

THE PROOFS
OF
CHRIST'S RESURRECTION;

FROM A LAWYER'S STANDPOINT.

BY
CHARLES ROBERT MORRISON.



ANDOVER:
WARREN F. DRAPER.
1885.

LIBRARY - HARVARD UNIVERSITY

MASS 3

P R E F A C E.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1882,
By WARREN F. DRAPER,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

All Rights Reserved.

THE present treatise is intended to give what the author has often felt the need of—a compact and thoroughly reliable statement of the principal historical facts to the authenticity and integrity of the New Testament writings concerning our Lord, and the presumptions from them which establish his claims as our Divine Redeemer and Saviour.

The question of his Resurrection from the dead is selected as the pivot, because everything hinges upon it. This question, whichever way it is determined, is decisive. It is a question which greatly concerns every one. It is a question of evidence, and as such is especially deserving of careful inquiry by members of the legal profession. For, as Prof. Greenleaf observed in his work hereafter cited,—“If a close examination of the evidences of Christianity may be expected of one class of men more than another, it would seem incumbent on us, who make the law of evidence one of our peculiar studies.”

As the question of Christ's Resurrection is the objective point of our inquiries, all other questions are subordinated to it, and examined so far only as deemed material to the main question.

The author has availed himself of a lawyer's privilege, and made use of the researches, arguments, and conclusions of others who may justly be regarded as authority, and to whom he has given credit as far as practicable, but has endeavored to form an independent judgment in view of all accessible sources of information.

The work is, in the main, as published in a series of articles in the *New Hampshire Journal*, and also in the *Vermont Chronicle*, from March 5, 1881, to April 1, 1882, which will explain the use of the common version in the earlier chapters and the New Revision in the later ones.

While the proofs have been marshalled around the principal fact, those to establish the subsidiary question of our Four Gospels and the Book of Acts have been largely centered upon the "Memoirs" mentioned in the confessedly genuine writings of Justin Martyr. Justin, in his First Apology, so called, written before the year one hundred and fifty of our era, and probably ten years earlier, has given a graphic account of the usages in the churches generally. In this account he says that, on the "day called Sunday," Memoirs of Christ were read with the Prophets, in all their assemblies. Hence, when it is ascertained that these Memoirs were our Canonical Gospels, we make a long stride toward the conclusion of their undoubted authenticity and genuineness.

To all questions of evidence which arise, the author applies legal principles and presumptions derived from experience and constantly acted upon in courts of justice. He asks of the reader a patient perusal to the end, for he confidently believes that the vital fact of Christ's Resurrection, with all the grand consequences which necessarily follow it, is as susceptible of proof, from undoubted historical facts and solid argument, as any other event in history.

The work is written for busy men in all the walks of life, and the writer has endeavored to make himself understood.

CHARLES R. MORRISON.

MANCHESTER, N. H., August, 1882.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE	7
II. ADMISSIONS AND PRESUMPTIONS	12
III. PAPIAS AND JUSTIN MARTYR	14
IV. THE MEMOIRS INTENDED BY JUSTIN MARTYR	18
V. QUOTATIONS AND CITATIONS	23
VI. JUSTIN'S USE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL	30
VII. NO OTHERS PROVED	34
VIII. PRESUMPTION OF PERMANENCY	43
IX. THE MEMOIRS OF THE YEAR ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY	45
X. ASCENDING THE STREAM	50
XI. STILL ASCENDING THE STREAM	57
XII. IN THEIR PROPER REPOSITORIES	63
XIII. INTEGRITY OF THE GOSPELS	67
XIV. THE CREDIBILITY OF THE EVANGELISTS	74
XV. THE APOCALYPSE AND THE FOUR EPISTLES	81
XVI. HIS PREDICTIONS CONCERNING HIMSELF	89

XVII. ORDER OF EVENTS	101
XVIII. SUFFICIENCY OF THE PROOFS (<i>False Assumptions.</i>)	110
XIX. SUFFICIENCY OF THE PROOFS (<i>Affirmative Evidence.</i>)	120
XX. LOGICAL RESULTS	134
INDEX	143

THE

PROOFS OF CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

CHAPTER I.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE.

IT is a characteristic of all who deny this and all other miracles, that they beg the whole question to begin with. They assume as an axiom that a miracle is impossible, or impossible to be proved by human testimony. Or, to put it more mildly, in the language of one of their number (Renan¹), "neither men of the people nor men of the world are competent to prove it. Great precaution and a long habit of scientific research are requisite." If these are sound axioms, it should be a matter of indifference who were the witnesses, or what their credibility or means of knowledge, since at the best they were but human, and it is not claimed that they were experts or *savans* after the modern skeptical school, although they might be expected to know whether one who walked with them, and to whose instructions they listened, and from whom they received their commission, were dead or alive.

It is also a comfortable assumption on their part that no one is a scholar who does not agree with their opinion, and many young men who would not be thought to be behind the times are misled by their confident boasting. "No modern theologian," says Strauss,² "who is also a scholar, now considers any of the four Gospels to be the work of its pretended

author, or in fact to be by an Apostle or colleague of an Apostle." The logic of this is, that if any one does so consider them, he is not a scholar. The same kind of scholarship and habit of thinking that induced this wise conclusion brought him at last to the denial of the existence of a personal God or a future life. His experience is instructive, and shows the inevitable tendency of all reasoning that denies the possibility of a miracle or a divine revelation. Mill's hard logic cannot well be resisted. "Once admit a God, and the production, by his direct volition, of an effect which in any case owed its origin to his creative will, is no more a purely arbitrary hypothesis to account for the past, but must be reckoned with as a serious possibility." If, then, a miracle may occur, it may be proved * by human testimony, for the very motive or reason for its occurrence, or, at least the principal reason, must be its value as an attestation.

And the immense labor which the Tübingen school and every class of skeptics have bestowed in attempts to disprove the authorship of the Four Gospels, shows that they have not much confidence in their axioms after all. Why so anxious as to the witnesses, if it is immaterial who they are, or what they testify to? If a miracle cannot be proved by *any* evidence, why have they multiplied books to prove or disprove the authorship of the gospels?

THE BEST EVIDENCE.

The best evidence of which the subject admits, is all that is required in courts; and it is sufficient in matters of the highest concern, even in cases of life and death, that a fact be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. The best evidence to Christ's disciples of his resurrection, was that of their own senses. This evidence we cannot have. We are in the position, in some respects, of jurors, who must decide not from their own knowledge, but upon the testimony of others. We have not, however, the witnesses upon the stand, but

* See also *post*, c. 18. p. 111.

only what may be regarded as their depositions, and it is made a question whether the writings produced are their depositions.

The question, then, in this stage is, who were the writers of the Four Gospels and the book of Acts? As to the latter, the writer claims to have written a former treatise, and it seems to be taken by both parties to the controversy, that the same person (whoever he was) wrote both books, so that any evidence of Luke's authorship of the third Gospel, is evidence of his authorship of Acts, and *vice versa*. And the same is true in respect to the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John.

The best evidence as to the authorship of any of these books which the nature of the subject admits of, is from history and tradition, including in these terms quotations, citations, harmonies, commentaries, translations, and manuscripts.

There are two modes of presenting this evidence. One is to begin with their present acknowledged acceptance, and ascend the stream; the other is to strike tributaries, as near their source as we are able, and descend to the river. The latter will be adopted here in the first instance, and ultimately both modes of proof.

LOST TRIBUTARIES.

One hundred years from the crucifixion, churches had been established in all the cities and in many of the villages of the Roman Empire, from Cappadocia and Pontus on the east, to Gaul on the west, and Christians were very numerous. Tacitus describes those at Rome at the time of Nero's barbarity, as "a great multitude," and Pliny, in his letter to Trajan, *cir.* A.D. 110, affirms that the heathen temples were almost deserted, so that the sacred victims scarcely found any purchasers, and that the "superstition," as he termed it, not only infected the cities, but had even spread into the villages, of Pontus and Bithynia (Gibbon, p. 576).

Hence persons unacquainted with the subject might suppose that it would be easy to adduce abundant proof from writers of the first century, as to what memoirs of our Lord, if any, were in the churches at the time Pliny wrote his celebrated letter. Such, however, is not the fact.

There is no *direct* historical testimony known to be earlier than the first apology³ of Justin Martyr to the Roman Emperor, *cir.* A.D. 139. There are certain fragments written by Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, which may be of an earlier date, but this is uncertain. There are also quotations apparently from the third and fourth Gospels, by Basilides,⁴ the Gnostic heretic who flourished at Alexandria as early as A.D. 125. There is an epistle to the Philippian church, attributed to Polycarp which Dean Stanley thinks dates about A.D. 130. Its genuineness is not universally admitted. There is an epistle, conceded to be genuine, from the church at Rome to the church at Corinth, of the probable date of A.D. 95. There are epistles attributed by some to Ignatius, who suffered martyrdom, *cir.* A.D. 107, but their genuineness is controverted. There are in addition three other writings known as the Epistle of Barnabas, the Letter to Diognetus, and the Pastor Hermas. They are by unknown authors, and of uncertain date, but were probably written in the latter part of the first or the first part of the second century.

And these are all that have come down to us in any form from the first one hundred years after the crucifixion. That we have no more is easily explained. This period was one of intense activity and violent persecutions. Five (as some reckon them) of the ten general persecutions were within⁵ this period or soon after. The first was under Nero, A.D. 64; the second under Domitian, A.D. 95; the third under Trajan, A.D. 103; the fourth under Adrian or Hadrian, A.D. 125; the fifth under the Antonines, 155; and as these persecutions continued several years, with local outbursts also between, there was scarcely an intermission. The horrible tortures and cruel

deaths under Nero are well-known, and, under Domitian, forty thousand were supposed to have suffered martyrdom.

It is no matter of surprise, therefore, that so little has reached us from this early period. Christians were making history, not writing it, and of their writings the most perished. There were hundreds and thousands who well knew what memoirs of our Lord were accepted by the churches in this period, from whose lips no voice comes except in the volume of universal tradition.

¹ Renan's *Life of Jesus*, p. 43.

² *The Old Faith and the New* (1874), p. 45.

³ A.D. 138 or 139 is the date most usually assigned to this most important work, although some place it as late as A.D. 150. If his statement in it that "Christ was born 150 years ago" were to be taken strictly, it would make its date A.D. 146 or A.D. 144, according as we allow four or six years as the error for the beginning of the true Christian era; but he may have used the number in a general way. His martyrdom is variously stated from A.D. 148-167. See also *post*, p. 61, note 1.

⁴ That the quotations were by Basilides himself Matthew Arnold's reasoning seems entirely satisfactory, and "no one" he says, "who had not a theory to serve would ever dream of doubting it." Perhaps it may be permitted to regard Matthew Arnold as a "scholar;" and see Abbot's "Fourth Gospel," Boston (1880), p. 86. See also *post*, c. 5. p. 27.

⁵ Buck's *Theological Dictionary*, and Vol. VII of *McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia*, p. 966. Before and at the close of the century (A.D. 197) there was another furious persecution under Severus.

CHAPTER II.

ADMISSIONS AND PRESUMPTIONS.

WITH the somewhat scanty and inconclusive evidence from writings of the first one hundred years from the crucifixion, are there any facts that are conceded, and any presumptions from them? There are concessions, and from what motives is immaterial, since there is no doubt of the existence of the facts that are admitted even by those who deny the authenticity of the Gospels. Says Renan¹: "Not the slightest doubt has been raised by serious criticism against the authenticity of the Epistle to the Galatians, the two Epistles to the Corinthians, or the Epistle to the Romans; while the arguments on which are founded the attacks on the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, and that to the Philippians, are without value." And it may be added that the genuineness of the Book of Revelations is conceded and insisted upon by most of his way of thinking.

Now, from the four Epistles against whose authenticity "not the slightest doubt has been raised by serious criticism," and the writings of Josephus, Tacitus and Pliny, these facts are as well established as any facts of history can possibly be established:—Jesus Christ was born in Judea in the days of Herod, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate. He was a most extraordinary character, and a wonderful teacher. He gathered disciples, of whom twelve were called Apostles. After his death, his followers were formed into numerous churches, which, in a few years, extended into all parts of the then known world, and of which there has been a continuous succession till now. If, from their disciples, we know something of the life and teachings of Confucius and Socrates, we should expect as much concerning him whose advent revolutionized the world, within three centuries overturned the old

pagan superstitions throughout the Roman Empire, and is still the greatest moral power of the most enlightened nations of the earth. But, if there were any accepted memoirs of him in that first hundred years from his crucifixion, what has become of them? It is incredible that they should have dropped out of existence and there be no history or tradition of it. It is incredible that they should have been lost to churches having a continuous life, or that others should have been substituted for them, and there be no trace of their disappearance or of a substitution. In the churches in every period, the old and the young were together. How, then, were displacement and substitution possible without protest? How was the loss of accepted memoirs possible, so long as there was a continued succession of teachers? Yet none have reached our time other than those which have come to us through all the centuries as authentic writings of those whose names they bear.

By the law of the "survival of the fittest," all other productions making any pretensions to such a character perished long ago, only fragments of them remain, and our four Gospels are in the churches. There is, therefore, to begin with, the strongest presumption in their favor. "It is," says Professor Greenleaf,² "for the objector to show them spurious; for on him, by the plainest rules of law, lies the burden of proof." And from what has appeared it is plain that this "burden" is a very heavy one.³

¹ Renan's *Life of Jesus*, p. 35.

² *The Testimony of the Four Evangelists* (p. 28, section 10), by Simon Greenleaf, LL.D., 1846. His standard work on evidence is in every lawyer's library.

³ See also *post*, c. 8, p. 43.

CHAPTER III.

PAPIAS AND JUSTIN MARTYR.

THE fact of the early reception, by the churches, of Memoirs of Christ deemed authentic, probable in itself without any proof, is very conclusively shown by writings to which reference has been made, particularly those of Papias and Justin Martyr.

Papias was bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, in the first part of the second century of the Christian era. Though of moderate capacity, and entertaining extravagant ideas of the millennium, he was entirely honest, and there is no reason to question his testimony as to what he was told in respect to Matthew and Mark. He suffered martyrdom about A.D. 163. From fragments of his writings found in Eusebius and in the works of Irenæus, it appears that "John the Presbyter" gave him information in respect to the First and Second Gospels.

There is a difference of opinion as to whether this John was John the Apostle. Eusebius held that he was not, and says that in his day (264-340) there were two tombs at Ephesus, both of which were called John's. The question of identity is not very material. Papias gives, in explanation, that he imagined that "what was to be got from books" concerning the Lord, was not as profitable to him "as what came from the living and abiding voice." For this reason, he says, "If, then, any one who had attended on the elders came, I asked minutely after their sayings, what Andrew or Peter said, or what was said by Philip, or by Thomas, or by James, or by John, or by Matthew, or by any other of the Lord's disciples,¹ which things Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say."

From this, it is plain there were then accredited "books"

concerning our Lord. And two of these books are identified by his statement of what he was told by John the Presbyter, that "Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately whatever he remembered of Peter's instructions," whom he accompanied (it was not, however, in exact order that he related the sayings or deeds of Christ), "and Matthew put together the oracles in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as best he could." These extracts prove that the First and Second Gospels were extant, not only when Papias wrote, and when the Presbyter gave him the information, but also some time before. His informant, if *not* John the Apostle, must have been one who had seen the Apostles or some of them, so that the testimony is very direct.

That Papias does not mention Luke's Gospel, or John's Gospel, proves nothing except that he had no occasion to say anything about them, in that connection. The Fourth Gospel may not have been *written* at the time of the interview with the Presbyter, for the Apostle John lived until about the year 100, and he wrote his Gospel very late in life. It is not quoted by Clement.

And as to the Third Gospel, the occasion for the writing of it is distinctly stated by the author himself, who was well known. And so of the Fourth Gospel; its authorship modestly but clearly appears upon its face. We have mere fragments from Papias not exceeding two or three hundred lines all told. In some of his five books (almost the whole of which have been lost) there may have been references to both Luke and John. Eusebius² states that Papias made use of testimonials from the First Epistle of John; but as he does not say that Papias ascribed that Epistle to John, his use of it only proves that it was extant when he wrote. There is, however, a quotation in one of these fragments (v), "In my Father's house are many mansions," which is literally as in John xiv. 2, and so, presumptively, was taken from it. It is an interesting fact that the only *quotations* other than this,

by Papias (if those in this fragment are indeed by him), are as in verses 25 to 28 of the 15th of First Corinthians, a chapter which will be found to have great weight in another part of this discussion.

Papias, therefore, probably³ quotes the Fourth Gospel. But, without such quotation, no inference could be drawn against Luke or John from mere silence. Papias would still prove the First and Second Gospels, leaving the Third and Fourth to stand upon the presumption in their favor stated in our last chapter, and upon positive evidence from other sources.

¹ The quotations from Papias are from Vol. I, of the Ante-Nicene Christian Library, translated by Rev. Alexander Roberts, D.D., and James Donaldson, LL.D.; and so in respect to any of the Apostolic Fathers. The editors say the words, "Which things, *etc.*," are usually translated, "What Aristion and John say," and that such translation is admissible, but that they more naturally mean that John and Aristion, even at the time of Justin's writing, were telling him of the sayings of the Lord.

² Eusebius B. III., c. 39.

³ The editors call it "mere guess-work" (Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. I., p. 444, note). Eusebius makes no mention of it, though his silence is not conclusive against it.

The question is of sufficient importance to warrant the giving of the entire passage from Irenaeus in which the quotations appear. It is the last of five short chapters of his work on Heresies. Certain passages are printed in italics, which the reader is specially asked to consider: "As the *presbyters* say, then those who were deemed worthy of an abode in heaven shall go there, others shall enjoy the delights of Paradise, and others shall possess the splendor of the city, for everywhere the Saviour will be seen, according as they shall be worthy who see Him. But there is this distinction between the habitation of those who produce an hundred-fold, and those who produce sixty-fold, and who produce thirty-fold; for the first will be taken up into the heavens, the second class will dwell in Paradise, and the last will inhabit the city; and that on this account the Lord said, 'In my Father's house are many mansions;' for all things belong to God, who supplies all with a suitable dwelling-place, even as His word says, that a share is given to all by the Father, according as each one is or shall be worthy. And this is the couch in which they shall recline who feast, being invited to the wedding. *The Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles*, say that this is the gradation and arrangement of those who are saved, and that they advance through steps of this nature; and that, moreover, they ascend through the Spirit to the Son, and through the Son to the Father; and that in due time the Son will yield up

His work to the Father, even as it is said by the apostle, 'For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.' For in the times of the kingdom the just man who is on the earth shall forget to die. "But when He saith all things are put under Him, it is manifest that He is excepted which did put all things under Him. And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that the Son may be all in all." There being no question of the genuineness of this passage from Irenaeus, by whom were the quotations, found in it? Now while it is possible they were by *Irenaeus*, to illustrate what 'the Presbyters, the disciples of the Apostles,' maintained, the more obvious and natural interpretation is, that they were cited by those Presbyters themselves. This being so, it is not of much consequence whether Irenaeus had this information of these views and citations, from Papias (from whom he had obtained like information upon other subjects as to the sayings of the Presbyters), or whether Irenaeus had this information of their sayings from other sources. In either event the quotations were made *either* by Papias, his contemporaries, or predecessors, "disciples of the Apostles." And of this opinion are Charteris (Canonicity, c. 17, of the Introduction), and Routh, Tischendorf, Wescott, Dorner and Riggerback, as cited in "Supernatural Religion" p. 604.

CHAPTER IV.

THE MEMOIRS INTENDED BY JUSTIN MARTYR.

GREAT importance attaches to them in connection with other facts.

The date of Justin's birth is uncertain, being placed as early as A.D. 85, and as late as A.D. 114; Rev. Mr. Wright says about A.D. 100. His martyrdom was about A.D. 165. His father and grandfather were probably of Roman origin. Before his conversion to Christianity, he studied in the schools of the philosophers, but after that he became an Evangelist, and a vigorous writer in defence of the Christian faith. It is probable that he travelled much. He was not the first that wrote an Apology for Christians, but his are the earliest extant. Besides these, he wrote a much larger work (the Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew), a work on the resurrection, and some others; and by some, he has been regarded as the author of the Pastor Hermas. His first and principal Apology, of the probable date of A.D. 138-9, was addressed as follows:

"To the Emperor Titus Ælius Adrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Cæsar, and to his son Verissimus, the philosopher, and to Lucius, the philosopher, the natural son of Cæsar, and the adopted son of Pius, a lover of learning, and to the Sacred Senate, with the whole people of the Romans, I, Justin, the son of Priscus and grandson of Bacchius, native of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine, present this address and petition in behalf of those of all nations who are unjustly hated and wantonly abused, myself being one of them."

Those to whom this formal address was made, would not be expected to know anything about Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John; but it was otherwise, in respect to the Old Testa-

ment, for Jewish synagogues were in every city, and the Septuagint had been known for three hundred years.

In this Apology he explains some of the teachings of our Lord, and the usages of his disciples; and in respect to the last, are these passages:

"For the Apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread and when he had given thanks said, 'This do ye in remembrance of me, this is my body;' and that, after the same manner having taken the cup and given thanks, he said, 'This is my blood;' and he gave it to them alone." . . . "And we afterwards continually remind each other of these things. And the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together; and for all things wherewith we are supplied, we bless the Maker of all, through his Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost. And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the Memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the Prophets are read, as long as time permits; then when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each. and a participation of that over which thanks have been given. and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well-to-do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word, takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ, our Saviour, on the same day rose from the dead. For he was crucified on the day before that of Saturn

(Saturday): and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, having appeared to his apostles and disciples, he taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration."

This passage is a part of chapter sixty-six, and the whole of chapter sixty-seven.

The great question is, What were these "Memoirs of the Apostles," which were thus read with the writings of the Prophets? It is a question of interpretation.

By the rule adopted in courts, these words are to be construed with the context, and in connection with other writings of Justin in relation to the same subject, and also in the light of all the surrounding circumstances.

These precise terms are first used in chapter sixty-seven. The same Memoirs, evidently, in chapter sixty-six, are described as Memoirs "composed" by the Apostles. They are not again referred to in this Apology. They are referred to several times in the Dialogue, chapters one hundred to one hundred and eight, by the following terms: The Memoirs of His Apostles; The Memoirs of His Apostles; The Memoirs of His Apostles; The Memoirs of the Apostles; *For in the Memoirs which I say were drawn up by his Apostles and those who followed them*; The Memoirs of His Apostles; The Memoirs; The Memoirs; The Memoirs; The Memoirs of the Apostles; The Memoirs of Him; The Memoirs of His Apostles; The Memoirs. Four times he calls them The Memoirs; three times The Memoirs of the Apostles; five times The Memoirs of His Apostles; and once, The Memoirs of Him, *i. e.*, Christ, as Roberts and Donaldson interpret it,² and as the context and the whole scope indicate.

It is plain that the same "Memoirs" are intended throughout, under these various terms.

In chapter eighty-eight of the Dialogue, in mentioning the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus at his baptism, Justin says that when he came out of the water, the Holy Ghost

lighted on him like a dove, as "the Apostles of this very Christ of ours wrote." The incident is mentioned in all four of the Gospels.

But for his explanation elsewhere, it would be inferred that *all* the "Memoirs" were "composed" by the Apostles. But he carefully explains his meaning, so that the "Memoirs," or some of them, may have been "drawn up" either by the Apostles, or by those who followed them.

It is obvious that these Memoirs were not biographies or sketches by unknown or irresponsible persons, but writings well understood by the Churches to have been "composed" or "drawn up" by the Apostles, or with their approval.

As Mark was understood to be Peter's interpreter, so Luke was understood to have been Paul's companion, and to have written under his sanction. And Paul was an Apostle, although not one of the twelve.

Justin had informed the Roman Emperor³ of the Apostles, and he gave like information to Trypho.³ He meant that all who should read should know that what he gave of the life and teachings of Christ was not from irresponsible sources, but from writings expressly sanctioned, if not actually written, by those whom Christ had selected as witnesses.

These Memoirs, therefore, were doubtless understood *by Justin, and by the church in general*, in city and country, to have been the productions of Apostles or their companions. They were read the same as the Prophets, and placed upon the same footing. Justin, in writing to Trypho, speaks of having believed GOD'S VOICE SPOKEN BY THE APOSTLES OF CHRIST.

And since, in speaking of their actual composition, he uses the plural, "Apostles," we should look for two or more Memoirs, "drawn up," by Apostles.

Now what were these Memoirs? What writings will answer the description? Matthew⁴ and Mark will, according to what the Presbyter said of them. Were there any others? There should be one more at least, that was written by an

Apostle, else wherefore, the *plural*? The four Gospels that have come down to us, answer the description in every particular. To use a legal phrase, — "From the time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary," two of them have been accepted in the Church as having been composed by Apostles, and two, by companions of Apostles.

Unless it can be shown that when Justin wrote, there were *other* Memoirs of Christ *that will answer to his description*, our four Gospels and no others were intended. *Were there any besides these?*

¹ The quotations from Justin Martyr are from Vol. II. of the Ante-Nicene Christian Library, edited by Roberts and Donaldson.

² See *post*, c. 7, note 14. p. 42.

³ "For from Jerusalem there went out into the world men, twelve in number, * * who proclaimed to every race of men that they were sent by Christ to teach all the word of God" (Ap. c. 39). "And by those things which were published in his name among all nations by the Apostles" (*ibid.* c. 42). "His Apostles going forth from Jerusalem preached everywhere" (*ibid.* c. 45.) "And further there was a certain man with us whose name was John, one of the Apostles of Christ" (Dia. c. 81). "For as he (Abraham) believed the voice of God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, in like manner we, having believed God's voice spoken by the Apostles of Christ, and promulgated to us by the prophets, have renounced even to death all the things of the world" (*ibid.* c. 119).

⁴ The writer of Barnabas, in quoting as in Matthew xx. 16, had used the authoritative Latin formula (*it is written*) for quotations from Scripture, as follows: "Let us beware lest we be found, as it is written, 'Many are called but few are chosen'" (*Ep. of Bar.* c. 4).

CHAPTER V.

QUOTATIONS AND CITATIONS.

THE *apparent* or seeming use of our Gospels by Justin and his contemporaries is a fact of great weight in determining whether they are the "Memoirs" referred to by him.

According to the Indexes of Texts by the learned editors of the Ante-Nicene Christian Library, John's Gospel is quoted or cited, twice in Barnabas, once in Diognetus, twice in Hermas, once by Justin, and once by Papias. Mark is quoted or cited, once in Barnabas, twice by Clement, three times by Justin, and once by Polycarp: Acts is quoted or cited once in Barnabas, once by Clement, once by Justin, and four times by Polycarp: Luke is quoted or cited three times in Barnabas, three times by Clement, once in Hermas, fourteen times by Justin, and twice by Polycarp: and Matthew is quoted or cited six times in Barnabas, five times by Clement, twice in Diognetus, nine times in Hermas, forty-seven times by Justin, and seven times by Polycarp.

As to *citations*, passages deemed such by one, may have been overlooked or regarded differently by another, so that there is not an entire agreement as to the number of citations, *i. e.* of allusions or references that are not quotations. And it should be understood that in the *quotations*, the books from which they are taken are not stated, except that Justin indicates that *his*, in general, are from the "Memoirs." Their agreement with our Gospels is sometimes literally exact, quite often it is otherwise; and not unfrequently two or three passages are seemingly blended, as if the author were quoting from memory and giving the sense, merely.

It will be sufficient for the purposes of the argument to give examples (except as to the Fourth Gospel) only from Justin,

and to omit *his* quotations from Matthew and Mark, since they are so numerous and not a few of them of considerable length. Of his references, Rev. Mr. Wright says¹: "Upon examination it is found that of the one hundred and twenty or more allusions which Justin makes to the Gospel history, nearly all coincide as to substance with the statements of either Matthew or Luke. Of the sixty or seventy apparently direct quotations, ten are exact, twenty-five are only slightly variant, while there are thirty-two in which the variation is considerable. But in respect to variations from the original in quotation, it should be remembered that familiarity often leads to carelessness with regard to minute points. Justin, himself, out of one hundred and sixty-two quotations from the Old Testament, has only sixty-four exact, while forty-four are slightly variant, and fifty-four decidedly so."

If the reader, with the New Testament in hand, will make a comparison in the examples which will be given, he can form his own judgment, which it is conceived, will be no doubtful one. The substantial agreement is very striking even when the language is not identical.

JUSTIN FROM ACTS.

"He was taken up into heaven while they beheld." (Res., c. 9.) Acts i. 9.

FROM MARK.

"But is it not absurd to say that these members will exist after the resurrection from the dead, since the Saviour said, 'They neither marry nor are given in marriage, but shall be as the angels in heaven.'" (Res., c. 2.) Mark xii. 25.

"And that we ought to worship God alone, he thus persuadeth us: 'The greatest commandment is, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve with all thy heart, and with all thy strength the Lord God that made thee."' (Ap. c. 16.) Mark xii. 30.

"He says, 'I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.'" (Res., c. 8.) Mark ii. 17.

FROM LUKE.

The first three are parts of long quotations from the Sermon on the Mount, principally as in Matthew (Ap. cc. 15, 16) Luke vi. : 28-36 and Matthew vi.

4. "We are persuaded that every man . . . will render account according to the power he has received from God, as Christ intimated when he said, 'To whom God has given more, of him shall more be required.'" (Ap. c. 17.) Luke xii. 48.

5. "And the angel of God who was sent to the same virgin at that time brought her good news, saying, 'Behold, thou shalt conceive of the Holy Ghost, and shall bear a son, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest. And thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins,' *as they who have recorded² all that concerns our Saviour Jesus Christ have taught*, whom we believe since by Isaiah also, whom we have now adduced, the Spirit of prophecy declared that he should be born as we intimated before." (Ap. c. 33.) Luke i. 32, and Matthew i. 21.

6. "As our Lord himself says, 'He that heareth me, heareth him that sent me.'" (Ap. c. 63.) Luke x. 16.

7. "And again in other words he said, 'I give unto you power to tread on serpents, and on scorpions and on scolopendras, and on all the might of the enemy.'" (Dial. c. 76.) Luke x. 19.

8. "For he exclaimed before his crucifixion: 'The Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the scribes and pharisees and be crucified, and on the third day rise again.'" (Dial. c. 76.) Luke ix. 22.

9. "Just as our Lord also said: 'They shall neither marry nor be given in marriage, but shall be equal to the angels, the children of the God of the resurrection.'" (Dial. c. 81.) Luke xx. 35, 36.

10. "For he taught us to pray for our enemies also, saying, 'Love your enemies; be kind and merciful as your heavenly Father' is, for we see that the Almighty God is kind and merciful, causing his sun to rise on the unthankful and on the righteous, and sending rain on the holy and on the wicked." (Dial. c. 96.) Luke vi. 36, and Matthew v. 45.

11. "But the Virgin Mary received faith and joy, when the angel Gabriel announced the good tidings to her that the Spirit of

the Lord would come upon her and the power of the Highest would overshadow her; wherefore also the Holy Thing begotten of her is the Son of God; and she replied, 'Be it unto me according to thy word.'" (Dial. c. 100.) Luke i. 35, 38.

12. "For when Christ was giving up his spirit on the cross he said: 'Father, unto thy hands I commend my spirit,' as *I have learned also from the Memoirs.*" (Dial. c. 105.) Luke xxiii. 46.

13. "He says, 'The children of this world marry and are given in marriage; but the children of the world to come neither marry nor are given in marriage, but shall be like the angels in heaven.'" (Res., c. 3.) Luke xx. 34, 35, 36.

14. "And wishing to confirm this, when his disciples did not know whether to believe he had truly risen in the body, and were looking upon him and doubting, he said to them, 'Ye have not yet faith, see that it is I,' and he let them handle him, and showed them the prints of the nails in his hands. And when they were by every kind of proof persuaded that it was himself and in the body, they asked him to eat with them, that they might thus still more accurately ascertain that he had in verity risen bodily; and he did eat honeycomb and fish. And when he had thus shown them that there is truly a resurrection of the flesh, and wishing to show them this also, that it is not impossible for flesh to ascend into heaven (as he had said that our dwelling place is in heaven), 'He was taken up into heaven while they beheld,' as he was in the flesh." (Res., c. 9.) Luke xxiv. 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and Acts i. 9.

Before presenting Justin, from the Fourth Gospel, the use of this Gospel by his contemporaries will be considered.

In *Barnabas* (c. 6) it is said that "He was to be manifested in flesh and to sojourn among us." (Com. John i. 14.) It is also said in c. 12, in effect, that the brazen serpent was a type of Jesus. (Com. John iii. 14-18.) Another passage in c. 7, although not cited by the editors, is, "Because they shall see him then in that day having a scarlet robe about his body down to his feet; and they shall say, 'is not this he whom we once despised and *pierced* and mocked and crucified?'" This *may* have had reference to what is recorded only in John, as

Apollinaris,³ bishop of Hierapolis (*cir.* A.D. 170), afterward wrote: "The Son of God, *pierced* in the sacred side, who shed forth from his side the two things again cleansing, water and blood, word and spirit."

In *Diognetus*, c. 6, it is said that "Christians dwell in the world yet are not of the world." (Com. John xvii. 11, 14, 16.) In c. 11 it is said, "This is he who was from the beginning" (Com. John i. 1); and in the same chapter, "For who that is rightly taught and begotten by the loving Word, would not seek to know accurately the things which have been clearly shown by the Word to his disciples, to whom the Word being manifested has revealed them." (Com. John i. 14, 18.) There is but a single *quotation* in this eloquent Letter, which is as in First Corinthians viii. 1, "Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth."

