiph. Haeres. XXX. c. 3: "Αλλοι δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς λέγονται ἀνθέν μὲν ὄντα, πρὸ πάντων δὲ κτισθήσεται, πνεῦμα ὄντα, καὶ πάντων τῆς κυριεύσσεται καὶ Χριστῶν λέγεσθαι, τῶν ἐκείστι δὲ αἰώνα κεκληρωθοῦσιν." Cap. 16: Οὐ φάσκοντων ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν γεγενηθαι, ἀλλὰ ἐκτίσθαι, ὡς ἐν τῶν ἀρχαγγέλων, μείζων δὲ αὐτῶν ὄντα, αὐτῶν δὲ κυριεύσεται καὶ ἀγγέλων καὶ πάντων ὑπὸ τοῦ παντοκράτορος πνευμάτων, — with Heb. i. 3, 4, viii. 1. Ix.: "Οὐτὶ ἠλθον καταλύσει τὰς θυσίας, καὶ εἰν μὴ πιάσῃθη τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐ παύσεται ἡ ἡμέρα οὐρανοῦ, — with Heb. ix. 9, 23. Ix.: καθ' ἡμέραν βαπτίζονται, — with Heb. xi. 10.
§ 162 b.

No other theory has any probability. The Epistle cannot be addressed to Jewish Christians in general, because it presupposes personal relations (xiii. 18, f. 23), nor to Jewish Christians at Thessalonica, Galatia, Alexandria, or elsewhere, because it does not touch the subject of Gentile Christians, and — not to mention other reasons — presupposes churches of unmixed Jewish Christians attached to the Jewish temple-service.

4 J. E. Chr. Schmidt, Einl. I. 284, 293. He uses this passage from Muratori's fragment: Furtur etiam ad Laodiceses, alia ad Alexandrinos Pauli nomine fictae ad haeresem Marcionis.

Perhaps in Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece (because of 2 Pet. iii. 15), according to W. Wall, Not. crit. p. 316, Wolf, Cur. p. 593; or in Rome, according to Wetstein, N. T. II. 386; or in Antioch, according to Böhme, Praef. p. xxxii.; or in Laodicea, according to Stein (see § 123 b, note c), compare also Schneckenburger, as above, who aims to show a certain affinity between the Epistle to the Hebrews and that to the Colossians; in similar strain, Baumgarten-Crusius, De orig. ep. ad Hebr. conject. Jen. 1829, who maintains that the Epistle to the Hebrews is an edition of the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, revised for the use of the Jewish Christians of those regions (cf. Lücke, in Stud. u. Kr. 1830. p. 450, f.); or in Lycaonia, according to Credner, p. 564.

Theories regarding the Author.

§ 163 a.

Although an individual fact can never be established with certainty in the absence of testimony, and the office of criticism is from its nature chiefly negative, yet attempts have been constantly made to find out the author. Various hy-
potheses have been started. In forming a correct estimate of the same, the three following certain characteristics of the author are of service: he must have been, 1. a Jew by birth; 2. well versed in the Alexandrian Scripture learning; 3. possessed of unusual eloquence.

§ 163 b.

Some have fixed on Luke. The ancient writers did this, however, that they might ascribe at least to the Apostle’s assistant what they were compelled to deny to Paul. There is a degree of resemblance between Luke’s writings and this Epistle in the language; none, however, in their contents or their mode of representation. Luke was not an Alexandrian Jew.


§ 163 c.

Others have supposed, Clement of Rome to be the author. But the Epistle to the Hebrews and the First Epistle of Clement cannot be by the same author, because the latter lacks the Alexandrian character and the author’s originality of mind. The similar passages found in Clement show merely his acquaintance with our Epistle.


b Clement’s First Epistle. Epistle to the Hebrews.

Ch. 17: Μιμητικὴ γενόμεθα κἀκεῖνον xi. 37: . . . περιήλθων ἐν μηλωταῖς, αὐτῶν ἐν δέρμασιν ἁγιοίς καὶ μη- ἐν ἁγιοῖς δέρμασι.

λατάς περιεπάτησαν.
Clement's First Epistle.

Ch. 36: ... δι' αυτοῦ ὀρθή σφημα μεγάλους τῆς μεγαλουσίας αὐτοῦ, τοσούτως μείζων ἐστὶν ἄγγελοι, διὸ διαφοράτωρ δύναμις κεκληρονομήκεν. Σύγκεισται γὰρ οὕτως: ο ποιῶν τούτω ἄγγελου αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοῦς λειτουργούσας αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγαν· εἰπ' ἐν τῷ νῷ αὐτοῦ οὕτως εἰπεν ο δεσπότης· οὐδὲς μου εἰ σὺ, ἐγώ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε· αἴτησας παρ' ἐμοὶ, καὶ δόσω σοι ἑθνην, κ.τ.λ., καὶ πάλιν λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, κ.τ.λ.

Epistle to the Hebrews.

i. 3: ... δι' αυτοῦ ὀρθή σφημα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, πέρι τὰ τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. ... 4: τοσούτως κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἄγγελων, διὸ διαφοράτωρ παρ' αὐτοῦ κεκληρονομήκεν δύναμις.

7: Καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἄγγελους λέγει· ο ποιῶν τούτω ἄγγελου αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοῦς λειτουργούσας αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγαν. 

5: Τίν γὰρ εἶπεν πρὸς τῶν ἄγγελων· οὐδὲς μου εἰ σὺ, ἐγώ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε;

Ver. 13: Πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἄγγελων εἴρηκεν πρὸς· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, κ.τ.λ.

Ch. 9: Λάβουμεν Ἔνωξ, δι' ἐν ὑπακοὴ δίκαιος εὑρέθη μετέτεθη, καὶ σύ εὑρέθη αὐτοῦ βάνατος.

Ib.: Νοεῖ πιστῶ εὑρέθη διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλαγηγεῖσαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξε, καὶ διάοικησεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ δεσπότης τὰ εἰσλθέντα εἰς ὑμοίῳ ζῶα εἰς τὴν κυβερνοῦν.

Ch. 12: Διὰ πιστῶν καὶ φιλοξενίας ἐσώθη Ὑραβῆ, ἢ πόρην.


§ 163 d.

The theory that Barnabas wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews is also ancient. But the allegorical use of the Old Testament, in which the Epistle of Barnabas somewhat resembles ours, is far less large and spirited. The former rests, too, on a different view of the Mosaic law. Barnabas, moreover, was not an eloquent speaker (Acts xiv. 12). b

§ 163 e.

Others regard Silas as the author;* but he seems to have dwelt at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 22), and must therefore have been better acquainted with the temple there than was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. b He probably was not versed in Alexandrian learning. All these three characteristics are found in Apollos, the eloquent Alexandrian scholar (Acts xviii. 24, 28). He is, in fact, regarded by several writers as the author of the Epistle. c But the personal references, in themselves obscure (xiii. 19, 23, f.), find no support in the existing accounts of him. Hence the most reliable conclusion is that the author is unknown to us.

* Mynster, p. 133, ff. Böhme, Praef. p. xi. sqq. Both connect this theory with that concerning those to whom the Epistle was addressed (§ 163 b). Böhme rests it especially on the supposed similarity between its style and that of 1 Pet.


Time and Place of Composition.

§ 164 a.

As the temple worship is throughout presupposed (viii. 4, ix. 6, 7, xiii. 11–13), the Epistle must have been written before its downfall and that of the Jewish state,* but at a time when the "Hebrews," their apostolic teachers having died (xiii. 7), were in a neglected condition, after the death of James the brother of the Lord, and shortly before the breaking out of the Jewish war (between A. D. 65 and 67).* That it was written from Rome or Italy, as the subscription in several MSS. indicates, far from being implied in xiii. 24, is, rather, irreconcilable with that passage.*
* Orelli, Selecta patrum capp. III. 4, asserts that the Epistle was not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem.

* Cf. Bleek, I. p. 433, ff. He, with Bertholdt, makes x. 32, xii. 4, refer to the persecution under Nero, and connects xiii. 24 with them. There is this difficulty, that if James’s death (about A. D. 63) had taken place earlier, and was yet in such fresh remembrance, xii. 4, xiii. 17, must have had a different turn. If xii. 22, f. was written with a reference to Rev. xiv. 1, ff., the date of the composition is brought much farther down.

* This is opposed by οὐ δὲ τῇ Ἰραλίᾳ. Bleek, p. 281.

The Original Language.

§ 164 b.

The theory that the Epistle was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic is as old as, at first glance, it is plausible. But a closer examination brings to light the strongest proof of the Greek origin of the Epistle, viz.: 1. the pure, flowing language; 2. the quotation and use of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, even in its mistakes (x. 5, cf. Ps. xl. 7; I. 6, cf. Ps. xcvi. 7; ii. 7, cf. Ps. viii. 7; x. 38, cf. Hab. ii. 4); 3. plays on words which are possible only in Greek (ix. 16, l., v. 8, ix. 10, xi. 35).^b


CHAPTER XI.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.


I. On the Catholic Epistles in general.

Meaning of their Designation.

§ 165.

Since the fourth century, the Epistles in the canon which are not Pauline nor ascribed to Paul, and some of which (1 John, 1 Peter) previously belonged to the Ἀποστολός, have been classed together under the special name of Catholic Epistles (ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαί).

The meaning of this designation is doubtful. The explanation given by the later ecclesiastical writers, that it is equivalent to ἐπιστολαὶ ἐγκύκλιοι, does not apply to them all, because two of them are private Epistles. It had, however, originally this or a similar sense (general letters of instruction, in contradis-
tinction from the Pauline, which were addressed to special churches). Following this idiom, Origen seems to call 1 John, 1 Peter, and the Epistle of Jude catholic. This designation was subsequently extended to all the non-Pauline Epistles, and was understood to mean, on the one hand, Epistles generally current in the Church, and, on the other, those universally acknowledged as canonical.


c Clemens Alex. Strom. IV. 512: κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τῆν καθολικὴν τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀποτομήν (Act. xv.). (Eichhorn, Einl. III. p. 557, needlessly assumes here the meaning, composed by the Apostles as a body.) Origen, Cont. Cels. I. 63: γέγρασα δὲ ἐν τῇ Βαρνάβᾳ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ. Apollon. in Euseb. H. E. V. 18, of Themison, a Montanist: ⸅⋮⋱⋮⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱⋱…) In this meaning the designation does not once occur with certainty in Euseb. IV. 23: Καὶ πρῶτος γε περὶ Διονύσιον φατέν· ὅτι τὸ τῇ Ἰούδα ἐπικοίνων τῶν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐγκεκριστοῦ, καὶ τῇ τῆς ἐνετίσιν φιλοσοφία Ῥωμαῖος γοῦν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἢ τοῖς αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ’ ἴδει καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀλλοθανίας ἀφθονοις ἑκοινωνεῖ, κρησμωτάτων ἐπιστολῶν καθιστάτας, ἐν αἱ ὑπετυπωτοῖ καθολικαῖς πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιστολῶν. These Epistles were only in part circular letters, but having a general aim aside from the Corinthian community, they came into more general Church use.

4 Comment. in Matth. Tom. XVII. III. 797: . . . πράξεις εἰ δύναμαι τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰούδαν καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς αὐτῶν ἐγγραφτοῖς, τῶν τέκνων θεοῦ ἐστερικ. κ. τ. λ. (1 John iii. 2), τῶν τρόπων τούτων ἐκλαβεῖν. Comment. in
THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

Joh. Tom. II. Vol. IV. p. 76: "ἐν δὲ τῇ καθολικῇ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐπίστολῇ λέγεται. Ἱβ. VI. 135: "παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπίστολῇ. Comment. in ep. ad Rom. ib. p. 549: Judas Apostolus in epistola catholica dicit. There is here no ground for assuming, with Bertholdt, I. 224, that 1 John and 1 Peter were called catholic in contrast with the other Epistles of these Apostles, which had a special aim (this, however, is not the case with 2 Peter). The First Epistle of Peter is indeed addressed to special churches, but to several, and is thus a circular Epistle. Eichhorn understands the meaning here as generally acknowledged as apostolic, and thinks Origen designated these Epistles thus because he considered them genuine. This derives a seeming support from Origen. in Euseb. H. E. VI. 25: "ἐν (Μάρκου) καὶ υἱῶν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπίστολῇ διὰ τούτων ὁμολογήσας ἕστε, ἦτε δὲ τῶν ἑπιστολῆς ὁμολογοῦμεν ἐν πάσης.

But the first time Origen is not thinking of the genuineness of the Epistle, and he has by no means regarded the Epistle of Jude as generally accepted (see § 184 b, note b). Dionysius also, in Euseb. VII. 25, can hardly be said to contrast ἐπιστολὴ καθολικὴ with ἐπ. φερομένη, as Eichhorn thinks: Οὐ μὴν ἐρώτησιν ἐν συνάξεως τούτων εἴναι τῶν ἀπόστολων, τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου, τῶν ἀδελφῶν Ἰακώβου 'οτέ τὸ εὐαγγελίον τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἐγγεγραμμένον, καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡ καθολική.... 'Ο μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελισμὸν οὐδαμοὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ παρεγγράφει, οὐδὲ κηρύσσει ἑαυτὸν, οὐδὲ δίδῃ τὸ ἐυαγγελίον, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς.... 'ἈΛΛ' οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φερομένῃ Ἰωάννου καὶ τρίτη, καίτοι βραχεῖας οὕσει ἐπιστολᾶς, ὁ Ἰωάννης ὄνοματι πρόκειται: ἀλλὰ ἁναφίσματος προετρέπτερα. Euseb. III. 22, also calls 1 John τὴν φερομένην Ἰωάννου προτέραν. In Euseb. III. 3, καθολικὸς occurs in the meaning of universally used in the Church: Πέτρου μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὴ μία ἡ λεγομένη αἰνομολογηταί. Τὴν δὲ φερομένην αὐτοῦ δεύτεραν οὐκ ἐνδιάθεσιν μὲν εἰναι παρελθόμενην, όμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανερῶς, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐστοιχίζοντα γραφῆς... τὸ τά λεγόμενα αὐτοῦ κήρυγμα καὶ τὴν καλομένην ἀποκάλυψαν οὐδ' ἅκους ἐν καθολικῷ ὁμοφῳρὸν παραδειγμάτων. It cannot mean recognized as genuine, for he has just mentioned the doubts against 2 Peter.

Cf. also II. 23, note a.

* So Cassiodorus calls them, Institut. divin. litt. c. 8, epistolae canonicae. According to Lücke, in Stud. u. Krit. 1836. p. 650, canonical here, as elsewhere, refers to the Church as a whole. — The opinion of Nüsselt (Conject. ad hist. cath. Jac. ep., Opusc. II. 308, ff.) and Ziegler (Progr. Rost. 1807. 410), that catholic is equivalent to canonical, and that of Salmeron, Tirinus, Corn. a Lapide, Schmidt (Einf. II. 297), according to which it must mean for the preservation and advancement of the orthodox catholic doctrine, are accordingly to a certain degree justified for subsequent times; Hug's opinion (Einf. II. 500), on the contrary, that the Catholic Epistles are in contrast with the Pauline, and Pott's explanation (given in the second edition of his Epp. cathol. fasc. 1, but abandoned in the third edition) by al locai ἐπιστολαὶ καθόλου, reliquarum epistolarum (sc. non Paulinarum) summam uteram sitas, are not sustained by the Church idiom. The right view is given by Credner,

Characteristics of these Epistles. Their Later Use in the Church.

§ 166.

They all belong to a different school from the Pauline. The Epistle of James stands in opposition to it; the Epistles of Peter take a middle ground; those of John assume a similar free stand-point, but not the polemic one of the Apostle Paul. We may, therefore, call them catholic in the sense of their having the catholic tendency of the post-Apostolic Church. It is a peculiarity that they all, excepting the Second and Third Epistles of John, want the genuine epistolary character, and originate in no special relation of the writers to their readers. Perhaps they are imitations of the Epistles of Paul. Hence it comes that their historical relations are so obscure and uncertain. Some of them came late into Church use, and were therefore less often copied. In the MSS. they are placed after the Book of Acts.

*Kern, Der Br. Jac. etc. p. 3.

II. Epistle of James.

The Author.

§ 167 a.

The author of this first of the Catholic Epistles (Euseb. H. E. II. 23) calls himself James, servant of God and of Jesus Christ (i. 1). But what James is meant, is a difficult question to answer.

He cannot be James the elder, son of Zebedee, brother of John the Evangelist, for he was early put to death (Acts xii. 1, 2), and the chronological indications in the Epistle (§ 168 b) require a later composition. On the other hand, the question arises, what relation James the younger, so called (Mark xv. 40), son of Alphaeus, one of the Apostles (Matt. x. 3, Mark iii. 18, Luke vi. 15, Acts i. 13), and James the “brother of the Lord” (Gal. i. 19, Joseph. Antt. XX. 9. 1), who enjoyed high consideration in the church at Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 9, cf. Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxii. 18, ff.) till he suffered martyrdom, after the death of the Procurator Festus, bear to each other and to the author of our Epistle. The following theories are possible, and have found their supporters in ancient and in modern times.

* Notwithstanding, the subscription of an old Latin version in Martianay, and of the Peshito in the edition of Widmanstadt and Trost, ascribe the Epistle to him. Bertholdt, VI. 2996, f.

