

tion, violence is done both to the original and the language into which the translation is made. The multiplicity of synonymes, the taste and consistency of metaphor, and the varieties in the forms of phraseology, traits particularly showing the genius of a language, and always manifest in every original production, cannot be brought forward in the language into which the translation is made. Yet all this does not deteriorate from the worth of the Moeso-Gothic as a philosophic language. One of the most valuable links in the chain of Indo-Germanic languages, it develops important principles, and its value for grammatical reference cannot be too highly appreciated.

Very little has as yet been done towards the cultivation of this interesting language, and, indeed, many educated men are not aware of its existence in a separate form. In the general awakening which seems to be taking place throughout our land with regard to the northern languages, we hope that the Moeso-Gothic will receive its due share of attention. While the Anglo-Saxon, the mother of our own native tongue is cultivated, may her elder sister not be neglected!

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

INQUIRY RESPECTING THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF MATTHEW'S GOSPEL, AND THE GENUINENESS OF THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF THE SAME; WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO MR. NORTON'S VIEW OF THESE SUBJECTS AS EXHIBITED IN HIS TREATISE ON THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS.

By M. Stuart, Prof. Sac. Lit. Theol. Sem. Andover.

##### § 7. *Introductory Remarks.*

In the preceding number of this Miscellany I have examined at length the position, that the Gospel of Matthew was originally written in *Hebrew*, and that our present canonical Matthew is only a Greek translation of the original. It is possible, indeed, that this position is true; but the sum of the evidence before us, when thoroughly examined, seems to render it highly improbable.

Mr. Norton, who rejects the first two chapters of our canonical Matthew because he deems them to be an interpolation, has prepared the way for the introduction of this opinion, by maintaining that the Original Gospel of Matthew was in Hebrew. He had his reasons for so doing. The state of the testimony before us, in regard to the two chapters in question, is such as makes the case desperate for those who impugn their genuineness, if the *Greek* Matthew is to be relied on as the source of evidence. This we shall see in the sequel. Consequently, if there be any room for suspicion as to the Genuineness of Matthew I. II., it must be sought for in the Hebrew editions of this Gospel. Now as the church has never heard any thing of these since about the beginning of the fifth century, excepting a few fragments that some of the fathers have preserved, conjecture has room apparently for a wide range; and at any rate it is freed from the danger of being overthrown by positive evidence drawn from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It is not until we come down to the times of Epiphanius, near the close of the fourth century, that we can find more than some four or five extracts from the Jewish Gospel, which enable us to form any decisive judgment as to its internal state or condition.

Mr. Norton uses very freely the liberty which this state of things seems to afford him. He tells us (p. liii.), that Matthew I. II. was at first a separate composition—an *Evangelium Infantiae* published by some curious inquirer into the early history of the Saviour; and that this, from its seemingly obvious congruity with the history of Jesus's public life as given us by Matthew, i. e. from its supplementary nature, was first written separately on the same Ms. with the Gospel, and finally incorporated with it. In that state the Greek translator found his Ms. or Mss. to be, and he rendered the whole into the Greek language, as belonging to one and the same author.

But what are the *facts* on which this very important deduction or proposition is built? Mr. Norton has not told us what they are; at least he has given us no *external* evidence whatever of a historical nature. No voice of antiquity is raised in favour of such an opinion. No hint of this kind any where appears. The two chapters under examination were indeed omitted, as Epiphanius avers, in the Gospel of the Ebionites. But instead of an intimation that there was any good reason for

omitting them, this father expressly calls such Gospel of theirs *νενοθευμένον καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένον*, adulterated and curtailed.

*Internal* grounds of suspicion, however, are to be found in the chapters aforesaid, according to the views of Mr. Norton. It is on these, and on these only, that he builds his opinion. These, therefore, claim our attention; and in the sequel they must be examined. But before we come to this part of our task, it will be important to show the reader what the actual state of evidence is, in regard to the chapters before us. This I shall now endeavour to do.

### § 8. Positive evidence establishing the genuineness of Matthew I. II.

(1) *All Ms. copies of Matthew the world over, and all the ancient Versions without an exception, contain the first two chapters of Matthew, and exhibit them as part of his Gospel.*

The only exception to this remark is, that some two or three Mss. are defective, i. e. have perished, at the beginning of Matthew's Gospel. Thus the Codex Bezae or Cantab. wants the first twenty verses in Matthew, and Cod. Eschenbach. at Nürnberg has a like defect. Both unquestionably exhibited the genealogy in their original state.

The time was, in the days of Griesbach, when it was given out that the Codex Ebner. (Cod. 105 apud Wetstenium) did not contain the genealogy in Matthew. But this was a mistake; which was rectified by Gabler in his *Journal für Theol. Lit.*, 1801, part. 6. Schoenleben, who published a minute account of this Ms., gave occasion to this report by saying in his *Exposé*: 'Primum caput A his verbis incipit, τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος. It is true, indeed, that κεφάλαιον A., i. e. Chap. I., does so begin. But there is another truth respecting matters of this kind, which shows that there is not a particle of weight in the testimony derived from this, in favor of the omission of the two first chapters of Matthew, but the contrary. "All the books of the New Testament," says Griesbach (*Comm. Crit.* II. p. 49), "omit the numbering of the first paragraph in any book. . . . Thus, in all the Codices of Matthew which are furnished with τίτλοι [i. e. titles, short contents], κεφάλαιον A., or chap. I., begins with Matthew 2: 1, and is entitled περὶ τῶν Μάγνων." So in Mark the first κεφάλαιον begins with Mark 1: 29; in Luke with 2: 1; in John with 2: 1; in the Epistle to

the Romans with 1: 18; and so of the rest. A matter of fact plain enough, indeed, but one which, if it had been earlier noticed, would have saved some critics not a little of empty declamation.

John Williams, who in 1789 published a second edition of his *Free Inquiry into the Authenticity of the first and second Chapters of Matthew's Gospel*, boldly avers that some of the old *Latin Codices* omit these chapters. It turns out, on investigation, to be nothing more than that some *Codices* place the genealogy by itself, as a kind of preface to the whole work. Thus the *Codex Harleianus*, written perhaps in the seventh century, at the end of Matt. 1: 17, contains the following words inserted by the copyist: *Genealogia hucusque*. Then, as a heading to the sequel, he adds: *Incipit Evangelium secundum Matthaeum*. Doubtless these notices were taken into the body of the work, from the margin of some older copy. They are evidently notes which are essentially *marginal* in their very nature.

A few other *Latin Codices*, mostly written in Ireland during the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries, in like manner arrange the genealogy in the way of a proem, after which they introduce *titular* matter before verse 18th of Matt. I., which commences the regular narration. But all this shows nothing more than the hand of some critical redactor, who wished the reader to make a distinction between a genealogical table of names, and what might be appropriately named the *Gospel* or *History of Jesus*.

Other *Latin Codices* older and better, all the *Syriac*, *Coptic*, and other versions, in all their copies, and finally all the *Greek* copies without any variation, exhibit the chapters in question.

So far then as it respects any evidence actually in being, either from *Mss.* or *Versions*, there is not one copy of either upon the face of the whole earth, which is known to be wanting as to Matthew I. II.

The case then is absolutely desperate, on critical ground. We may *conjecture* what we please, I admit; but *conjecture* can never stand in the place of plain and palpable facts, when the discussion turns upon a point of lower criticism. To the *Mss.*, and to the *Versions*—is the answer always to be made to every inquiry of this nature. *Conjecture* is allowable only where these fail us.

We might stop here, then, and consider the discussion as at

an end. We might lawfully do so. But, as Jerome sometimes says, in a dispute, that he will do this or that *ex abundantia*, in order that nothing may be omitted which the nature of the case will enable him to bring forward; so, in the present case, I will adduce other evidence to confirm more completely what is already substantially proved.

(2) *The two first chapters of Matthew have always belonged to his Greek Gospel, (and no other genuine Gospel, as we have seen, can be rendered probable), ever since it came into circulation.*

I will not occupy the time of the reader in making quotations to prove this, from Jerome, Augustine, Epiphanius, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, nor even Irenaeus and Tertullian. No one who has any candour and any tolerable acquaintance with these writers, and with others who were their contemporaries, will venture to deny or even to doubt, that they have quoted and often quoted the two first chapters of Matthew as a part of his Gospel.

I advance at once, therefore, to Justin Martyr, who brings us close upon the confines of the apostolic age.

Mr. Norton has laboured, and very much to the purpose, to show that Justin quoted our canonical Gospels. I aver, that he has quoted Matthew I. II., in such a way as to make it certain, that the Gospel of Matthew in his hands was the same with that which we now have. My proof of this is an exhibition of his quotations; which are arranged as found in Credner's *Beiträge*, p. 151 seq.

Dial. c. Tryph. 100. p. 195.

Matt. 1: 1—17.

<p>Γινόντες αὐτὸν [τὸν Χριστὸν] πρωτότοκον μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων, καὶ τῶν πατριαρχῶν υἱόν, ἐπειδὴ διὰ τῆς ὑπὸ γένους αὐτῶν παρθένου σαρκοποιηθεὶς. — — υἱὸν οὖν ἀνθρώπου ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγεν, ἥτοι ἀπὸ τῆς γεννήσεως τῆς διὰ παρθένου, ἥ τις ἦν, ὡς ἔφη, ἀπὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ Ἀβραάμ γένους· ἢ διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀβραάμ πατέρα καὶ τούτων τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν, ἐξ ὧν κατὰ γειή Μαρία τὸ γένος. Καὶ γὰρ πατέρας τῶν γεννωμένων ταῖς θυγατράσιν αὐτῶν τέκνων τοὺς τῶν θηλειῶν γεννήτορας ἐπιστάμεθα.</p>	<p>Βιβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ, υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. Ἀβραάμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰσαάκ· Ἰσαάκ δὲ — — Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσήφ, τὸν ἀνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς.</p>
--	--

Dial. c. Tr. 43. p. 139.

— — εἰς τὸν, διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ Δαβὶδ παρθένον, γεννηθέντα υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστόν. Comp. Ib. 45. p. 141.

Dial. c. Tr. 120. p. 212 seq.

Λέγει (ὁ Θεός) τῷ Ἰσαάκ· (Genes. 22: 18) καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς. τῷ δὲ Ἰακώβ· (Genes. 28: 14) καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου· οὐκ εἶπεν τοῦτο τῷ Ἰσααὺ, οὐδὲ τῷ Ρουβὶμ λέγει, οὐδὲ ἄλλω τινὶ, ἀλλ' ἐκείνοις ἐξ ὧν ἔμελλεν ἕσθαι κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν, τὴν διὰ τῆς παρθένου Μαρίας, ὁ Χριστός. Εἶγε καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν Ἰούδα (Genes. 49: 10) καταμάθοις, ἴδοις ἄν, ὃ λέγω· μερίζεται γὰρ τὸ σπέρμα ἐξ Ἰακώβ, καὶ διὰ Ἰούδα, καὶ Φαρισαί, καὶ Ἰεσσαὶ, καὶ Δαβὶδ κατέρχεται.

Apol. I. 33. p. 64.

Matt. I. II.

(Comp. Dial. 66, 163. 63, 160. 85, 181. Apol. I. 63, 82. etc.)