John alone speaks of Christ as the *door*, but the figure is often used in *Hermas*, as, "You saw, he added, the multitude who were building the tower? I saw them, sir, I said. Those, he said, are all glorious angels, and by them accordingly is the Lord surrounded. And the gate is the Son of God. This is the one entrance to the Lord. In no other way, then, shall any one enter into him except through his Son." (Simil. ix. 12.) John x. This book of *Hermas* is an allegory in which an angel, in the guise of a shepherd, gives instruction in the doctrines and duties that were held and required by the Church. It has not a single *quotation* from either the Old or New Testament. But as Dr. Chartris in "Canonicity" (p. 137) well says: "The dignity, mission, and sufferings of God's Son are prominent in *Hermas*' teaching, and remind us of the Fourth Gospel at every turn."

The supposed quotation by Papias, Fragment 5 (found in Irenæus), "In my Father's house are many mansions," has been given in a previous chapter.*

Basilides, according to Hippolytus, used as proof-texts the exact passages found in John i. 9 and John ii. 4. Hippo-

* Chap. 3. p. 16. note 7.

lytus first records the comments of Basilides on the sentence in Genesis, *Let there be light*, and then proceeds as follows: "And this, he says, is what is said in the Gospels, 'The true light which lighteth every man which cometh into the world.' And that each thing, he says, has its own seasons, the Saviour is a sufficient witness when he says, 'My hour is not yet come.'" Those who deny that these quotations⁴ were by Basilides, claim that Hippolytus sometimes mixes up the opinions of the master of a school with those of his followers, and so it is not certain that Basilides used these texts. The learned author of "Canonicity," recently published, p. 173, declares that the difficulties in the way of ascribing those quotations to any other than Basilides, are "enormous." The reasoning of Matthew Arnold⁵ (who is quite far from being rigidly orthodox) is so conclusive that we give the substance of it: "If we take all the doubtful cases of the kind and compare them with our present case, we shall find that it is not one of them. It is not true that here where the name of Basilides has just come before, and where no mention of his son or of his disciples has intervened since, there is any such ambiguity as is found in other cases. . . . The author in general uses the formula, *according to them*, when he quotes from the school, and the formula, *he says*, when he gives the dicta of the Master. And in this particular case he manifestly quotes the dicta of Basilides, and no one who had not a theory to serve would ever dream of doubting it. Basilides, therefore, about the year one hundred and twenty-five of our own era, had before him the Fourth Gospel."

The Epistles of Ignatius, whether the longer or shorter or Syriac, may be of too doubtful genuineness, or rather, the extent as to which they are genuine is too doubtful to be relied upon, although some of them contain numerous quotations.

¹ The Logic of Christian Evidences. By G. Frederick Wright, Andover, A.D. 1880, p. 190.

² Or, as Dr. Abbott translated it, as "those who have written Memoirs

of all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ, whom we believe," etc. Fourth Gospel, p. 21.

³ As quoted (p. 43) in The Supernatural Origin of Christianity. By George P. Fisher, Professor of Church History in Yale College (A.D. 1870).

⁴ Judge Waite does not even refer to these quotations except to quote from Dr. Davidson in respect to Basilides in general, that "His supposed quotations from the New Testament in Hippolytus are too precarious to be trusted." He does not seem to have known anything of Professors Arnold and Fisher, or Dr. Abbot, not to mention other very *respectable* writers within the last ten years, who have regarded the use of the Fourth Gospel by Basilides as sufficiently attested. See also note 5.

⁵ Keim (whom the learned Edersheim calls the greatest of *negative* critics) comes to the same conclusion. He also concedes that Justin, and the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Epistle of Barnabas, use this Gospel. This Epistle, he says, was written at the time of the building of the temple under Adrian, about A.D. 120; and he maintains that the fourth Gospel was written in the beginning of the second century, the time of the Emperor Trajan, in whose reign John is said by Irenæus to have been still alive, therefore about A.D. 110-115. The first Epistle of John, he thinks, was written before the fourth Gospel by the same author. While Keim is to be greatly commended for these admissions according to the undoubted facts they leave him not an inch of ground upon any historical basis for his denial of John's authorship. He considers successively persons suggested as possible authors, John the Presbyter, Appollos, Gaius, and rejects them, saying, "The results of our inquiry amount simply to this: the Gospel was published in the beginning of the second century under the name of the Apostle John, by one who was well acquainted with the Holy Land, a Jewish Christian, but liberal and friendly towards the Gentiles, probably one of the Jewish Dispensation in Asia Minor. . . . Our author wrote in the righteous conviction that the Apostles, that John would have written thus had he been living at that time." (A most important conclusion of so much labor and learning!) Keim's *Jesu v. Naz.* Vol. I., pp. 186-232. See also *post*, p. 49, note 6.

CHAPTER VI.

JUSTIN'S USE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

CHRIST's pre-existence, not declared in the other Gospels, is frequently referred to by Justin.¹ John alone calls Jesus the Word; Justin often refers to him as such. Justin regards the elevation of the brazen serpent in the wilderness as typical² of the crucifixion. He says it denoted salvation to those who flee for refuge to him who sent his crucified son into the world; the idea of God's sending his Son into the world is peculiar to John. The descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, at the baptism of Jesus, is mentioned only in the First and Fourth Gospels. Justin (Dial. c. 88) says that when Jesus "came out of the water, the Holy Ghost lighted on him like a dove, as the Apostles of this very Christ of ours wrote." Justin (Dial. c. 88) cites, as the words of John the Baptist, "I am not the Christ, but the voice of one crying."

This declaration, "I am not the Christ," and this application to himself of the language of Isaiah, are attributed to the Baptist only in John (John i. 20, 23, and iii. 28). Hilgenfeld, the latest representative of the Tübingen skeptical school, recognizes³ here the use of the Fourth Gospel by Justin. And Dr. Ezra Abbot, following Professor Drummond, gives twenty⁴ instances (including the express quotation) of the apparent or seeming use of this Gospel by Justin.

The express quotation as in John iii. 3, 5, is as follows: "For Christ also said, 'Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.' Now, that it is impossible for those who have once been born to enter into their mothers' womb is manifest to all." (Ap. c. 61.) This is as translated in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Dr. Abbot (p. 29) translates it "Except ye be born again, ye shall in

no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matthew Arnold, "Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Our common version is, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God;" and in verse 5, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The revised version, "Except a man be born anew," or "from above" (margin), he cannot see the kingdom of God." There is a *substantial* agreement in the quotation with John's Gospel, and unmistakable reference to the interview with Nicodemus, which is found only in John. The most *rational* inference is that it was from that source.

Justin, in this quotation, was as definite as when (Ap. c. 32) he wrote: "Moses then, who was the first of the prophets, spake in these very words, 'The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until he come for whom it is reserved; and he shall be the desire of the nations, binding his foal to the vine, washing his robe in the blood of the grape.'" (Com. Gen. xlix. 10, 11.) He does not state *where* the passage is to be found, and its divergence from Genesis is greater than the difference in the language of Jesus, as quoted by Justin and recorded by John.

Justin, in quoting from the Old Testament, usually gives the *name* of the prophet, *but nothing more*; just as he gives this quotation as the language of Christ. He writes *Moses said*, or *Isaiah said*, and he also writes *Christ said*.

The other Apostolic Fathers, in their quotations from the Old Testament, do not usually give the name of the prophet, but only, "It is written," "God said," "The Spirit saith," "The Scripture saith," and often only "saith," "The Scripture" in such cases being implied. And, as a rule, they do not quote with literal accuracy or a near approximation to it.

It has been objected, that if this quotation was actually from the Fourth Gospel, more than a single quotation from it should be expected. Let this be tested by the four epistles confessed to be genuine. There is not a single quotation

by Justin from *either* of these acknowledged epistles, and it is doubtful if there is a single reference to them, certainly not in his Apology.

Nor is this all. The epistle to the Galatians (and Renan says, "Thanks to the Epistle to the Galatians!") is not referred to in any way by Clement, or in Barnabas, or Hermas; nor First Corinthians in Barnabas or Hermas (and but once in Diognetus); nor Romans in Hermas; nor Revelation in Barnabas, or Diognetus, or Polycarp, and but once by Clement.

To account for Justin's silence, it has been imagined, without the slightest evidence, that Justin was "anti-Pauline." But how are the omissions by other writers to be accounted for? How did it happen that Clement made no reference to Galatians? It was not from hostility, certainly, for he speaks of "The blessed Apostle Paul." Yet writing this epistle from the church at Rome, to the church at Corinth, he has but a single quotation from Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and but a single quotation from Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, and *no* reference to Galatians.

The well-known distinction of everyday application in courts of law and elsewhere, between positive and negative evidence, is to be kept in mind. Whether John's Gospel would be quoted by any writer acquainted with it, might depend entirely upon his object in writing; and so of Galatians, or any of the books of the New Testament. While a single undoubted quotation proves the existence of that which is quoted from, non-quotation may prove nothing at all.

Justin apparently has one quotation from the Fourth Gospel, with many implied references to it. But if there were neither the one nor the other, to infer his ignorance of that Gospel from his silence would be just as sensible as to infer that a lawyer had never heard of Blackstone, or Kent, or Story, because he has not quoted from them.

If Justin in his Apology quoted once from Mark, and once from John, and not at all from Acts, or Revelations, or Paul's

Epistles, it was because his subject did not call for any use of those writings, beyond the use which he made of Mark and John. And if (as was apparently the fact) he quoted Luke six times and Matthew eighteen times in his Apology, it was doubtless because Matthew better served his purpose, or was more firmly fixed in his memory, from his having been born in Palestine, where Matthew's Gospel was published.

A like explanation accounts for the fact that the Fourth Gospel is not quoted by Polycarp in his Epistle to the Philipians. Neither does he quote or cite from Revelations.

The result so far is this: The Fourth Gospel, apparently, is quoted by Basilides, and Justin, and Papias; and, in addition, there are many implied references to it. There is about the same amount of evidence in respect to Mark and the book of Acts. The evidence accumulates as to Luke's Gospel, and from Matthew, the quotations and citations become very numerous.

That these quotations and citations were forgeries is an idea that cannot be seriously entertained by anybody. There were originals from which the quotations were taken; and presumptively, those originals were the "Memoirs" so often referred to by Justin; and *presumptively* our Gospels were those *Memoirs*, since they answer the description. And unless it can be shown that *other* writings *that will answer the description* were then extant, this presumption is well nigh conclusive.

¹ Ap. cc. 5, 23, 32, 42, 50, 53, 63; Dial. cc. 48, 57, 68, 76, 85, 100, 101.

² Ap. c. 60; Dial. cc. 7, 94, 140.

³ Abbot, p. 45; Fisher, p. 39; Sears, "The Heart of Christ" (A.D. 1873), pp. 46-67.

⁴ Abbot, pp. 40-50.

CHAPTER VII.

NO OTHERS PROVED.

THE latest work in this country which denies the genuineness of our Gospels, is "The History of the Christian religion to the year two hundred." (Chicago, 1881.) The author says it is the result of an investigation extending through several years, two of which were spent in the library of congress, "which is peculiarly rich in the department of biblical literature." He claims that his volume "will be found to be the most complete record of the events connected with the Christian religion during the first two centuries, which has ever been presented to the public." He shows no lack of ability or disposition to make as strong a case as possible against our Gospels. And he understands the issue. For, he says, the question what Gospels were used by Justin, "is of the highest importance." In this work, then, if anywhere, should there be proof of *other* writings than our Gospels, that will meet the requirements of the case. But what do we find? It gives a list of "*forty Gospels*," before the decree of Pope Gelasius, A.D. 494. The only marvel is that the list is not longer. The greater portion are the now extant Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations, which may be found in Vol. XVI., of the Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Much confusion, says¹ Dr. Ezra Abbot, has arisen from the fact that the term "Gospel" was in ancient times applied to speculative works which gave the writer's view of the Gospel, *i. e.*, of the doctrine of Christ, or among the Gnostics, which set forth their *gnosis*; *e. g.*, among the followers of Basilides, Hippolytus tells us, "The Gospel is the knowledge of supermundane things." Of all the Apocryphal Gospels, Samuel Ives Curtiss, the well-known German professor in the Chicago Theological Seminary, writes:² —

"I shall not waste any ink or paper to prove that the Protevangelium, the Gospel of the Infancy, the Acts of Pilate, etc., in their present forms as known to us and as quoted by Judge Waite, arose at a later period than our canonical Gospels." . . . "A knowledge of the original sources and the literature of the subject would have saved him from this pitiful blunder. I simply refer to Professor Lipsius' article on the Apocryphal Gospels, in Smith and Wace's Dictionary of Christian Biography, London, 1880, Vol. II., pp. 700, *seq.*; and Holtzmann's Apocryphon des Neuen Testaments, in Schenkel's Bible Lexicon, Leipzig, 1869, Vol. I., pp. 170 *seq.* As neither of these articles are by orthodox men, or by those who have the slightest bias toward orthodoxy, they are calculated to inspire confidence in persons of every shade of belief or disbelief. Both are authorities; Meyer's Conversations-Lexikon says of Professor Lipsius, of Jena, that he is one of the most eminent scholars in Germany." (See note 2. p. 41.)

With this concurring judgment of the most eminent scholars, not much time should be spent upon these Apocryphal books. But a single quotation is given by Judge Waite that is claimed by him to have been made by Justin from either of them. And this (although not to be found in any *single* passage in our Gospels) may be gathered from different passages, which would be in keeping with Justin's mode. It corresponds quite nearly, though not precisely, with a *part*³ of the description in the Protevangelium of the announcement to Mary. But this no more proves the use of the Protevangelium by Justin than it proves the use of Justin's Apology by the writer of the Protevangelium. Aside from this quotation, there are a few facts stated by Justin that are claimed, by some persons, to have been taken from the Apocryphal Gospels. *One* is, that Jesus made ploughs and yokes, which Justin of course would infer, from the fact that it was a part of the business of a carpenter to make ploughs and yokes. *Another* is, that Jesus was born in a cave. Dr. Thompson, says⁴, "It is not impossible, to say the least, but that the apartment in which our Saviour was born

was in part a cave. I have seen many such, consisting of one or more rooms in front of and including a cavern, where the cattle were kept." Justin, who was a native of Judea, added a circumstance well known from tradition, which Luke did not think it of consequence to mention, that the manger was in a cave, *i. e.*, that the stable in which was the manger was in a cave. He had no occasion to resort to books for such a fact. *Another* is, that Justin refers the Roman Emperor to "Acts of Pilate" as affording evidence of what he had stated concerning Christ's crucifixion, and the miracles which he had performed. According to the usual course, Pilate should have made a report of the crucifixion. It is supposed that he did, and that it was lost or destroyed. Justin appeals to it, as if then in the archives of the government. Whether he was well or ill informed upon the subject, the document to which he appeals, clearly was not understood by him to be one of the "Memoirs" of Christ, "drawn up" by an Apostle, or a "companion" of an Apostle. Nothing purporting to be Pilate's report is extant. The Apocryphal book, known as the Gospel of Nicodemus or Acts of Pilate, does not purport to contain⁵ any such report. *Another* is, that Justin says that Christ was of the House of David; a fact which Jesus himself had declared⁶ and which is also referred to, in Acts. The only remaining fact, in respect to the alleged use of the Protevangelium, is in relation to the *census*. It is claimed that Justin and the Protevangelium agree that it was only to be taken in Judea. But Justin does not so state. It also happens, that while Justin makes mention of Cyrenius, the Protevangelium only says, "And there was an order from the Emperor Augustus that all in Bethlehem of Judea should be enrolled," saying nothing of Cyrenius. This is followed by an absurd and worthless story of occurrences, by the way. Justin has two references to the census, which will be found in the note⁸. Justin, in stating that there was a census in Judea, does not exclude the idea that it was more general.

Judge Waite, following the anonymous author of "The Supernatural," and others, also claims that Justin's statement that at the baptism of Jesus "a fire was kindled in the Jordan," must have been taken either from the "Gospel of the Hebrews," or the "Preaching of Paul." As to the former (as he gives the translation from a fragment from Jerome) it is, that, "certainly there shone around the place a great light," which is not what Justin said. There is no evidence from any quarter that this "Gospel of the Hebrews" was in existence (other than as Matthew's Gospel was in existence), when Justin wrote. Nor is there any evidence that it was in use, at *any* period, except among the Nazarenes (a small Judaizing sect of Christians), and the Cerinthians, and Ebionites, two heretical sects. The very authorities quoted to prove its existence, clearly show that it was never in *general* use, or accepted by the churches generally. Neither the work itself, nor Jerome's translation of it, has been in existence *for centuries*. From what is known of it, it seems to have been⁹ the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, "not entire and perfect, but corrupted and curtailed." It omitted the first two chapters. Some of the corruptions show its true character¹⁰ so far as it varied from Matthew's Hebrew Gospel; for as Papias wrote, and the Fathers generally believed, Matthew first composed his Gospel in the Hebrew dialect.

"The Preaching of Paul" was less known, and even of less account, than the other. Judge Waite says (p. 229) that it "was referred to by Lactantius and others, and was generally known in the second century." But he furnishes no evidence of it, and Lactantius died about A.D. 325. As to its contents, Judge Waite only says that "It contained references to the Sybilline writings; also to the fire in Jordan at the time of the baptism of Jesus." There is no good reason to suppose that it was *extant* when Justin wrote; and most certainly, it was never received by the churches generally. Eusebius does not seem to have known anything of it, unless to reject it as spurious. He says (Book III., c. 25): "Among

the spurious, must be numbered both the books called 'The Acts of Paul,' and that called 'Pastor,' and 'The Revelation of Peter.'"

Eusebius also is equally pronounced against the production called the "Gospel according to Peter." That this "Gospel" was referred to by Justin in the passage before considered (*vide c. 4*), is the fact *to be proved*. The first mention of it, was by Serapion¹¹, who became Bishop of Antioch A.D. 191, fifty years after Justin wrote. He found a few copies of it among his flock, which he replaced, substituting Mark's Gospel for it, for the reason that he found in it "many things superadded to the sound faith of our Saviour; and some also attached, that are foreign to it." This *bishop* seems to have had no knowledge of its existence till that time. It favored the Docetæ, from some of whom it had come into his parish. The pretence that Tertullian referred to it, and intended to assert that in his day the Gospel of Mark was understood to have this Gospel of Peter for its original, has nothing to rest upon but another perversion of Tertullian's meaning. The passage relied upon is here given with such words in italics as must be *supplied* to warrant the use which has been attempted to be made of it: "The Gospel which Mark published is affirmed to be" *what is known as* "Peter's" *Gospel*, "whose interpreter Mark was." This forced construction, would make Mark the interpreter, *not* of Peter, but of the heretical work at some time known by some as *Peter's Gospel*. Not Strauss himself, nor even the author of "The Supernatural," so interpreted Tertullian. What Tertullian wrote was, that "The Gospel which Mark published is affirmed to be Peter's; whose interpreter Mark was." Marcion mutilated Luke's Gospel, and Judge Waite says, "Tertullian called him a *hound*." If any one in his day had perverted his language as to Mark's Gospel, so as to make it endorse the work which Serapion (who was a cotemporary of Tertullian) suppressed as heretical, Tertullian would not have been likely to have used a *less* expressive word than that which he applied to

Marcion. Tertullian simply meant, as Papias had written, and the church believed, that Mark was Peter's *interpreter*, and in *that* sense Mark's Gospel was Peter's Gospel.

The next writer referred to for "Peter's Gospel" is Origen, A.D. 230. Origen says: "There are some who say the brethren of Christ were the children of Joseph by a former wife, who lived with him before Mary; and they are induced to this opinion by some passages in that *which is entitled* (the italics are ours) 'The Gospel of Peter, or the Book of James.'" When it is considered that Origen, in most explicit terms, declares that our four Gospels "are the only undisputed ones in the whole Church of God throughout the world," and that of these, "the second is according to Mark, who composed it as Peter explained it to him, whom he also acknowledges as his son in his General Epistle," the perversion of his language is apparent. Mr. Norton, whose opinion, it is conceded, "is entitled to great weight," upon a careful examination of the subject, believes that this "Gospel" was not a history or biography of Christ's ministry at all, but only a *doctrinal*¹² treatise." *Not a single fragment of it has come down to us*. There is no evidence from any quarter that it was *generally* received in the churches *at any* period; on the contrary, the evidence, so far as it goes, proves that it was not so received. It was the Gospel exclusively used by the Ebionites,¹³ and neither Justin nor the majority of Christians in his time were Ebionites. Its very suppression by Serapion is conclusive; and there is nothing to impeach Eusebius' judgment against it. There is no evidence that it was even in existence when Justin wrote, for the mere fact of its being found by Serapion forty or fifty years after is too remote. Hence, if Justin, in the paragraph before quoted in chapter four, by "*him*" meant Peter, instead of Christ (which we do not accept),¹⁴ the Gospel of Mark, which in a sense was understood to be Peter's, was the one intended; and the true construction of the words in question is of minor importance.

Judge Waite has succeeded as well as any one, in his attempt to find *other* writings than our Gospels, that will meet the necessities of the case. Professor Lipsius, one of the most eminent scholars in Germany, says,¹⁵ "The attempt to prove that Justin Martyr and the Clementine Homilies had one extra-canonical authority common to them both, either in the Gospel to the Hebrews or in the Gospel of St. Peter, has altogether failed." Of recent writers this side of the ocean, Dr. Ezra Abbot of Harvard College (who has already "a distinguished Continental reputation"), states,¹⁶ after a thorough examination of the whole subject, as some of the results: "We have seen that there is no *direct* evidence of any weight that Justin used either the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' (so far as this was distinguished from the Gospel according to Matthew) or the 'Gospel according to Peter.' That he should have taken either of these as the source of his quotations, or that either of these constituted the 'Memoirs' read generally at public worship in the Christian churches of his time, is in the highest degree improbable." . . . "Still less can be said in behalf of the hypothesis that any other Apocryphal 'Gospel' of which we know anything, constituted the 'Memoirs, which he cites, if they were one book, or was included among them, if they were several."

Mr. Rowe's¹⁷ judgment is, that the facts referred to by Justin, but not recorded in the Gospels, stand to those which *are* recorded, in the proportion of only four, to one hundred and ninety-six. In other words, that all but four out of about two hundred references, appear in the Gospels. "It is marvellous," he says, "when we consider the nearness of the time when Justin lived to our Lord's ministry, that he should have preserved so few incidents respecting it which vary from those in our Gospels, rather than that those to which he has referred should present the slight variations they do; for it is an interval within which traditionary reminiscences must have possessed all their freshness."

¹⁵ P. 16 of "Authorship of the Fourth Gospel," etc. (1880).

¹⁶ The *Daily Inter-Ocean* of Feb. 12, 1881. To the same effect, "The Authorship," p. 98, note 6; The Supernatural Origin of Christianity, by George P. Fisher, D.D., Professor of Christian History in Yale College (1870), p. 191-2; Origin, etc., by Prof. C. E. Stowe (1867), p. 185, c. 7.

¹⁷ "And the angel of God who was sent to the same virgin at that time, brought her the good news, saying, 'Behold thou shalt conceive of the Holy Ghost and shalt bear a son, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.'" After a dozen lines, the last clause is repeated as follows: "Wherefore, too, the angel said to the virgin, 'Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.'" The last clause seems to have been transferred from Matthew by Justin. The Protevangelium (c. 11) reads as follows: "And she hearing, reasoned with herself, saying: Shall I conceive by the Lord, the living God? And shall I bring forth, as every woman brings forth? And the angel of the Lord said: Not so, Mary; for the power of the Lord shall overshadow thee; wherefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of the Most High. And thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins. And Mary said: Behold the servant of the Lord before his face; let it be unto me according to thy word. And she made the purple and the scarlet and took them to the priest," etc. The account is preceded by the story that it had fallen to her lot to spin purple and scarlet for the veil of the temple, and that when the angel spake to her she was going with a pitcher to fill it with water. It is not easy to believe that Justin's simple narrative came from such a source.

¹⁸ The Land and the Book, by W. M. Thompson, D.D., twenty-five years a missionary of the A. B. C. F. M., in Syria and Palestine, Vol. II, p. 503.

¹⁹ The first part contains a graphic account of the trial and crucifixion. At the trial witnesses are represented as appearing before Pilate and narrating different miracles which had been performed. Judge Waite devotes considerable space in comparing these accounts with the Gospel narratives. He argues that the Apocryphal account must have been the earlier one, *because* of its brevity, and because it does not include *all* the miracles. This is as if one should infer that the plea of the advocate, or the charge of the judge, preceded the testimony, or the compendium, the history.

²⁰ Matt. ix. 27; xii. 23; xv. 22; Mark x. 47; xii. 35-7; Luke xx. 30-1; xl. 6; xviii. 38-9; John vii. 42; Acts xiii. 23; Ro. i. 3.

²¹ Protevangelium, p. 17; vol. 16, Ante-Nicene Christian Library, pp. 18-19.

²² Apology, c. 34. "Now there is a village in the land of the Jews, thirty-five stadia from Jerusalem, in which Jesus Christ was born, as you can ascertain also from the registers of the taxing made under Cyrenius, your first procurator in Judea." Dial. c. 78. "Then he was afraid and did not put her away; but on the occasion of the first census which was taken in Judea under Cyrenius, he went up from Nazareth where he lived to

Bethlehem, to which he belonged, to be enrolled; for his family was of the tribe of Judah, which then inhabited that region." Joseph was both of the tribe of Judah, and of the house and lineage of David, and there is no contradiction. It is to be noticed that the census is spoken of as the *first* census that was taken. Cyrenius, called then procurator, was afterward governor.

⁹ See authorities in Note 2. p. 41, *ante*.

¹⁰ "Now my mother, the Holy Ghost, took me by one of my hairs, and brought me to the great mountain even Tabor." "Jesus said unto him, go sell all which thou possessest and divide among the poor, and come follow me. But the rich man *began to scratch his head*, and it did not please him. Origin, *etc.*, by Professor Stowe, p. 22.

¹¹ Abbott's Fourth Gospel, p. 78; Eusebius, b. 6, c. 12; b. 3, c. 25.

¹² Abbott, *etc.*, p. 79; Waite's History, p. 11.

¹³ Abbott, *etc.*, p. 104, Eusebius, b. 6, c. 12.

¹⁴ The entire passage is as follows: "And when it is said that he changed the name of one of the Apostles to Peter; and when it is written in the Memoirs of him that this so happened, as well as that he changed the names of other two brothers, the sons of Zebedee, to Boanerges, which means sons of thunder; this was an announcement of the fact that it was he by whom Jacob was called Israel, and Oshea called Jesus (Joshua) under whose name the people who survived of those who came from Egypt were conducted into the land promised to the patriarchs." The controversy is, whether the personal pronouns "He" and "Him" refer to Jesus, or whether "Him" refers to Peter. Judge Waite says that Justin has ten times "Memoirs of the Apostles," and five times, "Memoirs," and not once, "Memoirs of Christ." It is true we do not find "Memoirs of Christ." But confessedly the Memoirs intended were of or concerning Christ, and not of or concerning the Apostles, or either of them. Justin used the expression Memoirs of the Apostles just as we say the Gospel of John. They were concerning Christ; he is the grand subject of discourse in all Justin's writings. And in Ap. c. 33, Justin speaks of those "who have written Memoirs of all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ." In the proper and highest sense they should only be spoken of as "Memoirs of Christ."

Judge Waite, after the author of "The Supernatural" (p. 337), says, to refer to the more distant antecedent is contrary to the rule. The rule is of but slight importance as compared to the whole scope. And to apply the rule here, Peter would be the one who changed the names of the sons of Zebedee; for Peter, and not Christ, would be the last antecedent.

¹⁵ As quoted by Dr. Ezra Abbot, pp. 98, 99; see, also, *Inter-Ocean* of February 12, 1881.

¹⁶ Abbot, *etc.*, p. 103, 104; *Inter-Ocean* of February 12.

¹⁷ Bampton Lectures for 1877, pp. 279, 281.

CHAPTER VIII.

PRESUMPTION OF PERMANENCY.

In general, says Mr. Phillips,¹ there is a presumption in favor of the continuance of what is once proved to have existed. It is a familiar principle of law, says Chief Justice Parker, that a state of things once shown to exist is presumed to continue until something is shown to rebut the presumption. This presumption, says Professor Greenleaf, is founded "on the experienced *continuance* or permanency of longer or shorter duration in human affairs. When, therefore, the existence of a person, a personal relation, or a state of things, is once established by proof, the law presumes that the person, relation, or state of things continues to exist as before, until the contrary is shown, or until a different presumption is raised from the nature of the subject in question." With other examples of the application of this presumption, he mentions opinions and religious convictions: "The *opinions* also of individuals, once entertained and expressed, and the *state of mind*, once proved to exist, are presumed to remain unchanged until the contrary appears. Thus, all the members of a Christian community, being presumed to entertain the common faith, no man is supposed to disbelieve the existence and moral government of God, until it is shown from his own declarations." This presumption being founded in reason and experience, is of universal application. It is not conclusive, but stands "until something is shown to rebut it." It is the basis of Hume's argument against miracles, but which he misapplies, making it conclusive instead of presumptive evidence. As a presumption, it is strictly applicable to the question in hand, and will be found to have great force. For, from this natural and reasonable presumption, it should be taken, unless the contrary is proved, that the accepted

"Memoirs" of Justin's time *remained* in the churches. Hence if we can ascertain with entire certainty *what* "Memoirs" were accepted in the churches in the year 180, and no evidence of displacement and substitution appears, we shall have *most satisfactory evidence* what "Memoirs" were the ones intended by him in his Apology.

¹ Phillips on Evidence, 4th Am. Ed., 640: 17 N. H. Rep., 409: 1 Greenleaf on Evidence, §§ 41, 42.

CHAPTER IX.

THE MEMOIRS OF THE YEAR ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY.

THERE is undoubted proof that within forty years from the time Justin wrote his First Apology, our Four Gospels (and no others) with the Book of Acts, were universally received in the church, as we now receive them. It comes from the writings of Agrippa Castor, Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, Apelles, Athenagoras, Basilides, Celsus, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Heracleon, Irenæus, Jerome, Marcion, Melito, Bishop of Sardis, Origen, Pantænus, Polycarp, Serapion, Tatian, Theophilus, Tertullian, Valentine, The Letter of the Church of Vienne and Lyons, and the unknown authors of the Clementine Homilies, and the Muratori Canon—Christians, Gnostics, Heretics, and Heathen, all concurring to prove universal reception, beyond a reasonable doubt. So strong is this proof that even Strauss does not deny such reception by the *end* of the second century, and he admits that there is evidence of an *earlier* date. He says: "We learn from the works of Irenæus, of Clement Alexandrinus, and of Tertullian, that, at the end of the second century after Christ, our Four Gospels were recognized by the orthodox church as the writings of the Apostles and the disciples [companions] of the Apostles, and were separated from many other similar productions, as authentic records of the life of Jesus. The first Gospel, according to our Canon, is attributed [i. e. by the authors named] to Matthew, who is enumerated among the twelve Apostles; the fourth to John, the beloved disciple of our Lord; the second to Mark, the interpreter of Peter;¹ and the third to Luke, the companion of Paul. We have, besides, the authority of earlier authors, both in their own works, and in quotations cited by others." As a false witness sometimes admits a part, the better to conceal what

is more important, so Strauss *admits* a state of things as existing at the *end* of the century, that, beyond dispute, should be carried back to a time at least twenty years earlier. Thus Professor Fisher, in his exhaustive work, says of John's Gospel (which is conceded to have been the last): "We choose to begin² with the unquestioned fact of the universal reception of the Fourth Gospel as genuine in the last quarter of the second century. At that time we find that it was held in every part of Christendom to be the work of the Apostle John. The prominent witnesses are Tertullian in North Africa, Clement in Alexandria, and Irenæus in Gaul." And Professor Abbot³ says: "I begin with the statement, which cannot be questioned, that our present Gospels, and no others, were received by the great body of Christians as genuine and sacred books during the last quarter of the second century."

Theophilus of Antioch, as *early* as A.D. 180, not only quotes from the Fourth Gospel, as Scripture, but names John as its author, as follows:⁴ "As the Holy Scriptures, and all who have the Spirit, teach us, among whom John says, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God;' signifying that God alone was in the beginning, and that the Word was in him. And then he says, the Word was God, and all things were made by Him, and without him there was not anything made." Theophilus also wrote a Commentary upon the Gospels. Before this time, also, our Gospels and Acts had been included in a list⁵ of canonical books received in the churches. They were in their present order, and, as far as their authorship is stated, are attributed to the persons whose names are now assigned to them. And before⁶ this date, Celsus (who anticipated Strauss by seventeen hundred years) had cited alleged contradictions in the Gospels, and particularly as to there being one or two angels at the sepulchre. He attempted to ridicule the idea that blood and water came from Jesus' side—a fact that is stated only in John. He refers to the fact that Christ

"after his death arose, and showed the marks of his punishment, and how his hands had been pierced." Although he does not *name* the authors of the books, yet his numerous quotations correspond with them, including Luke and John. And in respect to all of the discrepancies, etc., he says: "All these things I have taken out of your own books," i. e. Scriptures. "We need," says he, "no after witness, for you fall upon your own swords." His work has not come down to us except as contained in Origen's writings, which, however, quote so fully from it, that it is nearly reproduced. And ten years⁷ before this time, Tatian, who had been a disciple of Justin (but after Justin's death became heretical), wrote a Commentary or Harmony upon the Gospels. He called it Diatessaron, which means the Gospel of the Four. The celebrated Syrian, Father Ephræm, who died A.D. 373, wrote a commentary on it. Bar-Salibi, who flourished in the last part of the twelfth century, was also well acquainted with Tatian's work; and says that it began with John i. 1: "*In the beginning was the Word.*"

Before this date, Heracleon, a disciple of the Gnostic Valentine, wrote a commentary upon the Fourth Gospel. The work is known⁸ to us through many fragments, which Origen has woven into his own commentary on the same Gospel.