† Joseph. i. c. 18: ὁ Ἅσιου νομίσας ἵχειν καυρόν ἐπινήδειον διὰ τὸ τεθνάκα μὲν Φώτου, Ἀλβίαν δὲ ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὑπάρχειν, καθίζει συνήθεις κρατῶν καὶ παραγαγόν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἱσοῦ τοῦ λεγόμενον Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος δυνάμει αὐτῷ, καὶ τυχόν ἐπίρονο, ὡς παραφράσσαντος κατηγορίαν παράσαμους, παρίδωκε λευσθησομένου. (Doubts regarding the genuineness of this account in Cleric. Ars. crit. p. 293. Lardner, Suppl. III. c. 16. Credner, p. 581; on the contrary, Neudeck. p. 655.) Hegesipp. in Euseb. H. E. II. 23: ἦλθεν δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰάκωβος, ὁ ὁμοσπονδικὸς ὑπὸ πάντων δίκαιος. . . . Οὕτως δὲ ἔχει κολάσας μετρὸν αὐτὸν ἐγὼ ήμῖν. Οὐκ ἦν καὶ σίκερα οὐκ ἦπεν. . . . . . . . ἦλθεν δὲ τὴν ἐπερβάλλην τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐκαλεῖν Δίκαιος καὶ Ὑμᾶς. . . . ἐκπείρασεν οὖν οἱ . . . γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι τὸν Ἰάκωβον ἐπὶ τὸ περίγραμα τοῦ ναι. . . . Ἀναβάτες οὖν κατέβαλαν τὸν δίκαιον . . . καὶ ἠρπάσατο λιθάζειν αὐτὸν, κ.τ.λ.
§ 167 b.

1. The theory that presents itself first and most naturally is, that these two Jameses are different persons, of whom the so-called "brother of the Lord" was an own brother, or at least half-brother, of Jesus. For ἀδελφός is (especially in Josephus, § 167 a, note b) most naturally taken in its proper sense,* and Jesus's brothers are mentioned in connection with his mother (Matt xiii. 55 [cf. πρωτότοκος, i. 25], Mark vi. 3, John ii. 12), b as unbelieving (John vii. 3, ff.), and are also subsequently distinguished from the Apostles (Acts i. 14; on the other hand, such a distinction is not necessary in 1 Cor. ix. 5). c

* Stress has erroneously been laid (Korn, Comm. Einl. p. 18, ff.) on the addition ὀ λεγόμενος, ὀ λεγέθης, in Euseb. H. E. II. 4, IV. 5, Clem. Homil. XI. 35, as favoring the improper meaning. Another passage, adduced in support of the improper meaning, proves the contrary. Hegesipp. in Euseb. IV. 29: "Καὶ μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τ. δικαίων, ὡς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῇ αὐτῇ λόγῳ, πάλιν ἐκ τοῦ θείου αὐτοῦ πατρὸς νησίων ὁ τοῦ Κλαστᾶ καθιστανα ἐπίσκοπος, ὅν προθετικάν πάντες δύτα αὐτός τοῦ κυρίου διέτυμον. It is correct to refer τ. θείου αὐτοῦ τοῦ κύριος (cf. Hegesipp. in Euseb. III. 32: ὁ ἐκ τοῦ θείου τ. κυρίου ὁ προειρημένος Συμεών τοῦ Κλαστᾶ, — incorrect, with Oeder, to James), and to explain the last clause also thus: whom they all preferred, as the second cousin of the Lord (deuterou cannot refer to the verb); but that the reference of this deuterou to James the brother of the Lord is correct, so as to make him the first cousin of the Lord, I doubt. It probably refers to James, Alpheus's son. (Neand.) It is certain that, according to Hegesippus, James the brother of the Lord could not be the son of Cleopas (Alpheus); for otherwise this Simeon would be his brother, and this consanguinity should have been assigned as the ground of his being chosen, or at least should have been mentioned.

b There is no doubt that these, if not own brothers, were at least step-brothers of Jesus. Fritzsche, Exeg. Hdb. z. Matth. on the passage. Tholuck, on Joh. ii. 12. C. F. W. Clemen, Die Brüder Jesu, in Winer's Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. III. 329, ff.

c Several Church Fathers regard the above-mentioned James as a half-brother of Jesus. Euseb. II. 1: Τότε δητα καὶ Ἰάκωβον τοῦ τοῦ κυρίου λεγόμενον ἀδελφόν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ ὁ θείος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ἠνάρεστος παῖς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς Ἰωσήφ, ὃς μετεμεθεῖσα ἡ παρθενία, πρῶτος ἢ συμμεθέντων αὐτούς, εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἐμφανίας ἐκ πνεύματος ἅγιου, ὡς ἡ ἱερά τῶν Ἐναγγελίων διδάσκει γραφῇ τοῦτον δὴ ὅποιον Ἰάκωβον, δὴ καὶ Δικαίων ἐπιλήσθη οἱ πάλιν δὲ ἀργετῆς ἐκάλουσα προτερήματα, πρῶτον ἰστοροῦσα τής ἐν ἱεροσολύμων ἐκκλησίας τῶν
2. The second theory, that the brother of the Lord is one and the same with the son of Alpheus, and is called brother of the Lord because he was his cousin, according to the common view, based on John xix. 25, Mark xv. 40, son of Mary,** the sister of Jesus’s mother and wife of Alpheus, or, more correctly, son of Jesus’s uncle Alpheus,* is favored by the law of historic frugality, and by the fact that in Acts only two of the name of James are found, and that he who was influential in Jerusalem after the death of the son of Zebedee is never distinguished from the son of Alpheus, nor reckoned among the brothers of the Lord mentioned in i. 14, while, on the contrary, in Gal. i. 19 (according to the simplest, though, it must be admitted, not the only possible explanation) he is reckoned among the Apostles. The objections, however, preponderate; namely, that in Hegesippus and other church writers James, brother of
the Lord, is rather distinguished from than reckoned among the Apostles; and that James the son of Alpheus appears in no list of the Apostles as brother of the Lord.

1 Clem. Alex. in Euseb. II. 1: Διὸ δὲ γεγοναυσιν ἰάκωβων ἐις ὁ δικαιος ὁ κατὰ τοῦ πτερώμιου βλησθεὶς καὶ ὑπὸ κνάφεως πληγεὶς εἰς θάνατον ἕτερος δὲ ὁ καραγομήθεις.

2 Hieron. ad Matth. xii.: Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Josephi filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta apocryphorum et a quodam Escha mulierecula confingentes. Nos autem, sicut in libro, quem contra Helvidium scripserimus, contineant, fratres Domini non filios Josephi, sed consobrinos saluatoris, Mariæ liberos, intelligimus, materterae Domini, quae etiam dicitur mater Jacobi minoris et Josephi et Judaeæ. De viris ill. c. 2: Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini cognomento Justus, ut nonnulli existimant, Joseph ex alia uxore, ut autem mihi videtur, Mariæ sororius mater Domini, cujus Joannes in libro suo meminit, filius, etc. Theodoret, ad Gal. i. 19: Ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου εκαλεῖτο μὲν, οὐκ ἦν δὲ φύσει, οὐτε μὲν, οὐς τινες ἵππησαν, τοῦ Ἰωσήφ δὲ ἔγειρεν ὡς ἐπροέρχετο, ἐκ προσερέσῳ γαμοῦ γενόμενον, ἀλλὰ τὸ Ἑλπίδα μὲν ἦν νῦν, τοῦ δὲ κυρίου ἁνεψεῖς, μνήμη γὰρ ἵνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς τῆς τοῦ κυρίου μνήμης.


4 In the passage in John, the commonly assumed apposition between ἡ ἁδελφ. τ. μορφόν αὐτοῦ and Maria ἡ τοῦ Καυπᾶ is incorrect, and the latter to be regarded as a third person. See Wieseler, in Stud. u. Kr. 1840. p. 648, ff. According to Hegesipp. in Euseb. III. 11, the above-given relation of consanguinity existed.

5 Hegesipp. in Euseb. II. 23 (see § 167 a, note b). Note: μετὰ (more correctly παρὰ) τῶν ἀποστόλων (one expects τ. λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων), ὁ ἀντικαθίστατο ὑπὸ πάντων δικαιοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου χρώμαν μέχρι καὶ ἡμῶν. ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ ἰάκωβοι ἐκκλησία. Euseb. ad Jex. xvii. 5, sq. (Montfaucon. Coll. n. patr. II. 422): Ὕδε καὶ τίνα καταστάσεις ἔστησε τοῦ πάντας (ἀποστόλους), διὸ ἵνα ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι ἀποστόλους εὑρεῖς ὡς εὑρεῖς, οὐδὲ ἀδίκα εἰς αὐτῶν τὴν ἁρπήν Παύλου. . . . καὶ τὸν ἰάκωβον γεγονός, τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, διὸ πρῶτος ἐπισκοπὸς τῆς ἱεροσολύμων ἐκκλησιας ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ καταστήσῃ τοῦ σωτῆρος μοιμανύσῃ. H. E. VII. 19: ἐκαβριοῦ . . . τοῦ πρῶτον τῆς ἱεροσολυμών εκκλησίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος κ. τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑπεδεξαμένους ὡς καὶ ἀδελφόν τοῦ Χριστοῦ οἱ θεῖαι λόγοι προέρχονται.

In the pseudo-Clementine writings he is always mentioned simply as brother of the Lord, not as an Apostle; and in the Apost. Constitutions he is expressly discriminated from the Apostles. II. 55: ἡμεῖς . . . μάρ
A third and intermediate theory,\* that James the brother of the Lord was another than James the son of Alpheus, but the latter only head of the church at Jerusalem, has the advantage of being in entire harmony with the Book of Acts. It is, however, contradicted by tradition, does not agree well with Gal. i. 19, ii. 9, 12, and receives but a weak support from the argument that only an Apostle could have held that position.


We prefer the first theory, and think it not improbable that, of the brothers of the Lord, who had from the first been unbelievers, but were convinced by his resurrection, one should attain high distinction among the Jewish Christians, partly on account of his personal character, partly through his relationship to Jesus; while James the son of Alpheus, like so many others of the twelve, remained in obscurity. That the author of Acts has confounded the former with the latter, or omitted expressly to discriminate him from the other, is one of the many objections which may be urged against his trustworthiness (§ 115 e).\*
§ 167 f.

Our Epistle has been ascribed, although not with universal consent, to James the brother of the Lord. An Epistle addressed to Jewish Christians, and proceeding from their own circle, could hardly be looked for from another than this head of the mother church at Jerusalem. The predicate θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, which he applies to himself, is also applicable to an Apostle (cf. Rom. i. 1, Phil. i. 1), though much more to one who did not belong to the twelve.

* Euseb. H. E. II. 23, see § 165, note a. For, according to the context, the James there mentioned is the brother of the Lord. Hieron. De vir. ill. c. 2: Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus, . . . unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quae de septem catholicis est, quae et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur, licet paulatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem. Cf. § 169.

Destination, Object, and Contents.

§ 168 a.

According to the easily misunderstood ascription i. 1,* the Epistle is addressed to all Jewish Christians out of Palestine. But it speaks to them as if they had formed themselves into separate churches, were in a peculiar position, and were suffering from certain errors (ii. 1—7, iii. 1, 13, f., iv. 1, ff., 13, ff., v. 14). Hence some have thought it necessary to limit the circle of readers. But out of Palestine there were few or no purely Jewish Christian churches. A correct interpretation of the ascription,* and a proper apprehension of the whole Epistle, show it to be addressed to all the Christians outside of Palestine, and intended to rebuke the faults of their condition as Christians, as these were manifested to the author in silent contrast with the simple, uncorrupted state of the mother church. These faults consisted especially in a growing worldliness through riches and luxury (ii. 1—7, iv. 1—v. 6), in a quarrelsome disposition (i. 19, ff., iii. 1—18), and in over-estimating faith in comparison with works (ii. 14—25).*
THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

* Literally, "‘to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad,’" without mention of their Christian faith. Lardner, Supplemente, XVII. § 3, understands it to mean unconverted Jews. Theile, Prolegg. p. 49, Credner, p. 595, following Heisen (Novae hypotheses interpretandae felicissim ep. Jac. Brem. 1739. 4to), Wolf, Hug, &c., Jews generally, whether converted or unconverted, especially the former, — truly an absurdity!

b Nüsselt, Conjict. ad histor. catholicae Jac. epist. (Opusc. II. 314), supposed that the Epistle was destined for the Christian church at Antioch (cf. Acts xi. 19: ... οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες ἀπὸ τῆς Θέας, κ. τ. λ.; Eichhorn, III. 585, for the Jewish Christians in pagan lands whom Paul and Barnabas had converted (Acts xiii., xiv.). Schneckenburger, Beitr. p. 211, thinks the churches whom James addressed, and which, according to p. 204, consisted solely of Jewish Christians, and still adhered entirely to the Jewish synagogue system, were in Syria and Asia Minor. Who founded them? Only Paul and Barnabas had taught there. But according to Acts xiii. 46, xiv. 1, 27, §§ 128, 148, Paul founded only mixed or wholly Gentile-Christian churches. A similar view in Neander, Pflanz. II. 575, f.

c αἱ δώδεκα φυλαὶ = τὸ δώδεκάφυλον (Acts xxvi. 7) is the Ἰσραήλ τ. Θεοῦ (Gal. vi. 16), i. e. Christendom. So Maudert in Wolf., Kern, Köster, in Stud. u. Krit. 1831. p. 581, ff.

d The proper mode of understanding the Epistle was, in general, first shown by Kern, Charakter u. Ursprung des Br. Jac., in Tüb. Ztschr. 1835. II., whom Schwegler (Nachap. Zeitalt. I. 413, ff.) follows. Schwegler abandons this in his Comm. — The opposition to Paul's doctrine of justification is not admitted by Knapp, Scripta var. arg. II. 413, sqq., Neander, Kl. Geleg. Schr. p. 103, ff., Pflanz. II. 564, ff., Gebser, Schneckenburger, Theile, Frommann, in Stud. u. Krit. 1833. p. 84, ff. According to Neander, James opposes the tendency of the Jewish mind to mistake in regard to the life of religion which has its root in the heart, and to insist always upon the mere dead form, the appearance instead of the essence, that tendency which set a dead proud Scripture knowledge in the place of a genuine wisdom inseparable from a holy life, and, moreover, neglected that reverence towards God which shows itself in works of love, &c. According to Schneckenburger (Annotatt. p. 198), James writes against the merely theoretical πιστίς, which was a Jewish error; but he forgets that this could not so directly pass over into Christianity, but must first gain a certain relation to Christ. So Thiersch, Standp. d. Krit. p. 257, f. All who deny the opposition overlook the peculiarly Pauline notion of justification. Luther saw more correctly on this subject. Cf. my remarks in Thes. Stud. u. Krit. 1830. p. 348, ff. Kern, in Tüb. Ztschr. 1835. II. 39, ff.
§ 168 b.

The contents are without plan or arrangement. The discourse passes from one theme (sometimes only briefly handled) to another, and, as it were, accidentally arrives at what seems its chief object (i. 19, ii. 1, iv. 1, v. 1).


* By the greeting χαλίμω is occasioned the exhortation to accept temptations joyfully, to endure them steadfastly and strive after Christian perfection, to implore for this end wisdom from above, to find through a higher consciousness joy in suffering, and so gain therefrom the prize of steadfastness, but in case of temptation not to blame God, but their own evil passions; for God is the giver of all good gifts, even of the new birth through the word of truth, i. 2—18. This last thought suggests the injunction to make the word of God ever more and more their own, and not merely to hear it; also not to be in haste to become teachers, but to practise it, i. 19—27. (One neglect, nay, violation of God’s law, among others, is the partiality towards the rich and against the poor.) Rebuks of this as a violation of the law of love, exhortation to a proper observance of the same, ii. 1—13. (As faith cannot exist without love, neither can it without works.) Confutation of those (Paulinians) who profess to have faith without being beneficent, and think to be justified through their faith, ii. 14—26. Resumption and continuation of the warning touched in i. 19—26, against pressing forward to the position of teacher and against the accompanying misuse of the tongue: they must show their wisdom by mildness, not by contentiousness, iii. 1—18. Rebuks of evil desires, as the source of other kinds of disturbances also, iv. 1—3. Warning and exhortation to repentance to the worldly-minded and sinners, iv. 4—10. Against the spirit of calumny and detraction, iv. 11, f. Against impious confidence in worldly undertakings, iv. 13—17. In continuation of iv. 4, 13, ff., a threat against the rich (among the Christians), v. 1—6. Comforting exhortation to suffering Christians to patience until the return of the Lord, v. 7—11. Out of all connection, a warning against oaths, v. 12. Recommendation to prayer in the various circumstances of life, v. 13—18. How important and blessed it is to lead back a brother from the error of his ways, v. 19, f.

* Date of Composition.

§ 168 c.