Ὡς αὐτολέξει διὰ παρθένου μὲν τεθησόμενος διὰ τοῦ Ἰσαίου (7: 14) προεφητεύθη, ἀκούσατε. Ἐλέχθη δὲ οὕτως·

Ἰδοὺ, ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει, καὶ τέξεται υἱόν· καὶ ἐρουσὶν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός.

Matth. 1: 22. ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·

Ἰδοὺ, ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει, καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ· ὃ ἐστι [μεθερμηνεούμενον], μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός.

Apol. I. 33. p. 64.

Matt. 1: 21.

Καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

Καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

Apol. I. 34. p. 65.

Matth. 2: 5, 6.

Ὅπου δὲ καὶ τῆς γῆς γενῶσθαι ἔμελλεν, ὡς προεἶπεν ἕτερος προφήτης ὁ Μιχαίας, ἀκούσατε, ἔφη δὲ οὕτως· (5: 2) Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου.

Οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου· Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου, τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

Dial. c. Tr. 77, 78. p. 174 seq.

Ἄμα τῷ γεννηθῆναι αὐτόν, μάγοι ἀπὸ Ἀρῆαβίας παραγε-  
νόμενοι προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, πρότε-  
ρον ἐλθόντες πρὸς Ἡρώδην,  
τὸν ἐν τῇ γῇ ἡμῶν τότε βασιλεύ-  
οντα. — Οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης,  
μαθὼν παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ  
λαοῦ ἡμῶν, τότε ἐλθόντων πρὸς αὐ-  
τὸν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀρῆαβίας μάγων  
καὶ εἰπόντων· ἕξ ἀστέρων τοῦ ἐν  
τῷ οὐρανῷ φανέντος ἐγνωκέναι,  
ὅτι βασιλεὺς γενένηται ἐν τῇ χώρῃ  
ἡμῶν, καὶ ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐ-  
τόν. [Comp. Dial. c. Tr. 106. p.  
201. Ἀνατείλαντος οὖν καὶ ἐν  
οὐρανῷ ἄμα τῷ γεννηθῆ-  
ναι αὐτόν ἀστέρας, ὡς γέ-  
γραπται ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονείμασι  
τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ, οἱ ἀπὸ  
Ἀρῆαβίας μάγοι ἐκ τούτου ἐπι-  
γνόντες, παρεγένοντο καὶ προσεκύ-  
νησαν αὐτῷ.] καὶ ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῶν  
πρεσβυτέρων εἰπόντων, ὅτι γέγραπ-  
ται ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ οὕτως· (Mich.  
5: 2.) “Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ γῆ Ἰούδα,  
οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχιστὴ εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμό-  
σιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται  
ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμαίνει τὸν λαόν  
μου.” Τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀρῆαβίας οὖν  
μάγων ἐλθόντων εἰς Βηθλεὲμ, καὶ  
προσκυνησάντων τὸ παιδίον, καὶ  
προσενεγκάντων αὐτῷ δῶρα, χρυσὸν  
καὶ λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν· ἐπειδὴ  
κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, μετὰ τὸ  
προσκυῆσαι τὸν παῖδα ἐν Βηθλεὲμ  
ἐκέλευσθησαν μὴ ἐπανελθεῖν πρὸς  
τὸν Ἡρώδην· καὶ Ἰωσήφ δὲ, ὁ τὴν  
Μαρίαν μεμνηστευμένος, βουλη-  
θεὶς πρότερον ἐκβαλεῖν τὴν  
μνηστὴν αὐτῷ Μαριάμ, νο-  
μίζων ἐγκυμονεῖν αὐτὴν ἀπὸ συνου-  
σίας ἀνδρός, τοῦ ἔστιν ἀπὸ πορ-  
νείας, δι’ ὁράματα κεκέλευστο  
ἐκβαλεῖν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,

VOL. XII. No. 32.

Matt. 2: 1—13.

2: 1. Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν  
Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἰδοὺ, μάγοι  
ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν παρεγένοντο. — 2:  
3. Ἀκούσας δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς  
ἐταράχθη.

2: 4. Καὶ συναγαγὼν πάντας τοὺς  
ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ,  
ἐπυνθάνετο παρ’ αὐτῶν, ποῦ ὁ Χρι-  
στός γεννᾶται.

2: 1, 2. μάγοι — λέγοντες· ποῦ  
ἔστιν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰου-  
δαίων; εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀσ-  
τέρα ἐν ἀνατολῇ, καὶ ἤλθομεν προσ-  
κυνῆσαι αὐτῷ.

2: 5. Οἱ δὲ (ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμμα-  
τεῖς) εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς  
Ἰουδαίας· οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ  
τοῦ προφήτου· Καὶ σὺ Βηθλ. κ. τ. λ.

2: 11, 12. Καὶ ἐλθόντες (οἱ μάγοι)  
εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, εἶδον τὸ παιδίον με-  
τὰ Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ· καὶ  
πιστόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ· καὶ  
ἀνοίξαντες τοὺς θησαυροὺς αὐτῶν  
προσῆνεγκαν αὐτῷ δῶρα, χρυσόν, καὶ  
λίβανον, καὶ σμύρναν. Καὶ χρημα-  
τισθέντες κατ’ ὄρα, μὴ ἀνακίμψαι  
πρὸς Ἡρώδην, δι’ ἄλλης ὁδοῦ ἀνε-  
χώρησαν εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν.—  
Matt. 1: 18 seq. Μνηστευθεῖσας γὰρ  
τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰω-  
σήφ, [πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς] εὐ-  
ρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύμα-  
τος ἁγίου. Ἰωσήφ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐ-  
τῆς, δίκαιος ὢν καὶ μὴ θέλων

εἰπόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ φανεύοντος ἀγγε-  
λου, ὅτι ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου  
ὃ ἔχει κατὰ γαστρός ἐστιν.

Φοβηθεὶς οὖν, οὐκ ἐκβέβληκεν  
αὐτήν.

Dial. c. Tr. 78. p. 175.

Καὶ αὐτὸς (ὁ Ἰωσήφ) ἅμα τῇ Μα-  
ριά κελεύεται ἐξελεῖσθαι εἰς Αἴγυπτον,  
καὶ εἶναι ἐκεῖ ἅμα τῷ παιδίῳ, ἄχρις  
ἂν αὐτοῖς πάλιν ἀποκαλυφθῇ ἐπα-  
νελεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν.

Dial. c. Tr. 78. p. 175.

Καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης μὴ ἐπανελεῖσθαι  
πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀρῶρα βίβας  
μάγων, ὡς ἠξίωσεν αὐτοὺς ποιῆσαι,  
ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα αὐτοῖς  
δι' ἄλλης ὁδοῦ εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐ-  
τῶν ἀπαλλαγέντων, καὶ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ  
ἅμα τῇ Μαρίᾳ καὶ τῷ παιδίῳ, ὡς  
καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀποκεκάλυπτο, ἤδη ἐξε-  
λεῖσθαι εἰς Αἴγυπτον, οὐ γινώσκων  
τὸν παῖδα, ὃν ἐληλύθεισαν προσκυ-  
νῆσαι οἱ μάγοι, πᾶντας ἅπλως  
τοὺς παῖδας, τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ,  
ἐκέλευσεν ἀναιρεθῆναι· καὶ τοῦτο  
ἐπεπροφητεύτο μέλλειν γίνεσθαι διὰ  
Ἱερεμίου, εἰπόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ  
ἁγίου πνεύματος οὕτως· (31: 15.)  
“Φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἠκούσθη, κλαυθ-  
μὸς καὶ ὄδυρμος πολὺς· Ῥαχὴλ  
κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐκ  
ἤθελε παρακληθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ  
εἰσίν.”

Dial. c. Tr. 88. p. 185.

Μαρτύριον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἔστω ἡμῖν, ὃ ἔφην πρὸς ἡμᾶς γεγονέναι ὑπὸ τῶν  
Ἀρῶρα βίβας μάγων, οἵτινες ἅμα τῷ γεννηθῆναι τὸ παιδι-  
ον, ἐλθόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ.

αὐτήν παραδειγματίσαι,  
ἐβουλήθη λάθρα ἀπολύσαι αὐτήν.  
Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος, ἰδοὶ,  
ἄγγελος κυρίου κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη  
αὐτῷ λέγων· Ἰωσήφ, υἱὸς Δαβὶδ,  
μὴ φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν Μαριάμ  
τὴν γυναῖκά σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ  
γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου.  
Matt. 1: 24. Διεγερθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰω-  
σήφ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου ἐποίησεν, ὡς  
προσείαξεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου,  
καὶ παρέλαβε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

Matt. 2: 13.

— ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος κυρίου φαίνεται  
κατ' ὄναρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ, λέγων· ἐγε-  
ρθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν  
μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπ-  
τον, καὶ ἴσθι ἐκεῖ, ἕως ἂν εἶπω σοί.

Matt. 2: 16—18.

Τότε Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν, ὅτι ἐπεταίχθη  
ὑπὸ τῶν μάγων, ἐθιμάθη λίαν·  
καὶ ἀποστείλας ἀνείλε πᾶντας τοὺς  
παῖδας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι  
τοῖς ἐρίοις αὐτῆς, ἀπὸ διετοῦ καὶ  
κατωτέρου, κατὰ τὸν χρόνον, ὃν ἠκρί-  
βωσε παρὰ τῶν μάγων.

Τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ φηθὲν διὰ Ἱερε-  
μίου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος· φωνὴ  
ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἠκούσθη, φωνὴ καὶ  
κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὄδυρμος πολὺς· Ῥα-  
χὴλ κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, καὶ  
οὐκ ἤθελε παρακληθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ  
εἰσίν.

Dial. c. Tr. 102. p. 196.

Ἄμα γάρ τῳ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν Βηθλεὲμ, ὡς προέφη, παρὰ τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀρῆαβλας μάγων μαθῶν Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν, ἐπεβούλευσεν ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν· καὶ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κέλευσιν Ἰωσήφ λαβὼν αὐτὸν ἕμια τῇ Μαρίᾳ ἀπέηλθεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον.

Dial. c. Tr. 103. p. 198.

— κακεῖ (ἐν Αἴγύπτῳ) ἦσαν ἀπελθόντες ἄχρις ἂν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀποκτείνας τὰ ἐν Βηθλεὲμ παιδία Ἡρώδης, καὶ Ἀρχέλαος αὐτὸν διεδέξατο· καὶ οὗτος ἐτελείτα πρὶν τὸν Χριστὸν τὴν οἰκονομίαν, τὴν κατὰ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ πατρὸς γεγενημένην ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρωθῆναι ἐλθεῖν.

γῆν Ἰσραὴλ. Ἀκούσας δὲ, ὅτι Ἀρχέλαος βασιλεύει ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀντὶ Ἡρώδου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐφοβήθη ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν· χρηματισθεὶς δὲ κατ' ὄναρ, ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη τῆς Γαλιλαίας. Καὶ ἐλθὼν κατοίκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ.

Matt. 2: 19—23.

Τελευτήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Ἡρώδου, ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος κυρίου κατ' ἕναρ φαίνεται τῳ Ἰωσήφ ἐν Αἴγύπτῳ, λέγων· ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πορεύου εἰς γῆν Ἰσραὴλ· τεθνήκασι γάρ οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου. Ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς παρέλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς

If there can be any doubt in the mind of any reader who is able to make and does carefully make the comparison of Matthew with Justin, whether the latter has cited the Evangelist in the cases here exhibited, it would seem to me truly strange. But that the matter may be made clearer still, let it be noted, that in the citations from the Old Testament, where Matthew differs both from the Septuagint and from the Hebrew, having probably made his own free translation, Justin has followed the Evangelist. E. g. in Matt. 1: 23, cited from Is. 7: 14, the Sept. has ἐν γαστροῖς λήψεται, but Matthew, and after him Justin, use the phrase ἐν γαστροῖς ἔξει. The Hebrew has *וְקָרָא וְשָׂא* and she shall call; the Sept. καλέσεις, τοῦ shalt call; but Matthew has καλέσουσι, τῆς shall call. Justin says ἐροῦσιν, using the third person plural (although of another synonymous verb), just as Matthew had done.

Observe again, in the quotation, Matt. 2: 5, 6, where the Evangelist agrees neither with the Septuagint nor with the Hebrew, Justin follows him *verbatim* throughout. The Septuagint runs thus: "Thou Bethlehem, house of Ephratah, art very small to be among the thousands of Judah; from thee shall go forth for me [one] who shall be a ruler of Israel." The Hebrew runs thus: "And thou Bethlehem Ephratah art small to

be among the thousands of Judah ; from thee shall go forth for me [one] who shall rule in Israel.”

In Matthew 2: 18, where a quotation is made from Jer. 31: 15, it will be seen by comparison that Justin's quotation is *verbatim*, with the exception that *θρήνος* is omitted, which has probably fallen from Justin's text. But the Septuagint has here *φωνή ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἀκούσθη θρήνου, καὶ κλαυθμοῦ, καὶ ὄδυμοῦ, Ῥαχὴλ ἀποκλαιομένη οὐκ ἤθελε παύσασθαι ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτῆς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ* which is a mode of construction quite different from that in Matthew. The Hebrew original runs thus : “ A voice in Ramah was heard, wailing, bitter lamentation ; Rachel, weeping for her children, refuses to be comforted respecting her children, because they are not.”

Such a harmony of Justin with these *minutiae* of the two first chapters of Matthew, and in respect to passages from the Old Testament, where the Septuagint Version afforded the greatest facility for the Greek quotation and yet is not adopted, prove beyond all reasonable controversy, not only that Justin has quoted the Gospel of Matthew, but quoted our canonical Greek Gospel ; and not this only as to some of the leading parts of it, but the peculiarities of chapters I. II. even in their nicest shades, are preserved by Justin. Indeed Mr. Norton himself feels compelled to concede, that our Greek Matthew, even in chapters I. II. is quoted by Justin ; see p. 228 of his work. If any reader has doubted of this, the view given him above must, as I think, remove all those doubts.

It is a remarkable circumstance, too, that nearly every important thing which is related in the first two chapters of Matthew, is referred to or actually quoted by Justin ; so that we have not merely some general and indistinct evidence, but testimony minute and circumstantial ; and consequently there is no room for reasonable doubt or hesitation as to Justin's having before him our canonical Matthew.

I might add other testimony of a similar nature, which is very little later than that of Justin. Celsus, the celebrated heathen philosopher and bitter enemy of Christians, flourished about 150. He wrote a learned and powerful work against Christianity, which Origen afterwards answered in his famous treatise *Contra Celsum*. In that Treatise, Origen has quoted largely from Celsus ; and among other quotations, he has given us several passages which shew with entire certainty that our canonical Matthew was in the hands of Celsus, and was read by him as

the Christian account of the life and actions of Jesus. Nothing can be more certain than that the copy which Celsus read, contained Matthew I. II. ; for the quotations from him by Origen make this plain. Let me present a few of them to the reader, for his entire satisfaction in this matter.

Orig. cont. Cels. II. 32, "Nimis insolenter ait [Celsus] τοὺς γενεολογίσαντας τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου αὐτίτος [sc. Adamo, Luke III], καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ βασιλέων." [Matt. I.]

Ib. I. 66, Celsus is represented as thus addressing Jesus : τί σε νήπιον εἶ ἐχρον εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐκκομίζεσθαι ; . . . ἄγγελος μὲν ἦκεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, κελεύειν σοι καὶ τοῖς οἰκείοις θύγειν' comp. Matt. 2: 13. Again : "Deus δύο ἤδη διὰ σε ἀγγέλους miserat ;" comp. Matt. 1: 20. 2: 12.

In V. 58 ib. Origen testifies that Celsus had mentioned τὸ περὶ τῆς Μαρίας κνουήσης ἐληλυθῆναι πρὸς τὸν Ἰωσήφ ἄγγελον [Matt. 1: 20], καὶ πάλιν, ὑπερ τοῦ τὸ βρέφος γεννηθῆν καὶ ἐπιβουλευόμενον ἐξαπαύσαντας θυγεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον [Matt. 2: 13].

In I. 34 of the same work, Origen says that Celsus had mentioned many things in the Gospel of Matthew ; e. g. τὸν ἀνατελῆναι ἀστέρᾳ ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, [Matt. 2: 2].

In I. 58 Origen says of Celsus : Χαλδαίους, φησὶν, ὑπὸ τοῦ κελέχθαι κινηθέντας ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει αὐτοῦ ἐληλυθῆναι, προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν, εἶ νήπιον, ὡς θεόν [Matt. 2: 11], καὶ Ἡρώδῃ τῷ τετραράρχῃ τοῦτο δεδηλωκῆναι [Matt. 2: 3], τόνδε πέμψαντα ἀποκτεῖναι τοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ γεγεννημένους [Matt. 2: 16.]

More might be added ; but these references to Matthew I. II. are so plain and indisputable that not a shadow of doubt can remain, that Celsus, about the middle of the second century, repeatedly quoted the first two chapters of Matthew as confessedly and avowedly a part of Gospel History.

Nor is there a quotation taken from the Gospel in question, among all the ancient fathers, from the apostolic ones downwards, the authority of which is plainly and simply avowed or implied, which does not come from our canonical Matthew. The use of any other Gospel in the church catholic is out of question. At all events, the earliest information we have, gives us no reason to believe that any other was ever used by the church at large.

The same evidence, moreover, which we have of the existence of a Greek Matthew, and of its being used by the early churches, we also have of the first two chapters of the same, as constituting a component part of the Greek Matthew.

Our *positive* external evidence, then, is as complete of the early existence and authenticity of this part of Matthew, as it is of the rest of his Gospel, or of any other Gospel which is contained in our Canon.

One circumstance more, however, should be here added; not because our proof actually needs any aid from it, but in order to shew how much testimony may easily be combined to establish the point which I am labouring to establish.

The Peshito or old Syriac Version of the New Testament, has already been mentioned, in my dissertation on the original language of Matthew's Gospel, published in the preceding number of this Miscellany. We have seen that this Version was in all probability made within the first half of the second century; and therefore that it was made about the time when Justin Martyr and Celsus wrote the works from which I have made so many quotations in the preceding pages. We have also seen, that Matthew I. II. is not only translated into the Syriac, but that the translator must have had the same text, *verbatim and literatim*, which now stands in our canonical Greek Matthew. Every *καί, δέ, οὐν*, or other particle, is scrupulously rendered; and the passage which gives offence to such critics as Kuinoel—"which being interpreted is *God with us*"—stands in the Peshito, exactly in accordance with our present canonical Matthew.

Let us look now at the nature of the case before us. Here, in the very next generation, or nearly so, after the apostolic age, is a writer (Justin Martyr) in the midst of Ebionites and Nazarenes, living at Flavia Neapolis in Samaria, and appealing to and citing our canonical *Greek* Matthew; and not only this, but particularly Matthew I. II. About the same period a heathen philosopher, probably an Epicurean, a strenuous and contemptuous enemy of Christianity, in his attack upon this religion appeals to our canonical Matthew, and oftentimes to chap. I. II. Not improbably this infidel writer composed his work in Egypt. Then, in the next place, we have a translation of the New Testament Scriptures, made about the same time in Syria, probably in the remoter part of it, at Edessa, of which it is certain that our canonical Greek Matthew was the basis, and beyond all doubt that chapters I. II. were translated from the identical text which we now have.

Nor is even this all the early external evidence which may be produced. Cerinthus was a *Jewish* heretic, of the Gnostic

cast, in the first century, and he lived but a few years after the Gospel of Matthew was composed (fl. 80). That he was a *Palestine Jew*, Paulus has rendered altogether probable, in his *Historia Cerinthi*, contained in his *Introduct. in Nov. Testament. Capita selectiora*, and Schmidt in his *Bibl. für Kritik und Exegese des N. Test. B. I. S. 181*, *Cerinth ein Judaisirender Christ*. That he and Carpocrates made use of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, is expressly asserted by Epiphanius (*Haeres. XXX. 13*), who says: "Cerinthus and Carpocrates, using the same Gospel with them [the Ebionites], endeavours to shew *from the genealogy at the beginning of the Gospel κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, that Christ sprung from the seed of Joseph and Mary. But they [the Ebionites] cutting off the genealogy in Matthew, begin their Gospel as I said before, viz., *Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου Βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας*, etc." By the same Gospel Epiphanius evidently means here *the Gospel in Hebrew*. This Gospel the Ebionites received, but they curtailed it by omitting the first two chapters; while Cerinthus and Carpocrates laboured to prove, from these very chapters, in their Hebrew copies, the merely natural and human origin of the Saviour.

So then we go back here to the very age of the apostles, and find Jews at that period using a *Hebrew Gospel*, which contains the chapters whose genuineness is now called in question.

Evidence simultaneous, from so many different quarters and in such a variety of ways, cannot be resisted. It is certain that in the next generation after the apostles, our canonical Matthew was the only authentic one to which the church catholic made appeal; and equally certain, that chapters I. II. constituted the same portion of it which they now do.

Such is the state of *external* evidence, that Matthew I. II. is genuine and contemporaneous with the whole book. In justice to the subject, however, it should not be dismissed, until we inquire whether there is any *internal* evidence which will serve to corroborate the testimony already exhibited. My answer to this inquiry is, that there are some phenomena in chap. III., which seem to be unaccountable in case the Gospel of Matthew originally began with the third chapter.

First the *δέ* in Matt. 3: 1 is deserving of special note. A perfectly clear case it is, that a book could not commence with a *δέ* in the first clause, inasmuch as *δέ* is such a *connective* particle as necessarily implies something *antecedent* in the discourse.

But if chapters I. II. did not originally belong to this Gospel, then there was in this case no antecedent.

I am aware that not a few Mss., and some of good authority, omit the *δέ* here; and so, also, several of the Versions. But, as Griesbach remarks (Comm. Crit. p. 23), 'no good reason can be given why *δέ* should be added, [to the text]. On the other hand, as this verse was the beginning of a *κεφάλαιον*, or of an *ἀνάγνωσμα* (lection), there is a very plain reason for its omission [in Lectionaries], specially as the matter which follows is very discrepant from that which precedes.' Hence Griesbach, concludes, respecting the particle in question, that "rectius retinetur." But if retained, it argues the necessity of precedent matter; i. e. the Gospel could not have begun here; and so the existence of chapters I. II., or at any rate of some matter of this kind, is of necessity implied.

I am aware that the usual answer to all this has been and still is, that the translator into Greek added the *δέ*, in order to keep up the connection between the two narratives, viz. that which precedes and that which follows. But why he needed to do this, cannot be well shewn. So great a transition would appear even to more advantage, so far as grammar or rhetoric is concerned, without the *δέ* than with it. And after all, it is a mere assumption, when one says that it was added by a translator. The Old Syriac translator, at any rate, found the *δέ* in the copy from which he made his version.