Quotations from the canonical Gospels *between* the periods mentioned are very numerous. It is unnecessary to cite them, or to give other specific proof of a state of things existing as *early* as 180, as shown by most incontrovertible evidence, whatever doubt may be had as to some items of this evidence. Indeed an earlier date might properly be assumed than that taken as the basis of our argument. Thus Dr. Charteris, in his recent work, says, in view of all the circumstances: "When we pass the *middle* of the century, and come to the works of Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus (with a quotation by name) we are out of the region of controversy." (Canonicity, lxxxi.) There were a few persons called the Alogi, a nickname having the double meaning of "deniers of the doctrine of the

Logos," and "men without reason," who denied John's authorship of the Fourth Gospel. They were probably a few⁹ eccentric individuals, who attracted no attention, and none of whose names are preserved. The fact that they appealed to no tradition in favor of their views, denied John's authorship of the Apocalypse likewise, and absurdly ascribed both to Cerinthus, whom no one supposes could have been their author, shows that they were persons of no critical judgment. They were *outside* of the churches of which Justin wrote. The reception of the canonical Gospels, to the exclusion of all others, was *universal* in those churches.

¹ Not the interpreter of "*Peter's Gospel*!" (Page 49-50, Vol. I, of "*The Life of Jesus*," etc., 1860).

² P. 39 of "*The Supernatural Origin of Christianity*," (1870), by Prof. Fisher.

³ P. 13 of "*The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*" (1880).

⁴ Letter to Autolycus, c. 22; A. N. C. L., Vol. III., p. 88; Strauss's "*Life of Christ*," p. 52; Waite's Hist., pp. 302, 354; Stowe's "*Origin*," etc., p. 177; Fisher's "*Supernatural*," p. 130.

⁵ A fragment of this writing was discovered by the Italian scholar Muratori, and from him is called the Muratori Canon. It is written in Latin, but is supposed to have been first written in Greek. The first part of the writing is wanting, so that it begins with Luke, which it calls the "Third book of the Gospel according to Luke." It was found in the Ambrosian Library, at Milan, in a manuscript containing extracts from writings of Ambrose, Chrysostom, and others. It professes to give a list of the writings that are recognized in the Christian Church. Judge Waite (p. 412) assigns A.D. 190 as its date. Prof. Curtiss says of it: "*The most eminent New Testament scholars* in America, England and Germany, with a few exceptions, hold that it was written in the last quarter of the second century (the most setting the date at about 170-180 A.D.) Some of them are: Prof. Ezra Abbot, of Harvard College; Drs. E. A. Abbott, Canon Wescott, W. A. Sanday, Credner, Weiseler, Bleek, Reuss, Hilgenfeld, and many others" (*Inter-Ocean*, February 12, 1881). The Fragment contains internal evidence of the time when it was written. In reference to the "Pastor" it says: This "did Hermas write, *very recently, in our times*, in the city of Rome, while his brother Bishop Pius sat in the chair in the church of Rome." Now Pius was Bishop from A.D. 142 to 157. Waite's History, p. 232.

⁶ In reply to Judge Waite, who assigned A.D. 210 to Celsus, Professor Curtiss says that "Dr. Keim, who belongs to the most liberal German school, and who made a very careful investigation of the subject (Celsus

Wahres Wort, Zurich, 1873), sets the date in the year 177 or 178,*A.D." See also Smith and Wace's Dictionary of Christian Biography, London, 1877, vol. I, p. 436; Fisher, p. 42; "Heart of Christ," by Edmund H. Sears, 1873, p. 148; Abbott's Fourth Gospel, etc., p. 58. See also Sanday, p. 262, and Canonicity, by Dr. Charteris, 1880, p. 369. Origen, in one place, in answering his objections, speaks of him as "a man long*since dead, or "who no longer shares in the common life of men, but has long since departed." Origen Against Celsus, B. I, cc. 1, 8; A. N. C. L., Vol. X. Dr. Keim adheres to the same opinion in a more recent work, in which, speaking of the school of Baur, he says of the fourth Gospel: "It is admitted that the Gospel was in circulation about A.D. 160-170, and was used by Athenagoras, Tatian, in all the spurious Epistles of Ignatius, by Melito, Apollinaris, and Theophilus, and even by the heathen Celsus, who, contemporaneously with Athenagoras, the apologist, before the imperial throne (176, 177), addressed his work, written in the interests of peace, to the Christians!" "Hist. of Jesus of Nazara," by Dr. Theodor Keim, translated by Arthur Ransom (1876), Vol. I., p. 187. See also *ante*, p. 29, note 5.

⁷ pp. 52, 53 of Abbot's Fourth Gospel.

⁸ "Tischendorf's Origin of the Four Gospels," p. 89.

⁹ Abbott's Fourth Gospel, pp. 18, 20; Fisher, p. 69.

CHAPTER X.

ASCENDING THE STREAM.

Now consider the tremendous force of the proved fact that, within forty years of the time when Justin wrote his First Apology, we reach a period when it is no longer a debatable question whether our Gospels are "the Memoirs" of Christ which were read with the Prophets in city and country. The presumption of *continuance* attaches. It has before been proved beyond a reasonable doubt that, in the year one hundred and forty, there were accepted "Memoirs" of our Lord, which were read with the Prophets in all the churches. There is no evidence whatever that those Memoirs in the intervening forty years were dropped and others substituted for them; therefore it should be presumed that they were in the churches in the year one hundred and eighty; and the Memoirs in the churches at this latter period *are positively known and seen, to have been the Canonical Gospels*. They have come closer to us, and in the nearer vision we are able to determine their identity with the utmost certainty. And the natural presumption that there was no substitution within the short interval of forty years, is immensely strengthened by the difficulties attending any attempted substitution,—difficulties so great that they must have left unmistakable evidence of conflict upon the page of history. The churches were very numerous, and occupied a territory of more than two thousand miles in extent from Syria to Gaul. Each church had its bishop or presbyter, and elders; and in each church, once in seven days, were the Memoirs of our Lord read with the Prophets. There were hundreds who, from their own recollections, and thousands who, from their parents or instructors, at any given time within these forty years, had perfect knowledge what Memoirs were thus read in the year one hundred

and forty. Young men of twenty then, were only sixty, forty years later. Was there a substitution in those forty years, and these bishops, and elders, and thousands of communicants every Sabbath of all ages, not know it; or knowing it had not objected; or objecting, and history have no record of it? Not a few of these were educated men; and indeed all the bishops and elders may be presumed to have been as well versed in the accepted Gospels as in the writings of the prophets. It is to be borne in mind that we are dealing now with the question of substitution within the short period of forty years. A *score* of names can be given of men living within that time or immediately after, who, from their own recollection or from others, must have had perfect knowledge of the whole subject: Athenagoras, a philosopher at Athens about the year one hundred and sixty; Caius, a presbyter at Rome about the year two hundred; Claudius Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, *cir.* 173; Clement of Alexandria, who became the head of the Alexandrian School in 187; Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, who died a martyr in 173; Hegesippus, the historian (whose works are now lost), who died in 180; Hermas, who was prominent toward the close of the century; Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons; Justin himself, whose martyrdom was as late as the year 165; Leonides, the martyr; Melito, Bishop of Sardis; the world-renowned Origen, son of Leonides; Pantæus; Polycarp; Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus; Pothinus the predecessor of Irenæus (and whose martyrdom was about 167); Serapion, Bishop of Antioch; Tertullian, the eloquent Roman lawyer of Carthage; Theophilus, the predecessor of Serapion; and Victor, Bishop of Rome.

It may be said, and with truth, that the Fourth Gospel, whenever introduced, came in not as a substitute, but as a supplement. The evidence, however, is conclusive that by the year one hundred and eighty, it had obtained as permanent a footing as either of the other Gospels. Its reception was as hearty, and the tradition of its authorship as strong, as in respect to the others. To infer that it was the forged product

of the period now under consideration, or any other, is as if De Soto had concluded that the mighty stream which he discovered hastening to the Gulf, with deep and rapid current, so wide that a man could scarcely be seen from shore to shore, had its origin not in far-off lakes or mountains, but in some miserable crocodile swamp of the country he was traversing, and but just out of sight. And *who* forged the Fourth Gospel and imposed it as John's upon this score of persons, and hundreds of others? Or did these men conspire together, to deceive themselves, the churches, and the world? What name has come down to us from *that* age, or any other, who was *capable* of such an undertaking? What *forger* wrote those discourses of Our Lord with Nicodemus? Or those with the women of Samaria? Or those with his disciples on the eve of his crucifixion? Or the parable of the good Shepherd? Or that memorable prayer recorded in the seventeenth of John? That any *sane man* should attribute either of these to a *criminal forger* would be incredible, if we were not confronted with the fact. And what sort of a man was this forger of the Fourth Gospel? We have Baur's conception of him as "A man of remarkable mind, of an elevated spirit, and penetrated with a warm adoring faith in Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the world!" And Baur thinks it *easier* to believe (without proof) in the existence of this remarkable genius and elevated character, who would *invent* fictitious discourses, *falsely* attribute them to the Christ whom he *adored*, and *forged* the name of the beloved disciple, than to believe with the whole body of the Christian Church, that the discourses and utterances were those of our Lord!¹ If John did not write the Fourth Gospel, *who did*? Not one of those who deny his authorship, can give an answer to this question. It is no answer to say that many in the second century believed that Hermas (whom Paul mentions in his Epistle to the Romans), wrote the Pastor or Shepherd of Hermas. Such was not the universal sentiment. The work was never generally received as Scripture. On the contrary, the author of

the Muratorian Fragment, while placing the Four Gospels in the list of canonical books universally received, says of "The Pastor," that it was written "very recently in our times" by another Hermas, a brother of the Bishop of Rome, and that it was read in "some of the churches," not as Scripture but for "edification," the same as the Epistle of Clement. It was rejected by Tertullian, not only as Apocryphal, but as hurtful. Nor is it any answer, to say that the so-called Epistle of Barnabas was early attributed to Barnabas the Levite. In the first place, it is by no means certain that this tradition was unfounded. From the little we know of Barnabas, it would be rash to conclude that he could not have written it. If uninspired, he *may* have written just such a book. In the second place, no one ascribed it to him till the time of Clement of Alexandria, and it was ranked by Eusebius among the "spurious" writings, which, however much known and read in the church, were never regarded as authoritative. Eusebius also places The Pastor Hermas in the list of writings whose authorship is disputed. The Fourth Gospel rests upon an entirely different basis. There was but *one* tradition in respect to it, and from our first knowledge of it, it was regarded as authoritative, and its authorship was undisputed; for the slight exception of the few individuals, called the Alogi, is of no account. It was included in the commentaries and harmonies to which reference has been made; and such works would not have been written until the books upon which they were based had been long enough in the churches for a felt need of commentaries upon them. It was quoted as Scripture by Theophilus, and John its author was expressly named as moved by the Holy Ghost. In the Muratori Canon, it was placed as Scripture in the list of Canonical books, universally received. And that it could not have come in after the year one hundred and forty, or have been received unless it was genuine, will be still more obvious from a more particular consideration of some of those who accepted it. Pantænus, who was at the head of the Alexandrian school in the year

one hundred and eighty, was (says Eusebius) distinguished for his learning. Before his conversion he was a Stoic philosopher. After that, and before he became the head of the Catechetical school, he travelled extensively as an Evangelist. He went as far as the Indies, where he found that the Apostle Bartholomew, who had preceded him, had left the Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew. Pantæus could not have been ignorant of the "Memoirs," which were accepted in Justin's time, and he lived until the year two hundred and twelve. We have no *direct evidence* from him; but Clement, his pupil and successor, and noted for his learning, could not have been ignorant of the opinions of Pantæus; and from Clement there is the strongest testimony. He flourished between A.D. 165 and 220, and became head of the Alexandrian School in A.D. 187. Origen, his successor, with his great genius and acquirements, and extensive travel, and from his father Leonides, and his predecessors Clement and Pantæus, must have been fully informed of the "Memoirs" which were in the churches in the year one hundred and forty. And he says, that he has "understood *from tradition*, respecting the Four Gospels, *which are the only undisputed ones in the whole church of God throughout the world*," that the first was by Matthew, the second by Mark, "who composed it as Peter explained to him," the third by Luke, the companion of Paul, and "last of all" John "who reclined upon the breast of Jesus," has left one Gospel, in which he confesses that he could write so many that the whole world could not contain them." Tertullian, the celebrated lawyer, says, "Of the Apostles, John and Matthew published the faith to us." In defending the Gospel of Luke against the mutilation of the heretic Marcion, he positively affirms that all the churches founded by the Apostles accepted, not Marcion's abridgment of Luke, but a well-known form which had been "*received from its first publication*;" and that the other Gospels had been received from the same sources in authenticated copies. "In his abundant writings," says Norton,² "there is not a chapter in

the Gospels of Matthew, Luke and John, from which he does not quote," and from most of them his quotations are numerous. Tertullian was born at Carthage about A.D. 160, and from his conversion, about the year one hundred and eighty-five, he entered with great earnestness and ability into a vindication of Christianity, and the discussion of various questions connected with it. This able advocate could not have been misinformed of the usages of the churches less than half a century previous to the time when he entered upon his work.

The evidence of Irenæus is still more conclusive. He was born in Syria about A.D. 120, and he was therefore twenty years old when Justin wrote. His teacher was Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and his immediate predecessor at Lyons was Pothinus. Polycarp, at his martyrdom, was asked to save his life by denying Christ. "No," he said, "eighty and six years have I served him and he never did me any injury; how, then, can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour?" *Pothinus*, at his martyrdom, *cir.* 177, was more than ninety years old. The lives of these two men reached far back into the first century. They were at, or past, middle life when Justin wrote, and presbyters of important churches; and it is utterly incredible that they should not have known what "Memoirs" were read in their churches in Justin's time. And it is *equally incredible* that Irenæus, the disciple of the one and the immediate successor in office of the other, and *himself twenty years old* when Justin wrote, should not have been as well informed upon this subject. Yet Irenæus quotes³ from our Gospels and Acts, as Scripture, ascribes their authorship to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, and says that such was the accepted tradition in all the churches. After referring to the others, he says of the Fourth Gospel: "Afterwards John, the disciple of our Lord, the same that lay upon his bosom, also published the Gospel while he was yet at Ephesus, in Asia" (Eu. v. 8). And again⁴: "All the Elders testify, who were conversant with John, the disciple of our Lord, in Asia, that he delivered these things." About A.D. 180, in a treatise

against heretics, he appeals to the canonical Gospels with as much confidence that they are all well known and accepted by Christians, as any would do at the present day. Tischendorf⁵ says the number of passages where Irenæus has recourse to the Gospels is about four hundred, and about eighty of these in John. Sanday⁶ estimates the quotations from John in this treatise at seventy-three. But Clement, and Origen, and Pantæus, and Polycarp, and Pothinus, and Tertullian, were not better informed upon this subject than Serapion, who so promptly suppressed the heretical Gospel of Peter, or than Theophilus, his immediate predecessor, and the first after Papias (other than the author of the Muratorian Fragment) to mention any of the four Gospels by name, or than the author of this Fragment, or than many intelligent officers and members of the numerous churches from the Euphrates to the Seine.

With such evidence and from such sources, and the entire absence of any evidence of *substitution*, it may well be regarded as morally certain, that none occurred. What was probable, from the *seeming* use of the Canonical Gospels by Justin and his contemporaries, has become a *moral certainty*. The Memoirs which, in the year one hundred and eighty, were universally accepted, *were the same* that forty years before were read with the Prophets, in city and country, in all the churches every Sabbath day. Of this there can be no doubt. The Memoirs of the year one hundred and eighty, *were* OUR CANONICAL GOSPELS; and the Memoirs of the year one hundred and forty, *were* OUR CANONICAL GOSPELS. And we take our stand with Justin, with these Gospels in our hands, only forty years from the death of John, the beloved disciple, and at the close of a hundred years from the crucifixion of our Lord. And still we ascend the stream.

¹ Wright's Logic, etc., p. 187, Tischendorf, p. 43.

² Norton's Genuineness of the Gospels, etc., Part II. c. 1; Wright, p. 187.

³ Wright, pp. 188, 189, Tischendorf, p. 35.

⁴ Stowe's Origin, etc., p. 176.

⁵ Origin, etc., p. 35; Wright, p. 189.

CHAPTER XI.

STILL ASCENDING THE STREAM.

THE evidence thus far has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that at the writing of Justin's First Apology, the Canonical Gospels were read with the Prophets in city and country, on "the day called Sunday," as authentic Memoirs of our Lord. Assuming the date¹ of this Apology to have been A.D. 138 or 139, the time was a little over one hundred years from the Crucifixion, and less than eighty years from the death of Mark and Luke, and all the Apostles other than John, and only forty years from his death. How long were these periods as they affect the argument from the universal reception of the Gospels in Justin's time, and from the universal tradition in their favor which accompanied such reception? The writer has within two days (in April, 1881) met with three persons who saw Lafayette on his visit to New England in 1824. One of them distinctly remembers the sentiment² which Lafayette gave at Concord, and another shook hands with him. There were hundreds of Revolutionary soldiers present, some of whom the General recognized and called by name, although he had not seen their faces for more than forty years. This was in 1824. Whittier's poem describes one of these soldiers, as he now remembers him, at the time of Monroe's tour in 1817, *sixty-four years ago*:

"Once a soldier, blame him not,
That the Quaker he forgot,
When to think of battles won,
And the red coats on the run,
Laughed aloud Friend Morrison."

And throughout the country there are thousands now living*

* Rev. Simeon Parmelee, D.D., celebrated his one hundredth birthday at the house of his son-in-law Hon. E. J. Hamilton, ex-mayor of the city of

who well knew men who were in active life during the War of the Revolution. In the *Granite Monthly* for December, 1880, was published the Diary of Rev. Timothy Walker of Concord, for the year 1780, and there were earlier Diaries kept by him which have been preserved by his descendants. The Diary of Matthew Patten of Bedford, from 1750 to 1790, is in the custody of Charles H. Woodbury, Esq., of New York. The Congregational church at Concord, of which Timothy Walker was the first pastor, November, 1880, celebrated its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. There are several towns in New Hampshire, as Londonderry, Dover, Exeter and Portsmouth, that were settled earlier than Concord; and some of them as early as 1623. The landing of the Pilgrims was *two hundred and sixty years ago*. It seems but as yesterday. A century from the Crucifixion was no longer than a century now; and as an event, to be remembered, the Crucifixion was as much greater than the Landing of the Pilgrims as the glory of the noonday sun is above that of the feeblest star in the most distant heavens. The time that has elapsed since Timothy Walker wrote Diaries which are now in existence is as long as from the Crucifixion to Justin's Apology; more than thirty years longer than from the martyrdom of Peter and Paul to Justin's Apology; and sixty years longer than from John's death to Justin's Apology. The churches in Justin's time were not dealing with writings from a dim and misty past, or of limited or infrequent use. None were as ancient as Walker's Diary; the last had not seen half its years; they were in all the churches, and read every Sabbath day. The argument which proves

Oswego, N. Y., Jan. 16, 1882. His intellect was clear, and to those who called he had an ever ready response, and replied happily and wittily to the addresses. He had been in the ministry from 1808 to 1869, and, for years after, preached occasionally. His eldest daughter is 72 years of age, and his descendants now living, number 53. Upon his 90th birthday he wrote a hymn of considerable merit. When 100 years old, he remembered with vivid freshness the Inauguration of George Washington, although at that time but in his 8th year. See *Congregationalist*, Jan. 25, 1882.

that there was no substitution between 140 and 180 is as much more forcible to prove that there was no substitution between the years 100 and 140, or between the years 60 and 100, as those times were nearer the great events which the Gospels recorded. If, for example, there were accepted Memoirs of our Lord in the churches in the year 100, from the presumed *continuance* of a state of things the existence of which has been proved,³ it should be *presumed* that they remained in the churches till Justin's time, there being no evidence to the contrary. And so there would be the same (or greater) difficulties in the way of displacement and substitution, between the year 100 and the year 140, as between the year 140 and the year 180. Justin and his contemporaries had from their own recollection,⁴ or from others, whether parents, teachers, presbyters or bishops, as great facilities for knowing what Memoirs were accepted in the churches forty years before, as had Irenæus and his contemporaries in respect to the period of forty years before one hundred and eighty. And there was a succession and continued life in the churches from 100 to 140, the same as from 140 to 180. This reasoning is applicable to Clement and his contemporaries, and shows that Memoirs which were in the churches in the year 100 could not have displaced accepted and generally received Memoirs of any previous period. We know from the Epistle of Clement, as clearly as from Justin's Apology, how Christians loved and adored their Divine Lord and Master, and how strongly attached they must have been to any Memoirs of him, which they accepted as authentic. And the testimony of Pliny is, that Christians in his day were accustomed to meet before daybreak and sing a responsive hymn to Christ as God. It is utterly incredible that accepted Memoirs of Christ, thus worshipped, should have been thrown aside by presbyters or bishops, and hundreds of churches, throughout the Roman Empire, without a shock that would have left unmistakable evidences of it in history. There being an entire absence of any evidence of displace-

ment and substitution, it is *morally certain there was none*. John's Gospel, however, stands upon a different footing, since it came in not to displace, but to supplement. John lived to the close of the first century. *Who dared* to forge a spurious Gospel in his name, so soon after his death that it had obtained such a footing in the churches, at the end of forty years, as to be quoted as his production? *Who*, during that period, was *capable* of composing it? And how were hundreds of presbyters or bishops, and churches, from Syria to Gaul, persuaded to receive a spurious Gospel, as the genuine work of the beloved disciple who was in life within the personal⁴ recollections of many? It is a fact to be emphasized, that neither this Gospel, nor the others, can be assailed on historical⁷ or traditional grounds. *There is but one history or tradition* concerning them. The objections to them are either negative or speculative, mere assumptions, not supported by any history or tradition.

The first *use* of the four Gospels of which there is any history, is in statements of facts found to be recorded in them, and in quotations of teachings of Christ, corresponding with them. The first *description* of them after Papias, is that of "Memoirs" of Christ, "drawn up" by Apostles and companions of Apostles. The first mention of them *by the names of the writers*, ascribes their authorship to the men whose names they now bear. There is no history or tradition of a time when the first Gospel was ascribed to any but Matthew, or the second to any but Mark, or the fourth to any but John⁵, or the third, with Acts, to any but Luke. The standing objection that none of them is mentioned *by name* till the time of Theophilus, and Irenæus, and the writer of the Muratori Canon, is not of the slightest consequence as opposing evidence. For, if these Gospels were not mentioned by name, neither were any⁶ others; and surely we are not expected to believe that there were *no originals*, from which the many quotations, from Clement of Rome, in the year 97, down, were taken. This objection proves too much. For it proves, if it

proves anything, that there were *no* Gospels or writings to answer to the quotations, which, under the circumstances, is a palpable absurdity.⁷

¹ The evidence for this date of the First Apology is briefly:—

(a) It refers to a rescript of Adrian in relation to Christians, but to none by Antoninus Pius (c. 68), and so, presumably, there had been none.

(b) The Jewish war of A.D. 131-136 "lately raged" (c. 31), and Antinous, who was drowned in the Nile A.D. 132, "was alive but lately" (c. 9).

(c) Justin (c. 46) says Christ was born "one hundred and fifty years ago," and in Trypho (c. 103) that Herod, "when Christ was born, slew all the infants in Bethlehem born about the same time," "not knowing that God had commanded Joseph and Mary to take the child and depart into Egypt, and there to remain until a revelation should again be made to them to return into their own country. And there they did remain until Herod, who slew the infants in Bethlehem, was dead and Archelaus had succeeded him." This implies a considerable stay in Egypt. And Justin (since his information was from Matthew) when he wrote "born about the same time," could have had in mind no less period than two years before the death of Herod, *i.e.*, six years or over before our era, the very time maintained by Keim. But this is *decisive* against Keim's view (I., p. 188) that Justin wrote about A.D. 155. For at *that* time, he would have written "one hundred and sixty years ago."

(d) Although Marcion came to Rome A.D. 139-142, he is not described as *of* Rome or *at* Rome, but as a man *of Pontus* (c. 26), and Marcion *of Pontus* (c. 58), whom the devils put forward. The saying that "he is even at this day alive" (c. 26) contrasts him with the heretic Simon, "who, in the reign of Claudius Cæsar, and in your own royal city of Rome, did mighty acts of magic by virtue of the art of the devils operating in him." If Marcion had been at Rome when the First Apology was written, his being there would have been as apparent from the Apology as the fact that Simon was, in the reign of Claudius. And if the two (Justin and Marcion) had been there together, a battle of words between them would have been as inevitable (and would have been as apparent in this Apology) as that between Justin and Crescens, so prominent in the Second Apology. There is not a *hint* of such an encounter, or the slightest reference to Marcion as being then at Rome. Justin, therefore, wrote before the year 142. In his extensive travels he knew of Marcion long before that time.

(e) In such a formal appeal to Marcus Aurelius (to whom Adrian had given the name of Annius Verissimus), after the year 139, Justin would have been sadly wanting in respect if he failed to address him by his illustrious title of Cæsar, than which there was none higher, save that of Augustus Cæsar. The presumption that it would have been given is the stronger, from the reference to the deceased Verus as a Cæsar. What is there to meet this presumption? 1. The appeal of Athenagorus calls the

emperors conquerors, and, more than all, philosophers. But it *first* styles them "Emperors." 2. The language of Lucius in the shorter Apology. But if this was written at a later period than the other, the words, "This judgment of yours, O Urbicus, does not become the Emperor Pius nor the philosopher, the son of Cæsar, nor the sacred Senate," spoken by the unknown Lucius to the prefect of the city, in the name of religion and philosophy, may not have been inappropriate. It is quite otherwise with Justin's formal address. And if, as is most probable, the *two* writings were the "little book" which Justin wanted published, the time might have been in the year 139. For then, as before and after, to be an avowed Christian was punishable with death if any one chose to prosecute. And the martyrdom of Justin, whenever it was, had no connection with his controversy with Crescens. The only evidence cited by Eusebius to prove a connection is to the contrary. Tatian would not have written merely that Crescens *plotted* Justin's death if he actually *caused* it. 3. The use of the plural "kings" by Justin (c. 17), where he says that Christians "everywhere, more than all other men, willingly pay taxes, acknowledging you as kings and rulers of men." But it is uncertain in what sense the word is used by him or to whom applied. Gibbon (vol. 2, p. 164), says that of the whole series of Roman princes in any age of the empire, Hannibalianus alone (A.D. 326) was distinguished by the title of KING.

(f) The accession of Antoninus Pius, who had a high reputation for moderation and justice, was an auspicious occasion, and had been for some time anticipated. Justin, writing in the beginning of the year (139), before the Senate had conferred upon Marcus the title of Cæsar, would address him as philosopher and not as Cæsar; and dating the birth of Christ from as early as six years before our era, he would, in an incidental reference to the time, call it in round numbers 150 years, although four or five years short of it. This date (139) best accords with all the known facts, and is generally accepted. See *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed., vol. 13, p. 791; McClintock's and Strong's *Encyclopædia*, vol. 4, p. 1106; Canonicity, by Dr. Charteris (1880), lv.; Fisher's *Supernatural* (1870), p. 48; Sears, 4th Gospel (1873), p. 151; Neander's *Church Hist.*, vol. 1, p. 663; Eusebius, c. 8, b. IV., and Pagi, Lemisch, Roberts and Donaldson.

² "The memories of Light Infantry Poor and Yorktown Scammel."

³ See Phillips, Parker, and Greenleaf, as quoted in c. 8.

⁴ Justin, in his *First Apology* (c. 15) refers to many of sixty or seventy years of age, who had been Christ's disciples from childhood.

⁵ Prof. Fisher (p. 69) says, that besides the few individuals called the Alogi, or men "without understanding," there is no allusion to the denial of John's authorship of the Fourth Gospel by any writer, before the latter part of the fourth century.

⁶ See *ante*, pp. 20-39, and p. 42, note 14.

⁷ And as to Matt. and Mark, see pp. 14, 15.

CHAPTER XII.

IN THEIR PROPER REPOSITORIES.

CERTAIN propositions have been established by facts and arguments that cannot be successfully controverted:

(a) The advent of Christ and its stupendous results.

(b) The formation of numerous churches which by the end of the first century were in all parts of the Roman Empire, with presbyters or bishops and elders in every church, and many thousands of communicants.

(c) They regarded him with the greatest reverence and affection, obeying his commands as their Lord and Master, paying him divine honors, and for his sake joyfully yielding up their lives.

(d) Of his disciples and followers, twelve, called Apostles, were understood to have special authority from him in the Church.

(e) From the nature of the case we should look for the reception in these numerous churches, of Memoirs of their Lord which they would *deem* authentic, and at so early a period, that they would be able to *determine* whether they were authentic or not,

(f) To such Memoirs, once accepted, they would be so strongly attached that they could not be displaced and others substituted for them, in hundreds of churches in all the Roman Empire, without such controversy as would have left indubitable evidence of it.

(g) As far back as history goes, doctrines¹ were taught, facts asserted, and quotations made, corresponding with the Canonical Gospels, and such use was continued until a time when there is a positive identification of them by name. Within this period there was one writer making numerous quotations and references, who declared that the writings from which he

quoted, and to which he referred, were "Memoirs" of Christ "drawn up" by Apostles or companions of Apostles.

(*h*) There is no proof of the existence of writings *other* than those Gospels answering to his description, or corresponding with the quotations; and finally within forty years of his first reference to these "Memoirs" they are clearly seen to be the Canonical Gospels.

(*i*) From first to last there is no evidence whatever of displacement of Gospels previously accepted, and the substitution of others for them in the churches generally.

(*j*) The Fourth Gospel is of such a character, and was in use so soon after the death of its author (and who is also stated as its author in the Gospel itself), as to make the idea of attempted and successful *forgery* in the highest degree improbable.

(*k*) And these Gospels within less than eighty years from the death of the Apostles other than John, and within forty years of *his* death, were read with the Prophets in the churches, in city and country, every Lord's day, and *accepted as Apostolic*.

(*l*) From the earliest period they were where they should be if authentic, and where they could not have been, unless *accepted as authentic*.

Some illustrations have already been given in chapter eleven of the brief interval between the Apostles and Justin Martyr. Let any intelligent reader of sixty, from his own recollection, or any young person, from the recollections of others with whom he is acquainted, determine for himself. The writer was admitted to the Bar almost forty years ago; he has within a few months seen an original deed² of land in Londonderry (the home of his ancestors) executed one hundred and fifty years ago; he has in his possession certified copies of certificates of marriages and births, in his own genealogical record — going back from one to two hundred years, in one instance two hundred and thirty years, and these certificates would be received as *evidence* in any Court. They would be received,

because made by the proper custodian of public documents, found in the proper repository for them. The presumption of law in such case is the judgment of charity. It presumes that documents found in their proper repository, and not bearing marks of forgery, are genuine. A deed thirty years old, followed by a possession agreeing with it, is admitted in evidence without other proof of its execution. Our Gospels in Justin's time were where they *should* have been, if authentic. The Church was the proper repository for authentic Memoirs of its Founder. *Our Gospels were there*. They were in their proper repository. And upon every principle that rules in the administration of justice, or in the common affairs of life, it must be presumed that they were *rightfully* there. Their rejection is *not* "the judgment of charity." It reverses the maxim that fraud is not to be presumed. It charges forgery, of which there is no evidence, upon persons whom it finds it impossible to discover and identify. It imputes ignorance and indifference to multitudes who had every opportunity for knowing the truth, and who were willing to suffer all things for their convictions of the truth. It presses, as of vital consequence, trivial objections and alleged errors in chronology, geography and history, which (if made out) would not for a moment be thought sufficient to successfully impugn the authenticity of any secular work as well supported by external evidence. It is unnecessary to further consider such objections.³ It is no exaggeration to say, that the various theories and speculations of those who deny the genuineness of the Gospels are, in the main, but ingenious attempts at the solution of the problem: "Given, the impossibility of miracles, what may be supposed to be the true history of Jesus Christ?" The only consistent answer that could be made, would be that upon such an hypothesis, it is impossible to determine what was his life or character. But, given, the possibility of miracles (and if there is a God they must be possible), there is no reasonable doubt of the authenticity of the Gospels, and the book of Acts. They come to us from their proper repositories,

and must be presumed to be rightfully there. They are proved to have been in those repositories within but a short period from the death of the Apostles. They were accepted as Apostolic, and as having been drawn up by Apostles or companions of Apostles. If such undoubted reception, and use, and tradition, at so early a period, and thence until now, cannot be *trusted*, no credit can be given to *any* writings or history from ancient times. They *can* be trusted. The stream which eighteen hundred years ago was issuing from Apostolic times and the hills of Palestine, has flowed onward, enriching and blessing the nations.