With its prevailing indefiniteness, the Epistle lacks reliable marks for determining its date. The reference to the
name of Christians points to a period after Acts xi. 26. All the Christian churches had overseers (v. 14); but the pastoral arrangement here assumed may belong to a later period.\footnote{a} The Christians likewise held church-meetings from the very beginning; but here (ii. 2, ff.) their external accommodations seem to betray a later date.\footnote{b} It is not unlikely that the author had read the Epistles to the Galatians, Romans, and Hebrews,\footnote{c} and borrowed from Paul ideas and formulas;\footnote{d} but it is certain that the opposition to Paul's doctrine of justification—which no longer, as in Acts xv., Gal. iii. ff., turned on the observance of the Mosaic law (to which the author pays no regard, he knows only the \textit{νόμος ἓλευθερίας}, ii. 12)—presupposes a later development of Jewish-Christian views.\footnote{e} Notwithstanding, the Epistle was written at a time when the hope of Christ's return was still fresh (v. 7, f.), and before the First Epistle of Clement was written (§ 169 b, note b).\footnote{f}

\footnote{* Kern, Tüb. Zeitschr. p. 105, and Comm. on the passage, shows that the author is speaking of such an arrangement of offices, and not of the exercise of the \textit{χάρισμα λαοῦ}.}

\footnote{a Schneckenburger (Beitr. p. 204) and Kern (Comm. p. 63) are in error in finding in ii. 2 a still existing agreement between Jews and Christians in visiting the synagogue. The rich and the poor are in ii. 2, f., as in i. 9, f., Christians. But that they had so far fallen away from the first Christian brotherly love, that the rich sought to distinguish themselves, and to be distinguished by the servants or overseers of the church, by having better seats assigned them, supposes a somewhat later time. Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 21.}

\footnote{c Cf. ii. 21 with Gal. iii. 6, Rom. iv. 3; i. 3 with Rom. v. 3; iv. 1 with Rom. vi. 13, vii. 23; iv. 4 with Rom. viii. 7; iv. 12 with Rom. xiv. 4. Mynster, Kl. theol. Schr. p. 103, f. Storr, Opusc. II. 376. Hug, II. 515, ff. On the other side, Rauch, as above, p. 257, ff. It is most probable that ii. 25 refers to Heb. xi. 31; for that the example of Rahab was used by Paul and his disciples in their spoken discourses (Bleek, Einl. in d. Br. an d. Hebr. p. 89) is hard to believe.}

\footnote{d δικαίωσαν πίστει, ἐκ π., ἐκ νόμου — ἓλευθερία — ἀκροατής, ποιητής, παραβάτης τοῦ νόμου — τελείν τὸν νόμον — καταθέτει τῆς δικαιοσύνης — μέλη — παραδότου — ἀδέλφος — μὴ πλανάσθη — ἀλλ' ἐρεί τις. Schott, Isag. § 91, note 29.}

\footnote{e Schneckenburger, on the contrary, makes it the earliest work in the New Testament, on the following grounds: 1. "All the Jewish ideas appear as preparatory to the Christian, not, as was the case soon after, as corruptions of the same," p. 203 (see § 166 a, note d). 2. "As regards the position
of the Church, no complete separation from the Jews appears (see note b); the Jewish synagogue system still exists, even to the name, which was subsequently abandoned” (i.e. is not found in Luke and Paul, though it might subsequently become common, cf. Heb. x. 25). “No order of teachers, but each could make himself a teacher” (as everywhere, cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 26, 1 Tim. ii. 12). “No bishop, an official who in the Ignatian Epistles” (far later) “makes so conspicuous a figure.” 3. The (uncertain, however) use of the Epistle in 1 Peter, whose genuineness is itself doubtful, and in the First Epistle of Clement of Rome. 4. Since no trace of division between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians appears (which is also entirely incorrect), the Epistle was written before Acts xv. p. 210.

There is also no trace of the destruction of Jerusalem.

**Genuineness and Church Acceptance.**

§ 169 a.

It is very doubtful whether the dogmatico-polemic standpoint accords with the authorship of James the brother of the Lord. The ornate Greek style of the writing seems also to indicate an author under the influence of Greek culture. It must, however, be acknowledged, that the Epistle contrasts advantageously with the productions of post-apostolic literature, and must not be (with Schoegler) unduly depreciated.

* Kern, in the above-mentioned treatise, considers the Epistle a post-apostolic work, and states in favor of his view (p. 86, ff.) the following additional grounds: 1. That the essential fundamental doctrines of Christianity, such as the death of Jesus, the redemption and reconciliation, and the Holy Spirit, retire into the background, as in the Clementine Homilies. 2. Its familiarity with the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, especially the Book of Wisdom and of the son of Sirach (the proofs in Thiele, Prolegg. p. 46, sq.), which first appeared in Christian writings after the time of the Apostolic Fathers. 3. Ch. v. 12 agrees with the text of the Gospel of the Hebrews, which the Clementine Homilies also use. In his Commentaries, on the other hand, he asserts its composition by James the brother of the Lord. This change in his opinion rests mainly on his erroneous apprehension of ii. 2, f. This Epistle does not correspond with the picture of James painted by Hegesippus; but this delineation is beyond doubt legendary.

§ 169 b.

The critical investigation of this Epistle may be pursued the more freely, as it belongs to the Antilegomena (Part I.
§ 24), for Eusebius expressly mentions that doubts existed in regard to it (§ 165, note a), and Jerome, that some thought another had written it under James’s name (§ 167 f, note a).\footnote{Clement of Rome had probably read it.\footnote{Irenaeus also betrayed acquaintance with it,\footnote{although without mentioning it as a canonical work. Tertullian is silent respecting it. Origens is the first of the Alexandrian Fathers who mentions it (although with some doubt).\footnote{Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it.\footnote{If it found acceptance in the Greek Church in the fourth century, with the other Antilegomena, and was then received into the canon by the Western Church, this took place because criticism had meanwhile fallen asleep (Jerome, § 167, f., note a). Whether its adoption into the old Syriac version, and its acceptance by Ephraem,\footnote{are better grounded, we cannot say.}}}}}}

\footnote{Credner, p. 590, erroneously asserts that the uncertainty refers simply to the question whether the Epistle is the work of the Apostle James. See, against him, Kern, Comm. p. 13.}

\footnote{Ep. 1. ad Corinth. c. 10: Αὐτοὶ δὲ φιλος προσαγωγευθείς, πιστὸς εἰρέθη, εἰ γὰρ αὐτὸν ὑπήκοον γενίσταθαι τοῖς μήμασι τοῦ θεοῦ . . . διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἑδόθη αὐτῷ νῦν εἰς γῆρα καὶ δι' ἱστακοῦ προσούμην αὐτὸν θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ, κ.τ.λ. Cf. James ii. 21, 23. Cap. 11: Διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἑσθεν Παῦλος ἡ πόρφυρα, cf. Heb. xi. 31, James ii. 25. — Also Herm. Mandat. XII. § 5: Si enim resistitis illi (diabolo), fugiet a vobis confusus, is similar to James iv. 7.}

\footnote{Cont. haer. IV. 16. 2: Abraham . . . credidit Deo, et reputatum est illi ad justitiam, et amicus Dei vocatus est.}

\footnote{Comment. in Joa. Tom. XIX. Opp. IV. 306: ἕαν γὰρ λέγηται μεν πιστίς, χειρὶ δὲ ζητημα τυχάνη, μεκρὰ ἐστιν ἡ τουαίτη, ὡς εἰ τῇ φερομένῃ ἱστακόων ἑστισθήναι ἄνθρωπον. Mill, Prolegg. 203: Imo vero ut in ipsius Origens operibus, a Rufino Latinis factis, allegetur haec epistola tanquam Jacobi apostoli, fratri Domini, et scriptura divina (hom. 13. in Gen. 3. et 8. in Exod. et hom. 2. in Levit. et comment. in cap. 5. Ep. ad Rom.), in commentarii tamen in Joannem Graecis, ab omni interpolatione liberis, dubiae apud quodam auctoritatibus citatur. Of Clemens Alex. Eusebius (H. E. VI. 14) says that he gave short explanations of all the Catholic Epistles. Cassiodor. Institut. divin. litter. c. 8: In epistolam autem canonici Clemens Alex. presbyter, qui et Stromateus vocatur, i. e. in ep. St. Petri prima, St. Joannis prima et secunda, et Jacobi, attico sermo declaravit. Lardner, Mayerhoff, and others would read Judae, instead of Jacobi. Moreover, Clement never mentions the Epistle.

\footnote{Leont. Byz. c. Nestor. et Eutych. III. 14.}
With the Reformation, criticism revived, and also the doubts concerning this Epistle, although, it must be confessed, on dogmatic grounds. Since, however, a way has been found of removing or softening its contradiction to Paul, its genuineness has been almost universally acknowledged.

* Erasm. Annotatt. in Ep. Jac. expresses himself sceptically. Luther, Vorrede auf die Ep. St. Jacobi und St. Judas, Walch, XIV. 148, remarks: "Although this Epistle of St. James was rejected by the ancients, I yet praise it and esteem it good, because it lays down no doctrine of men, and sternly insists on the law of God. But to express my opinion upon it, without prejudice to any one, I regard it as the work of no Apostle, and for the following reasons: First, that, in direct opposition to Paul and all the rest of Scripture, it ascribes justification to works, and says, Abraham was justified by his works, because he sacrificed his son, while St. Paul, Rom. iv. 2, 3, teaches the very contrary, that Abraham was justified without works.... But this James does no more than insist on the Law and its works, and mixes one thing with another so confusedly, that, it seems to me, he must have been some good, pious man who had caught up some sayings of the disciples of the Apostles, and put them on paper. Or perhaps it was written down by another after hearing the discourse of such a one," &c. Vorrede auf d. N. T. col. 105: "Therefore, the Epistle of St. James is a mere Epistle of straw compared with them [i.e. the writings of John, Paul, and Peter], for it contains nothing of the nature of the Gospel." Andreas Althamer, Erklärung des Briefes Jacobi, 1553. The Magdeburg Centuriators. Cf. Wetstein, N. T. II. 658.

III. The Epistles of Peter.

Accounts of Peter.

§ 170 a.

Peter, properly called Simon, son of Jona (John i. 43), brother of the Apostle Andrew (Matt. x. 2), born in Bethsaida (John i. 45), by profession a fisherman (Matt. iv. 18), and married (Matt. viii. 14, 1 Cor. ix. 5), was one of the most intimate of Jesus’s disciples, upon whom Jesus set great hope (Matt. xvi. 18). After having labored in Palestine for the Gospel, presided over the church at Jerusalem (Acts i. – xi.), and been miraculously released from prison (Acts xii. 3, ff.), he left Jerusalem (Acts xii. 17), and is said to have travelled as missionary through Asia Minor.* But wheresoever he may have preached, he addressed himself especially to the Jews (Gal. ii. 8). Subsequently, he was present at the meeting of the Apostles in Jerusalem (Acts xv.), when he cordially agreed with the Apostle Paul in regard to the conversion of the Gentiles; afterwards, however, at Antioch, he proved untrue to Paul and to himself (Gal. ii. 12). According to the First Epistle (v. 13) he found, at a later period, a sphere of labor in the Parthian empire, of which the ancients were so ignorant that they understood Babylon to mean Rome (§ 170 b, note b).

§ 170 b.

There is, especially, a general Church tradition that Peter preached at Rome, in company with Paul founded the church, and suffered martyrdom there (§ 122 a, note a); it will not, however, bear critical examination. One story, that Peter came in contact with Simon Magus at Rome, is acknowledged to be false. Another, referring to the composition of Mark’s Gospel (§ 99 b, note a), and in support of which Papias’s testimony is adduced, rests on the allegorical interpretation of Babylon, 1 Pet. v. 13. Irenaeus’s account probably rests on Papias (§ 97 c, note b). The testimony of Dionysius of Corinth (§ 122 a, note a), which attracts attention on account of its antiquity, is bound up with the erroneous assertion that Peter and Paul were founders of the church at Corinth, and is probably based, in part, on a misinterpretation of a passage in the First Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, c. 5 (§ 122 b, note a), which mentions together the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, but without naming the place. Caius, in Euseb. II. 25 (§ 122 a, note a), shares this error with Dionysius, and his appeal to documents weighs little (see the note referred to). The fact asserted is in itself improbable. Peter cannot have been at Rome, either before the composition of Paul’s Epistle to the Romans (§ 136 a, note c), or during Paul’s imprisonment in Rome, because the Epistles written there show no trace of it, or even later, because our Epistle presupposes his residence in Babylon. The legend seems to have originated in the endeavor on the part of the Jewish Christians to make the Apostle Peter founder of the influential church at Rome.

Clemens Alex. in Euseb. H. E. II. 14: Ἐπιστ. ἔς τῆς Ἡρωμαῖων πόλεως (Simon Magus), συναρμόμενος αὐτῷ τὰ μεγάλα τῆς ἐφεδρευόντος ἐνταῦθα δυνάμεις, ἐν ὀλίγῳ τοιούτῳ τὰ τῆς ἐπιχειρήσεως έντυστο, ὡς καὶ άνθρώπος ἀναθίνει πρὸς τῶν τιμὴς θεῶν τιμηθήναι. Ὡς μὴ εἰς μακρὰν αὐτῷ τινὰ προϊσχέρει παραπόδας γούν ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς Καλαθίων βασιλείας ἢ πανάγαθος καὶ φιλανθρωπίας τῶν ἀλλών πρόσωπα τῶν κάρτερ τῶν θεῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τῶν ἁρτίων ἐνεκα τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπότων προσόγγον, Πλείων, ἐπὶ τῆς τρόμομ, ὡς ἐπὶ τιθεοῦτον λυμένα μὴν χειρογραφεῖ. This, however, rests on an error of Justin Martyr’s, Apol. II. p. 69: Σάμωνα μὲν τοια Σαμαρίτας τὴν ἀπὸ κόμης
First Epistle. — Historical and Personal Relations.

§ 171 a.

The Epistle is not addressed, as the ascription (i. 1) seems to indicate, to the Jewish Christians in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, but, as much of its contents refers to Gentile Christians (i. 14, 18, ii. 9, f., iii. 6, iv. 3), to the mixed or Gentile-Christian churches in those places. In regard to their condition, we know nothing further than that they had to suffer or to fear persecutions and slanders (i. 6, ii. 12, iii. 13, ff., 16, iv. 12 – 19, v. 10), which (especially iv. 16) suggests the persecution under Nero.

There is no indication that these churches, which were probably founded and taught by Paul and his disciples, (not by Peter, according to i. 12,) stood in any special relation to Peter, save that Silvanus is represented as a mutual friend.
(v. 12). The Apostle, to be sure, describes himself as such (i. 1, v. 1); but concerning him we learn nothing precise, excepting that he was in Babylon or its vicinity, and in Mark’s company (v. 13).

The letter is addressed to Jewish Christians, according to Origen, Hieron. (§ 170 a, note a), Athanas. Synops. scr., Didym. In ep. canon., Epiphan. Haeres. XXVII. 6, Occumen., Theophyl., Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Semler, Augusti, Bertholdt, Hug; to Gentile Christians, according to Augustine, Cont. Faust. XXII. 89, Cassiodor. Institutt. div. Luther, Wetstein, Böhme (Ep. ad Hebr. Prolegg. XLVI.); to Jewish and Gentile Christians, according to Est., Calov., Wolf, Pott, Hänlein, Eichhorn, Schott, Guerike (Beitr.), Steiger, Mayerhoff; to former proselytes, according to Benson, Michaelis, Credner.


E. K. Rauch, as above, p. 398, ff., finds in the expressions τίκα παχυσάρκης, i. 14 (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 14, f., 2 Cor. vi. 13), and συμπερισσύτερον, traces of a peculiar relationship. Credner, p. 641, supposes that his readers were Petrine Christians in those parts to which the Epistle to the Ephesians was addressed, and that the latter had exerted a disturbing influence upon them which Peter wished to check; a groundless hypothesis, which Neudecker, p. 690, f., has rightly refuted.

There is no ground for understanding, with the ancients (and Schwegler), Rome thereby, excepting the doubtful legend that Peter was put to death there; none whatever for supposing, with the Copts, the Egyptian Babylon. Bertholdt, V. 3060, ff. The ancient Babylon may well be meant.


§ 171 b.

For determining the date of the composition, a point is found in the reference to the persecution under Nero, at which time the Apostle must have been residing in Babylon. Silvanus (Silas) appears (Acts xx. 4, f.) no longer among Paul’s companions, and may have attached himself from that time forward to Peter. The presence of Mark, if he were Paul’s assistant, is quite reconcilable with the above
chronological reference, for, according to Col. iv. 10, he proposed going from Rome to Asia Minor. At this time, also, the name χριστιανός (iv. 16, cf. Acts xi. 26) may have long been in general use.


**Design and Contents.**

§ 171 c.

The design and contents of the Epistle refer principally to the relation of the Christians to the heathen, which was embarrassing and difficult, because the latter entertained a hostile suspicion towards the former, and had even proceeded to oppression and persecution. This reference is manifested in the *general part* of the Epistle, i. 3–ii. 10* (i. 6, 14); but the *special part* refers particularly to it (ii. 11–v. 11); b scarcely alluding to the interior side of the Christian life (iii. 1–7 [even ver. 1 has an external reference], 8, iv. 7–11, v. 1–5), but, for the most part, treating of their walk among the heathen (ii. 11–21, iv. 1–3) and of the conduct to be maintained by the Christians in view of their suspicion and hostility (iii. 9–17, iv. 12–19, v. 6–9, even ii. 19, f.).

* After the *introduction* of an expression of thanks for the blessings of salvation, which his readers also share, who are supposed to bear themselves worthily in their warfare, in order to gain salvation,—that salvation concerning which the prophets searched with longing, and into whose mysteries angels desire to look, i. 3–12,— *general exhortations*, i. 13–ii. 10: exhortation to strong and full hope, i. 13, to obedience and holiness in remembrance of their call through him who is holy, of the fear due to him as the judge, and of the redemption through the blood of Jesus Christ, i. 14–21; exhortation to holiness, and, in special, to pure brotherly love through remembrance of their being born again, i. 22–25; exhortation to growth in the new life, ii. 1–3, to living participation in the spiritual communion with Jesus Christ, ii. 4–10.

b Particular exhortations, with special reference to their external and internal relations: 1. Exhortation, i. in general to a good conversation among the heathen, ii. 11, f.; 2. to obedience to authority, ii. 13–17; 3. to slaves, to be obedient to their masters, ii. 18–25; 4. to wives, to be
obedient to their husbands, and to husbands to honor their wives, iii. 1-7; concluding general exhortation, iii. 8-12. II. Exhortation to fearless, mild, morally pure, and forbearing conduct towards the heathen, iii. 13-iv. 19, and, 1. to a fearless and mild composure, founded on a good conscience, in view of possible suffering, ver. 13-17, with a reference to Christ’s sufferings and resurrection, ver. 18-22 (in ver. 19, f. is mentioned the preaching of Christ, the risen one, in hell); thereupon is based, 2. an exhortation and encouragement, iv. 1-11: a. since Christ suffered according to the flesh, Christians ought no longer, like the heathen, to live in fleshly lusts, iv. 1-3; b. the latter may be astonished at this, and may slander; they must give an account at the judgment, iv. 4-6; c. exhortation in view of the nearness of the judgment, iv. 7-11. 3. Encouragement to joyful acceptance of the trial, which, as the beginning of the judgment, is unavoidable, iv. 19-19. III. Exhortation, 1. to the elders of the churches to a proper discharge of their office, v. 1-4; 2. to the younger members and to all to subjection and humility, v. 5; 3. closing exhortation to all, v. 6-9; 4. benediction, v. 10, f.