But dismissing this, let us see if there be not something more in the text here, which is deserving of particular notice.

What can be meant by *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις*? "Those days" must necessarily refer to some days which had been already mentioned or alluded to. But if the first two chapters are not genuine, there is of course no such mention or allusion.

The Ebionite Gospel, which rejected these two chapters, instead of *ἐκεῖναις*, adds *Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας*. But what an emendation! *In the days of Herod*, who had been dead some twenty-eight years!

Nor is the appeal to Ex. 2: 11 for an analogical case, at all in point. Ex. 2: 11 runs thus: "It came to pass, *in those days*, when Moses was grown." The preceding verse (v. 10) says: "The child [Moses] grew; and she [his mother] brought him unto Pharaoh's daughter, and he became her son, etc." Now *those days*, in v. 11, may refer either to the period mentioned here, or to what is expressed in the phrase immediately sub-

joined in v. 11. viz. *when Moses was grown*, which seems to be added for the sake of explaining what *those days* mean.

Nor can *those days* in Matt. 3: 1, be satisfactorily explained, by merely calling the phrase a *Hebraism*. True it is, that the Hebrews were accustomed thus to designate time. But in all cases, where  $\text{הַיָּמִים}$ , *those*, is employed with  $\text{וַיְמַיֵּן}$ , the context shews the nature and object of reference.

There is another expression in chapter III. which would seem to be very strange, in case chapters I. II. were not originally integral parts of Matthew's Gospel. I refer to v. 13, where it is said: "Then cometh Jesus *from Galilee*." Now if chap. I. II. are removed, there is no mention whatever of Jesus, nor of the place of his abode, previous to this declaration. Would it not be passing strange for a writer thus to introduce a most important personage wholly unknown to the reader, and thus to mention his place of abode, just as if it were already familiar to the reader? How can we account for a manner so abrupt, and such declarations without the least preparation for them?

On the other hand; supposing the first two chapters of Matthew to be genuine, we can easily explain all these expressions. *Ἄ* connects chap. III. with the preceding history. *Ἐν ἡμέραις ἐξέλθαις* refers to what is said at the close of chap. II., viz., that Jesus came, with Joseph and Mary, and dwelt at Nazareth, and that *during his abode there* John the Baptist entered upon his public ministry. That Jesus "came from Galilee," 3: 13, is explained by 2: 22, where it is said that Joseph and Mary 'went to sojourn in the region of Galilee.'

That there is a large interval of time between the occurrences narrated in chap. II. and those in chap. III., is true enough. But as the writer had no intention of developing the *private* life of Jesus, the nature of the case required, that he should make a transition to the period of his public ministry. Transitions as great as these, are not unfrequent; specially in the prophetic parts of the Old Testament.

Let the reader now put all these *facts* together, and then ask himself, whether there is any probability that the two first chapters of Matthew are spurious? The external and internal evidence is certainly very strong in favour of the position, that they came from the hand of Matthew, the author of the whole book.

§ 9. *Examination of Objections.*

(1) 'The Gospel of the Ebionites did not contain Matt. I. II.'

So Epiphanius declares; and very probably he has told us the truth. But then we have the same authority to prove, that the Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarenes, and also that of Cerinthus, did contain these chapters. Jerome who translated the Nazarene Gospel, never intimates any deficiency here; which he surely would have done, had it been found in his copy.

Besides, we have a solution of this difficulty in the fact, that the Ebionites rejected the miraculous conception of Jesus. This led them to do the same thing, which the Manichaeans afterwards did for another reason drawn from their theology or philosophy, viz., to reject that portion of Matthew which disagreed with their speculations. So Marcion did, in respect to the Gospel of Luke; so some of the Romish church afterwards did with respect to the epistle to the Hebrews, in their disputes against the Montanists, who appealed to that epistle in order to shew that lapsed Christians could not be restored again to repentance; and so the Anti-millenarians did, at a later period, when they rejected the Apocalypse. So even Luther did, in respect to the epistle of James, when he disputed with the Romanists about the doctrine of justification by faith alone. There is no end of such subterfuges among men of ardent temperament, or of bigoted feelings in respect to particular sectarian points of doctrine. How could Mr. Norton say, (p. liv), that "he can perceive nothing in the prejudices or habits of mind [of the Ebionites] which led them to reject the facts [related in Matt. I. II. ?]"

All this, however, proves nothing except the strength of prejudice in a particular party among early Christians. Even the Hebrew Gospel of primitive times was mutilated, as we have seen, only by one small party; and the authority of this party can weigh but little indeed, in a matter like the present, where so much direct and positive testimony lies before us which is against them.

At all events, as Griesbach well remarks, (Comm. Crit. II. p. 52), 'nothing can be proved by the hints we have respecting the state of the Ebionite Gospel, until it shall be shown more clearly what relation this Gospel sustained toward our canonical Matthew, so that we can reason from the state of the former to that of the latter.'

The manner in which the Gospel of the Ebionites *commences*, shews what sort of a compilation it was : "It came to pass in the days of Herod, the King of Judea, that John came, baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan, etc." So it is quoted in Epiphanius. *Haeres.* XXX. 13 ; but in *Haeres.* XXX. 14, he gives us another beginning of this same Gospel : "It came to pass in the days of Herod, King of Judea, while Caiaphas was high priest, there came a certain John, by name, baptizing with the baptism of repentance, etc." Here Luke 3: 2, respecting the high-priesthood of Caiaphas, is intermingled with the text. In both, the wretched mistake is made of Herod being *King of Judea*, when John entered on his public ministry. Herod, the King of Judea, died the year after the birth of the Saviour, i. e. some twenty-eight years before John's public appearance, and after him there was indeed a Herod who was a *tetrarch*, but no Herod who was a *king*, as here quoted.

Shall we resort, now, to such a Gospel as this, for establishing the interpolation of Matt. I. II. ? I trust not.

(2) 'The *Protevangelium* from which three of the Evangelists composed their narrations, did not probably contain Matt. I. II.'

Supposing now I should aver, that it did probably contain these chapters ; my assertion would be just as good as the opposite one. Of the *Protevangelium* no ancient writer of the church ever spoke, heard, or dreamed. It is a phenomenon of Neology alone, first dreamed, I believe, among countless other like visions, by the great heresiarch Semler ; and after him by others, whose imaginations were as lively as his ; finally, however, dreamed even on English ground, and by a man who is now a bishop ; but, last of all, scattered, as dreams are at the opening day, by an American at Cambridge, who has, one would think, so completely dissipated it that it will not soon make its appearance again.

(3) 'Mark begins his Gospel without any preface which relates the history of Jesus' infancy ; and so Matthew probably began his, for Mark, who is the *epitomator* of Matthew, has not given us a word of the Gospel of the Infancy.'

Nor has he given us any of the Sermon on the Mount ; nor of many other things contained in Matthew. Are these therefore to be rejected as spurious ?

Besides ; there is no satisfactory evidence that Mark copied

Matthew at all. Mr. Norton has completely overthrown this position, in his work. And if he had not, the improbability of the thing is so great, when all the circumstances are taken into view, that almost no one now pretends to believe in such an allegation.

Moreover, John gives us nothing of the Gospel of the Infancy. Is Matthew, therefore, to be judged of by a comparison with him?

(4) 'Luke has given us a Gospel of the Infancy, which is not only different in all respects from that of Matthew, but in some respects is scarcely to be reconciled with it.'

But the fact that Luke has composed a Gospel of the Infancy, shows that such a thing might be done, and that it was done; and why could not Matthew as well compose one as Luke? As to the fact that his history differs from that of Matthew, is this any good reason for rejecting that of the latter? Does Luke give the same account of the Sermon on the Mount, as Matthew? Does he minutely accord with him in the relation of a great many transactions, and particularly those respecting the trial, condemnation, crucifixion, and resurrection of the Saviour? Every one knows the answer to these questions, who has made the comparison.

Another thing also is equally clear to a candid reader of both histories; viz. that there is nothing in Matthew which gainsays in the least what is set forth by Luke. On the contrary, the substantial fact, viz. the miraculous conception of the Saviour, is fully portrayed by both Evangelists.

(5) 'But there are internal difficulties, improbabilities, and at least seeming contradictions with other Evangelists, contained in Matt. I. II.'

On these Mr. Norton, and some others of his opinion, seem mainly to rely; for most of the objections already examined do not belong to Mr. Norton, but to other earlier writers. Let us now consider, then, the arguments which Mr. Norton specifically alleges in favour of his own views.

Mr. Norton concedes (p. liv.) that the two first chapters of Luke "always made a part of his Gospel." He thinks, indeed, that they were translated by Luke, or some other person, from a *Hebrew* writing; and he says that "the cast of the narrative has something of a poetical, and even fabulous character about it." But still, with these difficulties, Mr. Norton agrees to receive the narration as containing what is historically true in respect to its *main facts*.

He thinks, moreover, that Luke received the account given in these chapters, because it conformed to the belief of the apostles. 'Any thing contradictory to this, therefore, cannot be received as true.'

The first great stumbling-block thrown in his way by Matthew I. II. is, that the *genealogy* there differs so entirely from that of Luke. All the attempts to explain this he pronounces to be merely "conjectural;" i. e. as I suppose, to rest merely upon what is but conjecture. None of them, he says, are satisfactory.

One mode of conciliation has been the supposition, that Luke gives the *genealogy* of Joseph as *son-in-law*, and not improbably as also an *adopted* son of Heli. But says Mr. Norton, "if Luke had intended to give the *genealogy* of *Mary*, he would say so. He would not have indicated his meaning so ambiguously and circuitously as by affirming that Joseph was the son of Heli, when he meant only that he was his son-in-law, Heli being *Mary's* father." (p. lv.)

Yet, to a man who has made himself familiar with the manner and principles of Hebrew *genealogy*, nothing could be less probable than such a declaration. Luke give the Hebrew *genealogy* of a *female*! And give it directly, making her one of the prominent links, the very end of the chain! Where in all the Old Testament or the New is any such thing? In Matthew's *genealogy*, and in others contained in the Old Testament, a female is now and then mentioned; but it is merely as an *attachéé*, and not as one of the principal links in the chain. Luke, be it remembered, was giving a *Hebrew genealogy*, and not a Greek one. Had a female appeared in this directly as one of the main links, the Jews of course would have said: This is no *Hebrew genealogy*.

But has not Luke in fact said something, which may naturally enough lead us to suppose that he is giving the *genealogy* of Joseph as merely *putative* father or foster-father of Jesus? Considered in this light, Jesus may naturally be regarded as the *putative* son, or son by reckoning, of Heli, the son of Matthat, etc. What says he of Jesus? He says: ὄν, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ἡλὶ, κ. τ. λ. Now it is a fair and exact translation of this, when we render it: "Being the *putative* son of Joseph, [the son] of Heli, etc." The writer means clearly to say, that Jesus was not in reality, but only *putatively*, the son of Joseph, the son of Heli. Joseph then is reckoned here

simply as *putative* father. And such being most plainly the case, how comes he to sustain such a relation? Because, the natural reply is, he was the husband of Mary, the actual mother of Jesus. May it not be, then, that as a putative father of Jesus, i. e. as the husband of Mary, he is here affirmed to sustain the relation of *son* to Heli? May not the *son-in-law* of Heli, moreover, and perhaps his adopted son also, be called *son*, according to the Hebrew usage? At all events, there is something here in the language of Luke which claims particular notice, and deserves more investigation than Mr. Norton or the commentators in general have given it. Does not Naomi call Ruth and Orpah her *daughters*, when they were merely the wives of her two sons? See Ruth 1: 11.

