

AN
ELEMENTARY COURSE
OF
BIBLICAL THEOLOGY,

TRANSLATED FROM THE WORK OF
PROFESSORS STORR AND FLATT,

WITH
ADDITIONS

BY S. S. SCHMUCKER, D. D.
Professor of Theology in the Theol. Sem. of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran
Church in the United States, Gettysburg, Pa.

Second Edition.

ANDOVER:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY GOULD AND NEWMAN,
AT THE GODMAN PRESS.
NEW-YORK:
GRIFFIN, WILCOX AND CO.
1836.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

TO THE FIRST EDITION.

The work which is here presented to the public, is the result of the joint labour of two of the most eminent divines of the present age. Theophilus Christian Storr,¹ formerly Theological Professor in the University of Tübingen, was a very distinguished interpreter of the Holy Volume, and one of the most triumphant combatants of that fashionable philosophy with which Europe has been deluged. His numerous philological and exegetical works rank among the first critical productions of Germany, and few men have attained such profundity of erudition, and at the same time preserved so humble and faithful an adherence to the doctrines of the Bible, as are displayed in the literary and theological career of Dr. Storr. In his earlier life, after he had acquired a profound and critical knowledge of the original languages of Scripture and the cognate dialects, *he confined himself for some time to the study of the Holy Volume to the exclusion of all other theological works.* Accordingly his various productions display an extraordinary familiarity with the Bible, and in reference especially to Biblical learning, might with truth be applied to him what Casaubon said of his friend the great Salmasius, that he was "*ad miraculum doctus.*" Nor is, in general, his colleague and commentator Dr. C. C. Flatt at all his inferior. These distinguished champions of the truth sustained the cause of orthodoxy for upwards of twenty years, and published from time to time, the most able replies to the several systems of infidelity which sprung up in Europe. Having been harassed by metaphysical and speculative and infidel systems of pretended Christianity, they were taught the absolute necessity of building their faith exclusively on the word of God; and the present work is purely of this Biblical

¹ Dr. Storr was born at Stättgard, Sept. 18, 1746. Died Jan. 17, 1805.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1836, by
GOULD AND NEWMAN,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

character. It is confined to the doctrines which are taught in the sacred volume *TOTIDEM VERBIS*. The various *INFERENTIAL*, *sectarian* views, which are used by divines of different denominations to complete their peculiar systems, are here omitted; even those of the Lutheran church to which the authors belonged. The work is composed with the highest regard to exegesis, composed too in view of all the objections which the liberalists of the last thirty years have been able to raise. That such a work is peculiarly needed in the present day, must be evident to every reflecting mind acquainted with the course of theological discussion in our country. In regard to the dress in which the work is presented to the English public, it was the translator's wish that it might appear in the most favourable aspect. This he endeavoured to effect on the one hand by avoiding that servility, which whilst it hampered his diction would render the work offensive to the classic mind; and on the other, by guarding against that liberty which degenerates into unwarranted license, and deserves the name, not of translation but paraphrase. In the management of the work, some important improvements have been attempted. The original is printed thus: first, the propositions or text; next, notes; thirdly, notes upon these notes by Storr; then, notes upon all these notes, by Flatt; which occasionally creates much perplexity and confusion to the reader. All these the translator has incorporated into one continuous and connected discussion, consisting simply of the text or propositions and the Illustrations or discussion of them. The extremely numerous references which abound in all Storr's works, are generally thrown into the margin. Numerous additions also have been made to the body of the work. The most important of these are the translation of the very frequent quotations from heathen authors, from the earlier ecclesiastical writers, and from the Old and New Testaments. In some instances the critical reader will perceive, that improved translations have been given to scripture texts. On these the translator spent much time and investigation, and it is hoped his decisions will be found to have been made not without judgment. Every thing, also, included in [], throughout the work, is added by the translator. In a few instances in which the learned author's enthymemes seemed somewhat obscure, his reasoning has perhaps been rendered

more lucid by the insertion of the intermediate link in his chain of reasoning. For the purpose of facilitating references, a caption or summary view of contents, has been prefixed to every Illustration in the work, excepting those only which were so brief as not to require it. The occasional original additions are distinguished by the letter S. To the article of the Trinity an appendix has been added, in which an attempt is made to prove that this doctrine, as now understood and defended, is perfectly accordant with reason, and cannot be assailed on any ground of true philosophy.

Having undertaken this work, as he humbly trusts, with a supreme reference to the glory of the divine Redeemer, the Translator cannot but pray, most earnestly, that in his benevolent Providence, it may be made instrumental in the promotion of the interests of his kingdom.

Theol. Seminary, Gettysburg, 1826.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

In this edition the frequent repetition of literary references is avoided, whilst no work which had been cited in the former impression is entirely excluded in this. A few paragraphs of minor moment have been omitted in the text, and the whole is printed in a more compressed form. The work is again commended to the blessing of God, and the continued favour of the friends of radical, biblical investigation.

March, 1836.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

OF THE DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

| | Page. |
|---|-------|
| <i>A. The New Testament.</i> | |
| PART I. Of the genuineness of the N. Test. §§ 1—3. | |
| 1. Testimony of heathen writers respecting the early existence of the writings of the Christians, § 1 | 17 |
| 2. Genuineness of the homologoumena, § 2 | 24 |
| 3. Genuineness of the antilegomena, § 3 | 61 |
| PART II. Integrity of the books of the N. T. § 4 | 88 |
| PART III. Credibility of the N. T. | |
| 1. Historical, § 5 | 93 |
| 2. Doctrinal.—Divinity of the N. T. § 6—12. | |
| a) Jesus himself maintained the divinity of his mission and doctrines, § 6 | 102 |
| The truth of this declaration of Jesus, is established | |
| α. From his general character and conduct.—The plan of Jesus, § 7 | 105 |
| β. From his miracles, § 8 | 109 |
| His miracles were not allegorical narratives, Illust. 3. | |
| | 118 |
| —They were not the effects of human agency, nor a work of deception, Illust. 4. | |
| | 119 |
| —Not the result of an accidental coincidence of circumstances, Illust. 5 | |
| | 121 |
| —But are actually proofs of his divine mission, Illust. 6 | |
| | 122 |
| b) Jesus assures us, that <i>the doctrines of the apostles</i> also, possess divine authority, § 9 | 125 |

- Paul possessed divine authority: This is evinced by his own declaration in connexion with the history of his vocation to the apostleship, and his miracles, and the testimony of the other apostles in his favour, § 10 134
- c) The *writings of the apostles*, also possess divine authority, § 11 142
- d) The *writings of the evangelists* Mark and Luke, also possess divine authority, § 12 146
- B. *Divine authority of the Old Testament.*
1. The divinity of the Old Testament is proved by the declarations of Jesus and his apostles, § 13 151
2. The O. T. contained the same books, at the time of Jesus and his apostles, which it contains now; as may be proved from the N. Test. from Josephus, and from Philo, § 14 165
- Inference: The Holy Scriptures are the standard of our faith, § 15 176
- Confirmation of the divinity of the Scriptures from internal personal experience, inward witness of the Holy Spirit, § 16 180

BOOK II.