* The words, v. 12, ἐγραφα ..., ἐπιμαρτυρῶν, ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῶς χάριν τ. θεοῦ εἰς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ have been by many (Credner, as above, Naundor, II. 559, Guericke, Beitr. 170, Einl. 453, Schwager, as above, p. 22) so misinterpreted as to represent Peter as defending Paul’s doctrine against false teachers; they are rather designed to warn the readers not to allow themselves to be led astray by their sufferings.

* Spirit and Literary Character of the Epistle.

§ 172.

We seek in vain, in this ostensible work of Peter, that leader of the Jewish Christians with whose consideration they clothed themselves long after the Apostolic age, any definite peculiarity, such as appears in the works of John and Paul. Not only do we find reminiscences of passages in Paul’s Epistles, whose perusal by our author we may without hesitation assume;* but the doctrine and the language are essentially Pauline. To this we may add, that the writer does not treat with freedom and readiness the thoughts which he sets forth, as if they were his own, but handles them with a degree of uncertainty.*


The address and the greeting, i. 1, f., are formed in general on the Pauline type (cf., on the other hand, James i. 1; the greetings in 2 John 1, f., and Jude 1 are, however, similar). The Epistle shows the following parallelism:

**1 Pet. i. 1, f.: ... ἐκκλεσίας ... κατὰ πρόώνων θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἄγιασμῷ πνεύματος εἰς ... ἀνεμίστημι αἵματος Ἰ. Χρ.**

**Eph. i. 4-7: καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶχαί ἡμᾶς ἁγίους κ. ἀμώμους ... ἐν φώνῃ τῆς ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ.**

**Rom. i. 3: Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ ... ἀναγέννησας ἡμᾶς, κ.τ.λ.**

**1 Pet. i. 14: μὴ συνεχόμενοι ταῖς πρόοροις ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις.**

**Eph. ii. 3: ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστάλησαν ποτὲ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν.**

**Rom. iii. 9: Νυνὶ ἀπόβασθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὅργῃ, θυμῷ, κακίᾳ, βλασφημίαι. Cf. James i. 21: Διὸ ἀποβέμενοι πᾶσαν ῥοπαλίαν καὶ περισσείαν κακίας, ἐν πραΰτητι δίδασκε τὸν ἐμφύτου λόγον, τὸν δυνάμενον λέγεις τὸς φύσει ὑμῶν. Rom. xii. 1: ... παραστήσατε τὰ σάματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ἔως, ἄγιαν, εὐφρενίον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν.**

**Col. iii. 8: Νυνὶ ἀπόβασθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὅργῃ, θυμῷ, κακίᾳ, βλασφημίαι.**

**ii. 6 (from Isa. xxviii. 10): ἱδοὺ, τίθηµι ἐν Σιών λίθων ἀκρογονιαίοις, ἐκκλησίας, ἑρτίμων κ.ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ καταχωρήθη. Ver. 7: ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἔχουσιν νόμον.**

**Rom. ix. 33: οὗτος, τίθηµι ἐν Σιών λίθοι ἐκκλησίαις (LXX. ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰς θεμελίας Σιών) λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου καὶ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ (this ἐπ' αὐτῷ interpolated according to Cod. Al.) οὐ καταχωρήθησαν.**

**ii. 8 (from Isa. ixxiiii. 14): λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου.**

**Ver. 10 (from Hos. ii. 25, al. 23): οἱ σωτῆρ υἱὸς λαοῦ, τοῦ δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ οἱ οὖν ἑλπιημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθήνεις.**

**Ver. 25: ὦς καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ· καλεῖσαι τὸν οὐ λαῖν μου λαὸν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἡγασμήν ηγασμήν. Ver. 26: καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὗ ἐμφάνιζε.
A certain affinity to the Epistle of James also (on which side the dependence lies is doubtful) appears in the following passages:

i. 6, 7: *Ἐν δὲ ἀγαλλασθεὶς, ἐλθὼν ἀρτι... λυτρηθῆτε ἐν ποικιλοῖς πεισμοῖς...* *Ἰς τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως... εὐρέθη εἰς ἔπαινον, κ.τ.λ.*

James i. 2, f.: *Πᾶσας χαρὰς ἡγήσασθε... διὸν πειρασμὸς πειρατέστηκε ποικιλοῖς... γυναίκες δὲ τὸ δοκίμιόν ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ἐπομονήν.*

Rom. viii. 18: *πρὸς τὴν μελλοῦσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δέξεται κοινωνίας.*

Rom. vii. 6: *ὑποτασσόμενοι ἄλληλοις ἐν φίλημα ἁγάπης.*

Phil. ii. 14: *Πάσα ποιήσει χαρὶς γογγυσμῶν.*

Rom. viii. 20: *Ἀπεσάσατο ἄλληλους ἐν φίλημα ἁγάπης.*

Rom. viii. 13: *Ὑμίν ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τῆς δοξάσεως ἡμῶν διάφορα...*
i. 24: ἐνῶς τάσις σφόδρῳ ὡς χόρτος, καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνδρος χόρτου: ἡ ἡμερινὴ ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ ἐξίσευσε (I sa. xvi. 6).

iv. 8: ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλήθος ἀμαρτιῶν (Prov. x. 12).

v. 5, f.: ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἑπερηφάνειος ἀντιστάσται, ταπεινοὶ δὲ δίδωσι χάρμα (Prov. iii. 34). Ταπεινώθησε ὁ ἐβασάνιστὸς τὴν κρατικὴν χώραν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὥστε Ἰακώβις ἐν καρφ. 9: ἐπειδὴ ἵνα ἰδῆς ἐν καρφ. 10: ταπεινώθησι ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ἰδώσει ὡς ἤμας.

E. K. Rauch, as above, p. 414, ff., has only showed that the author did not directly copy other's Epistles, but has not disproved the fact that a certain affinity in language and ideas exists. He explains this, in a not very probable way, from the intercourse of the two Apostles. Schneckburger, Stud. d. würtemb. Geistlichen. V. II. p. 195, Beitr. p. 206, assumes that Peter had before him James's letter.

The view of Jesus's death is Pauline, ii. 24, cf. Rom. vii. 8—14 (ἀποστολὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας, Peter = ἀποστολήκειν τ. ἄμ., Paul), the ideas of calling (i. 15, cf. Gal. i. 6, 15, v. 8), election (i. 9), hope (i. 3, iii. 15; only once in the First Epistle of John, iii. 3, in the concrete sense), of obedience (i. 2, cf. Rom. vi. 16, xvi. 19), of freedom and its abuse (i. 16, cf. Gal. v. 13), of the gifts of grace (iv. 10), of recompense (ἐπαινοῦσιν Ἰακώβις, Ἰσαακίας, Ἰσαακίας, Ἱσαακίας), of inheritance (i. 4, cf. Gal. iii. 18, as in John). Note also the ideas and formulas: ἀποκαλυπτεί (i. 7, 13, cf. 1 Cor. i. 7 and often), κοινωνία τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων (iv. 13, cf. 2 Cor. i. 5, Phil. iii. 10), συνείδησις (ii. 19, iii. 16, 21, elsewhere only in Paul, Paulinians, and John viii. 9, a Hellenistic idea), κρύπτω (iii. 4, cf. Rom. ii. 29, 1 Cor. xiv. 19), ἐν Χριστῷ (iii. 16, v. 10, 14, cf. Rom. vi. 11, and often), κοινωνία (v. 10, cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 11, Heb. xii. 21).—The greatest peculiarities are the ideas of the regeneration through the word (i. 23), of the Christian priesthood (ii. 5, 9), of Christ's descent into hell (iii. 19, ff.). Schott, Isaq. § 96, note 6, enumerates also the following as peculiarities of its thought and teaching: i. 8, love to Jesus and faith 'in him without knowing him; Christ's patience, i. 10, ff. (i.), ii. 29, f., iii. 18; of the prophets of the Old Testament, i. 10, ff.; the Noachic flood as type of baptism, iii. 20, ff.; recommendation of patience, i. 6—11 (!), ii. 21, f., iii. 9, 14, iv. 7 (!), 19—19, v. 7, ff.; exhortation to give no offence, ii. 12, f., iii. 1, f., iv. 14, ff., v. 7—9 (!). Steiger, p. 5, f.: "The fire of his spirit shows itself throughout, but moderated by experience. His temperament is as distinctly expressed in it as in general is possible in such works without impairing the thought. It also shows itself in the fact that after the middle of the Epistle the natural fire of his spirit diminishes somewhat, and hence repetitions creep in," etc. Mayerhoff, p. 102: "The peculiarity of the Epistles is a pervading
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warmth. . . . It is rooted here with vital power in the depths of Christian perception, and thus every particular is controlled in a peculiar way by the hope, firmly grounded in Christ, of future salvation.” Peculiarity in the language, according to Dan. Schulze and Schott: more frequent repetitions than in Paul: iii. 16 = iii. 1, ii. 12; iv. 3 = i. 14, ii. 11; iv. 12 = i. 6—9; iv. 14 = iii. 14, 17, ii. 20; v. 8 = iv. 7, i. 13; the Pauline words, δι-καωσινή, δικαωσθαι, &c. are wanting; contrast of πνεῦμα and ψυχή, for πν. and σέρξ; ἀναστροφή, frequently; ἁγαθοσοφία, ἁγαθοσία, ἁγαθοσεια, κακοσιός; the use of εἰς, i. 4, 10, 11, 25; the use of the article, iii. 2, 3, 16 (!); the ἄντρα λεγόμενα: ἀδελφότης, ἁγιαινή, ἀμάρτως, ἀμάρτιους, ἀποροσπολίστας, πατροπαράδοτος, ἀρτιγίνητα, ἀλλοτροπότοις, συνεκλεκτή, ἀντιλοιφος, and several others; δόξα, i. 11; ἀρετή, ii. 9; κτίσει, ii. 13; τα αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων, v. 9; the formula of citation περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ, ii. 6.

* Schliefrench, Einl. p. 406, also observes this, while Steiger (as above) finds in the whole Epistle great facility of expression and in the connection of the thoughts. Schliefrench regards it as a proof of the genuineness of the Epistle.

Genuineness and Church Acceptance.

§ 173.

The improbability of Peter’s allowing himself to be so dependent on Paul, and especially of his being acquainted even with Paul’s later letters, and with the spurious Epistle to the Ephesians, awakens a strong suspicion of the genuineness of this Epistle. It is, however, supported by the whole mass of ancient Church authorities. Even the Second Epistle of Peter, although spurious, testifies to it (iii. 1). Some of the Apostolic Fathers knew and used it.* The testimonies of the most important Fathers down to Eusebius, who reckons it among the generally accepted writings, support it; and if we set aside its omission in the ancient Bible Catalogue of Muratori (Part I. § 21), and its rejection by the Paulicians, there is no opposition to it. The theory of forgery, in itself odious, lacks the positive ground of a demonstrable design to be accomplished by it, for the supposed design of mediating between Paulinism and Petrinism is not clearly manifest.* The theory of its composition by an assistant, in Peter’s name and with his knowledge, we leave in abeyance. The Epistle belongs to the
Apostolic age, because of its expectation of the near end of all things, iv. 7.


* A mediating, Paulino-apologetic character is ascribed to the Epistle by Mayerhoff, p. 103. Schweigler, p. 29. The amount of it is only that a Peter taught and wrote in a Pauline way.


Second Epistle. Historical and Personal Relations.

§ 174 a.

The author has indicated himself here more clearly than in the First Epistle, not only in his salutation and with his whole name (i. 1), but also in the Epistle itself, as one of the Apostles (iii. 2), as one of the companions of Jesus during his life (i. 14, cf. John xxi. 18, f. [?]; i. 16–18, cf. Matt. xvii. 1, ff.), as the apostolic brother of Paul (iii. 15), and as the author of the First Epistle (iii. 1).

The Epistle is ostensibly addressed to all Christians (i. 1),
but its readers must be they to whom the First Epistle was addressed (iii. 1). It even seems to be assumed that the Apostle had instructed them (i. 16). And yet they must be the same as the Apostle Paul had written to (iii. 15, cf. Rom. ii. 4).

Indications of its date are these: the Apostle Peter looks forward to his speedy death (i. 14), and the expectation of Christ's speedy return had been disappointed (iii. 4). The latter points to a very late period.

* It must be admitted that the grammar is opposed to the meaning "of us the Apostles" (see Exeg. Hdb. on the passage), and the author, by using Jude 17, has removed himself from the accepted list.

**Design and Contents.**

§ 174 b.

The main design of the Epistle is to defend the belief in the second coming of the Lord against certain doubts, and to exhort to a proper preparation in view of it.* The author supports his exhortation to strengthen themselves in their Christian calling, that they may gain admission into the kingdom of God, i. 3–11, by appealing, in confirmation of the doctrine of Christ's second coming, to his apostolic testimony and the Old Testament prophecies, ver. 12–21. As it were accidentally, he speaks in chap. ii. of false teachers who are to be expected, but from ver. 9 forward are regarded as present. These are not, probably, such as denied the second coming of Christ; b their confutation, therefore, has no connection with the main object of the Epistle. The certainty of Christ's return is first maintained against certain scoffers in chap. iii., and to the refutation of the doubts urged against it an exhortation is joined.

* According to Schweigler, Nachap. Zeitalt. I. 503, the design is to bring about a final and lasting reconciliation between the Petrinians and the Paulinians. In support of this view, however, only iii. 15 can be adduced.

b It is a mistake to refer, with Credner, p. 654 (cf. Mayerhoff, p. 156), their aberrations to their denial of Christ's return. The false teachers of chap. ii. are styled servants of pleasure, founders of sects, such as by their seductive eloquence seek for gain, false prophets like Balaam,
preachers of a false freedom. According to Gratius, they are Carpe-
eritians; according to Vitring. (Obs. s. IV. 9) and Michael., Gnosti-
ces; according to Hug, II. § 182, they belong to a branch school of the magico-
theurgic philosophy; according to Bertholdt, VI. 3112, they are Sadducees;
according to Schwegler, I. 501, Gnostics, but of no special sect.

Relation of this Epistle to the Epistle of Jude.

§ 175 a.

The Second Epistle of Peter has, especially in chap. ii.,
great affinity to the Epistle of Jude.*

* Table of Comparison.

2 Peter. Jude.

i. 1, 2: Συμεὼν Πέτρος δούλος καὶ 1, 2: Ἰωάννας Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ δοῦ-
ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . 3. λος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου . . .
i. 5: . . . σπουδὴν πᾶσαν πα-
ρεισένεγκαντες. 3: ἰαματοῖο, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποι-
oύμενος γράφει ομός, περὶ τῆς
i. 15: Σπουδάσω δὲ ἐκάστοτε, ἃς ἰμάς μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον τῆς τού-
tων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι.

ii. 1: Ἔγειροντο δὲ καὶ φευδοπροφητή-
τι τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ τῇ ἀμιὰν ἠστιᾶται
φευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισ-
έξουσιν αἰρέσιςς ἀπωλείας, καὶ
tὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς διε-
σπότην ἀρνοῦμεν, ἐκάστοτε
eἰς αὐτοὺς ταχυν ἀπώλειαν. 4: Καὶ
τῶν μάσιν
dεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν
Ἠσαύρον Ἰρ. ἀρνοῦμεν.

4: Παρεισέδυσαν γὰρ τοὺς ἀ-
θρωποί τοὺς καὶ προγεγραμμένου
eἰς τούτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀδελφῆς, τῆς
tοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριν μεταξύτεις
eἰς ἐσέλεγεα, καὶ τῶν μάσιν
δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν
ollecti, ἐκατολούθησον αὐτῶν ταῖς
ἐσέλεγεας, διὸ όσο ἡ δοξα τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσονται. 3: Καὶ ἐν
πλευροῖς πλαστοῖς λόγοις ἰμάς ἐμπροέρεσται οὐκ ἐπέκρινα
ὡς καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάξεις.

6: Καὶ πόλεως Σεοδόμων καὶ Γο-
μόρρας τεφρώσατε καταστροφὴν κα-
tέρνησαν, ὑπάδειμα μελλόντων
ἀσβεσίν τιθείοις. . . .

10: . . . τοὺς ὅπισώ σαρκῶς ἐν
ἐπιθυμίᾳ μασμοῦ ποιεύμενοιν,
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καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονοῦται 
. . . . δόξας οὐ τρέμοντι βλασφημοῦντες.

11. Ὁ οὖν άγγελος, ἵπποι καὶ
dυνάμεις ἰδείτες, οὐ
φέροντες κατ' αὐτὸν παρὰ κύριον
βλασφημον κρίσιν.

12. Οδοί δὲ, ὡς ἀλογα ὥα, φυσικὰ,
γεγενημένα εἰς ἄλων καὶ
φθοράς, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοούσι βλα-
σφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθοραί αὐ-
τῶν καταφθάρσονται.

15. . . . ἣκαθοδοῦσης τῇ ὁδῷ
tοῦ Βαλλαρίου τοῦ Βοσόρ, δὲ μη-
σθὲν αδικίας ἡγάγησιν.

13. . . . ἢδονήν ἤγονενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμὲ-
ῥᾳ τροφὴν, στῖκοι καὶ κάθισι, ἐν-
τριφώτες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐ-
τῶν, συνενχώσων ὦν . . . .

17. Οδοί εἰσιν πηγὰς ἄνωθεν κα
ἄμμελα ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυ-
νόμενα, οἵς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ
σκότους εἰς αἴώνα τετήρη-
ται.