¹ Mr. Waite assumes that Clement did not hold to a literal resurrection. Clement's language admits of no such construction, although in writing to Christians who understood all about it, he was not as definite upon this point, as Justin in *his* address to a different class. Clement refers to the resurrection in c. 24: "Let us consider, beloved, how the Lord continually proves to us that there shall be a future resurrection, of which he has rendered the Lord Jesus Christ the first fruits by raising him from the dead. And again in c. 42, after saying that the Apostles were commissioned, he adds: "Having therefore, received their order, and being fully assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and established in the Word of God, with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth proclaiming that the kingdom of God was at hand." The force of this language is not controlled by any means, by reference to the day's following the night, and the springing up of the fruits of the earth, from the sowing of the seed.

² The deed dated June 16, 1731, was by David Morrison, one of the grantees in the Charter of Londonderry of 1722, to his brother-in-law, David McAlister. This deed with another from the same grantor to William McAlister dated February 24, 1746, are now in the possession of Jonathan McAlister, Esq., a descendant of David and an owner of the original granted land.

³ One other correction should be made. Judge Waite arbitrarily assigns Cerinthus to the year 145. He gives no reason or authority for it. It is the testimony of all antiquity that Cerinthus was contemporary with the Apostle John, and that John died about the year 100. Irenæus, upon the authority of Polycarp, says that John, being about to enter a bath and finding Cerinthus within, drew back saying: "Let us even be gone lest the bath should fall to pieces, — Cerinthus, that enemy of the truth, being within." See Vol. II., Encyclopedia of McClintock and Strong, p. 190.

CHAPTER XIII.

INTEGRITY OF THE GOSPELS.

As stated in former chapters, this is to be presumed till the contrary is shown. There is, however, strong confirmation from many sources.

First. — The writings of the Apostolic Fathers present to our view the Christ of the Gospels, in his advent and life, ministry and teaching, death and resurrection. In particular, his resurrection from the dead is cited by Clement (A.D. 97) as an earnest of that of his followers, and as a proof that he came forth from God. The greatest of miracles, and the central fact of Christianity, appears in the earliest writings (outside of the New Testament), the date of which can be determined. Judge Waite, in his "wonderful hundred¹ years of silence by Christian writers" concerning the miracles of Christ, is oblivious of what he had before stated, that aside from the Gospels, there are left of the first century "only the Epistles of Paul, the one Epistle of Clement of Rome, some slight notices by Jewish and heathen writers, and the few legends and traditions preserved in the writings of the Fathers." Such an argument from silence, *where there are no writings extant*, is not befitting a judge.

Second. — The earliest quotations substantially agree with the Canonical Gospels. Some of those by Justin Martyr have been given in chapters five and six, and those by Clement may be found in the Note.² These quotations by Apostolic and Christian Fathers, afford ample³ means for comparison, and no variations appear to indicate any changes to affect the character or teachings of our Lord. Professor Fisher says⁴ of *Justin's* references, that they embrace "not more" than two sayings of Jesus that have not substantial parallels in the four Evangelists. The first is, "In what

things I shall apprehend you, in these will I judge you," which is found also in Clement of Alexandria, and Hippolytus. The second is, "There shall be schisms and heresies," a prediction referred also to Christ by Tertullian. These sayings may have come from *tradition*. It seems not improbable that they were current expressions, embodying what Jesus taught⁵ respecting the standard by which men shall be judged according to the light which they have received, and divisions in the same household. (See cc. 6 to 8 *ante*).

Third. — The facts in Christ's history referred to by the Fathers, with very rare exceptions (the most of which were stated and explained in chapter seven), correspond with the Evangelists. The exceptional facts are such as would naturally have been derived from tradition, and they in no way change the life or character of our Lord as they appear in the Gospels. The marvel is, that they should be so few and unimportant, considering that some of the writers lived at a time when⁶ "traditionary reminiscences must have possessed all their freshness."

Fourth. — Marcion's Gospel (written as early as the year 145), except in intentional omissions and mutilations, for which he was sharply called to an account by Tertullian, presents a substantial agreement with Luke's Gospel. Judge Waite claims that it was earlier than Luke's; but the almost unanimous verdict of scholars is against him. Indeed, Professor Fisher, in the March number of the *Princeton Review* for 1881 (p. 217), says: "That Marcion's Gospel was an abridgment of our Luke is *now conceded on all hands*, even by the author of 'Supernatural Religion.' Dr. Sanday has not only demonstrated this by a linguistic argument, but has proved by a comparison of texts that the Gospel of the Canon must have been for some time in use, and have attained to a considerable circulation, before Marcion applied to it his pruning-knife. There is no reason to doubt that he took for his purpose a Gospel of established authority in the Church." Professor Curtiss also says that "the weight of scholarship is

overwhelmingly in favor of the priority of Luke." And he quotes from the last edition of the "Supernatural Religion," the admission referred to by Professor Fisher. Its anonymous author says that Dr. Sanday's very able examination "has convinced us that our earlier hypothesis is untenable; that the portions of our third Synoptic, excluded from Marcion's Gospel, were really written by the same pen which composed the mass of the work; and, consequently, that our third Synoptic existed in his time, and was substantially in the hands of Marcion." Dr. Sanday⁷ shows, as he expresses it, that Marcion's Gospel stands to Luke's "entirely in the relation of *defect*. We may say entirely, for the additions are so insignificant — some thirty words in all, and those for the most part supported by other authority — that for practical purposes they are not to be reckoned. With the exception of these thirty words inserted, and also some slight alterations of phrase, Marcion's Gospel presents simply an *abridgment* of our St. Luke." That Marcion's Gospel was not one of Justin's "Memoirs," is plain from his calling him a wolf,⁷ "sent forth by the devil." Although Marcion's Gospel is not in existence, except as reproduced from the works of Tertullian and Epiphanius, its agreement with Luke (with the exceptions which they pointed out) becomes important evidence that Luke is to-day as it was in the year one hundred and forty-five.

Fifth. — Our Gospels and Acts before the close of the second century of our era were translated into other languages, and the Syriac, Coptic and Latin versions which have come down to us with some imperfections and slight variations, are in substantial agreement with our present version in all that is material. A translation of a given date presumably represents a text of greater age than itself. Hence the manuscripts from which these translations were made were older than the year two hundred, and probably older than the year one hundred and fifty.

Sixth. — The early and continued multiplication of copies

affords strong evidence. Those who copied from originals deemed authentic would certainly endeavor to make exact copies. As these Memoirs were read in all the churches, and, doubtless, in Christian families and Christian schools, they soon became very numerous. There was fraternal intercourse between the churches. Any substantial difference in the copies would be noticed. Any such differences would be transmitted in copies made from these copies, and so on, to the manuscripts which have reached us. The number of copies before the tenth persecution (commenced A.D. 300, and lasting ten years) must have reached many thousands.⁸ So complete was then supposed to be the extinction of Christianity, that coins were struck and inscriptions set up, recording the fact, that the "Christian superstition" was now utterly exterminated, and the worship of the gods restored by Diocletian, who assumed the name of Jupiter, and Maximian, who took that of Hercules. This persecution, in addition to the destruction of life, was specially⁹ directed to the destruction of copies of the Scriptures.

Seventh. — Constantine, their successor, in the year 331, caused fifty copies of the Scriptures to be made for Byzantium, under the care of Eusebius of Cæsarea, the church historian. The manuscript discovered by the celebrated Tischendorf, in 1859, at the convent of St. Catherine, on Mount Sinai, is believed to be one of those copies, and to be the oldest¹⁰ Greek manuscript in existence. If one of the fifty, it is more than fifteen hundred years old. It is called the Sinaitic Codex. The second rank belongs to the Vatican Codex. Its date is probably not later than the fourth century. The next in the order of time is the Alexandrian Codex. Its date is the latter part of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth century. The Vatican has been in the Vatican Library since 1445. The Alexandrian was sent, in 1628, by the Patriarch of Constantinople, to Charles I., and is now in the British Museum. The Sinaitic was presented by its discoverer to the Emperor of Russia. There is no

doubt whatever that these three manuscripts were written back of the "dark ages," and at a time when the true text could be known with great exactness, and was comparatively free from errors. With these, there are fifty manuscripts that are a thousand years old. There are, it is estimated, more than seventeen hundred manuscripts of the whole, or portions, of the New Testament, ranging in date from the fourth to the sixteenth century. Providence, says Tischendorf, has ordained for the New Testament more sources of the greatest antiquity than are possessed by all the old Greek literature put together. The number of manuscripts of the Greek Classics, says¹¹ Professor Stowe, is very small compared with the Greek Testament manuscripts, and the oldest of them scarcely reaches nine hundred years. There are such differences between the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrian manuscripts as indicate that no two of them were taken from the same original. A little reflection will convince any one, that while no single copy may be literally exact from its original, the multiplication of copies adds greatly to substantial accuracy as the result of the whole. For although there is a tendency to a repetition of *some* errors, by different copyists from the same original, as where successive sentences end with the same word, yet, in general, different copyists would make different errors, one in one part of the instrument, and the other in another, and, where the copies are numerous, they mutually correct each other. So it happens that in the different manuscripts of the New Testament, with different readings of many thousands (counting all trifles, like the omission to dot an *i* or cross a *t* in English chirography, as different readings), there is substantial agreement. It is a fact to be emphasized, says¹² Professor Fisher, "that the Scriptures are almost utterly free from wilful corruption;" and he endorses the opinion of the great critic, Bentley, that the real text "is competently exact in the worst manuscripts now extant; nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted or lost in them." And examining the subject in

hand from a lawyer's standpoint, the *worst* manuscript, or translation, or version, is sufficient for the purposes of the argument. And to cite once more the great authority of Professor Greenleaf,¹³ to the genuineness of the Four Gospels: "The entire text of the Corpus Juris Civilis is received as authority in all the courts of Continental Europe, upon much weaker evidence of its genuineness; for the integrity of the Sacred Text has been preserved by the jealousy of opposing sects beyond any moral possibility of corruption; while that of the Roman Civil Law has been preserved only by tacit consent, without the interest of any opposing school to watch over and preserve it from alteration."

And now (1882) the New Revision, both of the text and of the translation, by scholars who have no superior, and the careful product of ten years' labor, has been long enough before the world to know the results. Not a single fact or witness to the Resurrection is lost, and not a single doctrine is changed, while many passages are better understood.

¹ He puts the date of the Epistle of Barnabas, A.D. 130, but it is generally placed earlier. p. 29. note 5.

² "Be merciful that ye may obtain mercy; forgive that it may be forgiven to you; as ye do, so shall it be done unto you; as ye judge so shall ye be judged; as ye are kind so shall kindness be shown to you; with what measure ye mete with the same it shall be measured to you" (c. 13). Matt. vi. 12-15; Matt. vii. 2; Luke vi. 36-38. "This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me" (c. 15). Matt. xv. 8; Mark vii. 6. "Woe to that man! It were better for him that he had never been born, than that he should cast a stumbling block before one of my elect, yea it were better for him that a millstone should be hung about his neck, and he should be sunk in the depths of the sea, than that he should cast a stumbling-block before any of my little ones" (c. 46). Matt. xviii. 6; Matt. xxvi. 24; Mark ix. 42; Luke xvii. 2.

³ The entire Gospel could be reproduced from those writings, including Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen.

⁴ The *Princeton Review* for March, 1881, p. 201.

⁵ Matt. x. 34-36; Luke x. 13-15; Luke xii. 47-53.

⁶ Bampton Lectures for 1877, p. 221, by the Rev. C. A. Row, M. A., Pembroke College, Oxford, Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral.

⁷ Ap. I., cc. 22, 58. See also Sanday's *Gospels of the Second Century*, p. 214, and "Canonicity," by A. H. Charteris, D. D., 1880, pp. 76, 393.

⁸ Norton estimates the number by the close of the second century at sixty thousand, which may be a large estimate.

⁹ Vol. VII. of McClintock and Strong, p. 966; Neander's Church History, Vol. I., p. 148. Neander says that Feb. 22, A.D. 303, on one of the great pagan festivals, at the first dawn of day, the magnificent church of Nicomedia (then the imperial residence) was broken open, the copies of the Bible found in it were burned, and the whole church abandoned to plunder and then to destruction. The next day was published an edict that all assembling of Christians for the purpose of religious worship was forbidden; churches were to be demolished to their foundations; all manuscripts of the Bible should be burned; those who held places of honor and rank must renounce their faith, or be degraded; those belonging to the lower walks of private life to be divested of their rights as citizens and freemen; slaves were to be incapable of receiving their freedom so long as they remained Christians; and in judicial proceedings the torture might be used against all Christians of whatsoever rank. "It is quite evident," says Neander, "that the plan now was to extirpate Christianity from the root." But it was the darkness which preceded the dawn, for this was the *last* of the Pagan persecutions.

¹⁰ A facsimile steel engraving forming the frontispiece to Tischendorf's New Testament, gives specimens of the Greek text in which these three manuscripts are severally written. The difference in the style of the text is one great means by which experts determine the age of the manuscript. The oldest manuscripts are written in large, square, upright capitals; and they are called Uncials. The later manuscripts are written in flowing scripts; they are called Cursives. The proportion of Uncial to Cursive manuscripts is about one to ten. The Cursive was introduced in the tenth century.

¹¹ *Origin and History of the Books of the New Testament*, by Prof. C. E. Stowe, A.D. 1867, pp. 31, 62.

¹² In *Scribner's Monthly* for February, 1881, p. 617.

¹³ *An Examination of the Testimony of the Four Evangelists by the rules of Evidence administered in Courts of Justice, etc.* By Simon Greenleaf, LL.D., Royal Professor of Law in Harvard University (A.D. 1846), p. 28.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE EVANGELISTS.

THE question of their credibility is before that of their inspiration. If uninspired, they may have given us everything essential to the determination of Christ's resurrection. If inspired, inspiration may have been bestowed in such a manner as to leave them subject to some of the limitations of human testimony. If reliable accounts of the life, teachings, death, and resurrection, of our Lord, were to be published to the world, it was of the last importance that they should not carry upon their face the appearance of collusion and contrivance. Let any one who is disturbed by any seeming contradictions or errors, consider for a moment what would be the consequence if they did not exist. If each writer narrated the same occurrences and teachings and in the same terms, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to believe that they were independent witnesses. And so, if each should give all of the same occurrences and teachings, although in different terms, or a part of them, but in the same terms, it would be almost as difficult to believe that we have independent witnesses. As it is, no question can arise. Neither of them covers the whole ground, and where the same matters appear, it is, in general, except in brief passages easily remembered, in different terms. We are *sure* there was no collusion. We are sure we have the testimony of independent writers. This is conceded. Says Judge Waite (pp. 311, 313): That the Gospels "are not merely copied one from the other, with changes, is the almost unanimous verdict of Biblical scholars." And in this, he expresses the verdict of those who reject, not less than of those who accept the Gospels. Among the limitations attending mere human testimony, are, that, ordinarily, no witness will state the whole of

any transaction, and no two witnesses will state it in precisely the same terms, unless there is fraud or collusion, and the testimony of each is but the recital of something that has been committed to memory. Another limitation is, that even with two or more witnesses, errors to some extent will come in. There will be some lack of correct observation, or some misrecollection,—not only the omission of a part, but positive misstatement by one or more of the witnesses. The whole transaction is to be gathered *from all* the witnesses. And the law, having respect to human infirmities, says it is enough in all cases to prove the *substance* of words alleged to have been spoken, or the substance of the issue, in any civil or criminal cause; immaterial errors of time, or place, or distance, or other circumstance, will be disregarded. Now it is *conceivable* that the Evangelists, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, may have been left (to some extent) subject to these limitations, in order that their testimony, conforming to these laws of observation and memory, be the more credible. Hence, whether the Evangelists, in this stage of the inquiry, be regarded as inspired or uninspired, it is labor lost, to adduce alleged errors¹ or contradictions which, if made out, could not seriously affect their honesty and general competency. In order that a witness receive our confidence, we should be satisfied of his means of knowledge, his capacity to ascertain the facts, and his disposition to give a correct account of them. Two of the writers, Matthew and John, were of the twelve (and John was the beloved disciple) and hence they had the best possible means of knowing the facts. Matthew, from his business of a tax-gatherer, may be presumed to have been sharp, shrewd and observant. John, from his most intimate association, was pre-eminently qualified to give testimony. He gives it with solemnity equal to an oath: "And he that saw bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe" (c. xix. 35). "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written

in this book; but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through his name" (c. xx. 30, 31). Again, after stating what Peter asked concerning the disciple "whom Jesus loved," and what followed, it is said: "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and who wrote these things; and we² know that his testimony is true" (c. xxi. 20-24). This Gospel, obviously written later than the others, omits much that is contained in them, and is, so to speak, of higher order. The first incident mentioned in it, is the witness borne to Christ by the Baptist. It gives none of the parables, so abundant in the Synoptics.³ It relates but two of the miracles recorded in them, *i. e.* the feeding of the five thousand, and the walking upon the water, (c. vi. 1-21). It adds six miracles not recorded in the Synoptics (among which is the raising of Lazarus), numerous conversations and discourses of the greatest interest, and facts relating to the crucifixion and resurrection, of great weight as evidence. It is written in purer Greek than the others; its style⁴ is elegant and graceful; it gives every indication of calm, thoughtful and deliberate composition, and in these respects tends to confirm the uniform tradition that it was the ripe product of a mind and heart, enriched, quickened, and vitalized, by familiar intercourse with our Lord and the truths which he declared, as well as by the Spirit promised to the Apostles. Men with favorable native gifts, become educated fast under such influences.

It affords about the only means for a connected chronological history of our Lord's ministry, which is seen to have embraced a longer⁵ period, than could have been ascertained from the Synoptics.

Although Mark was not one of the twelve, the character of his Gospel in its life-like description of events, and its omitting nothing* where Peter was prominent, confirms the tradition, that he was an attendant upon Peter's ministry,

* Its omission of Peter's want of faith, as recorded in Matthew 14-30, is an exception.

and was his interpreter. Nine-tenths⁶ of the incidents related in Mark are also recorded in the other Gospels.

Luke was an educated man, and, as he incidentally discloses, a companion of Paul in a part of his journeyings. His Gospel was evidently drawn up with great care. In the prologue (c. i. 1-5) he gives a reason for his writing, and the sources of his information. "Many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us." These things, he says, "were delivered unto us by those who from the beginning were eye witnesses and ministers of the Word." He was stimulated to give an additional narrative ("having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first") for the satisfaction of his friend, Theophilus, and in order that he might know "the *certainty* of those things," wherein he had been instructed. No historian could enter upon his work in a better spirit, or with more excellent qualifications and opportunities. In a subsequent treatise which in terms refers to the former, he finds nothing to retract or qualify. Can any one tell why Luke, as a historian, is not entitled to as much credit as Josephus?

In comparing the Gospels with each other, or with Josephus, it should be constantly borne in mind, that *omission* (except under special circumstances) is *not contradiction*. The facts of history, like the conclusions of a jury, are to be drawn from all credible sources, and the transaction deemed to be as shown upon *all* the evidence. *Positive* testimony from a single witness may prove a fact against the *negative* testimony of any number of witnesses, who are silent upon the subject.

It is also to be remembered that the Gospels are not so much connected histories, as reminiscences of events and teachings, with but little regard (sometimes an utter disregard) to their chronological order. Neither Gospel is, of itself, any approach to a connected history from Christ's birth to his ascension. The events, so far as known to us, are to be

gathered *from them all*. Mark begins with the Baptist at the river Jordan, and John at about the same time. It is not to be inferred that they knew nothing of the infancy, or childhood, or young manhood of Jesus. Matthew omits the presentation at the temple, the vision to the Shepherds, and other incidents; and Luke omits the visit of the Wise men, the slaying of the children, the flight into Egypt, and other incidents. But in so doing, neither contradicts the other; nor does Josephus, by his silence concerning these events, contradict the Evangelists. He may have been ignorant of some of these events, for he was not born until the year 37, and, being a Jew and not a Christian, he might not choose to mention those which had come to his knowledge.

Luke's Gospel may or may not have made use of writings then in existence relating to Christ (but which never found general acceptance), and the same is true of the First and Second Gospels. *It is no impeachment of their credibility.* Every historian makes such use of materials that he deems reliable, as best answers his purpose, and his history is none the less trustworthy on that account. Hence, as a matter of evidence, it is of no consequence how many or how few, previous manuscripts may be traced in our Gospels, or either of them. Such writings had an ephemeral existence, never came into general use, and the Four Gospels and no others were the accepted Gospels in all the churches. Whatever literature of the kind preceded them perished so early that it cannot be told when it disappeared, or what was its character or completeness.

The Evangelists give every mark of honest witnesses. Their story is simple, straightforward and unimpassioned, even under circumstances calculated to arouse resentment. They seem intent upon nothing but the giving of a truthful narrative, not sparing themselves or extenuating their own faults. Their frequent incidental allusions to matters of government, custom, nationality, etc., and minuteness of detail,

are such as would never be found in false witnesses. "A false witness," says Mr. Greenleaf, "will not willingly detail any circumstances in which his testimony will be open to contradiction, nor multiply them where there is danger of being detected by a comparison of them with other accounts equally circumstantial."

It would detract nothing from the credit of the Evangelists, if, in the multitude of their incidental references, error⁷ should be found in a few of them, for some error is inseparable from all human productions; and their inspiration⁸ may not have been so circumstantial as to exclude immaterial⁹ errors.

With such differences as show most convincingly that the Evangelists are independent witnesses, there is such unity in the character and life of Christ, as exhibited by them, as shows the same *original* for the likeness. This essential unity of the Gospels is evidenced by the fact that not a single church or communion exists, that does not accept *all* the Gospels, if *either*.

From internal evidence, it is extremely probable that the Synoptics were written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Luke was certainly written before Acts, and the history in Acts is not carried later than the year 62, eight years before that event. As the four undisputed Epistles were all written before the year 60, the logical order will be to present the testimony of Paul to the Resurrection before that of the Evangelists.

¹ President Bartlett believes that notwithstanding its long line of exposure, the outer historical difficulties seem reduced to the solitary question of the taxing under Cyrenius. (*The Princeton Review* for January, 1880, p. 44.) Aside from any question of inspiration, it is improbable that Luke made a mistake. Justin Martyr, who wrote at a very early period, in his *Apology* to the Roman Emperor, refers to this taxing as a well known event (Ap., c. 34). He again refers to it in his *Dialogue* (c. 78) as being the first census taken in Judea under Cyrenius. Celsus, who was not wanting in skill or inclination to attack at all points, found no occasion here. It may well be that a person holding the office which Cyrenius held at the first enrolment was called a "procurator." Or Luke in speaking of this enrolment may have referred to Cyrenius by the title which he afterwards

bore; or Cyrenius may have been in the office twice. President Bartlett also concludes with Warrenton that there is not any instance of a really inapposite quotation from the Old Testament, although the quotations are sometimes inaccurate. He also concludes that the instances of alleged *contradictions* may be reduced to five, and that there is no insurmountable difficulty in reconciling them. But, for reasons stated in the text, the inquiry is not material to our argument.

² Many suppose that the "we" are the Elders at Ephesus. But if so, why did they not sign? The "we" preceded by the unmistakable reference to John and followed by the first person singular, in the closing verse, is as likely to have been John.

³ "Synoptics" — a word often used by writers at the present day to designate the first three Gospels.

⁴ The Apocalypse is quite different in style and in respect to pure Greek. For these reasons and others some of the early Fathers denied that the Apostle wrote it. But such was the early tradition. Justin Martyr refers to him as the author, and as Dr. Sears, in his *Heart of Christ*, well argues, these differences are sufficiently accounted for by the highly excited state of mind in which the Apocalypse was written; and he points out many agreements both in doctrine and mode of expression.

⁵ Three years, and possibly four.

⁶ Wright's *Logic*, etc., p. 210; Norton's *Genuineness*, etc., Vol. I., p. 188; Wescott's *Introduction*, cc. 3 and 4.

⁷ As to one *alleged* error, we adopt the view of Lange and Edersheim, that John, as well as the Synoptics, makes the crucifixion to have been on the 15th Nisan. The "feast" (13:29) was that after daylight of the 15th (Lev. 23:6), and for which purchases could be made the evening before; the "preparation" (19-31, 42) was as defined in Mark 15:42, and the "passover" (18-28) was that same feast after daylight (the *Chagigah*) and *could not* have been the paschal supper, for *that* is *after* sundown, and ceremonial defilement *ends* at that time (Lev. 11-24, 25-40). So Jesus and his disciples ate the paschal lamb at the usual and appointed time, after sunset of the 14th, and before midnight. Lange's "Life of Christ," Vol. I., pp. 164, 165; Edersheim's "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," 1883, Vol. II., pp. 507, 565, 566. And it is only by looking at the first verse, disconnected from v. 23, of c. 12, which uses the same expression, "The hour is come," that the events in c. 13 could ever have been supposed to have taken place before the passover. He had *foreseen* what was to come; "having loved his own he loved them to the end," and a striking exhibition of that love (*during* supper, and not *before*) is at once given, and others follow.

⁸ This is now conceded by Orthodox Protestant writers, and virtually by Cardinal Newman in an interesting article in the "Nineteenth Century" (Eclectic Magazine for April 1884).

CHAPTER XV.

THE APOCALYPSE AND THE FOUR EPISTLES.

WHILE all Infidels, from Celsus before the year 180 to Waite, in 1881, have agreed that "either Jesus was not really dead, or he did not really rise again," some¹ of them have assumed the one, and some the other alternative. Strauss, with Celsus, doubts the reality of the resurrection, rather than the death. Schleiermacher, on the other hand, held that Jesus returned again to life from a state of lethargy; and this view, although not the position generally taken by skeptics, is still held by a very few.

There have been two institutions in the Christian church, the Lord's Supper and the Lord's day, that have testified from the beginning that Jesus was really dead, and did really rise again from the dead. They displaced the Jewish Passover and the Jewish Sabbath, both strongly entrenched in the law of Moses and long established custom. Such substitution can be accounted for, only upon the hypothesis of the fullest conviction of the death and resurrection of our Lord. The Lord's day is referred to by Paul in First Corinthians (c. xvi.) under the designation of "the first day of the week," and is mentioned by John in Revelation (c. i. 10), where he says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day." The Lord's Supper has great prominence given to it by Paul in the eleventh chapter of First Corinthians. Those to whom he writes are admonished not to eat "of that bread," or drink "of that cup," in an unworthy manner, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." As to the origin of this sacrament, he says, "I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake and said, Take, eat; this is my

body broken for you; this do in remembrance of me: and after the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do ye as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." This Epistle was written as early as the year² 57, or within 27 years after the Crucifixion. It is not to be doubted that such a command would be observed from the first formation of any church. Both the death and resurrection of Christ appear in the book of Revelation. He is called "The first begotten of the dead" (c. i. 5), "He that liveth and was dead" (c. i. 88), "The Lamb as it had been slain," before whom the four living creatures and the elders (as representing the whole Church) fall down, saying, "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation" (c. v. 6 to 10). And John says that he was in exile, "for the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ" (c. i. 9). What was this "testimony," other than that which Luke says in Acts (c. iv. 2) was given by Peter and John when the Sadducees were "grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus Christ the resurrection from the dead;" or other than that, given by Peter in the presence of John, (c. iii. 15) that the Jews had "killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead; *whereof we are witnesses.*" Even from the book of Revelation³ alone, were there no other proof, should we conclude that *John* testified that Jesus died and rose again.

This was the burden of *Paul's* preaching and the inspiration of his life.

Nor do we stop with Paul. From his writings we know that all the Apostles and the whole Church from the beginning, maintained the same grand theme with all the strength of conviction of which men are capable. He had been preaching three years prior to the first visit to Jerusalem referred to in Galatians (c. i. 18). At this visit he had "returned again," to Damascus. His leaving Damascus was

probably the time when he was let down from the wall in a basket, as stated in Second Corinthians (c. xi. 33), and the city was then held "under Aretus the King." Fourteen years after his conversion or his escape (it is uncertain which), he went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus also with him. The precise date of his conversion is unknown, but was approximately⁴ in the year 36. He writes of the last visit mentioned in Galatians, "that when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." From that time, then, if not before, with the full recognition of all the Apostles, he became distinctively the Apostle to the Gentiles. And at the first visit mentioned, he saw James, the Lord's brother, and also Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. Afterwards, he went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia, and was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea, but they had heard, "That he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed;" and he says, "they glorified God in me" (c. i. 18-24). He says in the thirteenth verse, "Ye have heard of my conversation in time past, in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God and wasted it."

As there is no doubt what "the faith" was, which he preached after his conversion, so there is no doubt what "the faith" was "which once he destroyed." Within three years after the commencement of his ministry, he saw James the Lord's brother, and abode with Peter fifteen days; and at the expiration of the fourteen years, *all* the Apostles were ready to give him the right hand of fellowship. As there is no doubt what "faith" *he* preached (which was the same which he had destroyed), so there is none as to what faith the *others* preached, and *had* preached from the beginning. *His conversion was within six years of the Crucifixion.* As he from that time preached Jesus and the Resurrection,

there is no doubt but that Jesus and the Resurrection were preached during the six years before his conversion. Hence, from Paul's four Epistles (whose genuineness is beyond controversy), we are inevitably carried back to the first ministry of *any* of the Apostles, for the time when the doctrine of the Resurrection was *first* proclaimed. This conclusion is reached without recourse to the testimony of either of the Evangelists; and believers may say with Renan, though in a different spirit, "Thanks to the Epistle to the Galatians!" If from this Epistle the *precise* commencement of the ministry of Peter and John cannot be determined, it must be inferred that it was before, and apparently some time before, Paul's conversion, which, as has been seen, was *within six years* of the Crucifixion. For this reason, as well as many others, the importance of Paul's testimony can hardly be overestimated.

But in order that its full force may be better apprehended, it may be useful to present it more in detail, as: In Romans "God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. v. 8); "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more" (Rom. vi. 9); "Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God" (Rom. viii. 34); "Declared to be the Son of God, with power according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i. 4); "The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart *that God hath raised him from the dead*, thou shalt be saved" (Rom. x. 8, 9); And to the Galatians—"Paul, an Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who *raised him from the dead*" (Gal. i. 1); And to the Corinthians—"Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead!" "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is *Christ* not risen;" "And if Christ

be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain;" "Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God because we have *testified* of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not" (1 Cor. xv. 12 to 16); "For I delivered unto you *FIRST OF ALL* that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; after that he was seen of about five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep; after that he was seen of James; then of all the Apostles; and last of all he was seen of me also, as one born out of due time; for I am the least of the Apostles and am not meet to be called an Apostle because I persecuted the Church of God" (1 Cor. xv. 3-10).

We know not with what body Jesus appeared to Paul six years after his ascension; nor with what body or just when his saints shall rise. But when Paul says that Christ, having died for our sins, was *buried* and rose again the *third day*, and was seen by those enumerated, it would be a most violent perversion of language to infer that it was not a *material* resurrection. His flesh had not then seen corruption, and he had not yet ascended. The state of things had changed at the time he was seen by Paul, and hence the mode of his appearance was different. Paul could not have been ignorant that the Apostles were persuaded that they beheld and handled the corporeal body of their risen Lord, and if he had entertained a different idea of the character of the appearances to them, he could not have written as we have quoted. As will be shown in subsequent chapters, he had "received," a corporeal resurrection, and so he "delivered."

These four Epistles of Paul were written about A.D. 58, or within less than thirty years from the Crucifixion. By them, two things are established beyond dispute. *First*, the doc-

trine of the Resurrection, whether true or false, is not a *myth or legend*, in any sense in which those words are commonly understood, or in any sense in which they should ever be used. Nor are the appearances or *supposed* appearances of our risen Lord, mentioned by Paul (whether they be regarded as real or not), *myths or legends*. The *doctrine* of the Resurrection was not the product of a subsequent age; it was received from the beginning. Nor were the *appearances* of our risen Lord, which were the basis of that doctrine, the product of a subsequent age. A skeptic, if he will or must, may say that the doctrine is not true, and that the appearances which were accepted as evidence of it were not real; but he cannot without an abuse of language say that the one, or the others, are *myths or legends*.

Second, the Apostles and early disciples most intensely believed the doctrine to be true, and the appearances to be real. Even Strauss is compelled to admit their sincerity. He concedes that the Epistle to the Corinthians is undoubtedly genuine. And he says that on its authority, "One must believe that many members of the primitive church who were yet living at the time when this Epistle was written, especially the Apostles, were convinced that they had witnessed appearances of the risen Christ." (Strauss' Life, etc., p. 832.) And this is generally conceded by all skeptics at the present day who have any claim to be even tolerably informed upon the subject of the Resurrection, and any disposition to deal with it in any spirit of fairness. This narrows our inquiry very much. Thus far we rest on solid ground. We start with the fact fully established, that we are not dealing with myths, or legends, concerning a remote transaction. We know precisely what convictions in respect to the Resurrection were entertained at the very time of the transaction, by those best qualified to judge; and we also know many of the facts, upon which these convictions were based. We may say, if we choose, that the supposed appearances were not real; but we cannot say they are an *afterthought*. They

must have been entertained from the very beginning, certainly as early as the day of Pentecost. The Apostles believed with most intense earnestness, that they had seen their *Risen Lord*, and had received from him their Commission to disciple all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Their honesty being conceded, the only question remaining is, *were they deceived?* Mistake on their part could only have been in one of two things; either that he did not die upon the cross, or else that he was not alive afterward. And here it is important to observe, that the Evangelists do little more than give to some extent the times and circumstances of transactions already declared, in the Epistles, to have occurred. Of course those transactions as they were understood when the Epistles were written, *had* their times and circumstances. Paul declared what he had "received," — that Jesus *died* and was *buried*. The Gospels state the time and the attending circumstances. Paul declared, as he had "received," — that Christ *rose again the third day*. The Gospels state the circumstances. Paul declared, as he had "received," — that Jesus after he rose on the third day, was seen by Cephas, then by the twelve, after that by about five hundred brethren, after that by James, and then again by all the Apostles. The Gospels and the first chapter of Acts state the circumstances of some, though not of all, of these several appearances. From what we know already from Paul's Epistles, further information from some source should be expected; and the Evangelists afford that information. We must believe that they state the *circumstances*, as they were understood when Paul wrote his Epistles, and as they were understood when the Resurrection was first proclaimed on the day of Pentecost. As the principal facts, *i. e.* the Resurrection and subsequent visible appearances till the Ascension, were not an afterthought, neither are the *circumstances* attending them as recorded by the Evangelists, an afterthought. In respect to these circumstances, we

can see and know what the Apostles *supposed* they saw, and heard, and knew.