OF GOD.

PART I. Of our idea of God; and its truth.

- I. Sources of evidence for the divine existence.
1. Even conscience points us to a God, § 17 187
2. The moral nature of man; connected with the constitution of nature, necessarily leads him to the belief of a Moral Author and Governor of the world.—Combination of Physico-theology with moral theology, § 18 191
3. Our belief in the existence of God is confirmed by the miracles of Jesus and his apostles, § 19 202

- II. Biblical idea of God—he is Creator and Governor of the world, § 20 206
- III. Attributes of God.
1. Power, § 21 206
2. Knowledge and wisdom, § 22 208
3. The goodness of God, and its compatibility with the existence of physical evil, § 23 212
4. Justice and holiness, § 24 214
5. Spirituality, § 25 218
6. Veracity, § 26 219
- The truth of the Scriptures is a necessary consequence of the veracity of God, § 27 222
7. Unity of God—it cannot indeed be conclusively proved from reason, but from Scripture it can, § 28 223
8. Eternity and immutability of God: inferred from his absolute necessary existence, § 29 227
9. Incomparability of God, § 30 228
- PART II. Creation and Providence.
- I. *Creation.*
1. Immediate creation.—a) Immediate creation out of nothing.—b) Immediate formation of the earth out of the materials already created, § 31 232
2. Mediate creation, § 32 236
- II. *Preservation* of the universe, § 33 237
- III. *Government* of the world.—Providence.
1. Idea of the divine government—*particular* providence, § 34 239
2. Government of the world by the immediate agency of God.
- a) The possibility of it, § 35 240
- b) The reality of it—proved from the miracles, § 36 243
- Difference between miracles and other instances of the supernatural agency of God, § 37 249

c) Necessity of admitting the possibility of the supernatural agency of God in the world, in reference to prayer, § 38 250

3. Divine government in the course of nature.—Permission of moral evil, § 39 254

The doctrine of divine Providence affords no justification for indolence or temerity, § 40 258

Conclusion of this chapter, § 41 258

Part III. Doctrine of the Trinity.

I. *The divinity of Christ.*

1. Its proof, § 42 260

2. Importance of this doctrine.—Baptism in the name of Christ as the Son of God, § 43 291

3. Personal difference between the Father and the Son, § 44 295

II. *Divinity of the Holy Spirit*, and his personal difference from the Father and the Son, § 45 299

III. The difference between *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*—the nature of this distinction is inexplicable, § 46 301

Appendix by the Translator.

On the relation of the doctrine of the Trinity to reason 306

BOOK III.

OF CREATED RATIONAL BEINGS.

PART I. Angels. Connexion of this Part with the preceding, § 47 321

A. *Good Angels.*

1. Their existence and attributes—power, moral perfection, and happiness, § 48 321

2. Their destination to the service of God, and spe-

cifically to the promotion of the welfare of men, § 49 323

B. *Apostate angels.*

1. Their transgression and consequent fate, § 50 326

2. Their relation to the human family.—They are inimical to their moral improvement and happiness. They exerted an injurious influence on bodies of certain persons in the time of Christ and the apostles, § 51 328

Their baneful influence on the moral character of man, may be resisted, § 52 334

PART II. Of Man.

I. *Creation and fall of man.*

1. The creation and original state of man, § 53 339

2. The fall of our first parents.

a) Its history, § 54 343

b) Consequences of the fall, § 55 345

α) Its effects on our first parents themselves, Illust. 1—3.

β) Its effects on their posterity, Illust. 4 etc. 347

3. Innate depravity.—Description of it, § 56 350

—Its consequences.—Of death and the state of existence which follows it, § 57 353

Future punishment of the wicked, and its endless duration, § 58 358

II. *The provision made by God for the salvation of man.*

Christ the Saviour of man, § 59 365

1. Description of the happiness which is provided for man through Christ, § 60 366

a) Happiness immediately after death, 367

b) Happiness after the resurrection of the body and the transformation of the earth, together with the objects connected with it, § 61 369

c) Improvement of the blessed in intellectual and moral perfection, through the influence of Christ and the circumstances in which they are placed, § 62 . . . 377

d) Different degrees of future happiness, proportionate to the different conduct and the various situations of mankind in the present life, § 63 . . . 380

e) Their participation in the felicity of Jesus, § 64 . . . 382

2. It is exclusively through Jesus Christ, that we obtain salvation. He, as Lord and Judge, bestowed on men that salvation which he purchased for them, § 65 383

3. This salvation is intended for all men, § 66 . . . 389
 —But not all actually obtain it, § 67 392
 Little children also are saved for Christ's sake, § 68 . . . 394

4. Conditions of this salvation, and means to attain it.

a) In general, faithful obedience to the dictates of conscience, is the condition of salvation, § 69 . . . 395

b) God, from the beginning, provided for the propagation of saving truth, § 70 396

c) Those persons who have not received a revelation, and live in strict accordance with the dictates of conscience, will nevertheless be saved for Christ's sake, § 71 398

But the salvation of those who have become acquainted with the revealed will of God, is suspended on the faithful use of this divine revelation, as moral agents, § 72 402

Salvation is not merited by obedience, § 73 . . . 403

It is not God's fault, that some men fail of salvation, § 74 408

BOOK IV.

OF JESUS CHRIST, THE REDEEMER OF MEN.

PART I. Of the person and different states of Christ.

A. *His person.*

I. Human nature and supernatural conception of Christ, § 75 413

II. He is united with God in the closest manner, § 76, 77 417, 419
 This close union with the Godhead must be presupposed in his exaltation, § 78 421

B. Of the states of Christ (status Christi.)

I. The object of both his states is the accomplishment of his appointed work, § 79 427

II. His state of humiliation.

1. It consisted in a diminished influence of the Logos on the man Jesus, § 80 427

2. Jesus voluntarily subjected himself to this state, § 81 . . . 428

3. But in this state also, the influence of his higher nature was manifest, § 82 430

III. His state of exaltation.—Resurrection, Ascension to heaven, and Dominion over all things, § 83 . . . 434

PART II. Of the works of Christ (his offices.)