Let it be noted, that all the Evangelists of the New Testament regard it as a *plain matter of fact*, that *Christ is the son of David*. Paul says, in so many words: *τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα*, Rom. 1: 3. Christ then, in his human nature, was a *real*, not a merely putative, son of David. But if neither the genealogy of Matthew nor Luke proves this point, where is the proof to be found? It might indeed be true, that neither of these evangelists has given us the genealogy of Mary, and still she may have been of the race of David. But would it not seem very strange, when the Jews made so much of this point (see Luke 20: 41), and when it was a most evident expectation of the whole nation, even of the lowest class of people, that the Messiah would be an actual son of David, that no one of the Evangelists should have given us a hint on this subject, which would shew that he was any thing more than a mere *putative* son of David, and this because his foster-father was descended from that king?

I have another suggestion to make; which is, that on the ground that Luke has given Joseph's genealogy as a real and not as a putative son of Heli, then either the Gospel of Luke or of Matthew (our canonical Matthew) must have lost all credit soon after their publication. Every circumstance conspires to make the impression on us, that the genealogy of Matthew belongs to Joseph, and is intended to present him as a real descendent of those named as his ancestors. We have seen, moreover, that Cerinthus, near the close of the very age of the apostles, used this genealogy for his own peculiar purposes, in regard to establishing the human origin of the Saviour. We know that Cerinthus, Justin Martyr, Celsus, and the Syri-

ac translator, all found Matthew's genealogy in their copies of his Gospel. Now if the genealogy of Luke was regarded, at that period, as contradicting that of Matthew; and it was also known that a *genuine Hebrew* Matthew was in existence which omitted the genealogy, and this saved all appearances of contradiction; how is it possible to account for it, that the early churches did not at once embrace the opportunity thus offered of being freed from the difficulty? Either they did not actually find any serious difficulty, at a very early period; or else they were unaccountably remiss and negligent in attention to this perplexing subject. If they found no difficulty, it must be because they regarded Luke as *not* contradicting Matthew; which could happen, only in case they supposed Luke to give the genealogy of Joseph as *son-in-law* of Heli. Any other mode of conciliation seems to be so nugatory, that it is hardly worth a discussion. If they found difficulty, why did they not resort at once to the obvious method of freeing themselves from it, by receiving at once the Hebrew Matthew of the Ebionites as genuine, and thus omitting the two first chapters, or at least the genealogy?

But this is not all. There is another point of view which seems to make the matter in question plainer still. Matthew (in case he inserted the genealogy), and Luke also, must have taken their genealogies from the public tables, or at any rate from the family records. They could not have framed a genealogy of their own, i. e. one which was in any measure factitious. Had either of them done this, as soon as his Gospel was published the unbelieving Jews would have gone at once to the family records, and falsified the Gospel. Were there not Jews malignant and cunning enough to do this? And were there not members even of the Saviour's family, i. e. near relatives according to the flesh, who did not believe on him? John 7: 5. Did the vigilance of unbelieving Jews sleep when the Gospels were first published—that vigilance which had persecuted to banishment and blood the early Christians? This will not be said. What was here to be done, then, when a factitious genealogy was published by a Christian writer of seeming authority? Nothing more need to be done in order utterly to overthrow the credit of his so-called Gospel, than to investigate the family records of Joseph and Mary, and bring before the public the true state of the case. Was this done? We have no account of it. Not a whisper even in Justin

Martyr, to tell us that the Jews had discredited, or could discredit, the genealogies; and yet he gives all the Jewish objections to the Gospels, current in his day.

But let us put the subject in still another attitude. Matthew or Luke, (the objector may select which he pleases), publishes a genealogy which he knew to be factitious. Did not both of these writers know, that every opposing and malignant Jew had it in his power at once to discredit the whole of his narration? They must have possessed less understanding than we give them credit for, not to have known this; yea, they must even have been deficient in common sense.

But it will be said here, 'the supposition now is, that Matthew did not himself publish a genealogy.' Be it so then, for the sake of discussion; still the case is very little if any the more favourable for those who maintain this. Cerinthus had a genealogy; Justin had one; Celsus had one; the Greek translator of Matthew (if there was one) found one in his Hebrew copy of Matthew, as Mr. Norton himself concedes. Now as this translation (if it were ever made) must have been made in the first century, how came the difficulties about the genealogy then to be overlooked? There was no point of time during that period, when there were not keen sighted and malignant Jews, who would have exposed the inconsistencies and errors of such a Gospel of Matthew, had that been liable to confutation. The family of Jesus, i. e. at least some branches of his kinsmen after the flesh, must have been still surviving, and *genealogy* was a thing that could always be easily verified.

What remains then for us to believe, except that the earliest Christians did not see, or did not find, the difficulties in the genealogies which Mr. Norton finds. If they did not, it must have been because they viewed one of them as being a genealogy of Joseph as *son-in-law*. On any other ground the case is too plain to admit of any serious doubt.

Julius Africanus (fl. 210) as quoted by Eusebius (H. Ecc. I. 7) shews a somewhat different state of feeling on the subject of the genealogies, from what we must suppose had existed in the very early ages of Christianity. He strenuously endeavoured to reconcile the apparent discrepancies between them; and he testifies that others before him had in various ways attempted the same thing. Consequently these must have been writers within the second century. Whatever might have been the cause of it, it would seem that abroad, i. e. at a

distance from Palestine and among the Greeks and Romans, the subject of genealogies was not regarded in the same light as in and near Palestine. Hence it is easy to suppose, that difficulties would spring up; and they did in fact exist. But when they had sprung up, why did it never enter into the mind of any of the ancient fathers, that they might all be easily disposed of, by merely adopting that copy of the original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, which was in circulation among the Ebionites? Yet this obvious remedy was not adopted nor even proposed. On the contrary, Julius Africanus, as copiously quoted by Eusebius and with marked approbation, endeavours to conciliate the whole difficulty by the following ingenious conjecture, viz. ; Matthan (the proper grandfather of Joseph) was a descendant from David in the line of Solomon ; Melchi putative grandfather of Joseph sprung from David in the line of Nathan ; Nathan married and begat Jacob (the proper father of Joseph), and then died ; Melchi married his widow and begat Heli, so that Jacob and Heli were uterine brothers, the one being the real father of Joseph, and the other the putative father, i. e. *father-in-law*, inasmuch as he was the husband of Joseph's mother. Thus Africanus thinks, and Eusebius with him, that all the serious difficulties may be removed. But not with good reason, as the subject appears to my mind. For still there is no proof at all on this ground, that Christ is any thing more than a merely *putative* son of David. Julius Africanus, and after him Eusebius, does indeed suppose that Joseph married, according to the Jewish law, within his own tribe, i. e. the tribe of Judah ; but surely the family of David did not constitute this whole tribe ? This supposition, therefore, leaves open a wide chasm in the series of proof which seems necessary, in order to satisfy the mind that Jesus was the actual son of David. Besides, it is utterly improbable that the genealogy of Joseph should have, at one and the same time, been reckoned two different ways, either in the public or family tables. The only tenable position seems to be, then, that Luke reckons the pedigree of Joseph as *son-in-law*. The language of Luke is certainly peculiar, where he speaks of Joseph and Jesus. So long ago as the time of Julius Africanus this was remarked ; for he says, as quoted by Euseb. in I. 7: τὴν γὰρ κατὰ νόμον γένεισιν ἐπισημότερον οὐκ ἦν ἐξειπεῖν καὶ τὸ ἐγέννησεν ἐπὶ τῆς τοιαύτης παιδοποιίας ἄχρι τέλους ἐσίωπε i. e. ' he could not have more plainly designated a *legal* [i. e.

putative) mode of reckoning generations [than he has done, in *Matt. I.*]; he has even omitted the word *ἐγέννησε* through the genealogy down to the very end.'

Without resting the force of the argument, however, on the somewhat peculiar diction of Luke, it is enough to say, that two genealogies so discrepant as that of his and of *Matthew*, could not have existed in the primitive age, in two Gospels, without sacrificing the credit of one of these Gospels; I mean that such must have been the effect, in case they were both designed to be, and were counted as, the regular genealogies of Joseph. Two actual genealogies of him, and two that differed so much in regard to him in the *same relation*, he could not have. It is an absurdity on the face of it. One of the two, therefore, must have been of him as *son-in-law*, and not improbably as adopted Son. Then all is easy, natural, reconcilable, explicable. It was foreigners, who did not know how to estimate the Jewish genealogies, that first began to doubt and to find difficulty, and thus it is at the present day. Yet the very nature of the case shews, that such difficulties were not felt to exist, when the Gospels were first published.

To suppose, as Mr. Norton does, (p. lvi.), that 'some Hebrew convert, who composed the narration in *Matt. I. II.*, shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, found a genealogy of some Joseph, which he mistook for the Joseph in question, and adopted it as a part of his narration; and then that this double mistake should be backed up by a third, viz., the reception of all this as a genuine Gospel of *Matthew*—such a reception also while the Ebionites had in circulation a genuine *Matthew* from which these chapters are excluded—to suppose all this, is more conjecture than we can indulge. It strangles us if we attempt to swallow it. Besides; Mr. Norton has argued from p. 27 of his book and onward at great length, to shew the improbability, or rather the impossibility, that all the copies of the Gospels should in any way whatever have been corrupted to any extent of serious importance. He has arrayed a host of arguments against this; and a strong and well armed host it is, and, as it seems to me, quite invincible. But there is not a single argument there employed by him, in defence of the Gospels at large, which may not be employed against him here with the same power. An addition of so much, so important, so difficult matter as is contained in *Matt. I. II.* by any writer that lived only some ten or twenty years after this

apostle published his Gospel, and this while he himself, perhaps, or at any rate some of his personal acquaintance and friends were living, who knew what he did write and what he did not—such an addition, at such a time and under such circumstances, is in itself utterly incredible. The Ebionites did indeed exclude the chapters in question, and they had party reasons for so doing; but neither the Nazarenes, nor any part of the church catholic, ever thought of freeing themselves from the difficulties of these chapters in this way.

Other objections, if the *difficulties* presented by any part of the Scriptures is to be a good ground of objection to its genuineness, might have been suggested by Mr. Norton, in the present case. These are, that while Matthew reckons only twenty-eight links between David and Christ, Luke makes forty-two. Then again, Matthew has reckoned by three series of *fourteen*; which, as the text now stands, it seems difficult to make out; he has also omitted three links between Joram and Uzziah in chap. 1: 8, viz. Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah, see 2 Chron. XXII—XXV. He has evidently omitted more still between Naasson and David; for, during this period of more than 400 years he counts only *four* generations. In all probability he has also omitted some links in the last series of fourteen. Nor is his genealogy the only one which presents difficulties. Luke, in 3: 36, inserts a *Kaiván*, which belongs not to the Hebrew genealogies of the Old Testament. Now all these difficulties, except the last, might have been removed in early ages by adopting the exemplar of the Ebionites. Yet the early church, although it felt and recognized the difficulties, never once thought, as it appears, of removing them in this way. It is too late for us to do it now, by such a summary process. There are, I apprehend, other and satisfactory ways of removing the difficulties just stated; but my present object does not permit me to go into a discussion of these subjects. I must dismiss them, therefore, in order to investigate what Mr. Norton has said in respect to difficulties suggested by him.