The Evangelists, therefore, by stating circumstances not specified by Paul, enable us to determine more certainly, whether the Apostles were deceived. And what they state of Christ's predictions of his death and his resurrection, may also help us to determine whether the Apostles were deceived.

¹ Strauss' Life of Jesus, Vol. II., pp. 843-4; Godet's Com. on St. Luke, A.D. 1881, p. 511.

² Conybeare and Howson's Life, etc., of Paul, p. 962.

³ Judge Waite will not admit John's authorship, and he cites Eusebius cc. 3-39, as having attributed the Apocalypse to John the Presbyter. This may indicate a present "tendency" by skeptical writers to shift their ground. Eusebius, however, only states that there were two, John the Apostle, and John the Presbyter," and that "it is probable that the second, if it be not allowed that it was the first, saw the Revelation ascribed to John." Justin Martyr had long before (Dial., c. 81) in express terms given John the Apostle as the author; and such is the general verdict of scholars.

⁴ Conybeare and Howson, pp. 438, 961, 964.

CHAPTER XVI.

HIS PREDICTIONS CONCERNING HIMSELF.

IN the account of Christ's crucifixion by Matthew and Mark, it is recorded that they which passed by railed on him, saying,—"Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days, save thyself"; and that witnesses had testified to the same accusation, but did not agree. The disagreement seems to have been, that some (Mark xiv. 58) testified that he said,—“I will destroy this temple that is made with hands and in three days I will build another made without hands,” and the others (Matthew xxvi. 61) “I am able to destroy the temple of God and to build it in three days.” The Evangelists properly characterize both classes as *false* witnesses. Jesus had not said, “I *will* destroy,” nor “I am *able* to destroy,” but, “Destroy (*thou*) this temple.” It was not a destroying by *him*, but by *them*; and it was the temple of his own body. It was the earliest, and in some respects the most striking of his predictions of his death and resurrection. It was on the occasion of his cleansing the temple at the first Passover. The Jews demanded of him, “What sign showest thou unto us, seeing thou doest these things?” Jesus said, “Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up.” The Jews therefore said, “Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body. When, therefore, he was raised from the dead his disciples remembered that he spake this, and they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said.” (John ii. 13 to 22.)

It must have been soon after this Passover, and certainly before John the Baptist was cast into prison, that Jesus said to Nicodemus, that, as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that

whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life. (John iii. 14, 15.) Nicodemus does not appear again, until his mild protest to the rest of the Sanhedrim, — "Doth our law judge a man except it first hear from himself, and know what he doeth?"¹ They answered and said unto him, "Art thou also of Galilee? Search and see that out of Galilee ariseth no prophet." He was silent. (John viii. 45 to 52.) But when Jesus had been put to death as a malefactor, no longer afraid, he comes with Joseph of Arimathea, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds weight, and they gave the Crucified One a princely burial. (John xix. 39, 40, 41.) What had wrought this change in Nicodemus? The lifting up upon the cross, was to *him* assured proof that Jesus was a true "prophet, and more than a prophet."

On more than one occasion in his early ministry, Jesus in reply to a demand for a sign from heaven had said, "There shall no sign be given but the sign of Jonah the prophet; for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." (Matthew xii. 38 to 40; Luke xi. 29.) That he should be there only three days and three nights implied his resurrection. To any objection that he was not in the tomb any part of three nights, the customary² use of language among the Jews is a sufficient answer. In the *Talm hieros*, it is said that a day and a night together make up a period; and a part of such a period is counted as the whole. It is a received³ rule among the Jews that a part of a day is put for the whole. Yet that the prediction was expressed in such terms, is strong evidence of the truthfulness of the record. As Godet well says, "Who would ever have dreamed of *falsely* putting in the mouth of Jesus the expression three days and three nights, when in actual fact the time spent in the tomb did not exceed one day and two nights?"

Jesus, when called to account for healing on the Sabbath day, answered: "My Father worketh even until now, and I

work." For this cause, therefore, the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only broke the Sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal with God. In reply Jesus said: "For as the Father raiseth the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. . . . Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour cometh and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. . . . Marvel not at this, for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tomb shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of judgment." (John v. 1 to 29.)

In his discourse in the Synagogue at Capernaum, concerning the manna, he said to the Jews: "The bread which I give is my flesh (that is, my life), for the life of the world. . . . For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. . . . Many therefore of his disciples when they heard, said, 'This is a hard saying; who can hear it?' But Jesus knowing in himself that his disciples murmured at this, said unto them, 'Doth this cause you to stumble? *What* then if ye behold the Son of man ascending where he was before.'" (John vi. 30 to 63.)

His first distinct announcement that he should be put to death and be raised from the dead, was upon Peter's confession, — "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God;" and it doubtless was in consequence of this confession. It was after John the Baptist had been put to death, and after the third Passover, but before the time had come for a public declaration of his Messiahship; for he charged the disciples that they should tell no man that he was the Christ. The place was in the coast of Cesarea Philippi, near the sources of the Jordan. With verbal differences, the same account substantially is given by each of the Synoptics, and as follows: "From that time began Jesus to show unto his disciples, how that he must go into Jerusalem and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and the third day be raised up."

(Matthew xvi. 21.) "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again." (Mark viii. 31.) "The Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected of the elders and the chief priests and scribes and be killed, and the third day be raised up." (Luke ix. 22.) Such is the testimony of these three witnesses. They agree also, that he warned the disciples not to anticipate worldly glory, but the reverse. Peter, from *his* conception of the Messiahship, treated Christ's predictions of his death as but gloomy forebodings, and began to rebuke him, saying, "Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall never be unto thee." But he turned and said unto Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art a stumbling block unto me: for thou mindest not the things of God but the things of men." (Matthew xvi. 23; Mark viii. 33.)

Six or eight days after these transactions Jesus took with him Peter and John and James, and went up into a mountain to pray; and he was transfigured before them. As they were coming down from the mountain "he commanded them to tell the vision to no man until the Son of Man be risen from the dead." (Matthew xvii. 1, 2; Mark viii. 2 to 9; Luke ix. 28 to 36. Mark adds (doubtless from Peter), that they kept that saying, questioning among themselves, what the rising again from the dead should mean.

Elijah's appearance suggested to them the question, "Why do the scribes say that Elijah must first come?" To which Jesus replied, "Elijah is come already, and they knew him not, but did unto him whatsoever they listed. Even so shall the Son of Man also suffer of them." Then understood the disciples that he spake unto them of John the Baptist (Matthew xvii. 10 to 13). Mark (ix. 12 to 14) puts the reference to the Son of Man in the form of a question: "And how is it written of the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be set at naught? But I say unto you that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even

as it is written of him." In either form his own death is predicted.

After the transfiguration he went to Capernaum, passing through Galilee. "And while they abode in Galilee, Jesus said unto them, 'The Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men; and they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised up.' And they were exceeding sorry." (Matthew xvii. 22, 23.) "'The Son of Man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he shall rise again.' But they understood not the saying, and were afraid to ask him." (Mark ix. 30 to 32.) "'Let these words sink into your ears: for the Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men.' But they understood not this saying, and it was concealed from them that they should not perceive it; and they were afraid to ask him about this saying." (Luke ix. 44, 45.) It is not necessary to suppose that it was otherwise concealed than by their dullness of apprehension, and preconceived opinions.

At the feast of Tabernacles, Jesus said to the officers whom the Pharisees had sent to take him: "Yet a little while am I with you, and I go unto him that sent me. Ye shall seek me and shall not find me: and where I am ye cannot come." (John vii. 32 to 35.)

He said the same to the Pharisees or the "Jews," the day following the feast as he taught in the temple; and they said, "Will he kill himself, that he saith whither I go ye cannot come?" In reply, after repeating his previous declaration, he said, "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things. And he that sent me is with me; he hath not left me alone; for I do always the things that are pleasing to him." (John viii. 21 to 30.)

In the parable of the good shepherd spoken soon after the Feast, Jesus says: "I am the good shepherd . . . and I lay down my life for the sheep. . . . Therefore doth the

Father love me because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No man taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I of my Father." (John x. 11 to 18.)

He said to Martha, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he die yet shall he live." (John xi. 25.)

As he was going up to Jerusalem to the Passover at which he was to suffer, he again repeated his announcement to his disciples. "Behold we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of Man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles to mock, to scourge, and to crucify; and the third day he shall be raised up." (Matthew xx. 18, 19.) "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of Man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles; and they shall mock him, and shall spit upon him, and shall scourge him, and shall kill him; and after three days he shall rise again." (Mark x. 33, 34.) "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man; for he shall be delivered up unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and shamefully entreated, and spit upon; and they shall scourge and kill him; and the third day he shall rise again. And they understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them; and they perceived not the things that were said." (Luke xviii. 31 to 34.)

Immediately after (as it would seem), the mother of James and John came with them with the request, that the sons might sit one on his right hand, and one on his left hand, in his kingdom. The ten were moved with indignation. But Jesus said, "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." (Matthew xx. 20 to 28; Mark x. 45.)

Six days before the Passover, he came to Bethany, where Lazarus was whom he had raised from the dead, and they made him a supper in the house of Simon; and Mary (the sister of Lazarus) anointed his head and feet with very precious ointment. This excited the anger of Judas. Jesus said, "Why trouble ye the woman, for she hath wrought a good work upon me. For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always, for in that she poured this ointment upon my body she did it to prepare me for burial. Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her." (Matthew xxvi. 6 to 13; Mark xiv. 3 to 10; John xii. 2 to 8.)

Immediately after his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, on the first day of the week of his crucifixion, he was told that certain Greeks desired to see him. It was to him a sign of his glorification among the Gentiles, and, therefore, of his death. He answered, "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified. Verily, verily I say unto you, except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit. . . . Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour. . . . And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." But this he said signifying by what manner of death he should die." (John xii. 20 to 22.)

The parable of the wicked husbandman (to be found in all the Synoptics) represents them as killing the son and heir, by whom, as the context shows, our Lord was intended. And Jesus said, "Did ye never read in the Scriptures:

'The stone which the builders rejected,
The same was made the head of the corner;
This was from the Lord,
And it is marvellous in our eyes.'

Therefore, say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing

forth the fruits thereof. And he that falleth on this stone shall be broken to pieces; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust." (Matthew xxi. 42 to 45; Mark xii. 1 to 12; Luke xx. 9 to 10.)

And every day he was teaching in the temple; every night he went out and lodged in the Mount of Olives till the third day of the week (Tuesday) with which his public ministry ended; and then he departed from the temple, never to return.

When he had finished his teaching in the temple, he said unto his disciples, "Ye know that after two days the Passover cometh, and the Son of Man is delivered up to be crucified." (Matthew xxvi. 2.)

Peter and John, as he had directed, made ready the Passover, and when the hour was come, he sat down, and the Apostles with him. And he said unto them, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer." (Luke xxii. 7 to 15.)

All the Evangelists state, that Jesus at the Passover supper said to the twelve, "One of you shall betray me"; and two of the Evangelists say that he designated the traitor, by the giving of the sop. (Matthew xxvi. 21 to 25; Mark xiv. 18 to 21; Luke xxii. 21 to 23; John xiii. 21 to 35.)

After giving him the sop, Jesus said to Judas, "That thou doest do quickly;" and he having received the sop, went out straightway to carry out that which he had before agreed; *and it was night.* (Luke xxii. 2 to 6; John xiii. 26 to 30.)

After Judas had gone out, Jesus said, "Now is the son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him; and to Peter he said, Whither I go thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow afterwards." (John xii. 36, 37.)

To the institution of the Lord's Supper, there is the testimony of the three Synoptic Gospels, and that of Paul; four witnesses; and its constant observance from that time to the present. It was to commemorate his death to the end of the world, — "Take, eat, this is my body. . . . Drink ye all of it;

for this is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many unto remission of sins." (Matthew xvii. 26 to 28.) "Take ye; this is my body." "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many." (Mark xiv. 22 to 25.) "This is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. . . . This cup is the new covenant in my blood, *even* that which is poured out for you." (Luke xxii. 18 to 22.) This is my body, which is for you; this do in remembrance of me. . . . This cup is the new covenant in my blood; this do as oft as ye drink *it* in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." (1 Corinthians xi. 23 to 28.)

To his saying that he would go before them into Galilee after his resurrection, there are *two* witnesses. It was after they had sung their hymn, and had gone out unto the Mount of Olives. "All ye shall be offended in me this night; for it is written I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. But after I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee." So, Matthew. Mark's account is: "And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended; for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad. Howbeit after I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee. (Matthew xxvi. 31, 32; Mark xiv. 27, 28.)

That Peter should thrice deny that he knew him, is proved by *all* the Evangelists. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, that this night before the cock crow⁴ thou shalt deny me thrice." (Matthew xxvi. 34, 35.) "I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, until thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me." (Luke xxii. 34.) "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, the cock shall not crow till thou hast denied me thrice." (John xiii. 38.) Mark (probably from Peter himself) says that when Peter said, "Although all should be offended, yet will not I," Jesus said to him, "Verily I say unto thee, that thou to-day, *even* this night, before the cock crow twice, shalt deny me thrice." "But he spake exceeding vehemently, If

I must die with thee, I will not deny thee. And in like manner said they all." (Mark xiv. 26 to 31.)

Yet in the discourse which followed, Jesus again says, "Behold the hour cometh, yea, is come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone; and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me." (John x. 31, 32.)

"Yet a little while, and the world beholdeth me no more; but ye behold me; because I live ye shall live also." (John xiv. 19, 20.)

"Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be fearful."

"Ye heard how I said to you, I go away, and I come unto you. If ye loved me ye would have rejoiced, because I go unto the Father, for the Father is greater than I. And now I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass ye may believe." (John xiv. 27 to 31.)

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends if ye do the things which I command you." (John xv. 13, 14.)

"But now I go unto him that sent me, and none of you asketh me, Whither goest thou? But because I have spoken these things unto you sorrow hath filled your heart." (John xv. 5, 6.)

"A little while and ye behold me no more, and again a little while and ye shall see me." (John xv. 16.)

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, that ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice; ye shall be sorrowful, but your sorrow shall be turned into joy." (John xvi. 20.)

"And I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee." (John xvii. 11.)

"Again the high priest asked him and saith unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am, and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." (Mark xiv. 62.)

To Pilate he said, "I am a king"; and "Thou wouldst have no power against me, except it were given thee from above." (John xviii. 33 to 37; xix. 11.)

To the penitent thief he said, "Verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." (Luke xxiii. 43.)

When he had cried with a loud voice HE SAID, "FATHER, INTO THY HANDS I COMMEND MY SPIRIT." (Luke xxiii. 46.) And all the Evangelists, four witnesses, say that he "gave up," or "yielded up," the ghost.

There is as much evidence of these utterances (and they are not *all* of his predictions, in some form, of his death and resurrection), as there is of any of his sayings upon any subject, and they are so interwoven with the entire narrative that it is impossible to set them aside, and leave anything to which we can safely assent as historically true of all his recorded acts and words. There is no alternative, except to believe that he uttered these predictions, or else to arbitrarily set aside the testimony of the four Evangelists, as well as that of Paul. It is impossible to save their character as honest witnesses, and deny that Jesus at various times, and in different ways, foretold his death and the circumstances attending it, and also his resurrection, and that after he was raised from the dead, he would go before them into Galilee. Not that we have the *precise* words, neither more nor less, that he uttered. In no instance do any two of the five witnesses give *precisely* the same words. Their testimony is in accordance with what usually* occurs, with honest witnesses. The witness says, "I cannot give the exact words, or all of them." He is told to give the substance of what was said; and he does so to the extent of his recollection, using some of the same words, doubtless, but in the main expressing the idea in language of his own. Yet there is sufficient certainty, for the court or jury, in matters of the greatest concern. It is, in the highest degree, unreasonable to demand more of the Evangelists. It is also to be borne in mind that neither of them

* See *post*, c. 19. pp. 124, 136, 137.

professes to give all of our Lord's sayings ; and John, writing much later than the others, purposely omitted many things as having been already sufficiently stated.

If, then (as it cannot be doubted was a fact), Jesus plainly foretold his death, why did it take his disciples by surprise ? The answer to this question may be that not till within six months of the close of his ministry were they thus told ; those months were crowded with his teachings and miracles, multitudes were following him ; he had just before entered Jerusalem as they might expect their Messiah would do, amidst the hosannahs of thousands ; and they were so filled with their visions of his glory, and their false conceptions of the predicted Messiah, whom they believed him to be, that they could not understand him. Their mistake under the circumstances was a natural one. (See also *post*, c. 19.)

¹ Canon Farrar's *Life of Christ*, c. 13 ; Lange, ditto, Vol. II., p. 29 ; John ii. 13-22, and iii. 22-25. Here, and in all *subsequent* references, the citations are from the Revised Version of the New Testament, unless otherwise stated.

² Lange, Vol. II., p. 273, note, citing Stier, ii, 171.

³ Lange, Vol. II., p. 273, note ; Godet on Luke, p. 265 ; Whitby, as quoted by Scott, on Matthew xii. 40 ; Genesis i. 5 ; Daniel viii. 14, with Genesis vii. 4 and 17 ; Deuteronomy xiv. 28, with xxvi. 12 ; 1 Samuel xx. 12, with v. 19 ; 2 Chronicles x. 5, with v. 12 ; Matthew xxvi. 2, with xxvii. 63 and 64 ; Luke ii. 21, with i. 59 ; 1 Kings xx. 29 ; Esther iv. 16 ; Greenleaf on the Evangelists, etc., 268, 269 and notes.

⁴ The cock crows about midnight and about three in the morning, which was the beginning of the fourth watch. Galicinium (Cock-crowing) standing alone means the latter time ; so that the same time is referred to by all. Greenleaf's *Testimony*, etc., p. 436, and citations.

CHAPTER XVII.

ORDER OF EVENTS.

WHATEVER difficulties may exist as to minor points, all the facts necessary to a correct decision of the question of the Resurrection may be ascertained with reasonable certainty, and the order of their occurrence.*

That Jesus Christ was crucified under Pontius Pilate is the testimony of all history. That his crucifixion was the day before the Jewish Sabbath* is proved by all the Evangelists, and the constant observance of the First Day of the week as the Lord's Day.

Having been condemned to death, and his execution entrusted to Roman soldiers, there is the strongest presumption that the sentence was fully executed. This presumption is confirmed by all the Evangelists, by Paul in all his Epistles, and by the constant teaching of all the Apostles. On the day of Pentecost, Peter boldly said, Ye men of Israel, Jesus of Nazareth being delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, "ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay ;" and no one called in question the fact of his death. Again, at the healing of the lame man, he declared, "Ye denied the Holy and Righteous One and asked for a murderer to be granted unto you, and killed the Prince of Life ;" this charge he repeated before the Sanhedrim ; and there was no denial. When Peter and John, after their release from prison, were brought before the Council, one charge against them was : "Ye have filled Jerusalem with your teaching, and intend to bring this man's blood upon

* And hence there is no occasion to inquire whether the Evangelists agree precisely as to the details (as far as given) of his arrest, or trial, or crucifixion. That he was arrested and tried and crucified is admitted on all hands. See *ante*, p. 80, note 7.

us." Stephen, when brought before the Council, declared, "Ye have now become the betrayers and murderers . . of the Righteous One." If there could have been the slightest doubt of the actual death of Christ, the Council would have furnished the evidence.

John solemnly declares that "one of the soldiers, with a spear, pierced his side, and straightway there came out blood and water." It was a thrust by a Roman soldier to make the fact of death absolutely certain. It was such a result as would have followed, if, from excessive labors and extreme agony, there was a collection of water about the heart, or if from like causes, and as Dr. Stroud and other eminent surgeons suppose¹, the cause of his death was a rupture or breaking of the heart.

And, finally, not less than forty times, on different occasions, and in a variety of ways, had Jesus foretold his death. He instituted a Sacrament to commemorate it; he said to the penitent thief: "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise;" and in the extreme moment, "Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit." It is not possible to accept the hypothesis of his return to life from a state of lethargy, without destroying *his* moral character, as well as that of his disciples. Where was he, when Peter and Stephen were charging home his death upon the guilty Jews? Where was he, when Stephen suffered martyrdom for his sake, and when his apostles and disciples were preaching his death and resurrection?

Even Strauss is constrained to say "The whole country side knew that he was dead."

He was buried. So says Paul, and² all the Evangelists. As the day of the crucifixion was drawing to its close, that the bodies should not remain on the cross² upon the Sabbath (for that day² of the Sabbath, was a high day), the Jews asked of Pilate that the legs of those who had been crucified might be broken,² and they be taken away. The soldiers brake the legs of the others, but not of Jesus, for they found that he was already dead; and his death was assured by one

of the soldiers. Thereupon Joseph of Arimathea, a rich man and a counsellor, begged the body of Jesus. Pilate, after he knew from the centurion that he was dead, commanded it to be delivered. Joseph, with Nicodemus, wound it in fine linen with spices, and laid it in his own new tomb, hewn out in the rock, rolled a great stone "to," or "against" the door, and departed. The sepulchre was "nigh at hand," otherwise, there would not have been time for the burial before the coming in of the Sabbath. The next³ day the chief priests and Pharisees or some of them, obtained from Pilate a guard, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone (Matthew xxvii. 62, 66).

The objection that they could not have known that Jesus had said, "After three days I will rise again," is well answered by Alford: "Not the saying, but its meaning was hid from his disciples." Judas knew it, and may have informed the chief priests and Pharisees of it; and they may have known it from other sources, for it was not spoken in secret. Nor with their perverse rejection of him while they could not deny his works, is it improbable that they might have some apprehension of the necessity of a guard? We are not to judge them from our standpoint, but from theirs. They did *not* believe that he was the Messiah (Acts iii. 17; 1 Corinthians ii. 8). They said and doubtless believed, after a fashion, "He deceiveth the people" and "casteth out devils through the prince of the devils." Their guilty fears were the occasion of this increased certainty of his resurrection. The mention of a guard by Matthew (although not by the other Evangelists), is in perfect keeping with his previous occupation, which had led him to make, and observe, precautions against fraud. It was, in his view, as in ours, an important fact that their precautions against imposition had reacted upon themselves. His narrative is unimpeached. It was published early, and his statement of the appointment of a guard was not contradicted.

The facts must stand that Jesus died, and was buried; and

at the instance of his bitterest foes, soldiers guarded his tomb against the little company of his frightened followers.

At a very early hour on the first day of the week it was known that the stone had been rolled away, and the body of Jesus was not in the tomb. Such is the testimony of all the Evangelists. This great fact is at the threshold of our inquiry. It must be accounted for. The Christian's explanation is that Jesus rose from the dead, and an angel of the Lord descended and rolled away the stone. The account which the soldiers were induced to circulate was, that his disciples came by night and stole him away while they slept. This story was current among the Jews when Matthew wrote⁴ his Gospel, and when, nearly a hundred years after, Justin Martyr wrote to Trypho the Jew. It ought not to be difficult to determine which explanation is the true one.

As soon as Mary Magdalene (who was of the company of women who came first to see the sepulchre), saw that the stone was rolled away, she ran to Peter and John, saying, "They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb and we know not where they have laid him." (John xx. 2.)

The other women⁵ entered into the sepulchre, and found not the body of Jesus, but saw two angels, one of whom said to them, "He is not here, he is risen; but go your way and tell his disciples and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee, there shall ye see him as he said unto you." (Why should the Apostles be told that Jesus would go before them into Galilee, if he was to show himself to them that very day at Jerusalem? Both to prepare them for the interview at Jerusalem, and in order that the tidings might be carried to all the disciples, the most of whom were in Galilee.)

They departed quickly with fear and great joy, and told these things unto such of the Apostles as they found in the city; but "these words appeared in their sight as idle talk; and they disbelieved them." (Luke xxiv. 11.)

As soon as Peter and John knew from Mary Magdalene, of the open sepulchre, they ran both together, but John outran

Peter and came first to the tomb; "and stooping and looking in, he seeth the linen clothes lying; yet entered he not in. Simon Peter therefore also cometh, following him, and enters into the tomb; and he beholdeth the linen clothes lying and the napkin that was upon his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but rolled up in a place by itself. Then entered in therefore the other disciple also, which came first to the tomb, and he saw and believed. For as yet they knew not the Scripture that he must rise again from the dead. So the disciples went away again unto their own home." (John xx. 1-10.)

Such is the circumstantial account given by John of the state of things at the tomb, as they found it before Jesus appeared to any one, and before they had received any information that he had risen from the dead. The body was not there. It could hardly have been removed by friends, and they both be ignorant of it. Had it been taken by enemies? There were the linen clothes, and there, rolled up in a place by itself, was the napkin. Who had arranged them thus? "All had been done calmly, collectedly. Neither earthly friends nor earthly foes had done it; the one would not have stripped the garments from the body, the other would have been at no pains so carefully to arrange⁶ and deposit them." So John must have reasoned and, perhaps recalling what Jesus had said, he *believed*. He believed from what he *saw*, and not from the Scriptures, for as yet he knew not from them, that the Christ "must rise again from the dead." It is not probable that he then avowed his conviction. He trusted that Jesus would, in due time, reveal himself to them all.

The particulars of his appearance to Mary Magdalene appear in the Fourth Gospel. She was not expecting to see him, and, blinded by her tears, she knew not that it was Jesus until he spoke her name, doubtless in a familiar tone. She turneth herself, and saith unto him in Hebrew, *Rabboni*, which is to say, Master. She *would* have clung to him. Jesus had told his disciples before his crucifixion that he was

to go to the Father. But this event was yet in the future; and when she would detain him, Jesus saith to her, Touch me not (or Take not hold on me) for I am not yet ascended unto the Father: but go unto my brethren and say to them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and my God, and your God. This would remind *them* of what he had told them; and would remind *her*, as Peter afterwards was reminded, that she would best manifest her love by willing service. She obeyed. But those to whom she told it, when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, disbelieved. (Mark xvi. 17.)

The other women after delivering the message of the angels, returned. And behold Jesus met them saying "All Hail." And they came and took hold of his feet and worshipped him. Then saith Jesus unto them, Fear not: go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me. (Matthew xxviii. 9, 10.) Matthew, speaking in a general way, does not distinguish this appearance from that to Mary Magdalene, but blends the two together. The salutation was different, and the message and the circumstances were different. Nor is it, as Strauss (p. 813) vainly imagines, any objection to the hypothesis of separate appearances, that it involves "a restless running to and fro of the disciples and the women;" for under the intense excitement it could hardly have been otherwise.

Jesus joined himself to two of the disciples on their journey to Emmaus, discoursed to them by the way, and made himself known in the breaking of bread. One of them was Cleopas, the other (his name not given) is supposed⁸ to have been Luke. When they left Jerusalem, the woman had reported the message from the angel. Peter and John had returned from the tomb, but no one had seen the Risen Lord. The time of their leaving was before Mary Magdalene had told that she had seen the Lord. The day therefore must have been considerably advanced before Jesus appeared to her.

It was toward evening, when Jesus sat down with them to meat. Their eyes were opened and they knew him, and he "vanished out of their sight."

And they rose up that very hour and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together and them that were with them, saying, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon."

This, as we learn from Paul, was the first appearance to any of the Apostles. The time and place are not mentioned. We only know that it was before the arrival of the two disciples. Emmaus⁹ was about eight miles from Jerusalem. The narrative seems to indicate that the event had but just occurred.

The two disciples rehearsed the things that had happened. As they spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of the disciples, and said, "Peace be unto you." But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit. He said unto them, "Why are ye troubled, and wherefore do reasonings arise in your heart? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having." And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his feet; and while they still disbelieved for joy and wondered, he said unto them, "Have ye here anything to eat?" and they gave him a piece of broiled fish. And he took it, and did eat before them. (Luke xxiv. 35-43.)

But Thomas, who was not with them, having said, "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe," Jesus eight days after stood in their midst and said, "Peace be unto you." Then saith he to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing." Thomas answered and said unto him, "My Lord and my God." Jesus saith unto him, "Because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed

are they that have not seen and yet have believed." (John xx. 24-29.)

After these things Jesus manifested himself at the Sea of Tiberias, to Peter, Thomas, Nathaniel, James, John and two others. It was on this occasion that he three times asked Simon Peter, "Lovest thou me?" and he signified to him by what death he should glorify God. This is said to be the *third* time that he manifested himself to the disciples, *i. e.*, to the Apostles when they were together. (John xxi. 1-23.)

Then he appeared (says Paul) to above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now, but some are fallen asleep. Paul is speaking only of manifestations to Apostles or some of them. The Apostles surely were not absent from this great assembly. All the circumstances indicate that it was the meeting which he had provided¹⁰ for, before his crucifixion, and that it occurred on a mountain in Galilee.

Then he appeared to James. Paul is our authority. Neither time, nor place, nor circumstance is given. It is strong confirmation of the genuineness of our writings that there is no disclosure of the particulars of the interview with either Peter, the first of the Apostles, or with James, our Lord's brother. Jesus doubtless had something to say to each for himself alone, and none of the sacred writers have lifted the veil.

At the end of the forty days he led the Apostles out over against Bethany, gave them his final charge, and lifted up his hands and blessed them. And it came to pass while he blessed them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven. (Luke xxiv. 50-53; Acts i. 1-12.)

Such are some of the proofs of his resurrection. Their sufficiency as evidence of it, and its logical results, remain to be considered.

¹ Alford on John's Gospel. Lange, Vol. III., pp. 333, 334. Stroud on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ. Friedlieb, p. 167. The Last Day

of Our Lord's Passion, by Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL.D., c. 13, and Appendix. Barnes' Notes, Vol. II., p. 386.

² 1 Corinthians xv. 3, 4; Acts xiii. 28, 29; Deuteronomy xxi. 22, 23; John xix. 31-39; Luke xxxiii. 50-54; Mark xv. 42-46; Matthew xxvii. 57-60.

³ It does not appear that there was a formal meeting of the Sanhedrim, and the act may have proceeded from the more violent members of it. The time may have been during their Sabbath, or at its close, which would have been in season. Lange, Vol. III., p. 343; Farrar, c. 62.

⁴ Matthew xxviii. 15; Dialogue, c. 108.

⁵ Mary, the mother of James, Salome, Joanna, wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and other women from Galilee who beheld the sepulchre and where he was laid. They may not have come all at the same time, but in different companies. Matthew xvii. 55, 56, and xxviii. 1-7; Mark xv. 40, 41, 47, and xvi. 1-8; Luke xxiii. 49, 55, 56, and xxiv. 1-10; John xx. 1; Lange, Vol. III., pp. 362, 368.

⁶ The Forty Days after Our Lord's Resurrection, by Rev. William Hanna, LL.D., p. 53.

⁷ The words "as they went to tell his disciples," in our common version, are wanting in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts. Their omission in the Revised Version removes a difficulty. The true text does not state *when* it was, that Jesus met them.

⁸ Lange, Vol. III., p. 383.

⁹ All attempts to identify this with certainty, out of the numerous villages in the vicinity of Jerusalem, have failed. See Lange, Vol. III.; Robinson, Vol. III., pp. 146-150; Barnes' Notes, Vol. II., p. 107.

¹⁰ 1 Corinthians xv. 6; Matthew xxviii. 7, 10, 16; Mark xvi. 7, 15, 18; Lange, Vol. III., p. 411; Farrar, c. 62; Hanna's Forty Days, c. 8, p. 185; c. 9, p. 229; Geikie, c. 64.

CHAPTER XVIII.

SUFFICIENCY OF THE PROOFS (FALSE ASSUMPTIONS).

EVIDENCE which ought to convince a reasonable man should be deemed sufficient.

The standing objection from the days of Celsus, that Jesus should have shown himself after his resurrection to his enemies, is unreasonable. It is as if one should refuse to believe the transfiguration, the raising of the daughter of Jairus, or the agony in the garden, because not witnessed by the multitude, and by only Peter, James, and John of the Apostles.

His humiliation and sufferings were ended. Not again was he to be mocked, and scourged, and crucified. Those who had wilfully rejected him, would have been no more convinced than before. They had said he cast out devils through the prince of devils. They had plotted to put Lazarus also to death, whom he had raised up before their eyes. They had bribed the soldiers to report that his body had been stolen. They would have proclaimed that he was not dead, or else that his return to life was by the agency of Satan. To return to those who had put every insult upon him, and were ready to renew the attack, could only have been to their swift destruction, and the time for this had not come.