18. Τῇ πέρογεα γὰρ ματαιότητος
φθεγγόμενοι . . . .

iii. 1. Ταύτην Ἰησ, ἀγαπητοῖ, δεν-
tέραν ὡμίν γράφων ἐπιστολήν, ἐν οἷς
διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομονῇ τῆς εἰ-
lκυριαὶ διάνοιας. 2. μην σῇραι
tῶν προειρημένων ῥήματων
ὑπὸ τῶν ἰγών προφητῶν κα
τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐν-
τολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος;
tοῦτο πρῶτον γνώσκοντες, ἵνα ἐλεῦ-
σονται εἰς τοῖς ἑυρίσκουσιν τῶν ἱμα-
τῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμῇ ἑμπαί-
κται, κατὰ τὰς ὅδες ἐπιθυμι-
ὰς αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι.

16. . . . καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ
ὑπέρογεα . . . .

17. Ὡμεία δὲ, ἀγαπητοῖ, μνήσθη-
tε τῶν ῥήματων τῶν προει-
ρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων
tοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χρι-
στοῦ.

(14. Προσέβησον καὶ τούτο . . . .
"Εὐώχ, κ.τ.λ."

18. Ὡς ὅλεος ὑμῖν, ὃς ἐν ἔχαστε
χρόνῳ ἔσονται ἑμπαίκται,
cατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας
πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
§ 175 b.

There being this undeniable relationship, the originality belongs to the Epistle of Jude. For,—1. The expression in Jude is simpler, while in 2 Peter we find rhetorical, artificial circumlocution, with additions. 2. Some of the expressions in Jude are distorted in 2 Peter, and singularly exchanged. 3. The passages 2 Peter ii. 4, 11 become clear only from Jude 6, 9, and are manifestly taken from that passage. The indefiniteness of the second passage results from fear of using an apocryphal narrative. 4. The course of the thought in Jude is firm and distinct, in 2 Peter wavering, like that of an imitator. 5. The opponents whom Jude combats are strongly and distinctly indicated, whereas in 2 Peter the picture is quite indefinite, the vicious being arbitrarily converted into false teachers, of whom we know not whether they are present or future.
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Spuriousness and Uncertain Position in the Canon.

§ 176 a.

This use of another's (and a pretty late) work does not accord with the supposition that an Apostle was its author. It discloses, moreover, the unhistorical contents of the Epistle, for the false teachers there combated are a non-entity, a false copy of the seducers in Jude.* Besides this decisive reason there are several others: the assumption of a different relation to his readers from that in the First Epistle, and the fluctuations in this very assumption; the design of the writer to pass for the Apostles Peter; the appeal to the Apostolic “command” (iii. 2); the citation of Paul’s Epistles as γραφαὶ (iii. 15, f.); the reference to probably later doubts regarding the return of Christ; the doctrine of the origin and the destruction of the world (iii. 5 –7), which does not correspond with apostolic simplicity; the different style of the writing.b

* This ground falls away, if we suppose, with Bertholdt, VI. 3157, ff., only 2 Pet. ii., or, with Ullmann (above work), only chap. ii. and iii. to be spurious, but the others genuine. But Bertholdt’s view rests on a complete misconception of the relation of 2 Pet. iii. 1, ff. to Jude 17, f., and Hug, II. § 178, has correctly urged against Ullmann, that chap. i. 16 contains a reference to chap. iii. It is characteristic that in ii. 11 reference to a passage in the apocryphal book of Enoch is avoided; probably because, at
the time of the author, a sharp distinction was made between canonical and apocryphal writings.

Hieron. Epp. CXX. ad Hedib. c. 11: Habebat ergo (Paulus) Titum inter pretatem, sicut et beatus Petrus Marcus, cujus Evangelium, Petro narrante et illo scribente, compositum est. Denique et duae epistolae, quae rerum Petri, stilo inter se et charactere discrepant structuraque verborum. Ex quo intelligimus, pro necessitate rerum diversas eum usum interpretabus.

Cf. De vir. ill. c. 1, see next note. Nietzsche, Ep. Petri posterior autori suo imprimis e. Grotium vindicata (Lipsc. 1785), p. 26, sqq., Bertholdt, VI. 3120, Schott, § 101, note 1, adduce something to prove the relationship in the style; as, the use of the article, i. 4, ii. 7, iii. 2 (!); the form of greeting, i. 2; ἀναστροφή, ἀναστρεφθεῖσα, ἀρετή (i. 2), ἀσπίδας καὶ ἀμφίβολος, ἔπιτησις, i. 16, cf. ἔποιεύετος, 1 Pet. ii. 13, iii. 2; παρείσχεσθαι ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις ὑπὸ καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις, i. 10, iii. 3, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 3; κομίζεσθαι, καλεῖν, &c. Paulinisms also are found: ἀφέσεις, γνώσεις, ἑπίστευσις, i. 17, cf. Gal. v. 4; ἐπιχόρησις; παραστάσεις, i. 1, cf. παρείσχεστος, Gal. ii. 4; πλη- νοίας; συναγάγεσθαι τυί; the passages δὲ οὖν ἡ ὄδος τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφη- μηθήσεται, i. 2, cf. Rom. ii. 24, xiv. 16 (!); ἀπευθείας αὐτοῦ ἐπάγγελλο- μενον, αὐτῷ δοῦλον ὑπάρχοντος τῆς φθορᾶς, i. 19, cf. Gal. v. 13, Rom. viii. 21 (!). — The style of this Epistle is distinguished by its heavy repetitions (i. 3, f., where διὰ, δεδομενης, and δεδορρησσαι occur four times; ii. 1—3, ἀπόλευσα, three times; ver. 7, f., διακοινος, three times; iii. 13—14, προσδοκούμενοι, three times); by uniformity in connection, as with τοια, i. 4, 8, ff., 12, 15, iii. 11, 14, 16; by its want of the peculiar use of ἄς in the First Epistle (i. 14, 19, ii. 1, and often); by its peculiar mode of forming qualifications by ἐν, as τῆς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, i. 4, cf. ii. 3, 7, 10, 13, 18, iii. 1, 3; by its different idiom: σωτήρ often of Jesus; παροιμία, ἡμέρα κυρίου, ἡ κρίσις, for ἀποκαλύψης; κύριος of God; γνώσει, εἰπότατος of God and Christ; ὡς τῆς ἀληθ., δικαιοσύνης; by a surprising number, considering its narrow limits, of ἄπαξ λεγόμενα. Moreover, there are few or no quotations from the Old Testament.

§ 176 b.

In the ancient Church this Epistle was late in becoming known, and its genuineness remained doubtful.
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Origen, only in the Latin version, Homil. VII. in Josuam. Opp. II. 412: Petrus enim duabus epistolamurum suarum personat tubis. Homil. IV. in Levit. ii. 200: Et iterum Petrus dicit: Consortes, inquit, facti estis divinae naturae (2 Pet. i. 4). Cf. Comment. in Joan. Opp. IV. 135: Καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν φυλακῇ πορίας μετὰ πνεύματος παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ. In Euseb. VI. 25: Πέτρος . . . μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὑμολογούμενην κατάλοιπον . . . ἐτότε δὲ καὶ διετέραν ἀμφιβάλλει γάρ. Firmilian (c. 230), in ep. ad Cyprian.: Aduce etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos, quasi hoc ipsi tradiderint, qui in epistolis suis haereticos execrat sunt (this can apply only to 2 Peter), et ut eos evitemus, monuerunt. The Syrian church did not acknowledge this Epistle. Hence Euseb. III. 25, reckons it among the Antilegomena, cf. III. 3 (Part I. § 24, note b). In the fourth century it was received into the canon without the doubts being set at rest. Didymus: . . . praesentem epistolam esse falsatam (Part I. § 26, note b). Mayerhoff, p. 213, and others, regard these words as an addition from another source, because Didymus elsewhere (De trin. I. 15. 21, II. 6. 151, and often) cites the Epistle as Petrine and catholic. Hieron. De vir. ill. c. 1: Scripsit (Petrus) duas epistolam, quae catholicæ nominantur, quaram secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur propter stili cum priore dissonantiam. (Cf. Part I. § 27, note b.)

The following modern writers contest the genuineness: Calvin (Comment. in epp. cath. Opp. Vol. V. P. 3. p. 103), Grotius (ad cap. i. 1. His hypothesis is that the Epistle was written by the Bishop Simeon, that it presupposes the destruction of Jerusalem and refutes the Carpocratians), Erasmus (Nott. ad h. ep.), Semler (Praef. in h. ep.), J. E. Chr. Schmidt (Einl. I. 331, ff.), Welker (Clavis ub. d. kath. Br., &c., p. 181, ff.), Guericke (Beitr. p. 175, f.), Neander (AG. II. 598); to a certain extent, Eichhorn (III. 636, ff.), Schott (lang. § 102), Credner (Einl.), Mayerhoff (Einl. in d. petr. Schr.), Neudecker (Einl.); in part, Ulmann (as above), Magnus (Exam. de l'authenticité de la 2. ep. de Pierre. Strassb. 1835), Reuss
IV. Epistles of John.


The First Epistle a Work of John the Evangelist.

§ 177 a.

The author of this composition does not call himself the Apostle John, nor author of the fourth Gospel, but merely an eyewitness of the history of Jesus (i. 1, f., iv. 14), and in the Second and Third Epistles an elder (πρεσβύτερος). Thus much, however, is certain, that both writings, this Epistle and the fourth Gospel, proceeded from the same author; for both bear the distinctest stamp of relationship, as well in the style of the writing as in the development of the thought. Both throw the same spell of genial human feeling over the reader.
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a ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, 1 John i. 6, John iii. 21; οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐν τινί, 1 John i. 8, ii. 4, John viii. 44; ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας εἶλα, 1 John ii. 21, John xviii. 37; ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου εἶλα, 1 John iii. 8, John viii. 44; ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶλα, 1 John iii. 10, iv. 1, John vii. 17, viii. 47; ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἶλα, 1 John iv. 5, John viii. 23; ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου λαλεῖν, 1 John iv. 5, cf. John iii. 31; ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖν, ἐν αὐτῷ μισθωμέν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἦμιν, 1 John iv. 13, 14, f., cf. John vi. 56, xv. 4, f.; ἐν τῇ εἰκότητι, ἐν τῷ φωτὶ περιστατεῖν, 1 John ii. 11, i. 6, John viii. 12, xii. 35; γνώσασθαι τὸν θεόν, οὐ Χριστὸν, 1 John ii. 3, 4, 13, 14, iv. 6, 7, 8, v. 20, John xv. 3, xvii. 25; ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 John iv. 20, John i. 18, vi. 46, xix. 9; τὴν ψυχὴν ταῦτα τίθειν, 1 John iii. 16, John x. 11, 17, 18, xv. 13; ἄμαρτιαν ἔχειν, 1 John i. 8, John ix. 41, xv. 23, 24, xix. 11; ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνων ὑπὸ τὴν ζωὴν, 1 John iii. 15, v. 12, f., John iii. 15, f., 36, v. 24, 39, 40, vi. 40, 47, 54, x. 10; οὐκ οἶδα ποῦ ὑπάγει, 1 John ii. 11, John xii. 35; μεταβάτων ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν, 1 John iii. 14, John v. 24; μυκὴν τοῦ κόσμου, 1 John v. 4, f., cf. ii. 13, 14, iv. 4, John xvi. 33; μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνειν, 1 John v. 9, John iii. 11, 32, v. 34; αὕρειν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, 1 John iii. 5, John i. 29, 36; δύνασθαι of moral possibility, 1 John iii. 9, iv. 20, John v. 44, viii. 43, xiv. 17; παράλληλον, 1 John ii. 1, John xiv. 10, and often; ἀνθρωποκόμον, 1 John iii. 15, John viii. 44; μείζων, 1 John iii. 20, iv. 4, v. 5, John xiv. 28; ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, 1 John iv. 9, John i. 14, 18, iii. 16, 18; ὄστραχος, 1 John ii. 3, 4, 7, 8, iii. 22, 23, 24, iv. 21, v. 2, 3, John x. 18, xii. 49, 50, xiii. 34, xiv. 15, 21, xv. 10, 12.—Affirmation and negation placed together: ψευδόμεθα καὶ οὐ ποιοῦμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, 1 John i. 6, αὐτὸν ἀμαρτάνετε, John i. 20, cf. 1 John i. 5, 8, ii. 4, 10, 27, 28, with John i. 3, iii. 20, v. 24, vii. 18, xvi. 29, 30; explanation by antitheses placed side by side: 1 John ii. 9, 10, 11, 23, iii. 6, 7, 8, iv. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, v. 10, 12, John iii. 18, 20, 35, f., vii. 18, viii. 23, x. 10, ff.; progress, or more exact definition by antitheses: οὐ — ἀλλά, 1 John ii. 7, 21, iii. 18, iv. 1, 10, 18, v. 6, 16, John i. 8, iii. 17, 28, iv. 14, v. 22, 30, 34, vi. 32, 38, &c.; explanations of notions or things: αὐτὴ ἔστιν ἡ ἀγγέλεια, 1 John i. 5, iii. 11, and similar, ii. 25, iii. 10, 23, iv. 2, 9, f., 17, 21, v. 3, 11, 14, John i. 19, iii. 19, vi. 29, 39, 40, xv. 12, xvii. 3. Cf. Eichhorn, II. 281, ff. Dan. Schuize, Der schriftstell. Charakter und Werth des Joh. 1803. 8vo.

b ἡζι of Christ, 1 John i. 1, 2, v. 11, 20, John i. 4, vi. 26, 35, 48, xi. 25, &c.; φῶς of God and Christ, 1 John i. 5, 7, ii. 8, John i. 4, 5, 7, ff., iii. 19, and frequently; μαρτυρία and μαρτυρεῖν, 1 John v. 6, 9, 10, 11, John v. 36, viii. 17, f.; God’s love in the mission of Christ, 1 John iv. 9, John iii. 16; Christians the children of God, 1 John v. 1, John i. 12, f.; love the command of Christ, 1 John iii. 11, 16, 18, 23, John xiii. 34, f., xv. 12, 14. The view of the expiatory sacrifice, i. 7, ii. 2, iv. 10, does not find sufficient confirmation in the Gospel (i. 29, vi. 51); as also the expectation of Christ’s return (1 John ii. 18, 28).
§ 177 b.

The apostolic origin of the Epistle is attested by the almost unanimous voice of antiquity. *Papias* and *Polycarp* knew and used it. They are followed by *Irenæus*, Polycarp's disciple. In like manner, subsequent authorities confirm the acknowledgment of this work, which was classed among the Homologumenena without opposition, that of the Alogi alone excepted.

* Papias, in Eusèb. III. 39, see § 109 b, note c. Polycarp, Ep. ad Philipp. c. 7: Πάντα γὰρ δὲν μὴ ὁμολογηθήσοντος Χριστίν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλαχιστῶς, ἀποκριθῆται ἤτοι, cf. 1 John iv. 3.


§ 177 c.

The doubts urged in modern times against the genuineness of this Epistle* rest on the following weak grounds: the Logology and the Antidocetic tendency of the Epistle betray an author of the second century, who was not the Apostle, but, as he describes himself in the Second and Third Epistles, the Presbyter John; from its eschatological representations, ii. 18, 22, 28, iii. 2, iv. 3, its different notion of πνεῦμα, ii. 1, 20, 27 (†), and the difference between v. 6, f. and John xix. 34 (?), it belongs to an earlier form of doctrinal development.

Form, Destination, and Date.

§ 178 a.

As the work lacks the external form of an Epistle, some have been disposed to deny it the epistolary character. But this want is supplied by its internal character, by its address to the readers, the dedication of the writing to them, and the references to their situation (i. 3, f., ii. 1, 7, f., 12–15, 18, 20, f., 24, 28, f.), by the somewhat loose connection of the ideas, and the way in which they are presented, the thought being in some passages rather suggested than expressed, while in others we find repetitions.

The theory that attaches our Epistle to the Gospel as its practical or polemic section, incorrectly apprehends its essential character. For it is manifestly written differently from the Gospel, and presupposes a more precisely defined circle of readers; and besides, it is difficult to explain, on this view, why all antiquity regarded the work as an Epistle and separated it from the Gospel. It is also not a work written to recommend or dedicate the Gospel, for it contains no clear references thereto, although it gains in point, if we presuppose not only the oral preaching of the author (this must be presupposed, i. 3, ii. 7, iv. 14), but also his written teaching by the Gospel.

* Ziegler, Der 1. Br. Joh. ein Sendesch. an eine bestimmte Gemeinde, &c., in Henke’s Mag. VI. 2. 796. Lücke, as above, p. 34.
* Berger, Versuch e. moral. Einl. ins N. T. II. 118.

§ 178 b.

The Latin superscription of the Epistle, ad Parthos, originated in some error. According to the Epistle itself, the readers were (at least in part) Gentile Christians (v. 21). Hence the absence of Old Testament quotations, and the
warning against Docetism (iv. 2, f.). They were disciples of the Apostle (ii. 7), for he knows their spiritual condition (ii.12, ff., 20, f., 27); and his epistolary communication seems but a continuation of his oral preaching (i. 3). As John's later sphere of labor was in Asia Minor (§ 108), the Epistle seems to be addressed to several churches there as a circular letter.8


* Hug's supposition, that it was addressed to the community at Ephesus, is refuted by Lücke, p. 39.

§ 178 c.

There are no certain marks of the date of this Epistle. If it be true that the references and allusions presuppose the Gospel, it was written after that work. That its tone betrays the great age of its author, is an uncertain judgment of taste. There is no reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in ii. 18.9

* Arbitrary theories have been built on this passage by Hammond, Gratius, Calov, Lange, Michaelis, Hahnlein, and others, by Baronius, Mill, Clericus, and others. — In regard, also, to the place from which the Epistle was written, there are only uncertain conjectures.