A. His works during his earthly life—his office as Instructor and Mediator, § 84 439

I. His office as Instructor, § 85 440

II. His Mediatorial office (Priestly office.)

1. In general—what it embraces, § 86 443

2. His Mediatorial office on earth.—He purchased, by his obedience, the right to bestow salvation on the human family.

a) In his whole life, § 87 445

b) Especially by his death, § 88 448

a) Remission of sins is the chief object of the death of Christ, § 89 449

b) Remission of sins on the ground of reformation, is not the object of the Death of Christ, § 90 453

c) Deliverance from the punishment of sin, is the

immediate object of the death of Christ—his death is vicarious, § 91 456

a) The doctrine of the remission of sins on account of the merits of Jesus Christ, has a salutary influence on our morality, § 92 469

b) Other objects of the death of Christ, are either suspended on the chief object, or are connected with it, § 93 472

B. Works of the Redeemer in his state of exaltation.

I. In general;—Jesus is employed in bestowing salvation on men, § 94 477

1. The prosperity of the worshippers of Jesus, is a part of his reward, § 95 479

2. Jesus promotes the welfare of his people by virtue of his dominion over all things, § 96 480

a) He bestows salvation on them in the future world, § 97 481

b) He prepares them, in this life, for the blessedness of that which is to come, § 98 482

II. His special providence over the christian church.

1. Idea of the christian church, § 99 484

2. Origin of the christian church.

a) Origin of the church in general under the special influence of Christ, § 100 488

b) Origin of individual churches under the authority of the apostles, § 101 490

The institution of the ministerial office by the apostles was in accordance with the will of Christ, § 102 491

3. Preservation of the church by the continual guidance and protection of Christ, even amid circumstances of adversity, § 103, 104 492, 494

4. Mixture of good and bad in the church.—No ground for secession, § 105 498

5. The genuineness of the christian church depends on the purity of her doctrines, § 106 501

Hence, it is the duty of the church, to provide orthodox ministers, § 107 503

6. Means for the preservation of the christian church.—

Sacraments, § 108 510

a) Baptism.

α) Institution of it, § 109 511

β) Baptism in honour of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, embraces both promises of the blessings which are bestowed by Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, § 110 521

—and our obligations to God, § 111 523

γ) Infant Baptism is proper, as it is undoubtedly embraced in the command of Christ, and has accordingly been practised since the days of the apostles, § 112 525

b) Of the Holy Supper.

α) Idea of the Lord's Supper, § 113 531

β) Presence of Christ in the Holy Supper, § 114 534

Appendix to the doctrine of the Eucharist (by the Translator) 545

7. The influences of grace—(the consequence of the special providence of Christ over his worshippers.)

a) God does, according to the testimony of Scripture, exert an internal influence on the mind of man, § 115 553

b) This internal influence is exerted in accordance with the laws of our moral nature, and among Christians is connected with the use of the instructions of God's word, § 116 558

BOOK V.

REFORMATION OF MEN, AND ITS RELATION TO THEIR SALVATION.

- A. Justification by faith.
- I. Explanation of the proposition, "We are justified by faith, § 117 564
- II. Faith is a condition of our salvation which is perfectly consistent with the gracious nature of our justification, as being derived from the free grace of God without any consideration of personal merit in us, § 118 570
- B. Change of mind and reformation of life.
- I. Reformation is the effect of faith, and consequent on it.
1. Faith produces an exalted idea of our destination to eternal happiness, a love and gratitude, and in every respect a proper disposition toward God and the Lord Jesus, § 119 575
2. That repentance which is necessarily combined with true faith, produces an aversion to sin, § 120 375
3. Faith is necessarily connected with a belief of the doctrines of Jesus in general, and with obedience to them, § 121 381
- II. Reformation is a necessary condition, though not the meritorious cause, of our salvation, § 122 588

CONCLUSION.

- Transition from Doctrinal to Practical Theology, § 123 590

BOOK I.

OF THE DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

PART I.

OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

SECTION I.

Testimony of heathen writers respecting the extension of Christianity and the early existence of the religious writings of the Christians.

It is evident from the testimony even of authors who were not Christians, that during the reign of Nero and the period immediately subsequent, the Christians were not only augmenting their numbers in Judea, where Christianity had originated; but were also extending their influence into other countries(1); and used certain sacred writings(2), which were in part peculiar to themselves, and different(3) from the more ancient religious books of the Jews.

ILLUSTRATION I.

Evidence of the early existence and multiplication of Christians.

Tacitus,² in his narrative of the extensive conflagration, with which Rome was visited during the reign of Nero, makes use of the

[1 Nero flourished A. D. 54—68. S.]

[2 Caius Cornelius Tacitus, the intimate friend of Pliny the younger, was born A. D. 61 or 62. He was appointed to some of the highest offices of honour and confidence under the emperor Vespasian and his successors, and was contemporaneous with some of the apostles. In addition to this testimony, Tacitus, in his account of the incidents of the year of our Lord 57, states that Pomponia Græcina, a lady of eminent rank, was accused of what he terms a foreign superstition (*superstitionis externæ*), which, as Lipsius (ad locum) observes, was very probably the Christian religion. S.]

following language;—"Nero," in order to avert the suspicion that the city had been set on fire by his private command, "inflicted the most studied tortures upon a class of persons, odious for their vices, and known among the populace by the name of Christians. This name was derived from Christ, who was executed by Pontius Pilate the procurator, during the reign of Tiberius. But this pernicious superstition, which was suppressed at the time, again burst forth and pervaded not only Judea, where the evil had commenced, but also the city itself, the place in which every thing that is shameful concentrates, and every thing atrocious is practised."¹

The testimony of Suetonius² is very brief, and couched in the following words;—"Punishments were inflicted on the Christians, a race of men addicted to a new and magical superstition."³

¹ "Quæstissimis poenis affectit, quos per flagitia invidios, vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, qui, Tiberio imperitante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. Repressaque in præsens exitibilis superstitio rursus erumperebat, non modo per Judæam, originem ejus mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocità aut pudeuda confluent, celebranturque." Annales, XV. c. 44.

² Caius Suetonius Tranquillus, a Roman biographer and historian, flourished in the reigns of Trajan and Adrian. He was most probably born about the beginning of the reign of Vespasian A. D. 70. This writer also states that between the years A. D. 41 and 45, Claudius the emperor, "Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit," i. e. he banished the Jews from Rome, who were continually making disturbances, Chrestus being their leader,—that is, as Grotius states, on account of the doctrines of Christ. For both Tertullian (Ap. c. 3.) and Lactantius (Div. Inst. L. 4. c. 7.) state that the heathen pronounced the Saviour's name *Chrestus*; and Dr. Lardner (Works, vol. 7. p. 266) remarks, "it is not impossible that the Jewish enmity against those of their own country or others who had embraced Christianity, might produce some disputes and disturbances which came to the emperor's ear." Yet it must be confessed that Orosius, of the fifth century, was in doubt as to the meaning of this passage. S.]