And even if some of them had believed, it would have added nothing to the proof. Any one who now refuses to accept the genuineness of the Gospels, or the credibility of the writers, or, accepting both, refuses to believe upon the testimony of his disciples, would not be convinced by any amount of evidence. There would remain every question of credibility, and, in addition, that of personal identity, as to which only those intimately acquainted with him were fully qualified to judge.

The proofs will be found sufficient by those who are disposed to lay aside preconceived adverse opinions, and believe the fact when it is proved.

PROOF IS POSSIBLE.

The event *may* have occurred. By this is meant that it cannot be said that its occurrence is, in the nature of things, an impossibility.

The existence of the Lord God Almighty, the Jehovah of the Scriptures, may be real, as accepted by the reason and conscience of most men in civilized nations. It may have been within his power to raise his Son, Jesus Christ, from the dead; and there may have been sufficient reasons for the exercise of this power. He may have been able to do this, without violating, or suspending, any law of his universe. The resurrection may have been as conformable to law as the death of the body. The law of gravitation is neither violated nor suspended, but merely overcome, in numberless instances every day, by the introduction of what is, under the circumstances, a greater force; and it may be a universal *law* that the greater force (other things being equal) shall overcome the less. If it were true that the like had never occurred, it cannot be maintained that God has not in any instance done something which he had not done before, and of which consequently there had been no previous experience. "Men," says Dr. Taylor,¹ "are continually reaching results which the forces of nature, left to themselves, never could have caused; and if this be so with men, why should we deny to God the possibility of intervening in a similar way, and so producing effects that are not merely supernatural, but superhuman?" And why, we ask, should we deny to him the possibility of doing something which he has not done before; "My Father *worketh* hitherto," said Jesus, "and I work."

"The² affirmation of the impossibility of a miracle carries with it the elimination of God out of the universe." There is no escape from this conclusion; and consequently there are

those who admit the possibility³ of miracles, even while denying that they can be proved.

The event, then, *may* have occurred. *It is a question of evidence.*

Again, if Christ did rise from the dead, he would give his disciples sufficient evidence of it. He could give to the bodily senses and perceptive powers which they had as other men have (and which "experience" tells us, may be trusted when they have a fair chance), such proofs of his resurrection that they could believe it, and rationally believe it. This may be said to be almost a truism. To concede that God could, and did, raise Jesus Christ from the dead, and deny that he could, or would, afford evidence of it, if not an utter absurdity, is in the highest degree unreasonable, and we are not trying to convince any but reasonable men. To what end should he perform this miracle, and yet afford no evidence of it? The question right here is not whether *we* have sufficient evidence for our assurance, but whether his *disciples* could reasonably be convinced of his resurrection, assuming that it really took place.

Then if *they* might rationally believe what actually occurred, upon evidence furnished *them*, those to whom they declared it, and we to whom their testimony has come, may *also* believe it. If they were not bound to reject the evidence of their own senses, because of previous experience or the want of it, neither were those to whom they preached, nor we ourselves, bound to reject it.

In other words, assuming that Christ did rise from the dead, and assuming that satisfactory proofs of his resurrection were given to his disciples, it is not *impossible* that sufficient evidence of both of these facts may be accessible to us. To deny this, is to say that Christ must die and rise again, in every age, and in every place, where there are nations or persons, whether few or many, who have not before witnessed such events. Yet to this absurdity must Hume's famous argument from experience come.

If Jesus rose from the dead, the fact was susceptible of proof to his disciples. It was susceptible of proof to those who believed it on the testimony of his disciples. It is susceptible of proof to one to whom that testimony is transmitted. Assuming his resurrection to be true, it would be more wonderful than a miracle, if all means of a rational belief in the fact were the exclusive property of his immediate disciples; and their contemporaries and all after them, to the end of time, be compelled in the exercise of right reason to reject it, notwithstanding it is true. Hence we say as the basis of further argument that the resurrection *may* have occurred; and if it did occur, we undoubtedly have such evidence of it as may be accepted by a reasonable man. Leaving, then, the possible for the probable, in a matter that is but a question of evidence.

WHAT ARE THE PROOFS?

The fact of Christ's resurrection was proclaimed by his Apostles and disciples from the beginning of their ministry, commencing on the Day of Pentecost, fifty days after the crucifixion. This fact was, as expressed by Paul, that Christ "died," and was "buried," and was "raised on the third day;" and by Luke that "he showed himself alive after his passion, by many proofs," appearing unto the Apostles whom he had chosen⁴, for forty days, "and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God;" and by Peter, "whom God raised up, having loosed the pangs of death because it was not possible that he should be holden of it:" and "Ye killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses."

The evidence being conclusive that such was the proclamation, how is it to be accounted for? The obvious explanation is, that the Apostles so preached because they so believed, and because such was the fact, and they had sufficient evidence of it: and this has been accepted by the church these eighteen hundred years.

How do infidels account for the preaching of the Resurrection within fifty days after the crucifixion? *Some* have claimed that his death was not real, and that he recovered from a swoon. This is disproved by the evidence to which we have referred⁴, and, although once held by Paulus and others, has by later skeptical writers been "treated with contempt."⁵ "The whole country-side," says Strauss,⁶ "knew that he was dead." Roman executioners made sure work. Pilate refused his consent to any removal until he had instituted an inquiry, and knew that Jesus was dead; nor is it possible to accept the hypothesis of a return from mere lethargy or trance, without destroying his moral character. This hypothesis may be put aside.

Others have claimed that the Apostles did not believe what they preached. To accept this view we must conclude that, without motive and against every motive, and "amidst sufferings the most grievous to flesh and blood, they persevered in a conspiracy to cheat the world into piety, honesty and benevolence." Conscience and common sense revolt against such a theory, and it shares the fate of the other. It has, says Professor Milligan,⁷ "been abandoned by every inquirer to whom a moment's attention is due."

The *final* refuge of most infidel writers, is the theory of visions. By this they mean that the appearances of our Lord were either optical illusions, or mere hallucinations.

Some, like Dr. Hooykaas⁸ in Holland, and Judge Waite⁹ in this country, claim that the doctrine preached was *not* that Christ's *body* was raised up, but that his *spirit* came back from Hades, or the place of departed spirits. We have before⁹ shown that such a conception is an entire perversion of the language of Paul, as well as of the Evangelists. And Mr. Hooykaas' argument that we are never told that Jesus rose "from death," far less "from the grave," but always "from the dead," does not agree with the record; and if it did, the inference would be unwarrantable. When the angel said to the woman, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? he is

not here but is risen," they were not looking for him in Hades! Peter, in the passage from which we have quoted, distinguishes between Hades and the grave, for he says, that David, "foreseeing, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that neither was his soul left in Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus did God raise up."

Now, by what evidence is the theory of *visions* or optical illusions to be tested? By the *whole* evidence? By suppressing a part, and changing the rest? Judicial fairness requires that the whole be considered, just as it comes to us, reconciling such parts as may be reconciled, and adopting the more probable view in case of any seeming contradictions, if there *are* any. Yet those who deny the resurrection adopt a course that could not be tolerated in any judge or jury, or secular historian. They *suppress*, or *supply*, as best suits their theory.

Thus some of them assume that there were no appearances at Jerusalem, although the contrary is plain in all the Evangelists. Even Mark, whom Strauss treats as giving the oldest tradition, represents the women as going to the sepulchre. This implies that they were at Jerusalem, if the sepulchre was at Jerusalem. Were they there alone? Mark, in saying that "the disciples left Jesus when he was arrested, and fled," does *not* say that they fled from Jerusalem. On the contrary, he, in the same chapter, speaks of Peter as following Jesus afar off, and then denying him. And so in the Fourth Gospel, "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is said to have been so near to the cross, that Jesus could say unto him "Behold thy mother!" They would not leave Jerusalem till the end of the Feast. This continued one week, the first day and the last being "an holy convocation." Although they fled at first, they rallied; and they did not leave Jerusalem till they had conformed to the requirements of the law. Mark also, in giving the direction, "Go tell his disciples and Peter," "He goeth *before* you into Galilee," implies that they had not yet gone into Galilee.

They also assume that the Apostles believed because of Mary Magdalene's faith. *This is pure fiction.* Peter and John knew that the tomb was empty, before the appearance to Mary Magdalene. Matthew does not mention her statement that she had seen the Lord, nor John the reception which she had. Mark¹⁰ says that they, when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, "disbelieved;" and Luke¹¹ (referring to all the women) says that their words "appeared in their sight as idle talk, and they disbelieved them." There is not the slightest allusion to Mary Magdalene, or to the company of women, in the Acts of the Apostles, or either of the Epistles. How idle, then, is Renan's boast,¹² that "the glory of the Resurrection belongs to Mary of Magdala." Indeed it might appear to us that there should have been some reference to her. The explanation, probably, is twofold: Among the Greeks,¹³ women were not competent witnesses; and Paul and the Apostles rested their faith upon appearances to Apostles, either alone or in company with others, they being the constituted witnesses. When one was to be substituted for Judas, Peter¹⁴ said that the choice must be made from those "which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that he was received up from us; of these must one become a witness with us of his resurrection." And Paul makes no reference to the journey to Emmaus.

They also assume that the Apostles were in a state of mind conducive to misleading fancies. The reverse of this is true. It must, however, be conceded that the idea of a restoration to life of one who had been dead was not strange to them; for three¹⁵ such instances were recorded in their Scriptures, and they had witnessed three miracles of the kind. But these were in respect to persons who, after they were raised up, lived and died as other men; and they were brought to life by some visible agency, as by a prophet in the name of the Lord, or Jesus by his own word. The resurrec-

tion which the disciples came to believe was, on the contrary, to a temporary sojourning with them, and then an ascension before their eyes; and it was accomplished by no visible hand.

And although Jesus had predicted his death and resurrection, they could not understand the one, any more than the other, because they could not conceive how that their Messiah could suffer death at the hands of his enemies. The evidence upon this point is most conclusive; and its scope was admirably put by Gilbert West,¹⁶ four generations ago. "This, therefore, being their settled notion of the Messiah, can we wonder their former faith in him should be extinguished, when they saw him suffering, crucified, and dying, and, instead of saving others, not able to save himself? To prepare them for these events he had indeed most circumstantially foretold¹⁷ his own sufferings, death, and resurrection; but the Apostles themselves assure us that they did not understand those predictions till some time after their accomplishment; and they made this confession at a time when they were as sensible of their former dullness, and undoubtedly as much amazed at it as they now pretend to be who object to it against them; so that their veracity upon this point is not to be questioned. . . . They had conceived great expectations from the persuasion that he was the Christ of God; but these were all vanished; their promised deliverer, their expected king, was dead and buried, and no one left to call him from the grave as he did Lazarus. With his life, they might presume, ended his power of working miracles; and death, perhaps, was an enemy he could not subdue, since it was apparent he could not escape it, and hence their despair."

And hence we say, when the third day was ushered in there was no one of all his disciples at the sepulchre to welcome him. Those who loved him most, came but to embalm his body. Mary Magdalene beheld *not* her risen Saviour, but an empty tomb; and her hurried tidings were *not* that

he is risen, but, "They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they have laid him." When Jesus even speaks to her, she at first supposes him to be the gardener, and says, "If thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." Peter and John beheld no vision, but only "the linen clothes lying, and the napkin, that was upon his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but rolled up in a place by itself." The other women do not see Jesus until after they have found that the sepulchre is empty, and have been told by the angels, "He is risen, even as he said: COME SEE THE PLACE WHERE¹⁸ THE LORD LAY." The two disciples, some hours after, had heard, not that he had been *seen*, but that certain women who were early at the tomb found not his body, and were told by angels that he was alive; and that the absence of the body had been confirmed by those of their company who visited the tomb. And finally, the Apostles, instead of *expecting* to see him, refused to believe upon the testimony of the women, and were only convinced by the evidence of their own senses.

¹ Taylor on the Gospel Miracles (1881), p. 17.

² *Id.*, p. 25.

³ "We do not say a miracle is impossible; we say there has been no instance, up to this time, of a proved miracle."—Renan's *Life of Jesus*, etc., p. 57.

"What I insist on is, that a miracle cannot be established by human testimony."—Ingersoll, *North American Review* for November, 1881, p. 514. The skeptical author of *Supernatural Religion* in defending himself against the criticism that upon his theory his historical argument is unnecessary, in his preface to the sixth edition, says: "The preliminary affirmation is not that miracles are impossible, but that they are antecedently incredible. The counter allegation is that although miracles may be antecedently incredible, they nevertheless actually took place. It is, therefore, necessary, not only to establish the antecedent incredibility, but to examine the validity of the allegation that certain miracles occurred, and this involves the historical inquiry into the evidence for the Gospels. Indeed many will not acknowledge the case to be complete until other witnesses are questioned." This would leave the question of Christ's Resurrection to be determined as a matter of evidence; and of course evidence enough to induce a reasonable conviction would be sufficient to overcome

the antecedent improbability. But he dare not trust himself or his readers to an examination of the evidence upon this basis. For when he is pressed with the testimony of the Apostles to the Resurrection, and is compelled to concede their honesty, he says (p. 1050), "The belief that a dead man rose from the dead and appeared to several persons alive is at once disposed of upon abstract grounds." That is, his pretended examination of the evidence is a sham, and when he cannot meet it, it is at once disposed of "upon abstract grounds!"

⁴ See chap. xvii. pp. 101-2, *ante*, pp. 101, 102.

⁵ Milligan on the Resurrection of Our Lord, p. 76; Strauss, Vol. II., pp. 846-866.

⁶ The Old Faith and the New (1875), p. 80.

⁷ On the Resurrection, etc., p. 80.

⁸ The Bible for Learners, Vol. III., p. 464; Waite's History, etc., p. 26.

⁹ See chap. xv, p. 85, *ante*, p. 85.

¹⁰ Mark xvi. 11.

¹¹ Luke xxiv. 11.

¹² The Apostles, by Ernest Renan (1866) p. 61.

¹³ Adams' Roman Antiquities, p. 284; Condition of Women, by L. Maria Child, Vol. II., p. 3.

¹⁴ Acts i. 15, 21, 22.

¹⁵ 1 Kings xvii.; 2 Kings iv.; 2 Kings xiii. 21; Matthew ix.; Luke vii.; John xi.; Hebrews xi. 35.

¹⁶ Gilbert West on the History and Evidences of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Boston, 1834 (first published in England in 1747), p. 67.

¹⁷ See chap. xvi, p. 89, *ante*, p. 89.

¹⁸ "The ceremonies were there, but the body was gone. Whither? Had it been stolen and hidden? Who would have been the thieves? Friends or foes? Not friends; for how could their faith be made heroic for their crusade against the world's unbelief by a theft and a carcase? Not foes; for it was their interest to prevent the disappearance of the body, that there might be ocular demonstration of the falsity of the predicted resurrection. The fact of the actual resurrection of our Lord is a rock-of-ages that never can be moved."—Commentary on Mark, by James Morrison, D.D. (1882), p. 445.

CHAPTER XIX.

SUFFICIENCY OF THE PROOFS (AFFIRMATIVE EVIDENCE).

HOLDING, then, the objectors to the historical record, and keeping in mind that the question is narrowed down to the hypothesis of visions on the one hand, or to a true resurrection on the other, *what evidence had the Apostles and immediate disciples that they were not deceived?*

First and foremost, they had the empty tomb. They knew¹ that the body was neither left on the cross, in violation of the Jewish law, nor thrown to the "dust-heap," in violation of the Roman law, which required a delivery to the friends as soon as claimed, but was placed in the sepulchre, as attested by all the Evangelists, as also by Paul. They knew that *they* had not taken it away, and that *if the Jews had*, they would have been but too ready to produce it when, only a few days after, it was boldly proclaimed, that that Jesus whom they had crucified, God had raised from the dead. It was the absence of the body that first arrested the attention of the women, and also of Peter and John, and which, with the orderly arrangement of the grave clothes, induced a conviction of the truth in the mind of John, before Jesus appeared to any, and sent Peter to his home "wondering." And these same facts (the good faith of the disciples themselves being undoubted), can never be explained, in any rational way, otherwise than by the fact of the Resurrection. There is a great truth in Professor Keim's expression² that: "It is upon an empty tomb that the Christian Church is founded."

They had *further* proof, in subsequent appearances to individuals singly, to the collective body of Apostles, and to the multitude of believers, under circumstances that satisfied them, and should convince us, that they were not deceived.

There are several things to be considered, in determining

whether they were deceived. First, in respect to time. There were no appearances till after the fact that the tomb was empty was fully understood, *nor till some hours after*. This lapse of time has been overlooked by most writers; and, from want of attention to it, inconsistencies as to occurrences at the sepulchre, as to the number and appearance of angels, the companies of women, the persons composing them, the messages received and carried, and the appearances to them, of our risen Lord, have been imagined, that are easily explained, upon the very natural hypothesis of several transactions of like character during the six hours or more³ which elapsed before the journey to Emmaus. At that time no one had seen the Lord; for it cannot be doubted that his appearance would be reported as soon as possible after its occurrence. When Jesus joined the two disciples, their eyes were "holden," until in a long discourse he had prepared them for a revelation of himself. Peter must have meditated some hours upon the absence of the body, before Jesus showed himself to him. It was not till after this, and after the return of the disciples from Emmaus, that he said to the others, "Peace be unto you." Then a whole week, before he returns. Then, probably after a longer interval (for they returned to Galilee), he shows himself at the Sea of Tiberias. Then, after some days, to above five hundred brethren, at a place to which they had been directed to go by the angels, and by Jesus both before and after his resurrection. Then to James. And then at Jerusalem to the Apostles, whom he led out over against Bethany; and while he blessed them, he parted from them and was carried up into heaven.

In all this, we see how they were prepared to exercise a sober and intelligent judgment, so that neither they, nor we, should be in doubt whether what they beheld was their risen Lord, or a phantom of their own imagination.

And will any one tell us, right here, what better proof Jesus *could* have given his disciples, of his Resurrection? If the evidence was sufficient for them, it may be sufficient for us,

unless we are prepared to say that the miracle shall *be repeated whenever it is challenged!* Was it essential to a reasonable conviction on their part that the Scribes and Pharisees should also be convinced? (Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea, *were* convinced.) It must be admitted that the disciples, of all others, were qualified to judge, if any persons could be qualified. What force could the belief of the Sanhedrim have added to the testimony of their own senses?

Assume, as a hypothesis, the reality of Christ's resurrection, we again ask, What proof of it *should* have been given his disciples that was not given? They had the same kind of proof, during forty days, that they had before his crucifixion. He walked with them, talked with them, instructed them, ate before them, and with them (Acts x. 41), called things to their remembrance, opened to them the Scriptures, and gave them their great commission to disciple all nations; and, to preclude all questioning, said, "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me have. And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his feet." And to Thomas, eight days after, he said, "Reach hither thy finger and see my hands; and reach thy hand and put it into my side: and be not faithless but believing."

We do not accept Origen's⁴ view that Jesus after his resurrection and before his ascension "existed in a body intermediate, as it were, between the grossness of that which he had before his suffering and the appearance of a soul uncovered by such a body," although it now has the support of able writers. The general⁵ sentiment of the Church from the beginning has been against it. It is not warranted by the record, and it involves more mysteries and difficulties than it escapes. We fully agree with Judge Waite⁶ that, according to the Canonical Gospels, "The very body in which Jesus was crucified, and which was buried by Joseph of Arimathea, is raised from the dead, appears to the disciples, is not only seen but felt, and Jesus himself, in the flesh, as he was before he was crucified,

calls for fish to eat to satisfy his disciples that he was not a spirit; that his body was not spiritual, but material and human like theirs;" and also with a very different man (Mr. Barnes), who, with his usual good sense, says: "It was necessary *first* to establish the proof of his resurrection, and that could be done *only* by his appearing *as he was* when he died;" and also with Drs. McClintock and Strong in their invaluable Cyclopaedia, that: "According to the Scriptures the disciples were assured by the testimony of their own senses that the body of Christ after his resurrection was the same identical body of human flesh and bones which had been crucified and laid in the sepulchre." (Vol. VIII., A.D. 1879.) Peter's testimony (as recorded in Acts x. 41) that Jesus after he was raised up was made manifest, not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God, even to us "who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead," seems just as decisive as the Canonical Gospels. And so of John's testimony (1 John i. 1), "that which we beheld, and our hands handled."

Our Lord was in the tomb less than thirty-six hours, and his flesh "did not see corruption." His body, apparently, was as human as that of Lazarus after he was raised. The criticism that it is not said that there was *blood* seems frivolous, for there could be no living flesh or bones without blood-vessels and blood. Although for the time he forbade Mary Magdalene to touch, or rather to detain him, he permitted the other women to take hold of his feet, and directed the Apostles to handle him. Mary Magdalene saw him as a man, and supposed him to be the gardener, until he called her by name. The two disciples conversed with him as a man; and that they did not know him was only because their eyes were "holden." His sudden disappearance after the repast, and equally sudden appearance in the midst of the Apostles, at most present no greater difficulties than his transfiguration, his walking upon the sea, his passing through his enemies when they were about to throw him down the cliff (all before

his crucifixion), or the opening of the prison doors to two of the Apostles. The doors, even if bolted and barred, may have opened as to Peter, or those present may have been so preoccupied that a perfectly natural but silent withdrawal in the one case, and entrance in the other, were simply unnoticed.

As the man Christ Jesus, he rose from the dead, and angels, as porters, having rolled away the stone, he came forth in visible human form, and with the same body that was crucified. He would have been seen by his disciples, if they had been "watching and waiting" for him, and by the guard, if they had not become "as dead men;" perhaps in order that they might not behold him, for he had said, "Yet a little while and the world beholdeth me no more." (John xiv. 19.)

As the man Christ Jesus, he showed himself to his disciples forty days; and then, with a body, until then, of flesh and blood, as human as that of Elijah, before *he* was taken up, ascended into the heavens.

Thus, in his rising from the dead, and in the change *at his ascension*, he typified both the dead who shall be raised, and the living who shall be "changed."

And any conception of him as less corporeal from his resurrection to his ascension than before, does not conform to the record, and, by so much as it makes him less corporeal and tangible, it impairs the force of the evidence.

Each one of the Apostles had as much evidence that Jesus was alive after his crucifixion, as he had that Peter or John or Thomas was alive, and evidence of just as high a character. And this proof by facts addressed to their own intelligence and bodily senses of sight, and hearing, and feeling, was continued forty days. There is no conflict in the evidence on this point.

Every lawyer knows that omission is not contradiction. Even when witnesses profess to give the whole, it rarely or never happens that some will not state something which

others omit, and not unfrequently a witness is called to testify to a part only, and does not undertake to give the whole.

This is the precise truth in respect to the Evangelists. Not one of them professes to state all that occurred after the crucifixion, or all the instances of our Lord's appearing to his disciples. Each writes for the particular object he has in view. And there is a great liability to mistake, if one forgets that it is true in narratives in respect to transactions subsequent to the crucifixion, as well as before, that there is often a passing from one event to another with nothing to indicate but that they were immediately connected in point of time, when, in fact, there was a considerable interval between them.*

Of the ten specified instances of his appearing, Matthew speaks of two, Mark of three, Luke of three, John of four, and Paul of five, or seven;⁷ but neither contradicts the other, nor Luke's statement in his subsequent "treatise," that Jesus showed himself alive after his passion "forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God."

The instances were sufficiently numerous, the time long enough, and the acts tangible enough, to afford as undoubted proof as that which they had of the existence and bodily presence of each other. Peter might as well have doubted the denial of which he had so bitterly repented, as to have doubted that it was his Master who said unto him the third time, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?" and all of them might as well have doubted that they had ever listened to his teaching, as to have doubted the commission which they received from him.

The evidence that was personal to themselves we cannot have. We know they had it, and were capable of judging

* For example, it is an entire misconception of Luke's Gospel to conclude from it that the ascension was the same day as the resurrection; and his account in Acts makes this certain, it being conceded that both works were by the same writer.

concerning it, and we can see that it was of a character that might be justly deemed conclusive.

There is, besides, much that is common to us with them. The judgment was not of one but of many, and not from a single appearance to one of their number, but from many appearances to different persons, at various times, and under circumstances most favorable to a true apprehension, usually in open day; and it would be passing strange if each and all were deceived by their own senses.

These appearances were never repeated after the ascension. None of the disciples under any excitement ever again saw their Lord as the man Christ Jesus walking the earth as before; or saw him coming to the earth, although they all believed that he would speedily return in like manner as they beheld him going into heaven. Stephen saw him not upon the earth, but "standing on the right hand of God," Paul saw him, and "was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision" (Acts xxvi. 19). John saw him, in vision, not only as "the Son of Man" in glorious array, but as "the Lion of the tribe of Judah," and also as a "Lamb standing as though it had been slain," in the "midst of the throne" (Revelation i. 12-20, and v. 5-8).

Their subsequent experience is consistent, if they had been dealing with realities. But if all their interviews during those forty days were a delusion, and the ascension a delusion, it is wholly inexplicable that their imagination or senses never played them false afterward. They believed that he would soon return, just as strongly as they believed that he had ascended, and yet they never saw him returning, or as having returned.

If delusions created the faith, how much more should the faith multiply the delusions, and such appearances (as Godet⁸ has well put it) "go on increasing as the square of the belief itself." Yet at the very time when they should have multiplied, if they were *not* real, they ceased altogether!

We have, as the disciples had, our Lord's predictions⁹ of his

death *and* resurrection (for the two events were generally referred to in the same discourse), and the prophecies concerning him.

The greatest obstacle to their acceptance of his resurrection was their inability to comprehend his death if he were indeed the true Messiah. And hence we find that Jesus in the walk to Emmaus, opens to the disciples the Scriptures concerning himself, and says, "Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?" We may well suppose that with other prophecies, he interpreted to them what Daniel had said (c. ix. 26) that "after three score and two weeks, shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself;" and that wonderful chapter in Isaiah (the fifty-third) so descriptive of his passion, that it seems "as if written at the foot of the cross;" and all the sacrifices for fifteen hundred years; and that it was not possible "that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins;" and as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so was the Son of Man "lifted up." And so to the Apostles he explained the Scriptures, and said to them, "Thus it is written that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day." (Luke xxiv. 45, 46). He reminds them what he had said, that all things must needs be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and in the Prophets and in the Psalms concerning himself (Luke xxiv. 44). The angels say to the women, "Tell his disciples and Peter he goeth before you into Galilee, and there shall ye see him as he said unto you" (Mark xvi. 7); and also, "Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again" (Luke xxiv. 6, 7). And we find that when the disciples understood the mystery of his death, they joyfully accepted the proofs of his resurrection; and Peter, who had said, "Be it far from thee, Lord, this shall never be unto thee" (Matthew xvi. 23), on the day of Pentecost could explain that Jesus (whom God had "raised

up, having loosed the pangs of death"), was delivered up to be crucified and slain "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God"; and that David spake of his resurrection. (Acts ii. 22-31.)

Not only do the prophecies point to his resurrection, but as already⁹ shown, Jesus himself foretold it as well as the manner and circumstances of his death; and it is more rational to accept it, than to believe that such an One as is portrayed in the Gospels was either false or mistaken. "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" has found none to accept the challenge in eighteen hundred years! On the contrary, as Dr. Taylor has said,¹⁰ "Before the portraiture which the Evangelists have painted, men of every age have stood in rooted admiration." And as J. S. Mill concedes,¹¹ "It is of no use to say that Christ, as exhibited in the Gospels, is not historical: for none of his disciples or their proselytes were capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to him, or imagining the life and character revealed in the Gospels."

His resurrection was a moral necessity from his own character as delineated in the Gospels, even our enemies themselves being judges. His could not have been "the richest of human lives," as declared by Hooykaas,¹² nor his utterances "the most beautiful moral teaching that humanity has received," as avowed by Renan, if his power to lay down his life and "to take it again" were at the best a mere delusion.

His predictions of his death and resurrection, as we have before shown, are so interwoven with the entire narrative, that it is impossible to set them aside and leave anything to which we can assent as true, of all his recorded acts and words; and there is no alternative except to believe that he uttered them, or else to arbitrarily set aside the testimony of the four Evangelists, as well as that of Paul.

That the Christ of the Gospels should rise from the dead, as he said, is in the highest degree probable. Only by his resurrection could he vindicate himself from the charge of blasphemy. Without it, the cross was a gibbet, a monument of

folly if not of crime. Without it, the sacrament which he instituted on the eve of his crucifixion, keeps in perpetual remembrance the falsity of his pretensions, his impotency to save himself from his enemies. Without it, the taunt of those who mocked him, "He saved others, himself he cannot save," was merited. Without it, while one might pity him for his sufferings, we should the more sympathize with the Sanhedrim in protecting the people from a visionary enthusiast, if not a wilful impostor, and inflicting (although by irregular methods) the penalty for blasphemy expressly commanded by the Mosaic Law.

It cannot be too strongly stated that there is no middle ground. If he was what he claimed, his resurrection was already assured. If he was not what he claimed, he could not have been the exalted character eulogized by those who deny his resurrection, and before which the world bows in reverence.

If he was what he claimed, we can see a grand and all-sufficient reason *why* God (if there *be* a God) should by miracle give the highest possible authentication to his mission.

He said, "I am the light of the world;" and the world was in darkness. He said that he came forth from God, and he ought to show his credentials. He said he was the Son of God, and that he always did those things that pleased Him; which he could not do, if he set up claims destitute of foundation. He said, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth, may have in him eternal life. For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life."

The great central truths which he declared in all his teachings, were the *fact* of sin, the need of a Saviour, and that he is a Saviour.

If sin, as all experience testifies, is universal, always

downward, and its end when finished death, the redemption of multitudes* of the human race from its power to holiness, and bliss, and endless progress, as "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ," was an object *worthy* of divine interposition, and only an atheist should look upon such a miracle of redemption as impossible or improbable.

"'Twas great to speak a world from naught,
'Twas greater to redeem."

Christ's resurrection being established, the darkness over the land, the rending of the veil, the coming¹³ out of the tombs, the ministry of the angels in the garden before his betrayal, and at the sepulchre, the earthquake, the rolling away of the stone, and the fear that came upon the watchers, were fitting accompaniments of the transactions which they surrounded.

Nor, if some of them are not mentioned by other historians, are they overthrown, for omission is not contradiction, in history any more than in courts. Why should Josephus, who was not born till some years after the crucifixion, and not a Christian, be expected to mention them? And as to Greek and Roman writers, even Renan¹⁴ says that "it is not surprising that they paid little attention to a movement which was going on within a narrow space foreign to them. Christianity was lost to their vision upon the dark background of Judaism."

And so his being seen by Stephen the first martyr, by John in the Apocalypse, and by Paul on the way to Damascus, are in harmony with the record of his resurrection and ascension, and may be said to confirm them.

Yet it may be questioned if Paul would have been so absolutely certain that Jesus (against whose followers he was breathing out threatening and slaughter) said to him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" but for the previous appearances. If he would, he does not rest the case upon

* See Rev. vii. 9-17.

the one to himself. He gives the others first, and then adds, "And last of all . . . to me also." While there is a mutual support, the most solid basis for *our* belief is, in the incontrovertible and tangible appearances which preceded Paul's conversion; and when John would declare the *certainly* of their faith, he says, "That which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we have beheld, and our hands handled." (1 John i. 1).

And viewing the indubitable proofs of his resurrection, in their relation to the prophecies concerning him, the necessity for his advent, his predictions concerning himself, his character and works and teachings from his incarnation to his ascension, the lives and deaths of his Apostles, the wonderful enlargement of his little church, when the Apostles "with great power gave their witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus," and its equally wonderful continuance, extension, moral influence, inspirations and hopes, they rise to the sublimity of moral certainty.

These things cannot rationally be accounted for unless there is a God, and if there is a God, as all courts of justice everywhere assume, and universal conscience declares, to refuse assent to the conclusion to which they necessarily lead,—the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,—cannot be the exercise of right reason.

Least of all should lawyers, accustomed to weigh evidence, refuse to believe upon the testimony of others. As Gibson, the great chief justice of Pennsylvania, said: "Give Christianity a common law trial; submit the evidence *pro* and *con* to an impartial jury under the direction of a competent court, and the verdict will assuredly be in its favor."

We have not the witnesses before us; but it is every day's practice to prove historical facts by any approved and general history, and such are our Gospels and Epistles; and they are confirmed by sacraments and institutions that continue to our times, and will continue to the end of the world.

Nor does the sufficiency of the proofs depend upon any

question of the *precise* extent of the genuineness of the Gospels, or their *exact* agreement. Men accustomed to weigh evidence know that it is enough if the substance of the issue is proved, and that a literal agreement is never to be expected in honest witnesses. In all the great facts of the Resurrection, the Gospels and the Epistles concur. This has been found satisfactory to such standard authors in the legal profession as Blackstone and Kent and Story, such masters of the rules of evidence as Starkie and Greenleaf, and such giants as Lord Brougham, John Marshall, Theophilus Parsons, Jeremiah Mason and Daniel Webster, and many others both of the dead and the living, and no historical event rests on a firmer basis.

Some of its logical results will be suggested in the concluding chapter.

¹ See *ante*, c. 17, p. 101, and Godet's Defence, etc., 1881, p. 106.

² As quoted by Godet, p. 49.

³ See *ante*, c. 17, p. 101.

⁴ Origen against Celsus, Book II., c. 42.