Occasion, Design, and Contents.

§ 179 a.

Various polemic tendencies have been ascribed to our Epistle: a against Jews and Jewish teachers; b against Judaizing Christians, Ebionites, or apostate Jewish Christians; c against Gnostics in general; d against the Docete,9 and against Cerinthus in special; against the disciples of John; e finally, against the Persico-Median philosophy. It must be admitted that the Epistle contains remarks
against false Christians and false teachers (Antichrists); first in general, ii. 18-26, then more specifically, iv. 1-6. Here the Docetæ are hardly to be mistaken; they may also be assumed before and in i. 1-3. The allusion supposed by some, in iii. 4, to moral indifference in regard to the Law, which was, perhaps, also a peculiarity of the Docetæ, is uncertain. All the other supposed tendencies are improbable, especially those against apostate Jewish Christians and the disciples of John.¹

¹ Car. Ch. Flatt, Diss. qua variae de antichristis et pseudoprophetis in 1 Joh. ep. notatis sententiae modo examini subjiciuntur. Tüb. 1809. 4to.
² Lößler, Diss. Ion. ep. i. Gnosticos imprimis impugnari negatur, in the Comment. theol. Vol. i. C. Wunder, Utrum i. Ioan. ep. coetui e Judæis et Judæo-Christianis mixto scripta sit. 1799.
⁷ Storr, as above.
⁸ Paulus, as above, p. 45, ff.
THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

σαυ. ii. 22: Τίς ἐστιν ὁ ψεύτης, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀρνοῦμενος ὡς Ἰησοῦς σὺς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός;

1 Ignat. Ep. interpol. ad Trallian. c. 6: Καὶ οὐ νόμων συντήρουσιν, ἀλλ’ ἰνα ἄνομίαν καταγγέλειν. John iii. 4: Πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, καὶ τὴν ἄνομιάν ποιεῖ· καὶ ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἄνομία.

Lücke, p. 72, ff. — Ch. ii. 19 is not to be understood of the external separation of these Antichrists.

§ 179b.

The polemic design, which must be admitted, is not the main design of the Epistle. This is rather to exhort its readers to obedience to the Christian fundamental law of holiness and love, and, in necessary connection with this, to faith in the Son of God (who was really manifested), and hence, also, to steadfastness in faith. In this last connection, though in a subordinate position, the above references occur.

After the introduction, in which the verity of the facts of the Christian salvation is confirmed (i. 1–4), the writer, —

1. reminds his readers of God’s holiness and of the fundamental law of love, and that communion with God can consist only in freedom from sins and fulfilment of His commands (i. 5–ii. 11); then, after an appeal intended to awaken the Christian feeling of moral superiority to sin and the world (ii. 12–14), he warns them against love of the world (ii. 15–17) and against Antichrists, and exhorts them to steadfastness (ii. 18–28). 2. He reminds them once more of the moral condition indispensable to God’s communion or sonship, whose consummation is a good conscience and peace with God (ii. 29–iii. 24), and again warns them more distinctly against false teachers (iv. 1–6). Finally, 3. he again exhorts, especially to brotherly love, by which alone communion with God is attainable (iv. 7–21), and for which a firm faith is necessary in the incarnation and mission of Christ. This faith conquers the world, gives life (v. 1–13), and results in confidence towards God as the hearer of prayer and intercession. The Apostle speaks of the last topic, which leads him to other thoughts (v. 14–21).
SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN. § 180 a. 361

Second and Third Epistles. Their Genuineness.

§ 180 a.

These Epistles belong to the Antilegomena, although supported by a very respectable tradition. *Clement of Alexandria* was acquainted with several Epistles of John, certainly with the Second, at least. In *Muratori's* fragment on the canon, two Epistles of John are mentioned. *Origen* states doubts against the two smaller Epistles, but does not decide against them. *Dionysius of Alexandria*, on the other hand, draws from them, as genuine Johannic writings, proofs against the Apocalypse. *Irenaeus* acknowledged at least the Second Epistle as Johannic.*

*Eusebius*, probably on account of Origen's doubts, perhaps also of their exclusion from the Syrian canon, reckons them among the Antilegomena. Although the general opinion became afterwards more favorable, and *Jerome* himself considered them genuine, he yet mentions the doubts urged against them.4

---


*c* H. E. III. 25: Τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων . . . . ὁ δοματισμένης δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου, εἵ τε τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγχάνουσα, εἵ τε καὶ εὐτέρου δοματισμοῦ ἐκλήρου.

*d* De vir. ill. c. 9: Scripserit autem Joannes et unam epistolam . . . quae ab universis ecclesiasticis et eruditis viris probatur. Reliquas autem duse, quarum principium Senior . . . . Joanni Presbyteri asseruntur, cujus et hodie 46
alterum sepulcrum apud Ephesios ostenditur. Cf., on the contrary, Ep. ad Paulin. (7) 107, ad Evagr. 60.

§ 180 b.

Supported by these doubts, modern writers have also on internal grounds denied the Apostolic authorship of these Epistles, and attributed them to John the Presbyter, viz.:—1. Because, contrary to the Apostle's practice, the author gives himself a name, —ὁ πρεσβύτερος. But in a private letter of this kind it is natural that he should name himself; and this appellation, if taken in a distinguishing sense, applies better to the Apostle John than in its commonly accepted sense to the other John; to which may be added, that the latter cannot have held the high position of which the author of the Third Epistle is conscious. 2. It is true that the character of the language, though in general Johanne, shows some variations; but if the Apostle be not the author, 2 John 5—7, 3 John 12, must have been written from reminiscences or imitation, which indicate a dependence not to be supposed in regard to the Presbyter John, whom Papias places almost in a line with the Apostles.


b The following are Johanne: μίνιν ἐν τίνι, 2 John 9, 1 Joh. ii. 27, iii. 9; ἵνα ἔχειν, 2 John 9, 1 John ii. 23; ἄραν ἔχον, 3 John 11, 1 John iv. 20; ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι, 3 John 11, 1 John iii. 10; ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ἡ πεπληρωμένη, 2 John 12, 1 John i. 4; αὐτῇ ... ἵνα, 2 John 6; affirmation and negation side by side, 2 John 9; explanation by antitheses, 2 John 9; progression or more exact definition by antitheses, οὗ ... ἀλλά, 2 John 5: explanation of notions and things, 2 John 6. The following, on the other hand, are striking: κύριος (wanting in ΛΒ and other authorities) Ἰ. Χρ., 2 John 3; εἰ τίς, ver. 10, for εἰς τίς, 1 John ii. 1, 15, iv. 20, v. 16; διὰ διότι φέρειν, ib.; κοιμώνειν, ver. 11; περιπατεῖν κατά, ver. 6; μειζόνεσθαι, 3 John 4; πνεύμα ποιεῖν, ver. 5, and others.


SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN. § 181 b. 363

Destination, Design, and Date.

§ 181 a.

The Second Epistle is addressed to a Christian (ἐκλεκτή) lady (κυρία), or, better, to a Christian woman named Kyria, not to any single Christian community or to the whole Christian Church.

We know nothing of Caius, to whom the Third Epistle is addressed. Of the Christians bearing this name in the New Testament, Rom. xvi. 23, 1 Cor. i. 14, Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, the claims of each as recipient of this Epistle have been supported on various grounds. But it is better to suppose an otherwise unknown man in the neighborhood of Ephesus, and belonging to some other place than the dwelling-place of Kyria.

* We cannot, with Grotius, Wetstein, and others, regard ἐκλεκτή as a proper name, because of the position of the words, and ver. 13. Knauer, in Stud. u. Krit. 1833. II. 452 ff., conjectures that Kyria is the mother of Jesus.


§ 181 b.

The design of the Second Epistle is to confirm Kyria in Christian truth and love, and to warn her of false teachers. The Third Epistle asks the well-known, praiseworthy hospitality of Caius in behalf of travelling Christians (ver. 5-8), and, on the other hand, expresses disapprobation of the refractoriness of a certain Diotrephes (ver. 9-11). Both
were written shortly before a journey (perhaps of inspection) of the Apostle, probably after the First Epistle, from the similarity of 2 John 7 to 1 John ii. 18, ff.

V. Epistle of Jude.


The Author.

§ 182.

The author calls himself Jude, servant of Jesus Christ, brother of James (ver.1). As this James, through his relationship to whom he makes himself known, must have been a man of distinction, and can scarcely be supposed another than the head of the Jewish Christians and brother of the Lord (§ 167); and as Eusebius, III. 19, f., mentions a Jude, brother of the Lord, and among the brethren of Jesus a Judas is mentioned (Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3); the decision as to his person depends on that concerning this James. They who regard the son of Alpheus and the brother of the Lord as one and the same person, are quite consistent in regarding our Jude likewise as an Apostle, and as that Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, sc. ἀδελφός; Luke vi. 16, Acts i. 13, whom they identify with Lebbeus or Thaddæus. But we who discriminate between James the brother of the Lord and James the son of Alpheus, and do not regard the former as one of the Twelve, regard also this Jude, his brother, as not an Apostle, especially as he seems (ver. 17) to make a distinction between the Apostles and himself.

a Bertholdt, VI. 696, ff. Win. RWB. I. 632, ff. Schneekenburger, Beitr. 218. Among the ancients, Tertullian and Origen (?) consider our
Jude as an Apostle, cf. § 184. Eichhorn (Einl. III. 2), who thinks that
the author is not the brother of James the son of Alpheus, but an unknown
Jude, and Jessen, De authentia Ep. Jud. p. 47, who thinks James the
brother of the Lord is the same person as James the son of Alpheus, and
our Jude his brother, but not the Apostle Judas, brother of James, are in-
consistent. So Wieseler, in Stud. u. Krit. 1842. p. 120, f.
So Herder, Hug (wavering), J. E. Chr. Schmidt, Credner, Neudecker,
Reuss. Also Clem. Alex. Adumbratt. Opp. ed. Potter, II. 1007: Judas,
qui catholicam scriptis epistolam, frater filiorum Joseph, extans valde reli-
giousus, cum sciret propinquitatem Domini, non tamen dixit, se ipsum fra-
trem ejus esse, sed quid dixit? Judas, servus Jesu Christi, utpote Domini,
frater autem Jacobi. Cf., however, § 167 c, notes a, c. — Schott’s opinion is
groundless, that our Jude is the brother of an Apostle James, and at the
same time one with Judas Barsabas. Welker, Clavis, p. 157, f., also con-
siders him one with the latter. Dahl (Dissert., quoted above) supposed a
certain presbyter. Gratian regarded the fifteenth Bishop of Jerusalem
(Euseb. IV. 5) as author, and in consequence struck out the words δι στροφ.
§ 183.

Readers, Design, Contents, and Date.

The Epistle is addressed to Christians in general (ver. 1); but the author had in mind a specific circle, in which certain
corrump men sought a living.* The current notion that they
were false teachers has been erroneously transferred from
2 Peter to this Epistle. To warn against these, and to de-
clare their punishment, is the design of the composition. The
author, after a short introduction (ver. 3), proceeds im-
mediately to this subject: that into the circle of his readers
certain godless, lascivious, slanderous men have crept, who
through their feastings desecrated the Lord’s Supper, were
discontented, factious, and breeders of dissension; whose
punishment was long ago foretold in the Old Testament
and prophesied by Enoch, and their appearance predicted by
the Apostles (ver. 4—19). He then closes with the exhorta-
tion and the wish that his readers may remain steadfast in
goodness (ver. 20—23). The determination of the date is
not facilitated by the fact that the destruction of Jerusalem
is not mentioned in ver. 5—7, nor by the use of the Book of
Enoch, ver. 14, as the date of this book is itself uncertain.*
Jude must, however, have written at a pretty late period, for some time must have elapsed ere the Book of Enoch could have gained currency and estimation.

* Schneckenburger, Beitr. p. 225, thinks that the depreciation of the angels, ver. 8, is the contrast to the religious system combated in the Epistle to the Colossians, and the readers are therefore to be sought in those regions. Credner, p. 616, on the other hand, seeks them in Palestine, and finds delineated the then condition of the church there in the passages from Hegesippus in Euseb. III. 32: .... μέχρι τῶν τότε χρόνων παρθένος καθαρὰ καὶ αδιάφθορος ἐμείναι ἡ ἐκκλησία, εν ἁθῆρ οὗ σκέτει φωλευόντων εἰσεί τότε τῶν εἰ καὶ τινες ὑπήρχον παραβαθίσεων εἰπερεών τῶν ὑγίει κανόνα τῶν σωτηρίων κηρύγματος. 'Ως δὲ ὁ ἤρως τῶν ἀποστόλων χορὸς διάφορον αὐλήφαν τοῦ βίου τέλος . . . την κατα τῆς ἀδίκου πλάνης τῆς ἁρχῆς ἀλμάθιαιν ἡ σύστασις διὰ τῆς ἐπεροθησαυρίων ἀπάθείας, οί καὶ ἢ μηδενί προς τῶν ἀποστόλων λειψάμενοι . . . τῆς εὐθυμίων γνώσεως ἀντικρόττειν εἰς εἰρέσεων. But as the last words, and the passage IV. 22, still more clearly show, Hegesippus referred to Gnostic sects, of which no trace exists here.

* Cf., on the contrary, Schneckenburger, as above, p. 223.


** Genuineness and Church Acceptance.**

§ 184 a.

No important objection to the genuineness of this Epistle can be made good; neither the use of the apocryphal Book of Enoch, a nor the resemblance of ver. 24, f. to Rom. xvi. 25, nor a style of writing which betrays a certain familiarity with the Greek tongue. b The Epistle is the less open to suspicion, as the author does not distinctly claim to be an Apostle, nor can a pretext for forgery be discovered.

* The citation of an apocryphal book is not strictly unworthy of a writer of the apostolic age. The late origin of the Book of Enoch can alone excite question.


§ 184 b.

Several of the ancient Church writers strongly favor the Epistle, and speak of it with high respect.* The ancient
catalogue of the Canon of the Bible in Muratori (Part I. § 21) also mentions it. Others, on the contrary, had doubts of its genuineness: it was not in the Syriac canon, even Origen refers to such doubts, and Eusebius classes it among the Antilegomena. Perhaps, however, these doubts arose from the objectionable character of ver. 14. In the fourth century it was, with the other Antilegomena, adopted into the canon of the Church (Part I. §§ 26, 27).


Comment. in Matth. III. 814: Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰουδαν πρόσοτο τις ἐπιστολῆς (which, from the context, means merely, If any one will yet adduce the Epistle of Jude, cf. Schott, Isag. § 103, note 1). On this account, Euseb. H. E. VI. 25, also does not give it as in the canon of Origen.

* H. E. III. 25. II. 23. fin.: Οὐ πολλοῖς γονέων τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς (of the Epistle of James) ἐμφανίσατο, ὡς οὖν τῆς λεγομένης Ἰουδάς, μίας καὶ οὕτως ὁπερὶ τῶν ἐπτα τελεμένων καθολικῶν. Ομοίς δὲ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλεῖστοις δεδημοσεμέναις ἐκκλησίαις.


The following modern writers deny apostolic origin to the Epistle: Luthier (in Watch, XIV. 159), Groitzis, Bolten, Dahl, Berger (Moral. Einl. in d. N. T. II. 395), Schwegler; the majority, however, accept it as genuine. Cf. the Diss. by Jessien, referred to above.
CHAPTER XII.

THE REVELATION OF JOHN.


Nature of the Book.

§ 185 a.

The Revelation (disclosing of the future, cf. 1 Pet. i. 12) of John belongs, according to its nature, to the class of pro-
thetic writings (§ 62). Christian antiquity shows several of these, among them the Revelation of Peter. Its basis is Jesus’s prediction of his return, Matt. xvi. 27, f., xxiv. 29 (although not in harmony with the details in Matt. xxiv., especially ver. 2, 15), xxvi. 64, and it attaches itself to the Old Testament prophecies, more, however, to the later than the earlier, especially to Daniel, being almost wholly symbolical. The Old Testament prophetical style is somewhat modified by the address to the seven churches, i. 4 – iii. 22, which follows the usual announcement of the work as a prophecy, i. 1 – 3.


* Nothing can be more unfortunate than the thought that it is a dramatic work (Dav. Pareus, Proem. ad Comm. in Apoc. [Heidelb. 1618], c. 3, Hartwig, Eichhorn, Matthei, Feilmoser, and others).

*Cf. Ewald, p. 14. Lücke, p. 156, ff. And yet it is incorrect to say that the whole has the form of a letter. Though this is true of the greeting, xxii. 21, it is not of xxii. 16 (the words of Christ, not of the author).

§ 185 b.

The symbolical garb in which the prophecies are clothed presents to the interpreter a great difficulty, one on which even modern interpreters have, in part, been wrecked. Another difficulty lies, on the one hand, in the determination of the historic point of view from which the revelation of the
future is to be apprehended. This was long neglected, until the time of *Lud. ab Alcassar* among the Catholics, and of *Grotius* among the Protestants, and even longer by the latter, especially through *Bengel*’s mistake; many, even at the present day, pay it no attention. On the other hand, it has cost much pains to define precisely the historic horizon of the seer, and the actual amount of what he foresaw (see § 186, note a). However strongly the historic standpoint is to be asserted, we must yet insist also that the work contains an ideally prophetic element, which has force even for us.  


**Design and Contents.**

§ 186.