³ To this version of the word *magice*, the translator is aware that some objection can be made. Its more commonly received signification is *pernicious*, *mischievous*; and thus it has been rendered in the passage before us by the learned and excellent Lutheran divine, Dr. Mosheim. According to either version, the passage proves indisputably the fact in support of which it is adduced. The version adopted has however these advantages; it not only proves that Suetonius was acquainted with the new sect called Christians, but it farther evinces the falsity of the insinuation which the unbelieving Gibbon advanced to invalidate the evidences of Christianity, viz. that the great historians of the day have taken no notice of the pretended miracles of the first Christians, &c. For this passage of Suetonius proves that he had heard of those miracles, although having for obvious reasons not examined the evidence of their truth, he ascribed them to a magical superstition. This translation is adopted by Dr. Watson, Lardner, and many other men, and in support of his opinion the learned Bishop of Landaff says,—"The Theodosian Code must be my excuse for dissenting from such respectable authority; in IX. Cod. Theod. Tit. XVI. we read; 'Chaldaei, ac Magi, et ceteri, quos vulgus *magicos* ob facinorum multitudinem appellat—Si quis magus vel magicis contaminibus adsuetus qui *magicus* vulgi consuetudine nuncupatur. Nor ought any friend of Christianity to be astonished or alarmed at Suetonius applying the word *magical* to the Christian religion; for the miracles wrought by Christ and his apostles, principally consisted in alleviating the distresses, by curing the obstinate diseases, of human kind; and the proper

And Pliny,⁴ in his well known epistle, makes the following remarks, which prove the extensive diffusion of Christianity;—"Many of every age, and every rank, and even of both sexes, have been accused, and will be accused. Nor has this contagious superstition pervaded only the cities, but it has also spread through the towns and country."⁵

The reader may consult Haversaat's Vindication of Pliny's Epistles concerning the Christians, against the objections urged by Semler.

[The testimony of Josephus,⁶ the celebrated Jewish historian, from the universally acknowledged veracity of his character and the fact that he was contemporaneous with the apostles, is of the utmost importance. As the biblical student in America cannot always have access to the original work of Josephus, we will insert the celebrated passage entire, and add to it a translation.

Τίτται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς τις, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶπε ἀνδρᾶ αὐτὸν λέγειν ἰσθῆ. Ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τὸν ἥδονη τελειθῆ δεχομένων. Καὶ πρὸ λαοῦ μὲν Ἰουδαίου, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ Ἕλληνας οὐδὲ ἐπηγάγετο. Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐδείξει τὸν πρώτον ἀνδρῶν παρῆμιν σταυρῶ ἐπισηκότος Πιλάτου, οὗκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱε αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες. Ἐφανή γὰρ αὐτοῖς τοῖσιν ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θεῶν προσφητῶν ταυτὰ τε καὶ ἄλλα μυσία θαυμάσια προῖ αὐτὸν εἰρηκότων. Εἰς εἶ τε τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὀνομαζομένων, οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φύλον. Lib. XVIII. Antiq. Judaic. cap. III. 3.

"Now there lived about this time, a certain Jesus, a wise man, if

meaning of magic, as understood by the ancients, is a higher and more holy branch of the art of healing." Flatt also in his Annotationes ad Philosophiam Kantii &c. says, that this testimony of Suetonius undoubtedly does authorize the inference, that the miracles of Jesus and his apostles must have been historically true. S.]

"Afflicti supplicis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac magicæ." Nero, c. 16.

[Caius Plinius Cæcilius Secundus was born A. D. 61 or 62. He enjoyed the particular friendship of Trajan, who made him consul. His celebrated letter, from which the extract in the text is taken, was written A. D. 107. It is the testimony of one of the most enlightened men of that age, which establishes the important facts, that the ground of the persecution against the Christians in Pontus and Bithynia was, that they drew men away from the worship of their deities; that in less than seventy years after the disciples first preached Jesus to the gentiles, Christians abounded in Pontus and Bithynia to such a degree, that the heathen temples were visibly neglected, and their remaining friends began to fear "whereunto this thing would grow;" that they were in general remarkably constant in their profession; and many other facts of the deepest interest to the Christian heart. S.]

² "Multi omnis ætatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur. Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam, atque agros, superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est." Lib. X. ep. 97.

³ [Josephus was born A. D. 37, died 93.]

indeed it is proper to call him a man. For he performed many wonderful works: he was an instructor of those persons who received the truth with willingness. He induced many to become his followers, as well among the Jews as also among the Gentiles. This was the Christ. And when on the accusation of our principal men, Pilate condemned him to the cross, these did not cease to love him. For he appeared to them again, alive, on the third day; the divine prophets having foretold these and a myriad of other wonderful things concerning him. And even at the present time the tribe of Christians, so denominated from him, still subsists.¹ S.]

ILL. 2. Evidence that the Christians had sacred writings.

Michaelis, in his Introduction to the New Testament,² quotes from Lucian's³ work De Morte Peregrini,⁴ the words which refer to this subject; των βιβλιων τας μεν εξηγητο και διεβαρει Περειγρινος, i. e. Peregrinus explained and illustrated some of their books; and he is of opinion that the writings here alluded to, may have been the books of the Old Testament and the Hebrew gospel of Matthew; because this passage of Lucian refers to Nazarene Christians, who were resident in Palestine, [and who are known to have received these books.]

ILL. 3. Evidence that the sacred writings of the Christians were in part different from the more ancient books of the Jews.

Celsus,⁵ a writer of the second century, in his work against the Christians, not only assails Moses and the prophets, whom he knew the Gnostic sect of Christians rejected; but he also introduces a Jew as disputing with the Christians out of their own books, and makes the Jew conclude his disputation with the following words;— ταυτα μεν ουν υμιν εκ των υμετερων συγγραμμάτων, εφ' οις ουδενος αλλου μαρτυρος χρησησμεν· αυτοι γαρ εαυτους περιπιπτετε⁶ i. e. all these objections are derived from your own writings, besides which we need no additional evidence, for you confute yourselves.

From the quotations made by Origen from Celsus, it is apparent

¹ [The authenticity of this passage is ably vindicated by C. G. Bretschneider, Parerg. ad Capita Theol. Judaeorum dogmaticae e Fl. Josephi scriptis collecta;—translated and printed in the Christian Spectator for March 1825. S.]

² Third edit. p. 40. 4th edit. p. 41.

³ [Lucian was a native of Samosata in Syria, and flourished about 176.]

⁴ C. II.

⁵ [Celsus was contemporaneous with Lucian (176). In reply to his work against Christianity, Origen at the request of his friend Ambrose, wrote his excellent Apology for Christianity, about A. D. 246 or 249. S.]

⁶ Origines contra Celsum, Lib. II. § 74.

that the Christian writings, to which Celsus alluded in the passage above quoted, contained a biography of Jesus for the Jew whom he introduces is represented¹ as addressing Jesus himself, and urging the following accusations: "that his pretensions to being born of a virgin were false; that he was born in Judea of an indigent female, who was the wife of a carpenter, and had been convicted of adultery and discarded by her husband, and who gave birth to Jesus as she was wandering about; that poverty compelled him to seek employment in Egypt, where he became skilled in Egyptian necromancy (δυνάμεις); and that being inflated with his magical attainments, on his return to his native land, he called himself God."

It is evident from the objections advanced by Celsus, that our four Gospels formed a part of the sacred books used by the Christians when he wrote against them; for some of those objections have a reference individually to each of the evangelists, and others are derived from a comparison of the four.