⁵ See editor's note to Lange's Life of Christ; McClintock and Strong, Vol. VIII., p. 1055; Abbott's Dictionary of Religious Knowledge, p. 804; Barnes on John xx, 21; Scott on John xx. 19.

An able article by Professor Robinson of the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., on the Nature of Our Lord's Resurrection-body will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1845, p. 292. He thus distributes the opinions on the subject: "On this subject three different opinions have prevailed more or less at various times in the church. Some have held that the body of Christ was changed at the resurrection as to its *substance*, so that it was in its substance a different and spiritual body. Others have regarded the Lord as having had after the resurrection the *same* body as before, but glorified; or, as the earliest writers express it, changed as to its qualities and attributes. The third and larger class have supposed that the body with which Christ rose from the dead was the same natural body of flesh and blood which had been taken down from the cross and laid in the sepulchre."

This article we had not read until after writing chapter 19, but our convictions are confirmed by his thorough discussion of the subject. He concludes that the evidence of the reality of our Lord's human body, from the Resurrection to the Ascension, is even stronger than that for any other forty days, since Jesus was specially careful to assure his disciples of the fact.

⁶ History, etc., p. 335.

⁷ Paul seems to have grouped appearances. We may paraphrase thus: "And that he was seen of Cephas; then of the twelve *on three occasions*."

⁸ Defence, etc., p. 105.

⁹ See *ante*, c. 16, p. 89.

¹⁰ The Gospel Miracles, etc., p. 48.

¹¹ As quoted by Dr. Taylor, p. 41.

¹² The Bible, etc., p. 51; Renan, p. 135.

¹³ Those who came out of the tombs "after his resurrection," it may be presumed, had recently deceased (for they were recognized, as it would seem), and they appeared only to those who, like Simeon and Anna the Prophetess, had been looking "for the consolation of Israel;" and not to those who had rejected him. Their coming was so overshadowed by the principal events to which it was merely an incident, that it is mentioned only by Matthew, and even he gives no information of who they were, or anything of their subsequent history.

¹⁴ The Apostles, by Ernest Renan, p. 227.

CHAPTER XX.

LOGICAL RESULTS.

OF these we mention only the following :

First.—Since the proofs of Christ's Resurrection are incomparably greater than those of any other miracle, and its consequences are beyond conception more glorious, it is the part of wisdom to force the issue upon it. The decisive battle of the world in respect to the miraculous in Christianity is to be fought right here, and all other engagements are mere skirmishes. It is well it is so. Christ's Resurrection is our Gibraltar. If we cannot hold this position, we cannot hold any. But we do hold it, and with it the whole field of controversy upon the subject. Let any one who doubts or denies the reality of miracles, meet the overwhelming proofs of this the greatest of all miracles. If he cannot do it, he should yield; and it is no dishonor to be vanquished by the truth. If, after examining these proofs, he still imagines that he can overcome them, he is beyond the reach of argument.

Second.—As it is the central fact of Christianity, the keystone in the arch of the Christian Faith, those who reject it have no right to the Christian name. Strauss is so far to be commended that, when by his myths and sophistries he had brought himself to deny the one, he had the manliness not to appropriate the other. And of those of his fellows who still cling to it for its supposed advantages, he sarcastically says: "Reasons they may have, but reason they have none." Chadwick, Hooykaas, Miln, Savage and others,¹ who talk of their "Church of the Future," may well follow his example. If they refuse, there is as little sense as piety in a recognition, or *quasi* recognition, of them as ministers of the Gospel, when at the best they are only popular lecturers to mere social or literary, if not infidel clubs, that choose to be called Churches

or Religious Societies. This no doubt is distasteful to those who are looking for the time when all sects shall fraternize on a common level of skepticism and indifference. But if we have any colors we should stand by them. Fidelity to truth and to the Master requires a separation uncompromising and complete from all who deny Him. It is safe to be as tolerant as Jesus and his Apostles. (See John viii. 21; 2 Corinthians vi. 14, 15; Revelation i. 4, 5; 1 Corinthians xv. 16, 17, 18; 1 John ii. 12, 23; 1 Peter i. 3, 4; 2 Peter ii. 1, 2; Revelation ii. 6; Acts v. 30-33; Acts iv. 11, 12.)

Third.—It authenticates his mission and vindicates his claims to the utmost. By it God affixed the seal of his approval, and evermore declares as by a voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased: hear ye Him."

His teachings are no longer opinions to be accepted or rejected as they meet with our approval, but authoritative and final. They are not the speculations of sages and philosophers, either of olden or recent times, to be weighed in the balance of human reason, but everlasting truth to be received and obeyed without doubting or questioning.

Since Christ's resurrection is assured, Webster well declared,² as every man in the exercise of right reason must, "I hold it my duty to believe, not what I can comprehend or account for, but what my Master teaches me."

By this, of course, it is not intended that we are not to exercise our reason as to the genuineness of the teachings ascribed to him, or their proper meaning, or, in other words, as to textuality, inspiration, translation, and interpretation. In each of these departments there is and will be ample room for the greatest research, and the ripest scholarship. In respect to all these, is doubtless true now, as when spoken by Robinson, that, "The Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word."

But when in a teachable spirit, we know what Jesus taught, it is the end of controversy.

Fourth. — A necessary consequence from his Resurrection must be an undoubted assurance that we have the means of knowing what his teachings were, so far as they are essential to our guidance in this life and preparation for that which is to come. The very idea of a revelation is that it shall be so made known, that it can be understood, trusted in, and obeyed, by those to whom it is given, and for whom it is intended, so far at least, as shall be necessary for the regulation of their own conduct.

Beyond this, we cannot claim, as a logical result of Christ's Resurrection, and do not now inquire. And we find that through all the years since our Lord's ascension, while the church has had essential truth, and there has been substantial³ agreement in different copies and versions, there have always been and still are, unsolved questions of genuineness, translation, interpretation, and inspiration. In respect to the last, Ingersoll's demand⁴ that if the writers of the Gospels were inspired there should be but one account, or, if more than one, there should be *no* contradiction, is unwarrantable; and his own concession proves it. "As a rule," he says, "where several persons testify to the same transaction, while agreeing in the main points they will disagree upon many minor things, and such disagreement upon minor matters is generally considered as evidence that the witnesses have not agreed among themselves upon the story they should tell. These differences in statement are accounted for from the facts that all did not see alike, and that all did not have the same opportunity for seeing, and that all had not equally good memories. But when we claim that the witnesses were inspired, we admit that he who inspired them did know exactly what occurred, and consequently there should be no contradiction in the minutest detail." This is very poor logic. For although "He who inspired" did know exactly what occurred, there may have been the best of reasons for not inspiring a full record of all that occurred, or an exact record in all respects of what is recorded; and it must be presumed that

such an inspiration would be given as would be most conducive to the end in view. And a like answer disposes of his confident assertion, that "*one* inspired record of all that happened ought to be enough." *He* would have Divine wisdom sacrifice everything else for the sake of uniformity and precise accuracy in incidental and immaterial matters. In other words he would tithe "mint and anise and cummin," at the expense of "weightier matters." The Gospels were separately written at different times, according to the needs in the first instance of the particular classes for which they were immediately intended, and ultimately for the wants of the whole world. Each by itself was as complete and accurate as it was best it should be; and the whole taken together are as full and exact, as it is best they should be. And looking beyond the particular classes to whom they were first given, to all generations and peoples, it was of supreme importance that they should be *believed*; and in order to this, that they should be so written as not to carry suspicion of collusion or fabrication upon their face. Mr. Ingersoll knows that the testimony of four witnesses agreeing in the main points, while differing in minor matters, is more satisfactory than the testimony of one. If there were nothing to be counted but numbers, the evidence would be four times as strong. It is more than four times as strong. For, as Mr. Starkie says,⁵ and every lawyer knows, "The credibility of testimony frequently depends upon the exercise of reason, on the effect of *coincidences in testimony*, which, if collusion be excluded, cannot be accounted for but upon the supposition that the testimony of concurring witnesses is true; so much so that their individual character for veracity is frequently but of secondary importance." But to have this effect it is *indispensable* that *collusion* be excluded. And it is of vastly greater consequence that we be certain that we have (as it is conceded we have) independent accounts of the crucifixion than it is, for instance, that the inscriptions over the cross as given by the four Evangelists should precisely agree, or that either should

have been the exact words that were written. In fact, while they all agree that the accusation was "*The King of the Jews*" (which is all that is material), no two of them agree with each other. But as Professor Greenleaf says, no greater certainty is called for. "The same⁶ verbal exactness is not necessary in historians whose aim is religious instruction, as in recorders of public inscriptions."

If but one account, there would be the absence of that personality and variety, which we now have, and more especially the want of that conclusive proof which comes from independent witnesses.

If the Gospels had been written as Mr. Ingersoll says they should have been if inspired, the objections against them, if not insurmountable, would have been tenfold stronger. And why should not Divine wisdom so inspire as to secure the best possible results? And although two of the writers were Apostles, and to the Apostles was the Holy Spirit given to teach them "all things," and bring to their remembrance "all things" which Jesus had said unto them (John xiv. 26), this does not necessarily imply an exact transmission of all the words spoken. Regard should be had to the substance of things in this, as in other matters, and not to mere verbal accuracy, except in those rare cases in which it is important to know the precise language used.

It may safely be affirmed that there is *no* discrepancy in relation to any essential fact, or important doctrine or duty. And it is just this degree of certainty and accuracy, that we should expect from our Lord's true Messiahship as proved by his Resurrection.

Fifth. — By it, we know that he had power to impart to his Apostles to whom he entrusted the establishment of his church, and to Paul whom he especially selected as an Apostle to the Gentiles, inspiration and the gift of miracles. As the Father sent him into the world, even so he sent them into the world (John xviii. 18); and what things soever they should bind, or loose, on earth, should be bound or loosed

in heaven (Luke xxi. 14-16). Miracles were attestations of their Apostleship, "God also bearing witness with them, both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers and by gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will." (Hebrews ii. 4.)

With the writings of John the volume of inspiration was complete. If any miracles were wrought after his time (which is questioned by many⁷), there are none sufficiently authenticated to be of any evidential value to us.

But there is in every true Church, and will be to the end of time, what is of greater importance than the working of miracles, the convicting and transforming power of the Holy Ghost; and any community, by whatever name it may be called, that has not this attestation is not a true Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. The promise of the Comforter who shall "convict the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment;" and "Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," are as immutable as the throne of God.

If the Gospel had been only a "civilization," as Mr. Chadwick terms it, it had never been known outside of Judea. It is because it is the "wisdom of God, and the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," that it has gained its marvellous victories, overturning Pagan Rome, and in these later days transforming even Madagascar, the Sandwich Islands, and the cannibals⁸ of the Fiji Islands into Christian communities.

Sixth. — In our conception of Jesus as our Saviour, we should not separate his death from his resurrection and ascension. If he died for our sins, he rose again for our justification. He is now exalted as a Prince and a Saviour at the right hand of the Father, to give repentance and the remission of sins. United to him by faith, and changed into his image, our resurrection is assured by his, and because he lives we shall live also. As oft as we "eat this bread and drink this cup," we do show forth his death TILL HE COME. "Henceforth," (said⁹ the great Apostle) "there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the

righteous judge, shall give to me at that day, and not only to me, *but also to all them that have loved his appearing.*" "And¹⁰ the Spirit and the Bride say, Come; and he that heareth let him say, Come; and he that is athirst let him come; he that will, let him take the water of Life freely."

¹ It is one of the marvels of sin and shows the effrontery of Satan, that Hooykaas, who is about as rank an infidel as Strauss himself, should be pastor at Rotterdam, a Doctor of Divinity, and entitle his book, which laboriously excludes everything miraculous or supernatural in relation to Jesus, "The Bible for Learners." Mr. Chadwick, while admitting that he is not a Christian in the original sense of the word, argues against Strauss (with whom he agrees in sentiment) the right to apply the term to himself, but meaning by it only "a stream of tendency," "freedom, progress and civilization." "It may be," he says, "that some of you conceive that my definition of Christianity does worse than include those who are at pains to prove themselves not Christians. It includes the dangerous classes of society; it includes the men of vice and crime. There is no doubt of it." (See *Free Religious Index* for March 17, 1881, March 24, 1881, and March 31, 1881.) Mr. Miln recently *preached a sermon* upon "The Church of the Future," from which he said all speculative beliefs as a condition of membership will be excluded, even the belief in a personal Deity." (See *Index* for February 23, 1882.) He does not believe in prayer other than communion with himself. See *New York Observer* of February 23, 1882.) If Mr. Savage has not yet gone as far, he stops but little short of it.

² So expressed in a creed drawn up by him in 1807. (See *Congregationalist* of February 15, 1882.) A copy of this creed was read at the centennial anniversary of his birth (January 18, 1882) by the Congregational Church of Salisbury, New Hampshire. He joined this church on profession of faith September 13, 1807, and never removed his connection. (See *New Hampshire Journal* of January 28, 1882.)

³ See chap. xiii. p. 67, *ante*.

⁴ In the *North American Review* for August, 1881, p. 118.

⁵ Starkie on Evidence, Vol. II., Sec. 10, and note upon Hume.

⁶ Greenleaf's Testimony of the Evangelists, p. 478.

⁷ History of God's Church, by Enoch Pond, D.D., p. 606. And as to Judge Waite's "many cases of resurrection from the dead, handed down in the ancient mythologies" and by heathen writers, it will be soon enough to notice them whenever there shall be a serious attempt to run a parallel between the evidence in support of them, and that which proves the resurrection of our Lord. And so of the whole swarm of lying wonders, whether found in heathen writers, the Apocryphal Gospels, or exhibited by modern conjurers or spiritualists, — senseless, frivolous, for no worthy object, and, beyond the mystery accompanying them, supported by no rea-

sonable proof. Our Saviour told his disciples "beforehand" that "there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect." (Matthew xxiv. 24.) Paul told Timothy that "the Spirit saith expressly that in later times some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, through the hypocrisies of men that speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron." (1 Timothy iv. 1, 2.) This will be strange to any modern Sadducee who believes there is "neither angel nor Spirit," but the Christian will do well to give heed.

⁸ Within the last thirty years, through the labors of English Wesleyan missionaries, there has been an entire moral renovation of cannibals, once revelling and rioting in every excess of atrocity and bestial shame. Now there are nine thousand churches and thousands of communicants, fourteen thousand schools and nearly fifty thousand scholars: and out of a population of about one hundred and twenty thousand, over one hundred thousand are reckoned as regular attendants at the churches. Cannibalism has been voluntarily abandoned, save by a single tribe, in eighty inhabited islands: idolatry has been abjured, and all traces of it swept away. And to-day a gentle and refined English woman, as Miss Gordon-Cumming in her book, *At Home in Fiji*, testifies, can travel these islands alone, mingling with the people, rambling through their villages, sleeping in their huts and eating at their tables, with none to molest her or make her afraid. (See Rev. Edward Abbott, in *Congregationalist* of February 15, 1882.)

⁹ 2 Timothy iv. 8.

¹⁰ Revelation xxii. 17.

INDEX A.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX TO SUBJECTS AND ANCIENT
AUTHORS AND WRITINGS.

- Absence of the body of Jesus. See Empty Tomb.
- Acts and Luke, have one author, 9, 77.
- Acts, quoted from, by Justin, 23, 24, 26.
when written, 79.
- Acts of Peter and Paul (Apocryphal), 37, 38.
- Acts of Pilate (Apocryphal), 34, 35, 36, 41, note 5.
- Admissions and Presumptions, 9, 12, 13, 22, 43. See, also, Renan, Strauss, Waite.
- After-thought, Resurrection is not an, 6, 86.
- Aged disciples, 55, 57, 59, 60, 62, note 4.
- Agrippa Castor, testimony of, 45.
- Alexandrian Codex, 70, 71, 73, note 10.
- Alogi, 47, 48, 53, 60, with 62, note 5.
- Ambrose, 48, note 5.
- Ancient Deeds and Records, are evidence, 58, 59, 64, 65.
- Andrew, the Apostle, 14.
- Angels, as porters, 124.
at the Sepulchre, 104, 106, 118, 127, 130.
- Announcement, to Mary, 25, 35, 41, note 3.
- Antoninus, 10, 18.
- Apelles, testimony of, 45.
- Apocalypse, authorship of, 12, 48, 80, note 4. 88, note 3.
Quotations from, 32, 81, 82.
- Apocryphal Gospels, 34-42, 140, note 7.
Justin did not use, 34-42.
- Apologies of Justin Martyr, 18-67
dates of, 5, 10, 11, note 3, 18, 57, 58, 61, note 1.
- Apollinaris, testimony of, 27, 29, note 3, 45.
- Apostles, sincerity of, 74, 78, 86, 114.
- Apostleship, requisite for, 116, 119, note 14.
- Appearances, of the Risen Lord, 7, 81-89, 105-109, 115-126.
corporeal and material, 26, 66, 85, 107, 114, 122-124, 132, note 5.
- Jerusalem, 105-108, 115, 121.
none such after Ascension, 126,
on the mountain, 85, 87, 107, 108, 109, note 10, 121.
- Paul's enumeration of, 85, 87, 107, 108, 125, 133, note 7.
- sea of Galilee, 108, 121, 125.
- to James, 87, 108, 121.
- to Mary Magdalene, 105, 106, 116, 117, 121, 123.
- to Peter, 85, 87, 107, 123.
- to the Eleven, 85, 87, 107, 108, 109, note 10, 113, 121.
- Appearances, to the five hundred, 85, 87, 108, 109, note 10, 121, 125.
to the two disciples, 106, 107, 116, 118, 121, 123, 124.
to the women, 106, 109, notes 5 and 7, 115, 116, 118, 121, 123, 125.
to Thomas, 107, 108.
why not to Sanhedrim, 110, 122.
- Appearance, to Paul, 130, 131.
in the Apocalypse, 130.
to Stephen, 126, 130.
- Aretus, the King, 83.
- Aristion, 14, 16, note 1.
- Ascending the Stream, 50-66.
- Ascension, change at, 108, 124.
Luke's, account of, 125.
- Athenagoras, testimony of, 45, 47, 51.
- Authority of Jesus, vindicated, 135.
- Authorship of Acts, 9, 46, 77.
of Apocalypse, 12, 32, 48, 88, note 3.
of the Fourth Gospel. See same.
- Barnabas and Titus, 10, 53, 83.
- Barnabas, Epistle of, 10, 23, 53.
Date of, 10, 67, 72, note 1.
Quotes Matthew as Scripture, 22, note 4.
Uses the Fourth Gospel, 23, 26.
- Bar-Salibi, on Tatian, 47.
- Bartholomew, 54.
- Basilides, used the Fourth Gospel, 10, 11, note 4, 27, 28, 45.
time of, 10, 28, 34.
- Begging the question, 7.
- Best evidence, what is, 10.
- Blasphemy, or a true Resurrection, 129.
- Bodily senses may be trusted, 124, 125.
- Brethren of Jesus, 39.
- Burial of Jesus, certainty of, 102, 103, 109, note 2.
- Cæsarea Philippi, 91.
- Caius, of Rome, testimony of, 51.
- Canon of Muratori, see Muratori Canon.
- Cappadocia and Pontus to Gaul, 9, 50.
- Cave, birth of Jesus in, 35, 36, 41, note 4.
- Celsus, first Heathen writer against Christianity, 45-48, 110.
Date of his writing, 46, 48, note 6.
Quoted our Gospels, 45, 46, 47, 49.
Theory of, 81, 88, note 1.
Makes no reference to Cyrenius, 79, note 1.
- Census in Judea, 36, 41, note 8, 42, 79, note 1.
- Central Fact of Christianity, 134.
- Central Truths of the Gospel, 129.
- Cerinthians, 37.
- Cerinthus and John, 48, 66, note 3.
time of, 66, note 3.
- Certainty in courts, 99.
- Children of Joseph, 39.
- Christian Era, true date of, 11, note 3, 12, 61, note 1.
- Christianity, supposed extinction of, 70.
not a mere civilization, 139.
- Chronology of the Gospels, 76, 77, 80, note 5.
- Church at Lyons, 45.
- Church at Vienne, 45.
of Rome to Corinth, 10. See Clement of Rome.
- "Church of the future," 134, 140, note 1.
- Chuzza, Herod's Steward, 109, note 5.
- Chrysostom, 48, note 5.
- Citations by Justin and others, 23-40.
- Claudius Apollinaris, testimony of, 45, 51.
- Clement of Alexandria, 45, 46, 51, 53, 54, 56, 68, 72, note 3.
- Clementine Homilies, 45.
- Clement of Rome, 10, 15, 59, 60, 66, note 1, 72, note 2.

- Clement of Rome, date of his Epistle, 10.
 quotations in, 23, 32, 66, note 1, 72, note 2.
 upon the Resurrection, 66, note 1, 67.
- Cleopas and Luke, 106.
- Cock-crowing, 97, 100, note 4.
- Codex, Alexandrian, 70, 71, 73, note 10.
- Sinaitic, 70, 71, 73, note 10, 109, note 7.
- Vatican, 70, 71, 73, note 10, 109, note 7.
- Commentaries and Harmonies, 45, 47.
- Coming of Christ, 81, 126, 139.
- Coming out of the tombs, 130, 133, note 13.
- Confucius, 12.
- Constantine, 70.
- Copies, multiplication of, 69, 70.
- Coptic Version, 69.
- Corporeal Resurrection, 26, 66, note 1, 67, 85, 122, 123, 124, 132, notes 4, 5.
- Corinthian church, 10. See Clement of Rome.
- Corinthians, Epistles to,
 conceded to be genuine, 12, 86.
 quotations from, 16, 17, 18, note 3, 31, 32, 81-87.
 upon the Resurrection, 81-87.
 when written, 79, 82, 88, note 2.
- Corpus Juris Civilis (Body of the Civil Law), 72.
- Credibility of the Evangelists, 74-81, 99, 101, 108, 114, 122, 124, 125, 131, 132, 136, 138, 80. n. 7.
- Of witnesses, tests of, 75, 77, 78, 99, 124, 131, 132, 136, 137.
- Cross, inscription upon, 138.
- Crucifixion of Jesus—conceded, 12, 101.
 differing accounts of, 101, 125.
- Crucifixion of Jesus, surrounding circumstances, 130, 133, notes 13, 14.
- Cursive manuscripts, 73, note 10.
- Cyrenius, taxing under, 36, 41, note 8, 79, note 1.
- Damascus, Paul at, 82, 83.
- Darkness over the land, 130, 133, note 14.
- Day, how reckoned, 90, 100, notes 2, 3.
- Death of Jesus, certainty of, 101, 102, 103, 114, 117.
- Denial of Peter, predicted, 97, 98.
- Destruction of copies, 73, note 9.
 of Jerusalem, 79.
- Diatessaron of Tatian, 45, 47.
- Diocletian, 70.
- Diognetus, letter to, 10, 23, 27.
- Dionysius of Corinth, 51.
- Disagreement of witnesses against Jesus, 89.
- Docetæ, 38.
- Domitian, persecutions under, 11.
- Earlier writings, use of in Gospels, 78.
- Ebionites, 37, 39.
- Elders or Presbyters, testimony of, 17, note 3, 55, 60, 80, note 2.
- Elijah's ascension, 124.
 His coming, 92.
- Emmaus, locality of, 107, 109, note 9.
 journey to, 106, 107, 121.
 was late in the day, 106, 107.
- Empty Tomb, must be accounted for, 104, 106, 116, 118, 119, note 18, 120, 132, note 2.
- Ephesus, tombs at, 14.
- Ephræm (the Syrian Father), 47.
- Epistles, that are conceded, 12, 84.
 quotations from, 31, 32, 81-87.
 when written, 79, 82, 85.
- Epistle of John, 9, 15, 123.
- Epistles of Paul, 12, 31, 32, 79, 81-87.
- Errors in copying, 71, 72.
 of witnesses. See Credibility.

- Eusebius, fifty copies by, 70.
 on different subjects, 14, 15, 16, note 2, 37, 38, 53, 70, 88, note 3.
- Evidence, rules of, 9, 13, 22, 43, 77, 78, 124, 131, 136, 138.
- Experience, reasoning from, 12, 43, 112, 124.
- False Assumptions, corrected, 110-117.
- Fifty copies by Eusebius, 70.
- Fire in the Jordan, 37.
- Flesh, implies blood, 123.
- Flight into Egypt, 78.
- Forgery of John's Gospel, absurdity of, 52, 60, 64.
- Fourth Gospel, early use of, by or in,
 Agrippa, Castor, 45.
 Alogi, 47, 48, 53, 60, with 62, note 5.
 Apelles, 45.
 Apollinaris, 27, 29, note 3, 45, 49.*
 Athenagoras, 45, 47, 29.*
 Barnabas, 23, 26, 29.*
 Basilides, 10, 11, note 4, 27, 28, 45.
 Caius, of Rome, 51.
 Canon of Muratori, 45, 48, note 5, 53, 56.
 Celsus, 45, 46, 47, 48, note 6, 49.*
 Church of Lyons and Vienne, 45.
 Claudius Apollinaris, 45, 51.
 Clement of Alexandria, 45, 46, 51, 54, 56, 68, 72, note 3.
 Clementine Homilies, 45.
 Commentaries and Harmonies, 45, 46, 47, 53.
 Coptic Version, 45, 69.
 Diatessaron of Tatian, 45, 47.
 Diognetus, 23, 27.
 Dionysius of Corinth, 51.
 Elders at Ephesus, 55.
 Hegesippus, 51.
 Heracleon, 45, 47, 49, note 8.
 Hermas, 23, 27, 51, 29.*
 Hippolytus, 27, 28.
- Fourth Gospel, Irenæus, 45, 51, 55, 56, 72, note 3.
 Justin Martyr, 23, 30, 31, 34-67, 29.*
 Leonides, 51.
 Melito of Sardis, 45, 49.*
 Muratori Canon, 45, 48, note 5, 53, 56.
 Origen, 39, 45, 51, 54, 56, 72, note 3.
 Pantænus, 45, 51, 54, 55, 56.
 Papias, 15, 16, note 3, 23, 27, 33.
 Polycarp, 45, 51, 55, 56.
 Polycrates, 51.
 Pothinus, 51, 55, 56.
 Serapion, 38, 39, 45, 51, 56.
 Tatian, 45, 47, 49.*
 Tertullian, 45, 51, 54, 55, 56, 72, note 3.
 Theophilus of Antioch, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53, 56.
 Translations, 45, 51, 69, 70.
 Valentinus, 45, 47.
 Victor of Rome, 51.
- Galatians, conceded genuineness of, 12.
 evidential value of, 82-87.
 quotations from, 32, 80-87.
 when written, 79, 82, 88, note 2.
- Galicinium or cock-crowing, 97, 100, note 4.
- Galilee, appearances, 85, 87, 107, 108, 115, 121, 125, 133, note 7.
 meeting in, 97, 104, 108, 109, note 10.
- predictions of His death, 93 to 100.
- Gelasius, Decree of Canonicity, 34.
- Genuineness of Canonical Gospels, 67-73.
 legal presumption of, 13, 22, 43, 63, 64, 65.
 See, also, Credibility, Memoirs.
- Gnostic Heretics, 10, 45, 51.
- Good Shepherd, 93, 94.
- Going up to Jerusalem, 94.

- Gospel of Nicodemus (Apocryphal), 35, 36.
 Gospel of Hebrews (Apocryphal), 35, 37, 40, 42.
 Grand motive for Resurrection of Christ, 111, 129, 130.
 Grave clothes, evidence from, 105, 109, note 6, 119, note 18.
 Greek Classics, manuscripts of, 71, 73, note 11.
 Greek and Roman historians, 9, 10, 11, 130, with 133, note 14.
 Greeks, interview of, with Jesus, 95.
 Guard of soldiers, 103, 104, 109, notes 3 and 4, 124.
 Hades not the grave, 115.
 Hebrew, Matthew written in, 15, 37.
 Hebrews, (Apocryphal), Gospel of, 35, 37, 40, 42, note 10.
 Hegesippus, testimony of, 51.
 Herakleon, testimony of, 45, 47, 49, note 8.
 Heretics, testimony of, 45, 47, 51.
 Hermas, authorship of, 10, 18, 48, note 5, 52, 53.
 citations in, 27.
 date of, 10, 48, note 5.
 used John's Gospel, 23, 27, 29, n. 5.
 Hermas, Bishop of Rome, 48, note 5.
 Hippolytus, 27, 68.
 Historical difficulties, 65, 67, 68, 79, note 1. See, also, Credibility.
 Historical facts, how proved, 9, 131.
 See, also, Legal Presumption.
 Ignatius, Epistles of, 10, 28.
 Inspiration, extent of, 75, 79, 136.
 Iræneus, testimony of, 14, 16, note 3, 45, 55, 56, 66, note 3, 72, note 3.
 on Papias, 14, 15, 16, note 3, 27.
 on Presbyters, 16, note 3, 27.
 to John's Gospel, 45, 51, 55, 56.
 Integrity of the Gospels, 67.
 Intervals between appearances, 121, 122.
 James, appearance to, 87, 108, 121.
 James, the Apostle, 14, 83, 85.
 James, the Lord's brother, 83, 85.
 Jairus' daughter, 110.
 Jerome's translation, 37.
 testimony of, 45.
 Jerusalem, appearances at, 105-108, 115, 121.
 Jewish Sabbath, displaced by Lord's Day, 81, 82.
 Jewish Passover, displaced by Lord's Supper, 81, 82.
 Joanna, wife of Chuza, 109, note 5.
 John and Cerinthus, 66, note 3.
 John, the Apostle, 14, 15, 102, and *passim*.
 at the Cross, 115.
 at the Sepulchre, 105, 106, 120.
 time of his death, 15, 56, 57, 58, 64, 66, note 3.
 See Apocalypse and Fourth Gospel.
 John, the Baptist, 92.
 John, the Presbyter, 13, 14, 15, 17, note 3, 21, 88, note 3.
 John's Epistle, 9, 15, 123.
 John's Gospel, character of, 75, 76, 78.
 See Fourth Gospel.
 Josephus, testimony from, 12.
 compared with Luke, 77, 78.
 silence of, no proof, 77, 78, 130.
 when born, 130.
 Joseph of Arimathea, 90, 103, 122.
 Justin Martyr's writings, 14.
 birth, character and martyrdom, 14, 18, 36, 51, 61, note 1.
 Justin Martyr, on the Apocalypse, 80, note 4, 88, note 3.
 does not quote Epistles, 31, 32, 33.
 on Cyrenius, 79, note 1.
 on guard of soldiers, 104, 109, note 4.
 used the Fourth Gospel, 30-67.

- Justin's Apologies. See Apologies, etc., and Memoirs Intended, by Justin.
 Lactantius, time of, 37.
 Lapse of time as evidence, 13, 22, 64, 65.
 Latin Version, 69.
 Law, the Resurrection conformable to, 111, 112.
 Lawyers should investigate, preface and 131.
 Laying down His life, 93, 94.
 Legal presumptions, of genuineness, 13, 22, 43, 67.
 of permanency, 13, 22, 43, 50, 59, 62, note 3.
 of rightfulness, 13, 22, 43, 65, 66.
 Leonides the martyr, 51, 54.
 Lifting up the Serpent, 30, 89, 90, 129.
 Lineage of David, 36, 42, note 9.
 Literal Resurrection, 66, note 1, 85, 112, 123, 124, 132, note 5.
 Logical Results of the Resurrection, 134.
 Lord's Day, evidential value of, 81, 82.
 displaced the Jewish Sabbath, 81, 82.
 Lord's Supper, evidential value of, 81, 82, 96, 97, 102, 129.
 displaced the Passover, 81, 82.
 Lost Tributaries, 9, 67.
 Lucius, time of, 61, note 1.
 Luke's qualifications as a witness, 21, 45, 57, 77, 78.
 compared with Josephus, 77, 78.
 was a companion of Paul, 21, 45.
 Luke's Gospel, character of, 9, 48, note 5, 76, 77, 78.
 was mutilated by Marcion, 38, 45, 54, 68, 69, 72, note 7.
 quotations from, by Justin, 25, 26, 33. See Memoirs, etc.
 Lyons and Vienne, 45.
 Manuscript copies of Gospels, 69, 70, 71, 72.
 Marcion, time of, 61, note 1, 68.
 "Wolf of Pontus," 38, 61, note 1, 69, 72, note 7.
 Marcion's Gospel, date of, 68.
 an abridgment of Luke's, 38, 45, 54, 68, 69, 72, note 7.
 proves genuineness of Luke, 45, 68, 69.
 Mark as Peter's interpreter, 15, 21, 38, 39, 45, 46, 57, 61, 76.
 character of his Gospel, 76, 77.
 See Memoirs, etc.
 Material Resurrection, 26, 66, note 1, 85, 122, 123, 124, 132, note 5.
 Martha and Lazarus, 94.
 Matthew's qualifications, 14, 15, 75, 103.
 character of his Gospel, 15, 37, 76 to 78, 80, note 6.
 first in Hebrew, 15, 37.
 See Memoirs, etc.
 Mary Magdalen, not mentioned by Paul, 116.
 at the Sepulchre, 104, 105.
 beholds the Risen Lord, 105, 106, 117, 121, 123.
 but disciples incredulous, 105, 106, 116.
 Renan's empty boast, 116, 119, note 12.
 Mary the Mother of James, 109, note 5.
 Maximian, 70.
 Melito of Sardis, testimony of, 45, 51.
 Memoirs Intended by Justin, 18, 34, 45, 50-67.
 of the year one hundred and eighty, 45, 64.
 no others proved, 34, 64.
 no others substituted, 50 to 57, 64.
 summary of evidence, 63, 64.
 were Our Gospels, 18 to 67.
 Miracles, cessation of, 139, 140, note 7.