Luke presents us with an account of Joseph and Mary, first as residing at *Nazareth*; then, on occasion of the census under Augustus, as going to *Bethlehem*, where Jesus was born; then, after the forty days' legal purification of Mary, as presenting Jesus at the temple, and afterward returning again to *Nazareth*. With this Mr. Norton thinks the account in Matthew I. II. substantially to disagree. 'Matthew,' he says, 'without mention-

ing any previous residence at Nazareth, relates that Jesus was born at *Bethlehem*; that the Magi paid their visit to him there; that the jealousy of Herod was so excited by the story of his birth as to order the massacre of the children at Bethlehem; that Joseph and Mary, being divinely admonished, escaped and fled to Egypt with the child Jesus; that he waited there until the death of Herod, when he set out to return, intending to go to *Bethlehem* as his proper place of residence, (as it would appear from the narration of the writer, who seems to have supposed Bethlehem to be his *home*), and was turned aside to Nazareth only in consequence of divine admonition.'

These narratives, as thus represented, Mr. Norton says, "cannot be referred to the same authentic source, being apparently so contradictory, and scarcely a single circumstance in them coinciding;" their 'general complexion also presents an aspect very different.' The account of Luke being received by the apostles, Mr. Norton 'cannot believe,' he says 'that another so unlike it proceeded from Matthew.' (pp. lvii. seq.)

After all, however, I am not persuaded that Mr. Norton's conclusions in this case are well grounded. Let us attend to several circumstances which may help us in our judgment respecting this matter.

First, is it true that the accounts of Luke and Matthew coincide "in scarcely a single circumstance?"

Both agree that Jesus was born of a virgin; that his conception was miraculous; that he was the son of David; that he was born at Bethlehem; and that angels were employed in announcing the manner of his birth, and the object of his mission. Here then are all the *essential* facts in respect to his descent, character, and station. Other circumstances added by one Evangelist, are omitted by another.

If now we go upon the ground seemingly defended by Mr. Norton, that when one Evangelist inserts what another has omitted, then one of them must be considered as *contradicting* the other; it would follow that there is scarcely a narration of any important matter in all the Gospels, in which contradiction may not be found. Nothing can be more fatal to the whole *Corpus Evangelicum* than such a principle. Nothing can be more unfounded, I may well add, than such an objection. What two histories, ancient or modern, which are not merely copied from each other, could stand on the ground of a rule of criticism like that here adopted by Mr. Norton?

But amid all these varying circumstances narrated by Matthew and Luke, is there one in Matthew which *contradicts* any one in Luke? Not a single one. All may be true which Luke declares, and yet all may be equally true which Matthew has told us. It answers no purpose here to suggest, as Mr. Norton does, that Luke applied to the mother and family of Jesus for the particulars respecting his infancy, and that there could have been but *one* story among them respecting these matters. Might not the same be said of all the other discrepant (discrepant but not contradictory) narrations which the Gospels every where contain? Did not the eye and ear witnesses, from whom these accounts were derived, tell for substance one story? Yet the particulars inserted or omitted by different Evangelists vary exceedingly from each other, some inserting what others omit, and some narrating at length what others briefly touch. E. g. compare the history of the temptation by Mark, and even by Matthew and Luke; and where is the history of the *transfiguration* to be found, except in Matthew? Where is the history of the healing at the pool of Bethesda, of the opening of the eyes of the man born blind, of the raising of Lazarus from the dead, in any Gospel except that of John? It is in vain to think of deciding, on such grounds as Mr. Norton assumes, what one Evangelist should insert, and what he should omit. Each followed his own judgment; why is his credit to be suspected on this account?

The usual conciliation of Matthew with Luke has been, the supposition that *after* the presentation of Jesus in the temple, at the end of forty days, the visit of the Magi took place; and after this, ensued the massacre at Bethelhem, the flight to Egypt, and the attempt to return to Bethlehem, which was hindered by the admonition of the angel, and followed by a return to Nazareth, so as to escape the power of Archelaus.

Mr. Norton pronounces all this to be "a very improbable solution." *Why*—he has not told us. If the Magi came, as they probably did from the regions of Babylon, or perhaps Persia, the time necessary to prepare for their journey must be several days. The journey itself must have taken up many more. From sixteen to twenty miles a day is, for the most part, the usual day's journey of oriental travellers. The route to Palestine was very circuitous, extending up the Euphrates far north, and then southward through the eastern part of Palestine. He cannot well suppose the Magi to have been at Jerusalem much

within the forty days of the purification. We may well believe that they came soon after this event. And then followed the events as related in Matthew, and already recapitulated above.

‘But Luke,’ says Mr. Norton, ‘declares that the parents of Jesus went to Nazareth after the presentation in the temple; he says nothing of the Magi, nor of Herod, or the massacre, or the flight to Egypt.’ True it is, I answer, that Luke says, *they returned to Nazareth*. But how soon they returned, or what happened before their return, he does not tell us; Matthew does, nor is his narrative at all inconsistent with that of Luke.

Let us look deliberately at the nature of this case. At Bethlehem Joseph and Mary had certainly resided, before the presentation of Jesus in the temple, some six weeks. That, moreover, was the *ἰδία πόλις* of Joseph and Mary, for to such place, according to the decree of Caesar (Luke 2: 3), each individual was to repair, in order that the census should be completed. Here then this couple resided at least for six weeks; and here, it is very natural to conclude of course, they had relatives, and perhaps possessions. Now Jerusalem is only some six miles from Bethlehem, and of course we cannot suppose it to be probable, that Joseph and Mary did not return thither, for a time at least, after the presentation in the temple. It is not by any means certain, that they had any design at that time of returning to Nazareth. They were at least in their *own town* at Bethlehem. While they were here, preparing (if any one pleases) to return to Nazareth, the Magi came, and the events which followed took place. Leaving Bethlehem in such haste as they did after the warning in respect to the intentions of Herod, it is very natural to suppose, that they had business to transact there and concerns to settle, if not property to dispose of or regulate, after the death of Herod. Why wonder then that they should set out to return to *Bethlehem*, after that death took place? What improbability, in any way, of such an event? Nay, I may well ask: Is not probability altogether on the side of such a supposition?

From executing their design they were prevented by divine warning. In consequence of this, they went to Nazareth.

Both Evangelists agree, then, that Jesus spent his early childhood at Nazareth; neither tells us exactly how soon after his birth he was carried there. One of them relates circumstances, however, which shew that some months must have intervened, before this took place. Why are we to discredit his account?

Why—any more than we should discredit Luke's account of the temptation, when compared with that of Mark and of Matthew?

Mr. Norton (p. lvii.) seems to represent Matthew, or rather the writer of the two first chapters of Matthew, as mistaking Bethlehem for the home of Joseph and Mary, because he represents them as wishing to go thither, on their return from Egypt. But may we not well ask: If Joseph and Mary went to Bethlehem as their *ἰδία πόλις*, in order to be enrolled, as they surely did according to the account of Luke; if they, or either of them, had once dwelt there, and there was their original and proper home; if, as is certain again from Luke, they staid there for forty days or more after the birth of Jesus; and if we may admit the account of their sudden flight *by night*, as Matthew avers; or even if we leave out this last circumstance; is there any thing strange, or that wears the appearance of mistake, in representing them, on their return from Egypt, as desirous to revisit Bethlehem? And especially as this was not much out of their way in returning to Nazareth, in case they designed ultimately to go thither? I cannot find the internal evidence of improbability here, which Mr. Norton seems to find, and on which he has built much of his conclusion.

Again; Mr. Norton intimates (p. lix.), that the Gospel of the Infancy in Matthew wears a fabulous costume, like the apocryphal Gospels of this kind which were current in ancient times, and some of which have come down to us. "In the story of the Magi," says he, "we find represented a strange mixture of astrology and miracles. A divine interposition is pretended, which was addressed to the false opinions of certain Magi, respecting the significance of the stars; and for which no purpose worthy of the Deity can be assigned." He represents the star as having, according to the account in Matthew, 'guided them to Jerusalem. Then, distrusting its guidance, they there inquired, where the new born king of the Jews was to be found.' Such an inquiry, Mr. Norton thinks, would have been unintelligible to the Jews there, who had not, like themselves, been divinely admonished of a Saviour's birth. Herod also, he avers, is made to act a very improbable part in this drama. How could such a contemner of Judaism believe any thing respecting their promised Messiah? Or, even if he did, how improbable must the story be of an indiscriminate massacre of

the children at Bethlehem, when Herod could have easily identified the individual child whose life he sought to take away!

How easy it is to multiply questions and difficulties of this kind, respecting any unusual occurrence in past times, every one must know who has made the experiment, or who has read many of the neological commentaries and essays of the last fifty years. Yet we need something more than merely conjectural difficulties, in order to throw aside facts which are soberly narrated. Let us see, however, whether, after all, the improbabilities of the narration in Matthew are so great, that we must feel constrained to reject the account before us because of them.

The *Magi* were a Persian and Babylonian order of men, whose business seems to have been the study of religion, and of astrology as connected with it in relation to the science of divination. They were in some respects, to the Orientals, what the Scribes and Pharisees were to the Jews, viz. the *ἱερογραμματεῖς* of their country. In the book of Daniel we find them consulted by the Babylonish kings. We find Daniel, moreover, after his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, advanced to the place of president or head of this order of men.

There is then in itself no improbability, that men among the Jews of the *East* (*ἀνατολή*) who were like to the *γραμματεῖς* in Palestine, were called, after the usual fashion of the eastern country, *Magi*. Daniel had belonged to this so-called order of men; other Jews might belong to it without reproach.

Magi there were in the East, then; and Magi may have been, and probably were, among the Jews who lived there. Had not the Jews of the East copies of the Jewish Scriptures in their hands? Undoubtedly they had. Did they not, at the time when the Saviour was born, long for and ardently expect the coming of the Messiah? What says Suetonius of that period? In his *Vespas. c. IV.* he says: *Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judaeâ profecti rerum potirentur.* To the same purpose Tacitus, *Hist. V. 13*: *Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judaeâ rerum potirentur.* Deep, then, must this persuasion have rooted itself in the minds of the Jews, and wide must it have been spread, in order to give birth to such language as this by heathen historians. Josephus himself, a Pharisee and

of the priestly order, uses almost the same expressions: *Ἦν χρησιμὸς ἀμφίβολουσ ὁμοίωσ ἐν τοῖσ ἱεροῖσ γραμμασιν, ὡσ, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον, ἀπὸ τῆσ χώρασ τῖσ αὐτῶν ἄρξει τῆσ οἰκουμένησ* Bell. Jud. VI. 5. 4. i. e. there was a prediction moreover, in their sacred books, which was susceptible of various writings, that about that time, some one of their own number and country should have the dominion of the world.'

Jewish Magi of the East, then, (*percrebuerat toto Oriente*), cherished the expectation that *the King of Israel* was to make his appearance about that time. To the Jews of the East, moreover, as well as of the West, his birth was signified by the star of which Matthew speaks. That there was something supernatural in the admonition to the Magi, I readily admit and most fully believe. Why is not this as probable as the angelic song on the plains of Bethlehem, and the song or prophecy of Zacharias, of Simeon, and of Anna, as related by Luke? all of which Mr. Norton on his own grounds is constrained to admit.