Thus Origen says, "And after these things he recurs to what followed the birth of Jesus—to the narrative of the star and of the Magians who came from the east."² And it is well known, that the account of the star and of the Magians from the east is found only in Matthew. In other passages of the work just cited,³ Christ is himself termed τέκτων, i. e. carpenter, an appellation given him only in the gospel of Mark 6: 3 ουκ ουτος εστιν ο τέκτων; i. e. is not this the carpenter, etc. Again he remarks—"Celsus says that those display a great deal of presumption who trace the lineage of Christ from the first progenitor of the human family, and from the Jewish kings;"⁴—and this is done no where but in the genealogy of Luke 3: 38. Again, the same writer says,⁵ "Celsus reproaches the Christians for pretending that the Son of God is the λόγος or word (αυτολόγος), which is an evident reference to John 1: 1. A case of an objection derived from a comparison of the four evangelists, is that in which he accuses the historians of Christ of contradicting one another, εναντια σφισο ψευδειςθαι, and he adduces, as an example, the several accounts of the resurrection of Christ, some mentioning one and the others

¹ Origen. loc. cit. Lib. I. § 28.

² Καί μετὰ ταυτα ανατρεχει επί το εξης τῆ γενέσει τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀναγγελλόμενον—το περι τοῦ ἀστέρου διήγημα καί των ἐηλυθῶτων ἀπό ἀνατολῆς μάγων. Lib. I. contra Celsum § 40.

³ Lib. VI. §§ 34, 36, 37.

⁴ ἦσσι (sc. Κέλσος) ἀπειθαδῆσθαι τοὺς γενεολογήσαντας ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου φηκτος, καί των ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ βασιλέων τον Ἰησοῦν. Lib. II. § 32.

⁵ Lib. II. § 31.

two angels as having come to the grave and spoken to the women.¹ This is a reference to Matt. 28: 5. Mark 16: 5. Luke 24: 4. John 20: 12.²

But Celsus' knowledge was not confined to the gospels; it is evident that he was likewise acquainted with the other writings (*συγγράμματα*) of the Christians. This is evinced by a passage³ of that writer, in which he is assailing the words of the Saviour: "there shall arise false Christs and false prophets and shall perform great signs and miracles."⁴ He there endeavors to prove from them that the miracles of Christ are not divine, and adds: *καὶ Σατανῶν τινα τοιαῦτα παραμυχανώμητον ὀνομάζει* i. e. Jesus mentions a certain Satan who should also perform such miracles. Now neither in the above passage relative to the "false Christs," nor in any other, is there any such assertion contained as Celsus attributes to Christ. But in Rev. 12: 13, the power of working delusive miracles is ascribed to Satan, *ὁ δράκων*. And as this book professes to be "the Revelation of Jesus Christ,"⁵ Celsus may have alluded to this text, and therefore have ascribed it to Jesus. But as Celsus frequently attributed to Christ whatever he found in the writings of his disciples,⁶ it is more probable that he alluded to the passage of the apostle Paul, 2 Thess. 2: 9. And this is the more plausible, as he in another place, while speaking of the power of Satan to perform delusive miracles, quotes the passage above referred to relative to Satan, and in connexion with it uses the following words which very much resemble the context of 2 Thess 2: 9.—"The Son of God apprised his followers that Satan would make his appearance in a manner similar to his own 'coming,' that he would arrogate to himself the glory of God; and display great and marvellous works, to which however they should pay no attention, but determinately rejecting them should believe in him (Jesus) only."⁷ Comp. 2 Thess. 2: 4, 11, 12, 13.

Other traces of allusions to several epistles of Paul in the writings of Celsus, are pointed out by Hug. in his Introduction to the New Testament.⁸

¹ *Καὶ μὴν πρὸς τὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦδε τάφου ἰδθῆναι ἄγγελον, οἱ μὲν ἓνα, οἱ δὲ δύο (λέγουσι) τοὺς ἀποκρινομένους ταῖς γυναῖξιν, οὗ ἀνίστην.* Lib. V. § 52.

² See Hug's Introd. N. Test. pt. I. p. 31, Andover ed.

³ § 49.

⁴ Matt. 24: 24.

⁵ Rev. 1: 1, 22: 16.

⁶ Thus, for instance, he attributed to Christ what the evangelists had related, that, at his baptism, something descended from the air like a bird, and rested upon him. Origen, L. I. § 41.

⁷ *Ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ παῖς παραγορεύει ὡς ἄρα ὁ Σατανῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ὁμοίως φανείναι, ἐπιδειξάτω μεγάλα ἔργα καὶ θαυμαστά, σφαιριζόμενος τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δόξαν, οἷς οὐ χρήναι προσέχων βουλευθέντας ἀποτρέπεσθαι ἐκείνον, ἀλλὰ μόνον πιστεῖν αὐτῷ.*

⁸ Part I. p. 33, Andover ed.

Thus also, in the third century, Porphyry¹ in his attack on the Christians, not only assails the sacred books of the Jews, especially the book of Daniel, of which he used the Greek translation then received among the Christians; but he professedly directs his principal energies against the peculiar Scriptures of the Christians. And as far as can be inferred from the few passages incidentally quoted from him by Jerome, he was acquainted at least with the gospels of Matthew, Mark and John. For Jerome mentions² an error of which Porphyry accuses the evangelists in their account of Jesus' walking on the sea, an incident recorded in Matt. 14: 25, etc. Mark 6: 48, etc. and John 6: 19. He also states³ that Porphyry assails the account of Matthew's vocation, which is found only in the gospel of this evangelist; that he objects to Mark 1: 2; and takes occasion from John 7: 8, 10, to accuse Jesus of instability of character.⁴ Perhaps he was also acquainted with the Acts of the apostles,⁵ or at least with the epistle to the Galatians; for Jerome⁶ mentions an unfair use which he made of the dispute between Paul and Peter. And even Chrysostom⁷ appeals to Celsus and Porphyry for the antiquity of the New Testament Scriptures. He remarks: *ἱκανοὶ δὲ καὶ κατ' ἡμῶν εἰρηκότες, τὴν ἀρχαιότητα μαρτυροῦσαι τῶν βιβλίων, οἱ περὶ Κέλσον καὶ τοῦ Βατανεώτην τὸν μετ' ἐκείνων. Οὗ γὰρ δὴ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ συντεθείσιν ἀπέλεγον*, i. e. those who were our enemies, Celsus and after him Bataneotes,⁸ are suitable witnesses to testify the antiquity of our books.—for they did not surely endeavour to refute books which were composed after the time in which they lived.

To the testimony of Porphyry and Celsus may be added that of Amelius, who, as we learn from Eusebius, was acquainted with the gospel of John.⁹

LL. 4. *There is nothing strange in the preceding heathen testimony in favour of the Christian Scriptures.*

Nor is it by any means surprising that pagan writers should be acquainted with the facts, established by their testimony in the pre-

¹ [Porphyry was born at Tyre A. D. 233; died A. D. 270.]

² Quæst. in Genes. cap. I. v. 10.

³ Hieron. in Matt. 9: 9. 3: 3.

⁴ Hieron. contra Pelag. Lib. II. § 17.

⁵ Id. Com. in Joel 2: 28, etc.

⁶ Comment. in Es. 53: 12. Proem. in Ep. ad Gal.