148 ANCIENT AUTHORS, EVENTS, AND WRITINGS.

- Miracles, are not impossible, 7, 65, 111, 118, note 2, 3.
conformable to law, 111, 112.
gift of, to the Apostles, 138, 139.
grand motive for, 111, 129, 130.
may be proved, 8, 111, 112, 113, 118, note 2, 3.
- Mythological resurrections, 140, note 7.
- Moral necessity of Christ's Resurrection, 128, 129.
- Multiplication of copies.
insures correctness, 69, 70, 71.
- Murator Canon, date of, 48, note 5.
where found, 48, note 5.
what it is, 45, 48, note 5, 53, 56.
- Myths and Legends, disproved, 86, 87, 88.
- Nazarenes, 37.
- Nero's Persecution, 9, 11.
- Nicodemus, 31, 52, 89, 90, 103, 122.
- Nicomedia, Persecution at, 73, note 9.
- Omission is not Contradiction, 16, 16, note 3, 32, 36, 67, 77, 124, 125.
- Opening of prison doors, 124.
- Order of Events, 101.
- Origen, 39, 45, 47, 49, 51, 54, 56, 72 note 3, 122, 132, note 4.
against Celsus, 47, 49, 132, note 4.
against "Peter's Gospel," 39, 45.
on genuineness of Our Gospels, 45, 54, 72, note 3.
on Resurrection Body, 122, 132, note 4.
- Pagan Nations, Christianized, 9, 10, 12, 13, 139, 141, note 8.
- Pagan Persecutions. See Ten Persecutions.
- Pantaenus, testimony of, 45, 51, 53, 54, 56.
- Papias, character and martyrdom, 14, 15.
- Papias, fragments of his writings, 10, 14, and note 3 on pp. 16-17, 37.
on Mark's Gospel, 14, 15, 37, 56.
on Matthew's Gospel, 14, 15, 37, 56.
probably used John's Gospel, 15, 16, note 3, 33.
- Passover and the Lord's Supper, 81, 82, 80, note 7.
- Passover week, 115.
- Pastor Hermas, see Hermas.
- Part of a day for the whole, 90, 100, notes 2, 3.
- Paul's conversion, date of, 83, 88, note 2.
testimony to the Resurrection, 81 to 87.
visits to Jerusalem, 82, 83.
- Paul's conceded Epistles, 12, 67, 84, 86.
when written, 79, 82, 85, 88, note 2.
their great value as evidence of Christ's Resurrection, 12, 81 to 88.
- Peter's change of character, 127, 128.
at the tomb, 104, 105.
charge to, 108.
denial, 97, 98.
rebuked, 92, 97.
See Appearances.
- Peter's Gospel (Apocryphal), 20, with 22, note 2, 38, 39, 40, 42, note 14, 45, with 48, note 1, 62, note 6.
- Philip, the Apostle, 14.
- Philippians, Epistle to, 12.
- Physical cause of Christ's death, 102, 108, note 1.
- Pilate, assured of Christ's death, 103, 114.
- Pliny's Letter to Trojan, 9, 12, 59.
- Ploughs and Yokes, 35.
- Polycarp, testimony of, 10, 23, 33, 45, 51, 55, 56.
his Epistle, 10, 33.
his martyrdom, 55.

- Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, 51.
- Positive and Negative Evidence, 32, 36, 67, 77, 124, 125.
- Pothinus, testimony of, 51, 55, 56.
- Preaching of the Resurrection.
as early as Day of Pentecost, 83, 84, 101.
disproves Myths or Legends, 85, 86.
must be accounted for, 113, 114.
theories upon, 113, 114.
- Preaching of Paul, (Apocryphal,) 37.
- Predictions of His Death and Resurrection,
by Himself, 89 to 97, 102, 128, 129.
by the Prophets, 127, 128.
why not understood, 100.
their great force as evidence, 102.
- Preface, 5.
- Presumptions, see Legal Presumption.
- Presentation at the Temple, 78.
- Previous Resurrections, 116, 117.
- Proclamation of the Resurrection.
See Preaching, etc.
- Proof of the Resurrection possible, 111, 112.
and sufficient, 115 to 133.
- Prophecies of the Resurrection.
See Predictions, etc.
- Protevangelium (Apocryphal), 34 to 42.
- Public Ministry, termination of, 76, 80, note 5, 96.
- Quotations in the Second Century,
from Old Testament, not exact, 24, 31.
from Gospels, not exact, 23, 24, 31, 47.
name of writer not given in quoting, before Theophilus, 45, 46, 47, 53, 56, 67.
See Barnabas, Clement, Hermas.
- Quotations by Justin Martyr,
from Acts, 23, 24, 33.
from John, 23, 30, 31, 32, 29, n. 5.
from Luke, 23 to 27, 33.
from Mark, 23, 24, 32.
from Matthew, 23, 24, 33.
- Quotations, by Irenæus, 45, 51, 55, 56.
by Origen, 45, 72, note 3.
by Papias, 15, 16, note 3.
by Presbyters, 16, note 3.
by Theophilus, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53, 56.
by Tertullian, 38, 45, 54, 55, 68, 69, 72, note 3.
- Relation of Gospel to Epistles, 87, 88.
- Reminiscences, and not connected Histories, 77.
- Rending the Veil, 130.
- Repositories for the Gospel, 63, 64.
- Resurrection of Jesus Christ, antecedently probable, 128, 129.
sufficiently proved, 112 to 133.
- Resurrection Body, 26, 66, note 1, 67, 85, 122, 123, 124, 132, notes 4, 5.
- Revelations, generally conceded, 12, 88, note 3.
quotations from, 32, 81, 82.
style differs from Gospel, 76, 80, note 4.
sufficiently accounted for, 76, 80, note 4.
- Revised Version, 72, 100, note 1, 109, note 7.
- Roman Civil Law, text of, 72, 73, note 13.
- Romans, Epistle to, conceded, 12-quotations from, 31, 32, 81 to 87.
when written, 79, 82.
- Salome, 109, note 5.
- Sanhedrim, 82, 98, 101, 103, 109, note 3, 110, 113, 120, 122.
- Saturn-day, Sunday, 19.

- Septuagint, 19.
 Serapion, testimony of, 38, 39, 45, 51, 56.
 Severus, persecution under, 11.
 Slaying of the children, 78.
 Shepherds, visit of, 78.
 Sinaitic Codex, 70, 71, 73, note 10, 109, note 7.
 Sincerity of the witnesses conceded, 74, 86, 87, 114.
 Sign of Jonah, 90, 100, notes 2, 3, of temple of his body, 89, of Brazen Serpent, 89, 90, 129.
 Silence not contradiction, 16, 16, note 3, 32, 36, 67, 77, 124, 125.
 Socrates, 12.
 Soldiers', fabrication, 103, 104, 109, note 4, 124.
 Sources of Evidence, 7 to 10.
 Spear of the Soldier, 102, 114.
 Stephen's vision of Christ, 126, 130.
 Substitution of Gospels, disproved, 50 to 67.
 Sufficiency of the Proofs, 110 to 130, 132, 137, 138.
 Superscription on the Cross, 138, 140, note 6.
 Suppression of Evidence, 115.
 Survival of the fittest, 13.
 Sybilline writings, 37.
 Synoptics, meaning of, 76, 80, note 3.
 Syria and Cilicia, 83.
 Syriac Version, 69.
 Tabernacle predictions, 93.
 Tacitus, the Historian, 9, 12.
 Tatian, the Heretic, 45, 47, 48. See Diatessaron.
 Ten Persecutions, 10.
 Tertullian, the distinguished Lawyer, 38, 45, 53, 54, 55, 56, 60, 68, 72, note 3.
 Theophilus of Antioch, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53, 56.
 Theophilus of Antioch, quoted John by name, 46, 51, 53.
 Theophilus, the friend of Luke, 77.
 Thessalonians, Epistles to, 12.
 Thomas the Apostle, 14.
 Tiberias, appearances at, 108, 121, 125, 133, note 7.
 Time, how reckoned by the Jews, 90, 100, note 3.
 Titus and Barnabas, 83. See Barnabas.
 Toleration, rule for, 135.
 Tombs, at Ephesus, 14.
 Tradition, 9, 53, 54, 66, 67, 68.
 Trajan, persecution under, 9, 10, 12, 59.
 Transfiguration, 92, 123.
 Translations, 69, 70.
 Trypho the Jew, 18, 19, 20, 21, 104, 109, note 4.
 See Justin Martyr.
 Uncial manuscripts, 73, note 10.
 Unity of Gospels, 79.
 Usages in Justin's time, 19.
 Valentinus, evidence from, 45, 47.
 Vatican Codex, 70, 71, 73, note 10, 109, note 7.
 Victor, Bishop of Rome, 51.
 Vienne and Lyons, 45.
 Vision, theory stated, 114, disproved, 114 to 132.
 Walking on the Sea, 123.
 Wise men of the East, 78.
 Witnesses in Court, — see Credibility, etc.
 women not competent, 116, 119, note 13.
 Women at the Sepulchre, 104 to 106, 109, note 5, 115, 116.
 Yielding up the Ghost, 99.
 Zebedee's Sons, 42, note 14, 90 to 100.

INDEX B.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX TO MODERN AUTHORS, EVENTS, AND WRITINGS.

- Abbot, E. A., D.D., on date of Muratori Canon, 48, note 5.
 Abbott, Rev. Edward, on Fijis, 141, note 8.
 Abbot, The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel by Ezra Abbot, D.D., LL.D. (Boston, 1880.)
 Frequent citations from, 10 to 48.
 Abbott, Cyclopædia of Religious Knowledge, by Lyman Abbott, D.D., LL.D., cited, 122, 132, note 5, with 122.
 Adams' Roman Antiquities, 119, note 13.
 Alford (Dean) 103, 108, note 1, with 102.
 Ambrosian Library, 48, note 5.
 Ante-Nicene Christian Library, 16, notes 1, 3, 22, 23, 30, 34.
 Arnold, Matthew, on Basilides, 28, with 10, and 11, note 4.
 Bampton Lectures, 40 with 42, note 17, 68 with 72, note 6.
 Barnes, Albert, on site of Emmaus, 109, note 9.
 on the Resurrection Body, 123, 132, note 5.
 Bartlett, Pres., on the slight historical errors, 79, note 1.
 Baur, J. C., on Fourth Gospel, 52.
 Bentley, on genuineness of Gospels, 71.
 Blackstone, 32, 132.
 Bleek, on date of Muratori Canon, 48, note 5.
 Buck's Theological Dictionary, 11, note 5.
 Cannibals Christianized, 139, 141.
 Cardinal Newman, 80, note 8.
 Canonicity, — See Charteris.
 Chadwick's Views of Christianity, 134, 139, 140, note 1.
 Charteris, Prof. A. H., D.D., on Basilides, 28.
 date of Celsus, 49, note 6.
 date of Justin's Apology, 61, note 1.
 early universal use of Gospels, 47.
 Fourth Gospel, 17, 27, 28, 47.
 Marcion's Gospel, 72, note 7, with 69.
 Papias, 17.
 Pastor Hermas, 27.
 Child, L. Maria, 119, note 13.
 Congregationalist, 58, note, 140, note 2, 141, note 8.
 Conybeare and Howson's Life of Paul, 82, 83, with 88, notes 2, 4.
 Credner, on date of Muratori Canon, 48, note 5.

- Curtiss, Prof. Samuel Ives, D.D., on
Apocryphal Gospels, 34, 35, 39,
and 40 with 42, notes 15, 16.
date of Celsus, 48, note 6.
date of Muratori Canon, 48, note 6.
Judge Waite, 35, 48, note 6.
Cursive manuscripts of Gospels, 73,
note 10.
Davidson, Samuel, cited by Waite,
29, note 4.
De Soto, 52.
Donaldson and Roberts, 16, notes
1, 3, 20, 22, note 1, 23, 30, 61,
note 1.
Dorner on use by Papias of John's
Gospel, 17.
Drummond, Prof., on Justin's use of
John's Gospel, 30.
Early settlements in N. H., 58.
Dr. Edensheim on passover, 80, n. 7.
Farrar, (Canon), 100, note 1, 109,
note 3.
Fisher, Prof. George P., D.D., on
Alogi, 62, note 5.
date of Apocryphal Gospels, 41,
note 2, with 34.
date of Celsus, 49, note 6, with 46.
date of Justin's Apology, 61, note 1.
date of Muratori Canon, 46, 48,
note 5.
genuineness of text of Gospels,
67, 71, 72, note 4, 73, note 12.
John's Gospel, 27, 29, note 3, 33,
note 3, with 30.
Justin's Quotations, 46, 48, notes
2, 4, 62, note 5, 67, 68, 72, note 4.
Marcion's Gospel, 72, note 4, with
68.
Theophilus, 46, 48, note 4.
Free Religious Index, 140, note 1.
Friedlieb, on physical Cause of
Death, 102, 108, note 1.
Geikie, The Life and Words of
Christ, by Cunningham Geikie,
D.D., (1880), cited page
109, note 10, with page 108.
- Gibbon's Rome, 9.
Gibson, Ch. Justice, 131.
Gilbert West, — See West.
Godet, Prof. F., D.D., 88, note 1,
90, 100, note 3, 126, 132, notes
1, 2, 133, note 8.
upon Possibility of Miracles, 132,
notes 1, 2, with 111.
upon Sign of Jonah, 88, note 1,
90, 100, note 3.
upon Vision Theory, 126, 133,
note 8.
Gordon-Cumming, in Fiji, 141,
note 8.
Granite Monthly, 58.
Greenleaf, Prof. Simon, LL.D., on
cock-crowing, 100, note 4,
with 97.
credibility of witnesses, 78, 137,
138, 140, notes 3, 6.
genuineness of Gospels, 13, 72,
73, note 13.
presumption of Permanency, 43,
44, note 1, 66.
presumption of Rightfulness, 13,
44, note 1, 66.
sign of Jonah, 100, note 3, with
page 90.
superscription on the Cross, 138,
140, note 6.
truth of Christianity, 132, 138,
140, note 6.
Hanna, Rev. William, LL.D., on
cause of death, 109, note 1, with
102.
empty tomb, 105, 109, note 6.
Galilee meeting, 109, note 10,
with 108.
Hilgenfeld on Justin's use of John's
Gospel, 30, 33, note 3.
on date of Muratori Canon, 48,
note 5.
Hooykaas and his Bible for Learn-
ers, 114, 119, note 8, 128,
133, note 12, 134, 140, note 1.

- Holtzmann, on Apocryphal Gospels,
35.
Hume's argument from experience,
43, 112.
Ingersoll on inspiration, 136, 137,
138.
on miracles, 112, 118, note 3.
Inter-Ocean (Chicago), 41, note 2,
42, note 15, 16.
Kent, Chancellor, 32, 132.
Keim, Dr. on date of Celsus, 48,
49, note 6.
on the empty tomb, 120, 132,
on 4th. Gospel, 49.*
Lafayette's visit, 57, 62, note 2.
Landing of the Pilgrims, 58.
Lange's Life of Jesus, on
cause of death, 108, note 1, with
102.
Cleopas and Luke, 106, 109, note
8.
Galilee meeting, 108, 109, note 10.
guard of Soldiers, 109, note 3,
with 103.
journey to Emmaus, 106, 109,
note 8.
lifting up the Serpent, 89, 90,
100, note 1.
locality of Emmaus, 109, note 9.
sign of Jonah, 100, notes 2, 3,
with 90.
women at the Sepulchre, 104,
109, note 5.
Lemisch on date of Justin's Apol-
ogy, 61, note 1.
Light Infantry Poor, 62, note 2,
with 57.
Lipsius, Prof. of Jena, on
date of Apocryphal Gospels, 35.
that Justin did not use them,
40, 42, note 15.
Lord Brougham, 132.
Madagascar Christianized, 139.
Mason, Jeremiah, 132.
Marshall, Ch. Justice, 132.
- Matthew Arnold. See Arnold.
McClintock and Strong's Cyclope-
dia, on
Cerinthus, 66, note 3.
Pagan Persecutions, 11, note 5,
73, note 9.
Resurrection Body of Christ, 123.
Meyer's Lexicon, on date of Apoc-
ryphal Gospels, 35.
Mill, J. S. concedes, Christ Histor-
ical, 128, 133, note 11.
miracles possible, 8.
Miln, on "Church of the Future,"
134, 140, note 1.
Milligan, The Resurrection of Our
Lord, by William Milligan,
D.D., Prof. etc. in the Uni-
versity of Aberdeen. (Lon-
don, 1881), Cited, 114, 119,
notes 5, 7.
Morrison, James, D.D., on Empty
Tomb, 119, note 18.
New Hampshire Journal, Preface
and, 140, note 2.
New York Observer, 140, note 1.
Neander, on the date of Justin's
Apology, 61, note 1.
destruction of Church, etc., at
Nicomedia, 73, note 9.
New Revision, 72, 100, note 1.
North American Review, 118, note
3, 140, note 4.
Norton, on Peter's Gospel, 39, 42,
note 12, 56, note 2.
on Genuineness of Our Gospels,
54, 56, 76, 80, note 6.
on number of Copies of Gos-
pels, 73, note 8, with 70.
Page on date of Justin's Apology,
61, note 1.
Parker, Joel, Ch. Justice, 43.
Parmelee, Dr. Simeon, great age
of, 57.
Parsons, Theophilus, Ch. Justice,
132.

- Patten's Diaries, 58.
 Paulus, Theory of, 114.
 Phillips, on Presumptions, 43, 44, note 1.
 Pond, Dr. Enoch, as to cessation of Miracles, 140, note 7.
 Princeton Review, 68, 72, note 4, 79, note 1.
 Renan, Ernest, admissions by, 12, 13, note 1, 84, 112, 130, 133, notes 12 and 14.
 demands expert testimony, 7.
 denials, 7, 11, note 1, 112, 118, note 3.
 idle boasting, 84, 116, 119, note 12.
 upon Christ's teachings, 128, 133, note 12.
 upon silence of Historians as to occurrences at the Crucifixion, 130, 133, note 14.
 Reuss, on date of Muratori Canon, 48, note 5.
 Rigenback, on use by Papias of John's Gospel, 17.
 Roberts and Donaldson, 16, notes 1 and 3, 20, 22, note 1, 23, 30, 61, note 1.
 that Justin did not cite Peter's Gospel, 20.
 Robinson's Holy Land, 109, note 9.
 Robinson, John, the Pilgrim Father, 135.
 Robinson, Prof., on the Resurrection Body, 122, 132, note 5.
 Routh, on Papias' use of John's Gospel, 17.
 Rowe, Prof. See Bampton Lectures.
 Salisbury Church. See Webster.
 Sanday, Dr., on quotations by Justin, 24.
 by Irenæus, 56.
 dates of Celsus, Muratori Canon, 48 and 49, notes 5, 6.
 that Marcion's Gospel is an abridgment of Luke, 68, 69, 72, note 7.
 Sandwich Islands Christianized, 139.
 Savage, on the "Church of the Future," 134, 140, note 1.
 Schleiermacher, theory of, 81, 88, note 1.
 Schenkel's Lexicon, on date of Apocryphal Gospels, 35.
 Scott, Thomas, D.D., that part of the day is counted for the whole, 90, 100, note 3.
 upon Resurrection Body, 122, 132, note 5.
 Scribner's Monthly, 73, note 12.
 Sears' "Heart of Christ," 30, 33, note 3, 49, note 6, 61, note 1, 80, note 4.
 Smith and Wace's Dictionary, 35.
 Spiritualists, 140, 141, note 7.
 Stanley (Dean) as to date of Polycarp's Epistle, 10.
 Starkie, on coincidences, 137, 140, note 5.
 on Christianity, 132.
 Stier, that part of a day is counted for the whole, 90, 100, note 2.
 Story, Judge, 32, 132.
 Stowe, Prof. C. E., on
 Apocryphal Gospels, 35, 41, note 2.
 Elders at Ephesus, 56, note 4, with 55.
 Gospel to Hebrews, 37, 42, note 10.
 Greek Classic Copies, 71, 73, note 11.
 John's Gospel, 48, note 4.
 Theophilus, 48, note 4.
 Strauss, David, Admissions by:
 actual death of Jesus, 81, 102, 114, 119, note 6.
 sincerity of witnesses, 86.
 universal use of the Gospels, by the end of the Second Century, 45, 46.
 false theories of, 7, 8, 81, 88, note 1, 106, 115.

- Strauss, David, became an atheist, 8.
 how far commended, 38, 134,
 more candid than Waite, 38.
 Stroud, on physical cause of Death, 102, 108, note 1.
 Supernatural Religion. An Inquiry into The Reality of Divine Revelation. (Anonymous.) Referred to pp. 17, 42, note 14, 68, 69, 112, with 118, note 3.
 Taylor, William, D.D., on Miracles, 111, 118, note 1, 128, 133, note 10.
 Thomson's "Land and Book," 35, 36, 41, note 4.
 Tischendorf, Constantine, discoverer of the Sinaitic Codex, 70.
 on Commentary of Heracleon, 47, 49, note 8.
 on difference in Manuscripts, 73, note 10.
 on number of Manuscript copies, 71, 73, note 10.
 on quotations by Irenæus, 56, note 3, with 55.
 on use, by Papias, of John's Gospel, 17.
 Tübingen School, 8, 30.
 Uncials, number of, 73, note 10.
 Waite, History of the Christian Religion to the year Two Hundred. By Charles B. Waite, A. M. Second edition, Chicago (1881), 34.
 Waite, C. B., admits Gospels do not copy from each other, 74.
 Waite, C. B., his mistakes as to Apocalypse, 88, note 3.
 Apocryphal Gospels, 35, 36, 41, note 5.
 Waite, C. B., his mistakes as to Basilides, 29, note 4.
 Clement of Rome, 32, 66, note 1, 67, 72, note 2.
 Celsus, 48, note 6.
 Cerinthus, 66, note 3.
 Justin Martyr, 5, 10, 11, note 3, 61, note 1.
 Marcion's Gospel, 38, 45, 54, 68, 69, 72, note 7.
 Muratori Canon, 48, note 5.
 Peter's Gospel, 20, note 2, 38, 39, 40, 42, note 14, 48, 62, note 6.
 Resurrection body, and Paul, 85, 114, 119, note 8, 122.
 with other matters too numerous to mention.
 Walker, Timothy, Diaries of, 58.
 Webster, Daniel, 132, 135, 140, note 2.
 his creed, 135, 140, note 2.
 his church membership, 140, note 2.
 Warrenton, on quotations from O. T., 80, note 1.
 Weiseler, on date of Muratori Canon, 48, note 5.
 Westcott, 17, 80, note 6.
 Wesleyan Missionaries, 141, note 8.
 West, Gilbert, on Resurrection, 117, 119, note 16.
 Whitby, that a part of a day is put for the whole, 100, note 3.
 Whittier's Poem, 57.
 Wright. The Logic of Christian Evidences. By Rev. G. Frederick Wright, Andover, Mass. (1880), cited or quoted, 18, 24, 28, note 1, 56, notes, and 80, note 6.
 Yorktown Scammel, 62, note 2.

ANDOVER PUBLICATIONS.

W. F. DRAPER, PUBLISHER,

ANDOVER, MASS.

Among the Andover Publications will be found choice and valuable books for intelligent readers; also works for the special use of Theological Students and Clergymen. The Catalogue embraces some of the most valuable Commentaries in the language, such as those of Ellicott, Henderson, Lightfoot, Murphy, Perowne, and Stuart; and other helps to Biblical Study, among them, Buttmann's and Winer's Grammars of the New Testament, Gardiner's Harmonies of the Gospels in both Greek and English, Mitchell's Guide to the Study of the Greek of the New Testament, Gesenius' and Jones' Hebrew Grammars, Davies' Hebrew Lexicon, Immer's Hermeneutics; works on the Evidences and defences of Christianity, Devotional books, Essays in Philosophy and Theology, Church History, Discrepancies of the Bible, etc.

Descriptive Catalogues sent free on application. Any book sent by mail or express prepaid, at the prices annexed, with special discounts to clergymen and theological students.

ADDRESS

W. F. DRAPER, Publisher,
ANDOVER, MASS.

C-5

HELPS TO BIBLICAL STUDY.

NEW TESTAMENT.

Mitchell. *The Critical Handbook.* A Guide to the Study of the Authenticity, Canon, and Text of the Greek New Testament. By Edward O. Mitchell, D.D. Illustrated by a Map, Diagrams, and Tables. 12mo. \$1.75
From Rev. A. P. Peabody, D.D., LL.D., Harvard College, Cambridge.
— "I wish to speak of it in terms of superlative commendation, and more than half a century of conversance with the department of literature to which it belongs may entitle me to express an opinion with some good degree of confidence. I know of no manual that fills the place for which it is designed and fitted. . . . Such of the materials as can be tabulated are given in a series of tables, which for simplicity, thoroughness, and comprehensiveness leave nothing to be desired."
From Prof. Alvah Hovey, D.D. — "As a 'Handbook' for frequent use, I know of nothing equal to it."

Gardiner. *The Principles of Textual Criticism;* with a List of all the known Greek Uncials, and a Table representing graphically the Parts of the Text of the New Testament contained in each, also the Canons of Eusebius. 8vo. pp. 64. Paper covers, 50 cents. Cloth, flexible, 75 cts. From the Baptist Quarterly. — "A trustworthy and useful help."

Cary. *An Introduction to the Greek of the New Testament.* By George L. Cary, of the Meadville Theological Seminary. 12mo. pp. 72. 75 cents.
"This is substantially a primary Greek Grammar of the New Testament, intended for those who have had no previous knowledge of the language." — *Central Baptist*.
"The simplicity of its method, its conciseness and perspicuity admirably adapt it to the use of such persons." — *Theological and Homiletic Monthly*.

Buttmann. *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek.* By Alexander Buttmann. Authorized Translation [by Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D.]; with numerous additions and corrections by the Author. 8vo. pp. xx and 474. \$2.75
Buttmann's Grammar is more exclusively philological than that of Winer, it has less the character of a concise commentary. It is thoroughly scholarly, lucid, and compact. For comparing New Testament and Classic usage running references are made throughout the book to the Grammars of Hadley, Crosby, Donaldson, Jelf, and others. Winer and Buttmann supplement each other admirably.
From the *American Presbyterian Review*. — "By far the most important work on the Grammar of the New Testament Greek which has been produced of late years."

Winer. *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament:* prepared as a Solid Basis for the Interpretation of the New Testament. By Dr. George Benedict Winer. Seventh Edition, enlarged and improved. By Dr. Gottlieb Lünemann, Professor of Theology at the University of Göttingen. Revised and Authorized Translation. [By Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D.]. 8vo. pp. 744. \$4.00
Winer is the most valuable of all aids for a thorough and fundamental theological scholarship. Nothing has been left undone by Professor Thayer to make this the most complete and correct edition of the most celebrated of all New Testament Grammars. Three full Indexes have been added. One of them, that of passages in the New Testament explained or cited, occupies sixty pages. The texts that are merely cited are distinguished from these which are commented upon. In an important sense the book gives a grammatical commentary on the more difficult texts of the New Testament. K-6

Books Published by W. F. Draper.

HALEY. THE ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES OF THE BIBLE.
By John W. Haley, M.A. With an Introduction by Alvah Hovey, D.D., Professor in the Newton Theological Institution. Crown 8vo. pp. xii and 473. \$1.75.
"I do not know any volume which gives to the English reader such a compressed amount of suggestion and instruction on this theme as is given in this volume." — *Professor Edwards A. Park*.
"It would be difficult, by any amount of labor, to produce anything more convincing and satisfactory." — *The Interior*.

HALEY. THE HEREAFTER OF SIN:
What it will be; with Answers to Certain Questions and Objections. By Rev. John W. Haley, author of "Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible. 16mo. 75 cts.
"It presents, in a calm and admirable manner, the Scriptural doctrine of future retribution, divested, indeed, of the literalism with which it is sometimes presented, and showing its accordance with the deductions of a sound philosophy." — *Zion's Herald*.

HARRIS. THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST ON EARTH.
Twelve Lectures delivered before the Students of Andover Theological Seminary. By Samuel Harris, Dwight Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale College. 8vo. pp. 263. \$1.50
"Not often does the Christian pastor have the opportunity to purchase a work so rich in thought and spirit, so suggestive, stimulating, and helpful." — *Baptist Quarterly*.
"It is a profound and eloquent discussion of one of the sublimest themes that the human mind can consider." — *Zion's Herald*.

HILL. A STATEMENT OF THE NATURAL SOURCES OF THEOLOGY, with a Discussion of their Validity, and of Modern Sceptical Objections; also an Article on the First Chapter of Genesis. By Thomas Hill, D.D., LL.D. 8vo. Paper, 60 cents; cloth, flexible, 80 cents.
"Powerful discussions, rich in thought and illustration, and directed with crushing force against the positions of infidel scientists." — *The Advance*.

McOURDY. ARYO-SEMITIC SPEECH:
A Study in Linguistic Archaeology. By James Frederick McCurdy. 8vo. pp. xi and 176. \$2.00.
In two main respects the work claims to have made an advance upon any of its predecessors in the same inquiry. In the first place the *morphology* of the Proto-Semitic as well as of Proto-Aryan roots is fully discussed. Secondly, it is postulated that if the two families of speech were ever one, the only evidence of their identity is to be adduced from their expressions for primitive and simple ideas. The method employed in this book is to take such elementary notions and see how they have been expressed in the two systems of speech.

WRIGHT. THE LOGIC OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.
By Rev. G. Frederick Wright. 16mo. pp. 328. Cloth. \$1.50.
This work is now used in a large number of Academies and Colleges as a Text-book. Among the number are Abbot, Bradford, Cushing, Mt. Holyoke Seminary, Smith College, Mass.; Brunswick, Maine; Chapel Hill, N. C.; Cumberland University, Tenn.; North Western, Evanston, Ill.; Asbury University, Ind.; Simpson, Iowa; Ripon, Wis.; Drury, Mo.; Central Wesleyan, Mo.; Waco, Texas.

WRIGHT. STUDIES IN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.
By Prof. G. Frederick Wright, author of "The Logic of Christian Evidences." 16mo. \$1.50.
"The grand point contended for and carried is that 'Christianity, in its appeal to historical evidence, allies itself with modern science rather than with the glittering generalities of transcendentalism,' and that in its beginnings science has no advantage over religion in solidity of basis." — *The Leader*. K 2

BISHOP ELLICOTT'S COMMENTARIES.

Critical and Grammatical Commentaries on the Epistle of St. Paul, with Revised Translations [And the Revised Version of 1881 added]. By Rt. Rev. Charles J. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

GALATIANS. With an Introductory Notice by Calvin E. Stowe, D.D., Professor of Sacred Literature in Andover Theological Seminary. 8vo. pp. 192. \$1.25

"We have never met with a learned commentary on any book of the New Testament so nearly perfect in every respect as the 'Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians' by Professor Ellicott, of King's College, London—learned, devout, and orthodox."—*Independent*.

EPHESIANS. With a New Translation. 8vo. pp. 198. \$1.25

"Ellicott, possessed of a deeper reverence [than De Wette] and a more thoughtful piety, has adopted the same method [grammatical analysis] and has produced commentaries on the Pauline writings which for accurate analysis and clear statement have not yet been equalled."—*Watchman and Reflector*.

THESSALONIANS. With a New Translation. 8vo. pp. 176. \$1.25

"For clearness, brevity, scholarlike fidelity, appreciation of the real grammatical sense of the text, absence of all discursive disquisitions, and evidence of comprehensive and profound learning without the slightest parade, and joined with a child-like reverence for the word of God, these commentaries are unique in the biblical literature of England. We know nothing equal to them anywhere."—*American Presbyterian*.

PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND PHILEMON. With a New Translation. 8vo. pp. 290. \$1.75

"A scholarly and religious earnestness, a thoroughness, candor, and moderation, in connection with their convenient shape and compendious comprehensiveness, give them a character elevated and unique among works of their class."—*The Lutheran and Missionary*.

PASTORAL EPISTLES. With a New Translation. 8vo. pp. 280. \$1.75

"Bishop Ellicott's Commentaries belong to the best class of that new order of exegesis whose object is to simply and clearly and thoroughly and honestly explain in English what the Scriptures mean in the original tongues. . . . Brief, and to the point, he never wearies, while there is still a wonderful affluence both of original and garnered thought in its fertile pages."—*Congregational Quarterly*.

The whole set of Ellicott's Commentaries in two volumes, bevelled edges, \$6.75.

"His Commentaries are exactly what he styles them, critical and grammatical. His notes are brief, modest, unpretending, faithful, laborious, full of the most accurate and varied learning, without the taints of pedantry, and always expressed in language of the utmost clearness and simplicity."—*Bibliotheca Sacra*.

Also by the same Author.

Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1859. With Notes, Critical, Historical, and Explanatory. Crown 8vo. pp. 382. \$1.75

"An able book by an able man. It deals with the facts rather than with doctrines or truths of gospel history. It designs to harmonize, synchronize, and illustrate those facts. It is also apologetic in its character, being designed to vindicate the historical unity of the Evangelists. It is, therefore, a very seasonable and valuable book."—*Princeton Review*. I-12