Let us now turn our attention to some other circumstances alleged by Mr. Norton. 'The Star,' he says, 'led them to Jerusalem; and there, distrusting its guidance, the Magi made inquiry where the new-born King of the Jews was. Afterwards it reappeared and guided them to the very house in Bethlehem, where Jesus and his mother were.'

Yet this is an account of the matter somewhat different from that which I believe to be exhibited in Matt. II. I understand the Magi as saying, in Matt. 2: 2, "We have seen his star, when we were in the East, and we have come to do him homage." That a meteor of an extraordinary nature did appear to them in their own country; that the place of this meteor was *west* from where they then were, and of course in the direction of Judaea; that an impression was divinely made on their minds of the significancy of this extraordinary luminous body, (which the writer, as any Greek would do, calls *ἀστήρ*), that in consequence of this, and in connection with the general and ardent expectations of a Jewish king as mentioned above, they set out upon their journey to pay an early and joyful homage to this new king; is what Matthew relates, and what no one is able to gainsay by shewing either the impossibility or the improbability of it. That *ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ* means, as I have rendered it, *while we were in the East*, is plain enough from the fact, that if the star had been eastward of them, they would

have travelled of course in that direction, and not have gone to Jerusalem.

But does Matthew say, as Mr. Norton represents him as saying, that 'the star led them to Jerusalem,' that is, accompanied them on their way thither? Not at all. The guidance afforded them was purely its first appearance, the direction in which it appeared, and the strong expectation that *the King of the Jews* was about to be born. When persuaded that his birth had taken place, where should they go to make inquiry respecting him but to the capital of Judea? The star they did not see on their way. At least, so Matt. 2: 9 would seem very plainly to intimate. It was not until they had commenced their journey from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, that the meteor again appeared. "When they saw it they rejoiced greatly;" as it was very natural they should do. "It came and stood over the house where the young child was;" which shews that now, at least, its course was low down in the atmosphere, so low that it could designate any particular locality by standing over it. Is any part of all this more miraculous, more incredible, than the account of Luke as to events during the infancy of the Saviour? No one can establish the allegation that it is.

But Herod, we are told, 'is made to act a very improbable and foolish part.' *Improbable*, however, I do not deem it. Could it be possible that Herod was ignorant of the universal expectation, among the Jews, of the appearance of their King Messiah, who, as they confidently believed, would enable them to throw off both his and the Roman yoke, and make them masters of the world? If this be possible, it is utterly improbable. Did not Herod know that the Jews most heartily hated him, and were longing to be delivered from his tyranny? He doubtless did. His precautions, his jealousies, his suspicions always on the alert, his military guards, his repeated and horrible cruelties toward even his own family and some of his best friends, because of his jealousy and suspicion—all these serve to shew what might be expected from Herod, the moment he heard of a new-born King, to whom the whole Jewish nation would joyfully and eagerly pay their homage. Herod deride such a matter as this, and treat it with scornful neglect! Why one might as well expect Nero or Caligula to put up with a personal insult, and meekly to remonstrate with him who should smite them in their faces. Nothing could be more in unison with Herod's character and whole temperament, than the order for the massacre at Bethlehem.

‘But Herod is represented as guilty of the consummate folly of an indiscriminate massacre, when nothing could have been easier than to identify the individual child whose life he sought.’

Herod then, a more passionate, cruel, and despicable tyrant, if possible, than Nero himself, is expected, it would seem, to make minute inquiry which of all the babes at Bethlehem was the one that he should wish to destroy. Where is he to get the information? According to Matt. 2: 5 seq. Herod did assemble the chief priests and scribes of the people, and demand of them where *ὁ Χριστός*, i. e. the Messiah whom they expected, was to be born. They said: At Bethlehem. This was enough for Herod; and this they argued from prophecy, as their appeal to it shews, and not from any information which they had respecting what was revealed to the Magi. It matters not as to Herod, whether we suppose that he believed in prophecy or not; it was enough that the Jews believed in it. It is enough for our purpose that he knew, that if either a real or supposed Messiah was born, the Jews would rally around him at once, and overthrow their present oppressor. Herod moreover meant to be secure against any mistake or failure on this occasion; and so he ordered an indiscriminate massacre.

If Mr. Norton should say: ‘Jesus had been presented in the temple, and there public acknowledgement was made of him, so that Herod might have traced him out individually;’ my answer would be, What probability that Herod knew any thing of all this? Herod was at Jerusalem but a small portion of his time. His concerns led him elsewhere; and Cesarea was the place where he enjoyed most popularity and had the most adherents. Even if he had been at Jerusalem, during the time of the presentation, he would have been one of the last men to whom pious persons would have been likely to communicate the knowledge of a new-born King. There is no probable way in which we may suppose him to have known, or believed that he could obtain an individual knowledge of the exact place where Jesus was. Of course the indiscriminate massacre in question was the ready and obvious dictate of his jealous and cruel spirit. Subsequent to such a massacre, there could be no pretence among the Jews, that the new-born king, after all, had escaped the hands of the assassins, and some other babe been murdered in its place. An indiscriminate massacre, then, would plainly be viewed by Herod, as essential to the extinguishment of the rising Jewish hope in respect to their long-wished for king.

And is it not plain too, that, because of such a massacre, all the then present and rising hopes of the Jews, even of the pious, (who knew not of the flight of Joseph and Mary), were actually extinguished? On what other ground can we account for the deep and long silence of all Judea, during nearly thirty years, in relation to the new-born king, whose birth had been ushered in by so many prodigies, even if Luke's account of the matter, and no more, is to be admitted? It has often been matter of wonder among the pious, and of scoffing among the impious, that after all the miraculous annunciations of the Saviour, and the prodigies attending his birth, there should for thirty years be such a profound and mysterious silence in Judea with respect to him. Where were the Simeons and the Annas—the shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem and those to whom the glad tidings had been published by them and others? Why was not the glorious Redeemer, in his humble and quiet occupation at Nazareth, sought out, and brought forward to the notice of the admiring world?

My answer would be, that the massacre at Bethlehem extinguished all the rising hopes of the pious Jews in that quarter, and dissipated the fears of the ungodly. Providence so ordered it, that Jesus should be withdrawn in the dead of night to Egypt, and none should know of his escape. His return was to a distant, obscure, and despised town of Galilee, where no Jew would expect to find him, and therefore none would go to seek him. There his parents and he waited in quiet and in silence, until the proper time for the commencement of his ministry arrived. Had they noised abroad his origin and his pretensions, during his early life, danger would have followed, civil and religious commotions been excited, the jealousy of tetrarchs stirred up, and unnumbered evils have been the natural and immediate consequence. As things were ordered, all this was prevented. And that this prevention was the result of some such occurrence as the massacre at Bethlehem, which extinguished all present hopes about the new-born king, seems to my mind so probable, that I can in no way account for it in a manner that is satisfactory, how things went on as they actually did, without a supposition of some such event as Matthew has related.

I cast myself now on the candour of my readers, and ask them, whether there is any such incongruities and improbabilities in Matthew's Gospel of the Infancy, as Mr. Norton urges

upon us? On the other hand, does not the story of Matthew seem to be quite essential to the satisfying of our minds, how the youth and early manhood of Jesus could have been spent in the silence and quietude in which it evidently was? The Bethlehem massacre had quieted the fears of the enemies to the claims of Jesus; it appears also to have extinguished the rising hopes of friends. Subsequent to this, Joseph and Mary, admonished of danger, and aware of the importance of shunning jealousy on the one part and popular expectation on the other, lived in an obscure and despised place, from which, as Nathaniel intimates (John 1: 46), no good thing was expected to come. There they peaceably acquired the means of subsistence by bodily labour; and there Jesus pursued the same occupation as his foster-father, and was quietly and peacefully subject to his authority. There he did not develop himself as differing from others apparently his equals in age and condition, until the fulness of time had come. In this way, envy, jealousy, malignity, and (what was no less dangerous to the youthful Saviour) popularity and applause, were neither excited nor occasioned. Premature development would have called forth premature persecution and early death. As matters were arranged by an all-wise and over-ruling Providence, every thing went quietly on "until the fulness of time had come."

One might dwell here with great satisfaction, on the lovely character which the Saviour exhibited, during so long a period, and in such a humble condition. Conscious of a heavenly origin and of a dignity above that which belongs to any creature named in heaven or on earth; knowing that he possessed power to fill Palestine with admiration of his deeds and astonishment at his wonderful attributes; conscious also of a power which could easily summon countless hosts of angels to his aid, in case he should fall into danger through the malice of his enemies; yet he forbore any development of himself, kept on in his humble, patient, daily toil for his sustenance, and all this for years after he had come to a vigorous maturity. This is indeed a part of his character which has seldom been considered, and of which little has been said. To my mind, however, it is not less wonderful, and scarcely less attractive, than the god-like benevolence which he displayed in the garden of Gethsemane and on the cross.

I find myself insensibly drawn to moralizing on this shining and lovely trait in the character of Jesus. Let us return to our critical investigations.

I must make a remark on one thing more which Mr. Norton has said, in connection with the history of the visit to Bethlehem by the Magi. This is, that a divine interposition in respect to giving them an intimation of the birth of a Saviour is "pretended," and that "no purpose worthy of the Deity can be assigned for it;" p. lix.

If such a visit did take place on this occasion, a divine interposition seems to be something more than *pretence*. We find it, indeed, actually indispensable; or, in other words, we cannot well account for it, considering the time and manner in which it happened, in any other way.

Mr. Norton seems to think, that the affair of the star was merely a business of *astrology*, and that it is incongruous to suppose an interposition on the part of heaven in aid of such a science. My view of the case is very different. I am not compelled to believe that these Magi were really *astrologers*, in case they were Jews, any more than I am obliged to believe that Daniel was an astrologer because he was a Magus. I must and do believe, that on the appearance of the star, a divine admonition was given to the minds of the Magi respecting the design of it; just as one was given to Abraham, to leave his country and kindred and go to Palestine and sojourn there. The whole account leads to this impression; and I know of no more reason to reject divine interposition here, than in the cases of it mentioned by Luke, in his Gospel of the Infancy.

And is there "no purpose worthy of the Deity" in all this? Is it nothing, that this homage was paid to the new-born King, by distinguished persons from a distant land? Nothing—that the Jews of the eastern region should be advertised in this way of the birth of a Saviour, as well as those of Palestine? Nothing—that his high prerogatives and exalted state should thus be taught, as well as by the choir of angels on the plains of Bethlehem, or by the devout exclamations of Simeon and Anna? And even if we could not perceive at once, as doubtless we cannot, all the purposes to be answered by such an event, can we not find as much in it that is explicable, as we can in the miracle of the water which was turned into wine, or of the withering of the fig tree which was cursed; or of the destruction of the swine on the borders of the lake? Mr. Norton admits the truth of these miracles; does he see a purpose of God in them more explicable and more worthy of the Deity, than in the visit of the Magi? If he does, I can only say that it seems more easy to me, to explain the latter than the former.

I have said enough, as I would hope, to remove some of the difficulties which Mr. Norton has thrown in our way, in regard to this part of Matt. I. II. I come, therefore, to another portion of his remarks.

The beginning of Matt. III. *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις*, he apprehends, may be thought to throw some objections in the way of commencing the Gospel of Matthew here. In order to remove this difficulty, however, he supposes, first, that the translator of Matthew into Greek, or the compiler who added the two first chapters to his Gospel, inserted these words as "a form of transition" from the one narration to the other. The original Gospel, he thinks, began thus: *John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness of Judea*; for this, he says, is the manner in which the Gospel of Mark begins.