⁷ Homil. VI. in Ep. 1 ad Corinth.

⁸ [Bataneotes was a name given to Porphyry by both Jerome and Chrysostom; but the reason of this appellation seems to be but imperfectly known. Heumann supposed it to be a fictitious name affixed by Porphyry himself to his work against the Christians; and Fabricius thinks it derived from Batanea, a town in Syria, in which he supposes Porphyry may have been born. S. J.]

⁹ Præp. Evang. L. XI. c. 18, 19.

ceding illustrations, when we recollect what Tertullian¹ says to them in his defence of the Christians against the heathen, c. 31: "Read" says he "the words of God, our Scriptures," from which he soon after quotes some words of Christ, and c. 32, of Paul, "which we ourselves have no disposition to conceal from our view, and which have, in various ways, fallen into the hands of those who are not Christians."

SECTION II.

The genuineness of the homologoumena or universally received books of the New Testament.

If we listen to the testimony of the Christians themselves, we find that not only the age of *Eusebius* (the commencement of the fourth century), and the earlier age in which *Origen* lived (the third century)(1), but also the tradition of still more ancient times(2); that is, the concurrent opinion of all those writers whose productions had fallen into the hands of these Christian Fathers(3), unanimously declare the *four Gospels*, the *Acts of the Apostles*, *thirteen epistles of Paul*, and the *first epistle of John and first of Peter*, to be the genuine productions(4) of those disciples of Jesus to whom they are ascribed. Nor have we any reason to doubt their genuineness. For in the few fragments of those earlier writers which have reached us, we find that they did actually view these books in that light, in which Origen and Eusebius report these earlier writers to have viewed them(5). Moreover there is nothing found in these writings incongruous either with the age in which they are said to have been written, or the authors to whom they are attributed(6). And even those (heretics) to whose interest the authority of these sacred writings was extremely prejudicial, did not at first presume to dispute their genuineness; but endeavoured to extricate themselves from their difficulties by arbitrary interpretations(7) of the odious paragraphs, or by the alteration, or erasure

¹ [Tertullian was born at Carthage soon after A. D. 150. He flourished in the time of Severus and Antoninus Caracalla, A. D. 194—216. He is generally considered the most ancient Latin Father extant, for he was well skilled in Roman law and in the Greek and Roman poets. S.]

of them; thereby pronouncing these writings not spurious but only adulterated(8); or finally, they sought refuge by denying the authority of the writers(9), while they confessed the genuineness of the books. And when, in the course of time, they began to dispute even the genuineness of the writings, they did not urge the want of ancient testimony in their favour, or attempt to impugn their genuineness with any historical objections; but they were contented to adduce some trifling pretended doctrinal objections, extorted from the writings which were the object of their hatred.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The testimony of the ages of Eusebius and Origen.¹

The principal passages of Eusebius and Origen, containing their testimony on this subject, and which will frequently be referred to in the sequel, are the following.

Eusebius says;²—"It seems therefore proper here to give a cata-

¹ [Eusebius, surnamed Pamphilus from his friend the martyr of that name, was born at Caesarea in Palestine about A. D. 270, or perhaps earlier. He flourished principally during the reigns of Constantius and Constantine; and as Jerome states "was a man most studious in the divine Scriptures, was very diligent in making a large collection of the writings of Christian authors, and published innumerable volumes." He was made bishop of Caesarea about 315, and died in 339 or 340.

Origen, the son of Leonidas the martyr, was born in Egypt A. D. 184 or 185, and early made great proficiency in knowledge. He taught at Alexandria and Caesarea. His writings were so extremely numerous that Jerome says, "He wrote more than any other man could read." After having spent a life of astonishing activity in the cause of Christianity, and suffered much in the Decian persecution (A. D. 250) he died in the 70th year of his age. S.]

² *Εὐλόγον δ' ἐν ταῦθα γενομένους, ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰς δηλωθείσας* τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης γραφάς, καὶ δὴ τακτεῖν ἐν πρώτοις, τὴν ἁγίαν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τετρακτὴν, οἷς ἔπειτα ἡ τῶν πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφή, μετὰ δὲ ταύτην, τὰς Παύλου κατακτεῖν ἐπιστολάς, οἷς ἔξης τὴν φερομένην Ἰωάννου προτέραν, καὶ ὁμοίως τὴν Πέτρου κειρατέον ἐπιστολήν. Ἐπὶ ταῖς τακτεῖν, εἰς φανερίαν, τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου (περὶ ἧς τὰ δοξαστὰ κατὰ καιρὸν ἐκδησομεθα). Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν δ' ἡμολογουμένους. Τῶν δ' ἀγχιεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὐκ ὁμοίως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰουδα. ἢτε Πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολή, καὶ ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου εἴτε τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυχάνουσα, εἴτε καὶ ἕτερον ὀμιώνυμον ἐκείνη. Ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατακτετέον καὶ τῶν Παύλου πρᾶ-*

* Vogel, who, in his Program: p. 3—8, has illustrated this passage with distinguished perspicuity, explains, p. 4, the word *δηλωθείσας* thus:—*libros quos in ἐκδηθῆναι referendos esse, manifestum est et extra controversiam positum, i. e. books which were beyond all doubt received into the canon of the New Testament.* He therefore makes it refer solely to the homologoumena.

logue of the writings of the New Covenant to which we have alluded. The *four holy evangelists* must be placed first. After these must follow the book of the *Acts of the apostles*; after that are to be placed the *epistles of Paul*. The first *epistle of John* and also *that of Peter* are then to succeed. After these, if it is thought proper, may be placed the *Apocalypse of John*, the opinions relative to which we will mention in due time. And these belong to the *homologoumena*. But to the *antilegomena*, which yet are well known to many, belong those which are called the *epistle of James* and of *Jude*; also the *second epistle of Peter*, and those which are considered the *second and third of John*, whether written by the evangelist or some other person of the same name. With the spurious are also to be reckoned the *Acts of Paul*, and what is called the *Shepherd*, and the *revelation of Peter*. And to these are to be added the reputed epistle of *Barnebas*, and the so called *Instructions of the Apostles*; and if thought proper, the *Revelation of St. John* may be added, which, as has been stated, some reject, and others class among the *homologoumena*. There have likewise been some who placed among these the *Hebrew gospel*, which is prized more especially by the Hebrews who have embraced Christianity. Now all these may be classed with the *antilegomena*. Nor is it indeed without necessity, that we have made a catalogue of these books also, in order that we may distinguish those writings, which according to the traditionary opinion of the church, are not fictitious but genuine and universally acknowledged, from others which, although they were disputed, were known to the greater part of ecclesiastical writ-