As one object of all prophecy, even that of Daniel, is comfort and warning, so also here its first and chief aim is to stimulate the Christians to steadfastness and fidelity under persecution (xiii. 7, 10, xiv. 12, f., cf. i. 9, ii. 10, iii. 10), and then to exhort the Jews (xi. 13) and Gentiles (xiv. 6, f.) to conversion, by the prophecy of the speedy coming of the judgment and of the triumph of God’s kingdom. The hortatory portion is found chiefly in the address to the seven churches, which forms the introduction to the prophecy (i. 4—iii. 22). The prophecy, in its form a vision and visual representation of the hidden future (iv. 1—xxii. 5), contains the following leading particulars: — 1. Calamities which precede the advent of the kingdom of God (vi. 1—8, 12—17, viii. 6—13, ix., xvi. 1—11); 2. The judgment on Jerusalem and the conversion of the remaining inhabitants (xi. 13); 3. The judgment on Babylon (Rome) and heathendom, the
chaining of Satan (xix. 1–xx. 3), — the main catastrophe and a chief point in the Apocalypse; 4. The first resurrection and the thousand years' kingdom (xx. 4–6); 5. New outbreak of Satan, the final decisive victory over him, descent of the New Jerusalem, eternal blessedness (xx. 7–xxii. 5). As these topics admitted of but little development, or the prophet-poet was unequal to the task, he made use of an artificial mode of development, in which it was his purpose, by slowness and delay, partly to set forth a succession of scenes, and partly to excite expectation. There are two series of development, the one preparatory, iv.–xi., which leads to the judgment on Judaism, the other (xiv. 6 to the end) leading to the final decision. The latter is preceded by an explanation (xii. 1–xiv. 5) intended to point out the enemies of Christ and his kingdom, and particularly to introduce the heathenism and antichristianity which are to be overcome.

* Since Eichhorn, critics have usually found the victory of Christianity over Judaism, and the destruction of Jerusalem, in the first of these series of development, and in the second the overthrow of heathenism; but the plagues, vi.–ix., strike equally all the peoples of the earth, and Jerusalem shall, after being subject to the heathen for a space of time (xi. 2, cf. Dan. ix. 26, 27), be but partially destroyed by an earthquake (xi. 13). What remains to the end of chap. xviii. is plainly directed against heathenism, and forms the proper kernel of the revelation (i. 1 refers to xvii. 1). Cf. Bleek, as above, p. 260, ff. The older historical interpreters, Abauzit, Wits Ein, Herder, and Hartwig, erred also in finding, in the second part, only the victory over Judaism. Züllig repeated this.

b I. First Series of Development. The book of fate with the seven seals is given to the Lamb to be opened (iv., v.). But the opening of the first six seals (vi., vii.) is only introductory. After the opening of the seventh, the decision is delayed by the consequences being dependent on the sounding of seven trumpets, with the last three of which three woes are connected. Six of these trumpets bring great plagues and the approach of the judgment (viii., ix.). Before the seventh trumpet sounds, solemn announcement of the complete revelation of the divine mystery is made, which is contained in a book given to the prophet to swallow (x.). Announcement of the possession of the Holy City by the heathen for a period of time (xi. 1, f.).

* He had no presentiment of the actual historical process which Christianity must pass through.
Appearance and martyrdom of two prophets (xi. 3—12). Judgment on Jerusalem and conversion of the remaining inhabitants (xi. 13). The third woe and the seventh trumpet (xi. 14, f.). Proclamation and preparatory celebration of the victory of God and Christ in heaven (xi. 14—19).

II. 1. Explanation. Introduction of the enemies of Christ and his kingdom. Satan, being hurled out of heaven after a vain attempt to destroy Christ, fiercely persecutes the Christians (xii.). Antichrist (Nero) and heathen priesthood come on the stage in the form of beasts (xiii.). The victory of Christ and his followers foreseen (xiv. 1—5).


Date of Composition.

§ 187.

In determining the date, a point which materially affects his whole view of the book, the critic must pay no heed to the doubtful accounts of the Fathers regarding John’s alleged banishment to Patmos (§ 108 b, note a), or to their opinions as to the date of the composition, but must rely on the internal grounds alone. Chap. xi. 1, f. assumes that Jerusalem was yet standing, and proves, accordingly, that the work was composed before the destruction of that city. Chap. xvii. 10, also, according to which the book was written during the reign of the sixth Emperor, may refer to the same period, if Galba, and not Vespasian, be reckoned the sixth. That the book was written after Nero’s death is clear from the expectation of his return (xvii. 11), and from the allusions to the persecutions of the Christians under him (vi. 9, xvii. 6).

* Irenaeus, Eusebius, Hieronymus, and others, place it under Domitian. Epiphanius, on the other hand, under Claudius; the Syrian version, Theophyl., and others, under Nero. Cf. Lücke, p. 405, ff.
UNITY OF THE BOOK. § 188.

Against Eichhorn and others, who assume the destruction, see Bleek, as above, p. 267, f. Lücke, p. 247, ff. Zeller, in his Jbb. 1842, p. 660, ff. In favor of chap. xi. 1, f. corresponding to the condition of the city under Galba, Hofmann (Weissag. u. Erfüll. II. 301) and others adduce the circumstance, that, at that time, the Zealots were in possession of the temple. On other points his language is confused.

In favor of the first, Enssl., p. 47, sqq., Lücke, Einl. p. 252, ff., Cremer, Neudecker, Reuss, Zeller, Jbb. 1842, p. 694; of the second, in itself more probable, Eichhorn, Comment. ad xvii. 10. Bleek, as above, p. 290, ff., cf. Beitr. I. 81. When Bertholdt, IV. 1893, in reckoning the Emperors, begins with Julius Cæsar, and accordingly places the composition earlier, under Nero, he misses wholly the explanation of xvii. 11 by the then current expectation, which, historically, is amply attested (Bleek, as above, p. 286, note, and the first No. of the above Zeitschr. p. 244, note).
The same occurs when Hug, II. 613, holds merely to the ten kings mentioned in xvii. 12 (the Parthian allies of Nero), supposes them ten emperors, and consequently, with Irenæus, places the composition of the Apocalypse under Domitian. Against Züssig's supposition, that the beast means pseudo-Judaism, see Zeller, as above, p. 665, ff. Among the critics of a certain school, Ebrard, Hofmann, and Thiersch, this traditional date is an axiom. They reject the interpretation of xvii. 11, without being able to give a better. Schleiermacher, Einl. p. 451, ff., also, with a strange exegetical scepticism, declares himself in favor of this date. Guerike, Fortges. Beitr. I. 70, ff., denying the historic interpretation of xi. 1, f., xvii. 10, placed the composition under Nerva, A.D. 96 (against him, Lücke, p. 258, ff.). In his Einl. p. 532, he finds in the former passage Jerusalem still standing, but does not go into the interpretation of the second, and adopts A.D. 68 as the date.

Unity of the Book.

§ 188.

According to the correct apprehension of the relation of the second series of development (chap. xii. ff.) to the first, the whole book was written at the time indicated in the preceding section, viz. before the destruction of Jerusalem, and every supposition of heterogeneousness in its contents is to be rejected.

* Grotius (ad Apoc. i. 9, xv. 1) and Hammond (Prolegg. ad Apoc. p. 435) suppose that chap. i. - xiv. were written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and the remaining chapters after that event, but divide these main divisions again into several sections. Vogel (Comment. de Apoc. Joh. P. I. - VII. Eri. 1811 - 16. 4to) regards i. 9 - iii. 22 as a composition which must have been written later than iv. - xii., and bears no relation to the Apocalypse; and
The Revelation of John.

xii. - xxii. as the work of the Presbyter John, who united the three parts into one whole. Bleek, p. 296, ff., thought that the second part, beginning with chap. xii., was written later; but he has retracted this, Beitr. I. 81. - Schleiermacher, p. 462, considers the Apocalypse a collection of single visions.

The Author.

§ 189 a.

We must first put the question regarding the author in this form: Can the Revelation, and the fourth Gospel, with the three Epistles, have the same author? The following considerations may be urged in the negative:

1. The author of the Apocalypse gives his own name (i. 1, 4, 9, xxii. 8), but the Evangelist never. This circumstance is at least worthy of attention.⁸

* Dionysius Alex. in Euseb. VII. 25: ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδαμοῦ τὸ δώμα αὐτοῦ παρεχγράφης· οὐδὲ κηρύσσει ἑαυτὸν, οὐκ δὲ γὰρ εὐαγγελίσω, ὡς διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς . . . ἀιώνιος δὲ οὐδαμοῦ οὐδὲ ὡς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, οὐδὲ ὡς περὶ άπερε. Ω δὲ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν γράφας, εὑρήκε τε ἑαυτὸν ἐν ἀρχῇ προτάσσει, ο. τ. έ. τ. λ.

* Eichhorn, II. 438, finds a reason in the custom of the prophets to name themselves. But the epistolary form also demands the mention of the name, and yet John does not follow it. Lücke, Einl. p. 360.

§ 189 b.

2. The language of the Revelation is very different from that of the fourth Gospel and the Johannic Epistles. This appears in its Hebraizing roughness and carelessness, its want of pure Greek and genuine Johannic words and turns of expression, and in peculiar favorite expressions. These can be satisfactorily explained neither by the supposed difference in the Evangelist's age, nor by the prophetic character of the book and its Old Testament coloring. The traces of resemblance in style adduced by the defenders of its Johannic origin, moreover, are of small importance.

* Mistakes in respect to the connecting of nouns and adjectives by the cases, i. 5, 6, ii. 20, iii. 12, iv. 4, 8, vi. 1, vii. 9, viii. 9, ix. 14, xiii. 3, xiv. 7, 12, xv. 2, xvii. 4, 8, xix. 6, xxi. 12; in the connection of genders, iv. 1, 3, xi. 15, xiv. 19; a thoroughly Hebraistic use of tenses, iv. 9, 10, x. 7, viii. 11.
§ 189 b

The genitive absolute is wanting, and the attraction of the relative pronoun (i. 80. text. rec.). ζη επειδή the demonstrative pronoun; ζη επειδή is used more frequently than ζη, which alone occurs in John (cf., however, 2 John 10); the particles τής (adv. temp.), καθώς, μέν, μέντοι, πάντοτε, πώς, John's favorite words and ideas, κόσμος, φῶς, σκοτία, ζωή αἰωνος, ἀπόκλισθαι, θεαθαι, the perfect ἑώρακα, δοξάζεσθαι (in the usual sense, xiv. 4, xvi. 7), μένει ἐν τοι, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ πονηρός (in its stead, διάδοχος, σατανᾶς), the comparative μείζων, are omitted; οὖν occurs only as an illative conjunct., peri simply locally, ἀμών always single; always ἵνα, never ἵνα; always ἵστανται, for ἵστανται, and several others. Cf. Ewald, p. 67, sqq. Lücke, Einleit. p. 361, ff. Credner, § 266. Cf. on the contrary Kolthoff, p. 86, sqq. Dannemann, p. 8, ff. Dionysius, l. c.: "Εἰς δὲ καὶ τῆς φράσεως τῆς διαφορᾶς ἐστι τεκμήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς πρὸς τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν. Τά μὲν γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἀπαντάσιν κατὰ τὴν Ἐκκλησίας φωνήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λογιστάτα ταῖς λέξεσις, τοὺς συνεικόνισεν, τοῖς εἰρημένοις ὑπογράφαλα τοῦ θεοῦ γείτων τοῖς βαρβαροῖς την φθόγγον, ἢ σολομοσον, ἢ διδυμοῦ ἢ αὐτοῦ εἰρήθησιν. Ἐκάτερον γὰρ εἰχεν ὡς θεοκράτη, τῶν λόγων ἀμφίστητον αὐτῷ χαρισμάτων τοῦ κυρίου, τῶν τῆς γνώσεως τῶν τῆς φράσεως. Τούτων δὲ ἀποκάλυψιν μὲν ἑωράκειν καὶ γράφειν ἐλπίδαν καὶ προφητεύειν οὐκ ἀπετέρῳ διάλεκτον μὲν τοῖς καὶ γιάλεσαν οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἔλεγχον αὐτοῦ βλέποι ἀλλ' ἔλεγχος μὲν θεοῦ βαρβαροῖς ἐρωτοῦντα καὶ ποιεῖται ἐρωτοῦτα.

* οἰκουμήνη. iii. 10, xii. 9, xvi. 14; ὑπομνήμα, i. 9, ii. 2, 3, 19, iii. 10, xiii. 10, xiv. 12; κρατεῖν τὸ ὅσιομα, ii. 13; τ. διδαχὴ, ii. 14. f.: παντοκράτωρ, nine times; θεος καὶ πατὴρ, i. 6, as in Paul; ὁ ἀληθιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, iii. 7, 14, xiv. 11; μαρτυρία Ἰησ. Χρ., i. 3, 9, xii. 17, xiii. 10, xiv. 4; ἀρτιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, v. 6, 8, 12, 13, and thirteen times besides.

* As Bertholdt, IV. 1838, Eichhorn, II. 379, and recently Kolthoff, p. 69, sqq., Dannemann, p. 5, f., do. The Evangelist was over sixty years of age at the time the Apocalypse was composed. So at such an age a man a man develops no further.

§ 189 c.

3. The whole style of representation is different: in the Gospel and Epistles quiet, deep feeling, here lively creative power of imagination. This difference, also, is not to be explained by the difference in the age of the Evangelist and in the literary character of the work. We may compare it to the difference between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. In the letters to the seven churches, at least, a Johannic tone must have manifested itself. To this we may add, that the style of composition in the Apocalypse is marked by Jewish learning and art, whereas John, an unlearned man in the Jewish sense (Acts iv. 13), makes little or no use of Old Testament and Jewish learning.

* Dionys. l. c.: τεκμαίρομαι γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ ἤθους ἑκάτέρων καὶ τοῦ τῶν λόγων εἴδους καὶ τῆς τοῦ Βιβλίου διεξαγωγῆς λεγομένης, μή τῶν αὐτῶν εἶδος.

§ 189 d.

4. Their views and mode of representation are different. The Evangelist has wholly shaken off the trammels of Judaism; the writer of the Apocalypse is strongly attached to it. Although in the Gospel and Epistles we find points of connection with, or statements which presuppose, the common eschatology, the spiritual view preponderates; here, on the other hand, we meet with vivid sensuous representations and expectations of the Messiah (i. 7, ii. 27, iii. 12, v. 5, [xxii. 16,] xix. 11, ff., xx. 1, ff., 7, ff., xxi. 1, ff.). There we have an interior development of the cause of Christ, an internal glorification of the same in his disciples; here, the victory of Christ through external events, through exertions of God's power. The relation of the Apocalypse to the Gospel is like that of Matt. xxiv. to John xiv. 18, ff.

It glows, moreover, with a spirit of Messianic revenge (vi. 10, 16, viii. 6, ff., xiv. 20, xvi. 4, ff., xix. 13, 15, 17, ff.), which is
irreconcilable with John iii. 16, ff., xii. 47. In the genuine Johannic writings we find no such pneumatological, demonological, and angelological representations as here, i. 4, iii. 1, v. 6, xvi. 13, xii. 7, 9. The apparently kindred elements in many, especially the Christological representations, prove on nearer examination to be different. Whoever is capable of apprehending, without bias, the spirit of a work as a whole, will not allow himself to be misled by this and like arguments advanced by its defenders.

* Dionysius, i. c.: Καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν νοημάτων δὲ καὶ τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τῆς συντάξεως αὐτῶν εἰκόνας ἔτερας οὕτως παρ’ ἐκείνοις ὑπονοοθέτηται. Συνήδουσι μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοις τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολή, ὡμοίος τε ἄρχεται . . . . Ἔχεται αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν προβοσκίων οὐκ ἀφίσταται: διὰ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν καθαλασίων καὶ ὁμομάτων πάντα διεξιχθέται διὸ τινὰ καὶ μὲν ἡμεῖς συνόμενοι ὑπομνημόνευμ. ὃ ἐγερχαίσθαι εὐαγγελίων εἰρήσει ἐν ἐκατέρω πολλὴν τὴν ψωφή, πολὺ τὸ φῶς, ἀποφοβήτσα τοῦ σκότους, συνεχῆ τὴν ἀδόξησιν, τὴν χάρην, τὴν χαράν, τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου, τὴν κρίσιν, τὴν ἀφετωρίαν, τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ, τὴν πρὸς ἄλλους ἡμᾶς ἀγάπης εἰσολήν, ὡς πάντας δὲ φυλάττει τὰς ἐντολὰς· ὃ θελεῖς τοῦ κόσμου, τοῦ διαβολοῦ, τοῦ ἀντιχριστοῦ, ἡ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ ἡγίου πνεύματος, ἡ νοθεσία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ διάλογος πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀπαντομένη, ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ νῦν παντοκράτορ· καὶ ὅλος διὰ πάντων χαρακτηρίζεται ὡς καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν συνορίᾳ τοῦ τε εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς χρόνων πρόκεται. Ἀλλοιστήτη δὲ καὶ ξίνη παρὰ τοὺς ἀποκλυμένιοι, μήτε ἐφαπτομένη, μήτε γειτνώσα τοῦτοι μηδενὶ σχεδόν, ὡς εἰσίν, μηδὲ συλλαβῆν πρὸς αὐτὰ καὶ χίουσα.

b Against Baur, in Zeller's Jbb. IV. 663, f., Krit. Unter. p. 347, f., who says too much of the Judaism of the writer of the Apocalypse, see Bleek, Beitr. I. 184, ff. It is certain that to him "Jew" is not the same as "unbeliever" (ii. 9, iii. 9), that Jerusalem is the holy city (xi. 2), the beloved city (xx. 9), that he hopes for the preservation of the temple and of the Jews worshipping there, and for the conversion of the majority of the inhabitants (xi. 1, f., 13), and that Jerusalem shall be the central point of the millennial kingdom (xiv. 1, xx. 9).

It is true that the conception of an internal return of Christ also appears in Revelation iii. 90.