If the reader, however, will take the pains to open his New Testament at the beginning of Mark, he will find there a natural introduction to a Gospel, *the design of which was only to give an account of the public ministry of Jesus*; and a very different one it is, from that which Mr. Norton would here lead us to suppose. Indeed, the beginning of a Gospel by the words which he suggests, would be so abrupt, so unintelligible to a reader who was a stranger to the course of events in Palestine, that the bare recital of it is a sufficient refutation of it.

Mr. Norton himself seems to feel this; for he immediately suggests another beginning: *In the days of Herod*, meaning the tetrarch of Galilee. So the Gospel of the Ebionites began; only it ran on in such a way as to create no small difficulty in the sequel. "In the days of Herod, King of Judea," was its commencing clause. Unfortunately for this clause, however, this same Herod (the King) had been dead some twenty-eight years, when John the Baptist made his appearance in public, as immediately stated in the sequel. Mr. Norton thinks that Epiphanius, who tells the story of this notable commencement of the Gospel of the Ebionites, "by a blunder of his own added the words *King of Judea*." This is an easy way, to be sure, to dispose of at least a part of the difficulty. But who does not see, that it is merely cutting the knot, not untying it? If we are at liberty to reason thus, and conjecture whatever facts we please, (how can I call this *reasoning*?) then, *deducere aliquid ex aliquo* is fully within the power of every controvertist.

After all, the beginning of Matthew's Gospel, according to Mr. Norton, would be a wonderful beginning—entirely *unique*.

*In the days of Herod?* What Herod?—exclaims the reader at once. Herod the *tetrarch*, says Mr. Norton. But how is the reader of this Gospel, fifty or more years after all the Herods were dead, to know that the *tetrarch* was meant? There is no context, no previous matter to give him a hint of this. There is no like thing, moreover, in all the Scriptural records. When the *days* of a person are mentioned as a point in chronology, the person meant must necessarily be designated; above all, where many persons about the same time had the same name, must this be done; as it is always both in the Old Testament and in the New. But if we are to credit Mr. Norton, nothing of this kind was done by Matthew. *Quodcunque mihi narras sic—*

‘But we have a more serious difficulty still,’ according to Mr. Norton. ‘If we allow chap. I. II. to be genuine, the last events mentioned are Archelaus’s reign and Joseph’s residence at Nazareth. . . . It was not *in those days*, but thirty years afterwards, that John the Baptist was preaching in the wilderness of Judea.’

Indeed! Archelaus’s reign is to be sure mentioned in Matt. 2: 22, and as a reason why Joseph repaired to Nazareth, rather than to Bethlehem. But the chapter *ends* with an account of Joseph’s fixing the abode of himself and family at Nazareth, and the third chapter begins with the clause, *in those days*, i. e. plainly and simply, during the period of the abode of his family at Nazareth. This comports with simple fact. It was really and truly what happened, viz., that John entered on his public ministry while they abode at Nazareth. What “serious difficulty” there can be in all this, I am not able to see. I am sure Mr. Norton has not succeeded in presenting any. It is not to Archelaus’s reign, but to Joseph’s sojourn at Nazareth, to which *those days* refers.

Mr. Norton says, at the close, that ‘he thinks these reasons ought to satisfy us that the two chapters in question did not proceed from the apostle Matthew.’ He then turns to the examination of the two first chapters of Luke; and “although,” he suggests, “the style is rather poetical than historical;” although, “with its real miracles, the fictions of oral tradition had probably become blended;” although, “with our present means of judging we cannot draw a precise line between the truth and what has been added to the truth;” yet we may on the whole, as he concludes, regard the account of this Evangelist as being substantially correct.

What kind of *faith* we can have in a Gospel which we regard in such a light, is for Mr. Norton to tell us. With such a faith I am sure we could say nothing more appropriate than "Lord, help our unbelief!"

But—to our immediate purpose. I may now be permitted to ask, at the close of this examination, by what kind of evidence or process Mr. Norton has laboured to establish his cause? What, I ask, is the question before us? A question simply of *lower criticism*; one which respects the mere fact, *whether there is evidence that Matthew I. II. is genuine*. And how are such questions to be decided? By *a priori* reasoning; by objections of a theological cast; by our mere estimate of the probability or improbability of events related? Surely not. Whether the story in Matthew I. II. is probable or improbable, strange or a thing of common occurrence; whether it teaches Unitarian or Trinitarian theology; has nothing at all to do with the question of criticism, which is simply and only, *whether critical witnesses speak for or against it*.

And what is the result of our inquiries with regard to this last point? The result is so clear, that not a doubt of a *critical* nature can be sustained. All the known Mss. and Versions on the face of the earth speak but one language. All the Christian writers of the primitive ages speak but one language. We can trace the contents of these chapters in Justin Martyr, in Celsus, in the Syriac Peshito; we find Cerinthus using the matter of them about A. D. 80, before the apostolic age had passed away. No part of the church, except a small insignificant sect of the Ebionites, has ever ventured to doubt their genuineness, or to tamper with them. We have now as it were word for word and letter for letter, in the Syriac Version (made in the second century as we have good reason to believe), the very text which lies in the canonical Greek Matthew before us. A *critical* doubt on this subject, can scarcely be less than a critical heresy.

Yet Mr. Norton, passing by all this, suggests *internal difficulties*. We have also examined them. We have seen that a very different estimate from his may be made out from all the facts as they lie before us. And if it could not, his proof is not legitimate. We cannot betake ourselves to theologizing, on a mere subject of lower criticism. The deductions which might be made out in our own way of reasoning, cannot be shewn to have been made out by the mind of Matthew. Even if chap. I. II. of his Gospel have given us erroneous statements, (which

however I do not believe), yet in the present state of criticism we are obliged to attribute these chapters to Matthew. The question now before us is not whether he has truly said or written this or that, or erroneously, but *whether he actually said or wrote it*. That question is settled, until some evidence yet unknown, at any rate yet unproduced, shall be developed, which will give a new aspect to the whole matter.

At the close of this somewhat protracted investigation, I cannot refrain from adding a few considerations, which are quite different from and opposite to the general nature of those suggested by Mr. Norton, and examined in the preceding pages. If they do not go to prove the genuineness of Matthew I. II., they may afford some aid in removing suspicion that these chapters are an interpolation.

It has often been remarked, and truly, that no one of the Evangelists refers so frequently to the Old Testament, or quotes from it so often, as Matthew. I say this has been *truly* observed; for Matthew plainly quotes at least thirty-five times from the ancient Scriptures, while Mark quotes eighteen, Luke twenty, and John fourteen times. I reckon here only the plain and obvious cases of quotation. The *references* in all the Gospels to sentiments contained in the Old Testament, would add to the list of appeals to the ancient Scriptures; but these are proportionally as frequent in Matthew as in the other Evangelists.

This characteristic in Matthew has been accounted for by many on the ground that he wrote more immediately for the benefit of the Jews, to whom frequent appeals to the Old Testament would be peculiarly gratifying. Matthew, it has been thought, labours in a peculiar manner to prove the Messiahship of Jesus from the predictions of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Whether these views be well grounded or not, it is still true that a prominent characteristic in his style is such as has now been stated. How then does the style or manner of chapters I. II. compare with this? Just as we should expect it would in case these chapters were from the hand of Matthew. No less than five appeals are here made to the Old Testament, viz. in 1: 23. 2: 6. 2: 15. 2: 18. 2: 23. Was it a matter of mere accident, or even a matter of design, that the supposed interpolation, or rather the writer of a narrative which another and subsequent redactor interpolated, thus imitated the manner of Matthew? I verily believe it was neither. There is no *imitation* here, but the hand of an original writer.

Again; Matthew is the only one of all the evangelists who has taken any notice of *dreams*, as means of divine admonition. In 27: 19 he tells us of a dream by the wife of Pilate, warning her that Jesus, accused before the tribunal of her husband, was innocent. In Matt. 1: 20. 2: 12, 22, we have the like occurrences.

Of all the Evangelists or writers of the New Testament, Matthew is the only one who uses the word *ὄραο*, *dream*. This is employed in 27: 19, and in all the passages just referred to in chapters I. II. Is this a mere accidental thing, belonging to the *translator* of Matthew, as Mr. Norton would have us believe; or does it look like a mode of expression familiar to the original author of the whole book?

It would be easy to produce a number of idioms or phrases employed in chapters I. II. and afterwards in the other part of Matthew's Gospel, but found no where else in the New Testament. But I forbear, lest I should tire the patience of my readers. They may be found in Gersdorf's *Beiträge*; who has expended incredible labour on the examination of chapters I. II. Mr. Norton would probably say: 'These peculiarities belong to the *translator* of Matthew, and can as well be accounted for in this way as in any other?' Yet some of them are of such a nature, that I should doubt whether this could be made credible. They seem to characterize *original composition* rather than *translation*.

Thus have I gone through with the details of this subject; and I now submit the whole to the reader, and to Mr. Norton himself, and ask the question, whether any reader of Matt. I. II. and of the rest of his Gospel, would have ever thought that the whole book is a *translation* from another language, or that different parts of it were composed by different writers, unless some doubts about the facts in chapters I. II. had set him to making an effort to get rid of this part of the book? After reading again and again, in order to see whether I could detect any sensible difference in style, language, mode of thinking, order and manner of narrating, or even in the use of the small particles of transition, etc., I must confess unhesitatingly that I have been able to discover no such difference. Nor can I think Mr. Norton himself, who appears to understand the laws of lower criticism so well, would ever have doubted, if some *a priori* views of what Matthew ought, or ought not, to comprise in his Gospel, had not led him to doubt.

I cannot resist the persuasion, that if there be a clear case in respect to the genuineness of any passage of the New Testament which has ever been controverted, the one before us is such a case. Most fully do I assent to the words of Griesbach, at the close of his critical examination of this subject (Comm. Crit. II. 55), who says: "*Cum igitur parum roboris insit argumentis omnibus adversus duorum istorum capitum authenticam prolatis, genuina ea esse censemus; ipsaque inde ab initio, cum primum in publicam lucem emitteretur Matthaei Evangelium, huic adhaesisse, ac in autographo seu archetypo jam extitisse, nulli dubitamus.*"

---

## ARTICLE V.

### THE SCRIPTURAL IDEA OF ANGELS.

By Lewis Mayer, D. D. late Prof. in the Theol. Sem. of the Germ. Ref. Church, York, Pa.

THE existence of a world of spirit is as much a subject of observation and experience as the existence of a world of matter. The human soul is a spirit manifesting itself in the affections and operations of mind; there is a spirit in the brute which is the seat of sensation, of memory, of pleasure and of pain; the reproduction of animals, the vegetation of plants, the crystalization of minerals, and chemical agencies, are not the effects of inert matter, but must be referred ultimately to a cause which acts spontaneously and rationally. Ancient philosophy conceived that cause to be a soul of the world, and considered the world an animated, sentient, and rational being. The Bible makes it God, and the spirit of God, which pervades all things.

All spirit is not of the same order. There is an infinite difference, both of nature and of attributes, between the uncreated infinite Spirit, and all created finite spirit. There may also be an order of spirits among the creatures, perhaps embracing many genera and species, superior to man, and existing in a state of being which is not subject to the observation of our senses; nor, perhaps, even to be apprehended by the human mind, in its present connection with matter.

That intelligent creatures, superior to man, and still at an