των ἡ γραφή, ὃ τε λεγόμενος ποιμήν, καὶ ἡ ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου καὶ πρὸς τοῖς τοῖς, ἢ φερομένη Βαρνάβα ἐπιστολή, καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδάχαι· ἐτι τε ὡς ἔφη, ἡ Ἰωάννου ἀποκάλυψις, εἰ φανή, ἢ τιμῆς, ὡς ἔφη, ἀθετούσαι, ἔτεροι δὲ ἐγκρίνουσι τοὺς ὁμολογουμένους. "Ἦδη δ' ἐν τοῖς τοῖς καὶ τὸ κατ' Ἑβραίων εὐαγγέλιον κατέλεξαν, ἢ μάλιστα Ἑβραίων οἱ τὸν Χριστὸν παρὰ ξαίμενοι χαίρουσι. Ταῦτα μὲν πάντα τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων εἰς εἰς ἀναγκάως δὲ καὶ τούτων ὁμοῦ τὸν κατάλογον πεπονήμεθα, διακρίναντες τὰς τε κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν ἀληθεῖς καὶ ἀπαλάστους καὶ ἀνομολογημένας γραφάς, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας παρὰ ταύτας, ὅτι ἐνδιάδηκτος μὲν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀντιλεγόμενα, ὁμοῦ δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γινώσκόμενα· ἢ εἰδέναι ἔχομεν αὐτὰς τε ταύτας, καὶ τὰς ὀνόματι τῶν ἀποστόλων πρὸς τὸν αἰρετικὸν προφερομένας· ἢ τοῖς ὡς Πέτρου καὶ Θωμᾶ καὶ Μαθθία, ἢ καὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῦτους ἄλλων εὐαγγέλια περιουσίας· ἢ ὡς Ἀνδρέου καὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων πράξεις, ἢ ὅτι οὐδὲν οὐδαμῶς ἐν συγγράμματι τῶν κατὰ διαδοχὰς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τις ἔφη εἰς μνημὸν ἀναγεῖν ἠέτι οὐδὲν πόρου δὲ που καὶ ὁ τῆς φράσεως παρὰ τὸ ἦθος τὰ ἀποστολικὸν ἐναλλάττει χαρακτήρ· ἢ τε γινώσκῃ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς φερομένων προαιρέσεις, πλείστον ὅσον τῆς ἀληθοῦς ὀρθοδοξίας ἀπέδουσα, ὅτι δη αἰρετικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐναλλάτματα τυγχάνει, σαφῶς περιήστην ὅθεν οὐδ' ἐν νόμοις αὐτῶ κατατακτῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς αἰτοια πάντα καὶ δυσσεβῆ παρατηρήτων. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. III. 25.

ters. And again, that we may discriminate between these and such as the heretics brought forward, under pretence of their being productions of the Apostles; such as the *gospels of Peter*, and *Thomas*, and *Matthias*, and some others, and the *Acts of Andrew* and of *John* and of the *other Apostles*; which not one of the whole list of ecclesiastical writers has ever thought worthy of being quoted. The character of their diction is very diverse from the style of the Apostles; and the spirit and tendency of their contents deviate so entirely from the true doctrines, as clearly to prove them to be the fabrications of heretics. Hence they cannot be classed even with the spurious writings; but must be denounced as absurd and impious.¹

The principal passage of Origen may be seen in his Commentary on *Matthew* and *John*, preserved by Eusebius.¹ It is true that in these passages, neither Eusebius nor Origen specifies the number of the universally received writings of the apostle Paul. But it is evident from other passages of Eusebius, that the epistle to the Hebrews is: the only one which was not received into the number of the homologoumena. He says,² "The fourteen epistles of Paul are well known (*πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς*); yet it ought not to be concealed that some have excluded the epistle to the Hebrews, alleging that the church at Rome deny (*ἀντιλεγέσθαι*) it to be Paul's; and in another passage he remarks, that the epistle to the Hebrews *παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τοῖς οὐ νομιζέται τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἔργον*,³ is by some Romans not regarded as a production of the apostle (Paul). And he elsewhere⁴ classes this epistle with the antilegomena, i. e. with those books which were not universally received. In like manner Origen⁵ excludes none but the epistle to the Hebrews from the universally received apostolical writings; and all the other epistles of Paul, he attributes, without the least hesitation, to that apostle, in innumerable instances; excepting that to Philemon, which from its extreme brevity would naturally be but seldom quoted; and yet even this epistle is in one passage expressly ascribed to Paul.⁶ Yet Origen was much disposed to express his doubts relative to the antilegomena; and it has been proved that he distinguished them from the homologoumena, by his manner of quoting them.⁷ Thus in his Commentary on John,⁸ he quotes the first epistle of James with these words, *ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένη τοῦ Ἰακώβου*

¹ Eccles. Hist. VI. 25.

² Euseb. Hist. Eccles. III. 3.

³ Euseb. VI. 20.

⁴ Hist. Eccles. VI. 13.

⁵ Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 25.

⁶ In the 19th Homily on Jeremiah, § 2.

⁷ See the Apology for the Revelation § 6, note 2; and the work "On the Gospel and Epistles of John," p. 106, etc.

⁸ Tom. XIX. § 6.

ἐπιστολῇ ἀνεγνώμεν, i. e. as we read in the reputed epistle of James; and in his Commentary on Matt.¹ when citing the epistle of Jude, he adds, *εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰουδᾶ προσοίκοις ἐπιστολὴν* i. e. if we acknowledge the epistle of Jude. Thus also in his letter to Africanus,² although he there undertakes to prove Paul to be the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, still when pressed with the objection that it was not genuine, he waves the quotation which he had made from it, and passes on to another proof from Matthew. But still stronger are the terms in which he expresses himself when citing the Pastor of Hermas, which he regarded as a divine book;³ *εἰ δὲ χοῆ τολησάντα καὶ ἀπὸ κινδύος φερομένης μὲν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ γραφῆς, οὐ παραπᾶσι δε ἀμολογουμένης εἶναι θείας, κ. τ. λ.* i. e. if we may venture to quote from a book that is commonly used by the church, yet not received as divine by the unanimous consent of all. And he himself informs us, that he cited passages from such books, "non ad auctoritatem, sed ad manifestationem propositæ quaestionis," i. e. not for the proof, but illustration of the point under discussion.⁴ The principal passages of Origen, in which he quotes the Epistles, are the following:—

For the Epistle to the Romans and the first of Corinthians, see Orig. contra Celsum, Lib. III. § 46—48.

For the second of Corinthians and the Epistle to the Galatians, idem Lib. I. § 48. 47. II. § 1.

For the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians, Lib. VI. § 54. Lib. IV. § 49. 18. Preface, § 5.

For the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, Lib. V. § 17. Lib. VI. § 44, etc.

For the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, Lib. I. § 63. Lib. IV. § 70. Lib. III. § 48.

In like manner also the Acts of the Apostles, Origen expressly attributed to Luke; *ὡς ὁ Λούκας ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔγραψε*,⁵ i. e. as Luke in the Acts of the Apostles has declared. And the reason why he did not mention the book of Acts in the passages which Eusebius quotes from his Commentary on Matthew and John, was that Origen there wished to speak only of the Gospels, of the writings of the apostles Paul, Peter, and John.