4 This comparison is admirably carried out by Lücke, p. 377, ff.

* John could not have written καθαλάσατι τὸ δόμα αὐτοῦ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, xix. 13; ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως, iii. 14, cf. John i. 2, f. The divine name of Christ, iii. 12, xix. 12, is in the spirit of the Old Testament rather than of John; and although that, as well as the divine attributes, i. 17, ii. 8, xxii. 13, indicates Christ's oneness with God, this approximates no nearer to John than to Paul. The description of Christ as a Lamb is made different from John's, i. 29, 36, by the word ἀνέσαν; ii. 11 from John viii. 50 by the notion
of the second death; xxii. 6 from John vii. 38 by the allusion to the fountain in Paradise, xxii. 1; xiv. 15 from John iv. 35 by its reminiscence of Joel iv. 13; xix. 7 is more closely allied to Matt. xxii. 2, ff., xxv. 1, ff., than to John iii. 29; the spiritual manna, ii. 17, reminds us of John vi. 31, ff., but κεκρυμένον is not Johannic. Hence we cannot, with Lücke, as above, p. 372, Zeller, as above, p. 703, suppose imitation on the one side or the other. I know not even whether the work presupposes a Johannic type (Neand. Pflanz., etc., II. 628). Only the agreement in using Zech. xii. 10 according to a translation different from the Alexandrian, Rev. i. 7, John xix. 37, is remarkable. If Ewald's theory be correct (note on Rev. i. 7), that the Septuagint also formerly, like Aqu. Symm. Theod., read ἑκκεντροδοχος, only one point of the agreement would be explained, while the other (the use of the verb δεσπεράω) would remain. Probably the author of the Apocalypse and the Evangelist used a common source, and that an eschatological one. For the verb δεσπεράω, as in Rev. i. 7 and Matt. xxiv. 30, must refer to the appearance of the returning Messiah, a subject which John xix. 37 does not, of itself, suggest. Hence, in this citation the Evangelist seems dependent. But the author of the Apocalypse seems also to be so (see Exeg. Handb. on the passage).


§ 189 e.

From all this it follows, (and no conclusion of modern criticism stands more firmly than this,) that if the Apostle John wrote the fourth Gospel and the Johannic Epistles, he did not write the Apocalypse; or, if the Apocalypse be his work, he is not the author of the other writings. If, leaving out of view this conditional relation, we ask whether the Apocalypse can be the work of the Apostle John, as he is delineated in the New Testament and Church tradition, we cannot, after due deliberation, with Baur and others, answer decidedly in the affirmative. For,—1. The spirit of the work, though it is that of a son of Zebedee and a "son of thunder," is not that of the disciple who lay on Jesus's breast; b 2. The expectation of Christ's speedy return is indeed apostolic, but whether chiliasm also is, is doubtful; 3. The Apocalypse differs, to its disadvantage, from the ancient Christian eschatologies with which we are acquainted, especially in its throwing too much into the shade (cf. Rev.
xiv. 6) the universal spread of the Gospel (Matt. xxiv. 14), and a general conversion to Christ (Rom. xi. 25, f.).

* In this conclusion, Baur and his school agree with us.

Baur, p. (660) 345, and others are manifestly wrong in referring the tradition concerning John current in Asia Minor, even with the "'δ εν τον στηθον του κυριου ομασαρων'" (Polycrat. in Eus. V. 24, see § 109 c, note d), to John, the author of the Apocalypse. Blee, I. 195, f.

* This against Schnitzer, in Zeller's Jbb. 1842. p. 468, ff. — It is very doubtful, as is also maintained by Luther (§ 194 b) and Schleiermacher, Einl. pp. 466, 470, whether the book in general is after the manner of an Apostle. Two principles are certain, — 1. that the kingdom of God has an internal development (cf. Matt. xiii. 31—33); 2. that it is given to none, not even to Apostles, to know the day and the hour of this development (Acts i. 6, ff.). With neither of these is the Revelation in harmony. It is, moreover, questionable whether one who was intimately acquainted with Jesus, and retained a vivid remembrance of him, could have written symbolic descriptions like i. 13, ff., v. 6, based on abstract conceptions.

§ 190.

The author, it is true, calls himself John, i. 4, 9, xxi. 2 (common text), xxi. 8, but does not describe himself as one of the Apostles, in whose number, according to xviii. 20, xxi. 14, he seems not to reckon himself; the passages i. 2, 9 also do not indicate the life and circumstances of the Apostle John. The address to the churches of Asia Minor, which is to be understood in the strictly historical sense, presupposes an author held in honor by them, but not necessarily this Apostle. Hence the theory, that a disciple of the Apostle John edited, in his own way, a revelation made to and perhaps in part written down by him, is destitute of critical basis, and irreconcilable with the early date of the work (before the Apostle John's death). There is no objection to the ancient theory, that another John, the Presbyter, so called, is the author, if we but date the work, and the consideration which, according to chap. i., ii., its author held among the churches of Asia Minor, earlier than the Apostle John's residence in Asia Minor (cf. § 108 a). The hypothesis, that John Mark, the author of the second Gospel, wrote the Apocalypse, has too slight a foundation in the simi-
larity (still stronger in the readings of the Cod. Sangall.) of the Hebraizing style of this Gospel to that of the Apocalypse. There are also dissimilarities. It is also bound up with the false theory of the originality of the second Gospel.

* Dionysius, l. c.: "Ως μὲν οὖν Ἰωάννης ἦσαν ὁ ταύτα γράψας, αὐτῷ λέγοντι πιστιστεύειν· ποίοι δὲ οὖσι, ἄδηλοι. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν Ἰωάννης εἶπα· ὥς τί ἐναγγελία πολλαχοῦ, τῶν ἡγαμέμονων ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν· οὐδὲ τῶν ἀπανεστού ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ· οὐδὲ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἵκαβου, οὐδὲ τῶν αὐτόπτων καὶ αὐτήκοντο τοῦ κυρίου γενόμενον. Guerike, however, Einl. p. 524, ff., and Schnitzer, as above, p. 458, ff., assert, that, according to all, he wishes to pass for the Apostle; and the last mentioned, that only an Apostle can be supposed the recipient of such a revelation. Lücke, also, Einl. in d. Offenbarung, p. 240, admitted that the exegetical probability seemed to favor John; but see note b.

b The banishment to Patmos is not certainly implied in the second passage, and in both γαρῳπλία is to be referred to the Apocalypse itself. Lücke, in Stud. u. Kr. 1836. p. 654, ff. Bleek, I. 192.

* Against the mystical view, see Lücke, Einl. p. 198, ff. An actual address was supposed by Tertull. Cont. Marc. IV. 5. But, with Vitr. 'Ἀνακ. p. 51, the historic and the symbolic senses are to be combined, but in a simpler way. These seven churches represent all the others.


* Bes. Prolegg. in Apoc. Joh.: Quod si quid aliud liceret ex stylo conjicere, nemini certe potius quam Marco tribuerim, qui et ipse Johannes dictum est: adeo non in verbis tantum, sed etiam in formulis dicendi plerisque
Church Tradition in Favor of John as the Author.

§ 191 a.

The earliest testimony would be that of Papias. All our knowledge of him, however, comes through later historians, and we are left in doubt whether he really knew the Apocalypse, and as the work of the Apostle John. Justin Martyr († 165) is the first to speak of the Apocalypse as a work of the Apostle John. The statements are unsatisfactory that Melito, a contemporary of Justin, Bishop of Sardes, wrote a book on the Apocalypse (Euseb. H. E. IV. 26, Hieron. De vir. ill. cap. 24), and that Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, towards the end of the second century, in his work against Hermogenes, drew proofs from the Apocalypse of John (Euseb. IV. 24). That Apollonius (end of second and beginning of third century), in his work against the Montanists (who rejected the Apocalypse), drew proofs from it (Euseb. v. 18), is a matter of more consequence.

* Andreas (c. 475), Praef. ad comment. in Apocalypse.: Περὶ μὲν τοῦ θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου περιττῶν μηκόνων τῶν λόγων ἠγούμεθα, τῶν μακαρίων θρησκευόμενοι τοῦ θεολόγου καὶ Κυρίλλου, προσέθη τε καὶ τῶν Ἱερομοναχῶν Παπίας καὶ Ευσέβειαν, Μεθοδίου καὶ Ἰππολύτου τούτων προσμαρτυροῦσιν τοῦ ἀξίωματος. Arethas (a little later), Praef. ad comment.: Περὶ δὲ τοῦ θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου ὁ ἐν ἀγίοις Βασίλειος καὶ Γρηγόριος ὁ βίος τῶν λόγων καὶ Κύριλλος καὶ Παπίας καὶ Ευσέβειας καὶ Ἰππολύτους οἱ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ πατήρες ἤχεσαν πιστώσασθαι. Euseb. H. E. III. 39, is silent on the subject: Καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς συγγράφεις (ὁ Παπίας) ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως ἡγράφως οἱ αὐτὸν ἴκνον παρατίθενται, ξύνετι τὴν τινα παραβολὰς τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ των ἄλλων μουσικά. Ἐν οἷς καὶ χιλιάδα τινὰ φηνών ἑτῶν ὀστεῖα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἁπάσης, σωματικῶς τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείας ἐπὶ ταυτηθείς τῇ γῇ ὑποστηρικμένης. Ἁ καὶ ἡγούμεναι τὰ τοῦ ἀποστολικὸς παρεκδεχόμενος διηγήσεις ὑπολαβεῖς, τα ἐν ὑποδείγμασι πρὸς αὐτῶν μυστικῶς ἐνθέμενα μὴ συνεκωτά. We gain, also, nothing certain from the citation in Andreas, on Rev. xii. 7: Καὶ Παπίας δὲ οὗτος ἐν τῇ λείψεως.
Irenaeus (cir. 178) accepts the genuineness of the Apocalypse as undoubted, and appeals in support of it to tradition. As, however, he has erred in regard to its date, the sources of his information cannot have been the most reliable. Several allusions in the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons testify to the wide use of the Apocalypse in the churches of Asia Minor and Gaul. Tertullian, *Clement of Alex.*, and *Origen* also accept the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle John. The testimony of the last two has the more weight, as they, unlike most of the others, were not chiliasmists.

---

* Contr. haeres. IV. 20. 11: Sed et Joannes, Domini discipulus, in Apocalypsei, etc. V. 26. 1: significavit Joannes, Domini discipulus, in Apocalypsei . . . . V. 30. 1: His autem sie se habentibus et in omnibus antiquis et protobibinis et veteribus scripturis numero hoc positro, et testimonium perhibentibus his, qui facie ad faciem Joannem viderunt (according to Zeller, Jbb. 1842. p. 696, he means Papias), et ratione docente nos, quoniam numeros nominis bestiae, secundum Graecorum computationem per litteras quae in eo sunt, sexcentos hebabit et sexaginta et sex, hoc est decadas sequalis hecatomtasin et hecatomtadas sequalis monasion . . . . ignoro, quomodo eravent quidam sequentes idiomatism et medium frustrantes numerum nominis, quinquaginta numeros deducentes, pro sex decadas unam decadam volentes esse. (A remarkable instance of the unreliableness of the tradition
coming through Papias in *Iren.* is the passage V. 33, 3, sq., where Jesus is said to have foretold gigantic vines in the Messianic kingdom. Cf. Zeller, Jbb. 1842, p. 202, ff.) In regard to the date, see V. 30, 3, § 108 b, note a. Lücke, p. 296, ff.

b *Euseb. H. E. V. 1: *'Ἡ γάρ καὶ οὗτος ἄμωμος ἔφη, ἀκολουθών τῷ ἀρχέω, ὅπως ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἦν (Rev. xiv. 4). Ib.: οὐα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ ὁ ἄμωμος ἀναμφότερος ἦτο, καὶ ὁ διεκαθομένως ἦτο (Rev. xxii. 1).


Hippolytus, a disciple of Irenæus, wrote on the Apocalypse, probably against the Montanists. Gruter, Corp. inscript. fol. 140. Hippolytii Opp. ed. Fabric. p. 38. Lücke, p. 316, f. Other testimonies adduced by Lardner, Eichhorn, and others, have, especially when they are later, no further force as proofs.

Church Tradition against him.

§ 192 a.

The so-called Alogi or Antimontanists rejected the Apocalypse, as well as the other Johannic writings, and ascribed it to Cerinthus; but their assertion was based neither on tradition nor on critical grounds. The similar assertion of *Caius of Rome* (197–217) was likewise occasioned by the opposition to Montanism. In the controversy against the chiliasm of Nepos, hence not without some dogmatic design, *Dionysius of Alexandria* (cir. 255) denied that the Apocalypse was written by John; but he went to work in a more critical way (§§ 189, 190).

* It is true they did adduce one such ground. *Epiph. Haeres. II. c. 33: Ἐκ τῶν ἱδεῖν εἰς αὐτῶν πολὺν ἐπιλαμβάνοντα τούτου τοῦ ὅτι τῇ ἀποκαλύψει
§ 192 b.

That Eusebius was so wavering in regard to this book,\footnote{H. E. III. 25: Εἰπὲ τοῦτοι (τοῖς ὁμολογομένοις) τακτίως, εἶχε φανεί, τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου, περὶ Ἡ τὰ δόξαν κατὰ καιρὸν ἐκθήματα . . . καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοι (τοῖς ἀντιλεγομένοις) . . . έτι τε, ός ἔφη, ἢ Ἰωάννου ἀποκαλύψις, εἰ φανεί, ἢν τινες, ὣς ἔφη, αθετοῦν, έτοι έτι ἐγκύρων τοῖς ὁμολογομένοις. Previous. III. 24: Τής δ’ ἀποκάλυψις ἔφῃ έκάστου ἐτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς περιλεκτεῖ η δόξα· δόμων γε μὴν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων μαρτυριῶν ἐν οἰκείῳ καιρῷ τὴν ἐπίκρουσιν δέξαται καὶ αὐτῆ. This promise he has, however, nowhere fulfilled. III. 39, on the Presbyter John, see § 190, note d.} probably arose likewise from a dogmatical bias, which led him, as well as others, to judge respecting it either with favor or with aversion.\footnote{Lücke, p. 333, finds the cause in the want of sure historic grounds.} And yet his doubts were not caused solely by the above-adduced opponents of the book; for the Syrian Church also had it not in her canon (§ 11 a).\footnote{Kolthoff, p. 25, sqq., tries to make it probable (cf. § 11 a, note b) that the Apocalypse, at an earlier period, was in the Peshito, because Ephrem Syrus quotes it.} It is excluded from the canon, also, by Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. IV), Gregory of Nazianzus (Carm. XXXIII), and the sixtieth canon of Laodicea (see Part I. § 26).\footnote{Hieron. Ep. 139. ad Dardan. § 3. p. 973. ed. Vallarsi. : Quod si eam...}
Later Opinions of the Church and of Scholars on the Apocalypse.

§ 194 a.

While in the Greek Church the work continued the object of doubt, in the West it was formally adopted into the number of the canonical books and has since then maintained its canonical authority.

* Even at the beginning of the ninth century, it was rejected by the Patriarch Nicephorus. Lardner, Credibility, P. II. Vol. XI. pp. 249, 252. Michaelis, Einl. II. 1062.


§ 194 b.

With the revival of criticism in the age of the Reformation, the doubts regarding the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse also revived. It was opposed, sometimes by implication, sometimes directly, by Erasmus, Carlstadt, Luther, and Zwingli.*

* Erasm. Annott. in N. T., ed. 1597, at the close of the notes on the Apoc. Carlst. (Welche Bücher biblisch seind, 1530) alludes to the early doubts, and to the characteristic dissimilarity of the work to the other Johannic writings. Luther, Vorrede auf die Offenbarung St. Joh., 1522: "To me, this book lacks not a single proof of its being neither apostolic nor prophetic. First, and chiefly, the Apostles do not deal in visions, but prophesy in clear and plain words, as Peter, Paul, yea, Christ in the Gospel, also do; for it belongs to the office of an Apostle to speak clearly, and without figure or vision, of Christ and his work. Even in the Old Testament, letting alone the New, there is no prophet who deals throughout in visions; so that I put it almost in the same rank with the Fourth Book of Esdras, and cannot in any way find it to have been dictated by the Holy Spirit. Moreover, it seems to me too much for him to commend his own book, — a thing done by no other sacred writer, even when it would seem more fitting, — and to threaten that, if any man shall take away from the words of it, God shall take away his part out of the book of life; and, moreover, to declare that they shall be blessed who hold to what it contains, although no one is able to understand what that is, much less to keep it; which is equivalent to our not having it. There are also far nobler books in existence, the words of which are to be kept. Many of the Fathers, also, in olden time rejected this book, and although St. Jerome uses grand words, and says it is above all praise, and contains as many mysteries as words, he cannot prove this, and indeed is in many places too liberal in his praise. Finally, let everyone think of it what his mind suggests. My mind cannot reconcile itself to the book; and to me a sufficient reason for not esteeming it highly is, that Christ is neither taught nor recognized therein, — to do which is certainly the highest duty incumbent on an Apostle; for he says, Acts i., 'Ye shall be my witnesses.' I therefore hold fast to those books which give me Christ clearly and purely." Preface of 1534: "On account of such
uncertain interpretations and hidden senses, we have hitherto left it to itself, especially because it was considered by some of the ancient Fathers not the work of the Apostle John, as is stated in libr. 3. Hist. Eccles. In this uncertainty, we, for our part, shall also leave it, so that no one may be hindered from regarding it as the work of St. John the Apostle, or as whatever he pleases. *Zwingli* (Werke von Schuith. II. 1. 169): "We take no notice of the Apocalypse, for it is not a Biblical book."

§ 194 c.

The Catholic Church confirmed, in the Synod of Trent, the whole established canon, and hence this book, in its canonical authority. The Reformed Church paid no attention to *Zwingli*’s doubts. The Lutheran Church, on the contrary, excluded the Apocalypse and the Antilegomena from the number of accepted canonical books until the seventeenth century, when Church opinion became more favorable to them. Since the beginning of the eighteenth century critical doubts have again been raised, and the reasons for and against it brought forward."

---


THE END.