¹ Tom. XVII. § 30. ² § 9. ³ Lib. X. in Epist. ad Romanos, § 31.

⁴ Vide Mag. für christliche Dogmatik und Moral, Stück 9. S. 17—26.

⁵ Lib. VI. contra Celsum, § 11. See also the passage which Eusebius quotes from his Homilies on the Hebrews, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 25.

ILL. 2. The reference of Eusebius and Origen to the ecclesiastical tradition respecting the homologoumena; together with remarks on the nature of this tradition.

The passages in which this reference is contained, are those quoted in the last Illustration; together with another passage, in which Eusebius remarks, that the Gospel and first Epistle of John, which were classed with the homologoumena in ch. 25, were without the least hesitation received as genuine by the ancient and the present church.

Relative to the nature of this tradition, Eusebius, in his principal passage above quoted at length, uses the following language: *αἱ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν ἀληθεῖς καὶ ἀπλάστοι καὶ ἀμολογημένοι γραφαί*; i. e. the books which according to the tradition of the church are generally received as true and undelivered; and Origen says (Euseb. Ec. Hist. VI. 25.) *ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν*; i. e. as I have learned from tradition. That by this *ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παράδοσις* is not meant the oral declarations of the contemporaries of Eusebius, is proved in the Apology for the Revelation,¹ where it is evinced that this phrase of Eusebius signifies the testimony of writers, and especially of those prior to his day. This opinion is more fully discussed by Dr. Flatt in his Magazine,² and vindicated against different significations which have of late been given to that phrase as used by Eusebius. Eckermann, in his dissertation "On the probable origin of the gospels and the Acts of the apostles,"³ regards the word tradition in general, and also in the passage of Origen above quoted, as the then prevalent tenet or opinion of the church. According to his idea therefore, Eusebius and Origen acknowledged the genuineness of the homologoumena for this reason, that it was a settled opinion of the church that the gospel of Matthew or of John etc. was really written by the person whose name it bears. The ground therefore of their reception of them was, that their genuineness was a traditionary dogma of the church. In the "Essay on the Canon of Eusebius," by J. E. C. Schmidt,⁴ that writer explains the *παράδοσις ἐκκλησιαστικὴ* as signifying the Canon which was settled by the church of Eusebius. And Münscher thinks it signifies the prevailing opinion of the Christian churches relative to the books of the New Testament; and adds that the private opinion of Eusebius, as well as of

¹ Hist. Euseb. III. 24.

² p. 26. note 7.

³ Aches Stück s. 75—86.

⁴ Theologische Beiträge (Theological Contributions) Band 5 Stück 2.

⁵ Henke's Mag. für Rel. Phil. (Mag. for Religious Philosophy) B. V. St. III. s. 451, etc.

other learned men, may possibly have been at variance with it.¹ The principal proof that *παράδοσις ἐκκλησιαστική* signifies *written tradition*, or the testimony of those authors with whose works Eusebius was acquainted, is found in the leading passage itself relative to the canon.² Here Eusebius describes the first class of sacred writings, the homologoumena, in the words before cited: *αἱ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν ἀληθεῖς ἀλάστοι καὶ ἀνομολογημένα γράφαί* i. e. books which according to the tradition of the church are generally received as true and unadulterated; but relative to the latter class, that of heretical writings, he uses these words: *ὧν οὐδὲν οὐδαμῶς ἐν ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙ τῶν κατὰ διαδοχὰς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τις ἀνήθ' εἰς μνήμην ἀγαγεῖν ἤξιωσε*, i. e. whom not a single one of the whole succession of ecclesiastical writers, has thought worthy of being quoted. The same idea is elsewhere³ thus expressed: *μητὲ ἀρχαίων μητὲ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικός συγγραφεὺς τὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεχρήσατο μαρτυρίας*, i. e. no ecclesiastical writer, either in ancient or modern times, has ever made any use of their testimony. The descriptions of these two classes of books, are evidently correlative; and as the latter class is distinguished by the total want of testimony of writers in their favour, so by virtue of their antithetic relation, the former must have in their favour the testimony of all the writers whose works were extant, that is the *παράδοσιν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν*. Vogel⁴ gives this sense of *παράδοσις ἐκκλησιαστική*; "Judicium ecclesiae antiquitus traditum" i. e. the judgment of the church transmitted from former ages; and subjoins this remark: *certum est, παράδοσιν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν vel confirmari, vel nullam esse demonstrari, ex scriptorum testimonio vel silentio*, i. e. it is clear that the *παράδοσις ἐκκλησιαστική* may either be confirmed or be proved a nullity, by the testimony or silence of writers. According to this explanation *παράδοσις ἐκκλησιαστική* would signify "the judgment of the church, relative to the origin and authority of the sacred writings, derived from historical transmission:" and this historical transmission is identical with the testimony of writers, especially the more ancient ones.—This explanation, it is self-evident, detracts nothing from the weight of the *παράδοσις ἐκκλησιαστική*.

[The true signification of the phrase *παράδοσις ἐκκλησιαστική* may, perhaps not unaptly, be illustrated by a passage of the Apostle Paul, in which the word *παράδοσις* is used and its import determined by the context: "therefore, brethren, be steadfast, and hold the traditions (τὰς παραδόσεις) which ye have been taught, whether orally or by our epistle." Tradition, therefore, would signify

¹ Handbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte (Manual of the History of the Christians doctrines) Marburg 1797. vol. I. p. 246.

² See that passage quoted in Illust. I. supra.

³ III. 3.

⁴ Commentationes de Canone Eusebiano, Ft. I. p. 7. n. 9. Erlangen, 1809.

any historical account or opinion transmitted to us from former ages, whether orally or by writing; and *ἐκκλησιαστική* would point us to persons connected with the church, as the channel through which it was conveyed. S.]

ILL. 3. *The testimony of all the writers known to Origen and Eusebius was in favour of the homologoumena.*

The following passages from Eusebius may be adduced, as proof that the homologoumena were supported by the unanimous testimony of all whose opinion that very learned man had read. Relative to the first epistle of John, he remarks: *παρὰ τε τοῖς νῦν καὶ τοῖς ἐξ ἀρχαίων ἀναμφίλεκτος ὁμολογῆται* i. e. it was acknowledged as genuine, without contradiction, in earlier as well as later times. And in the same place, he terms the books of John, (which he afterwards classed with the homologoumena,) *τοῦδε τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἀναντιρρήτοι γράφαί* i. e. the productions of this apostle, which had never been disputed.

In the work entitled "The design of the gospel and epistles of John" the fact is established, in refutation of Merkel,⁴ that Origen and Eusebius never termed any books *ὁμολογούμενα*, excepting such as were unanimously, and without any exception, acknowledged as genuine. Accordingly they could not have given this appellation to books, which were merely supported by some testimony, with which other testimony might be at variance. Origen remarks of the four Evangelists, that *ἀναντιρρήτα ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ* i. e. they are every where received without contradiction by the whole church of God. The same universal coincidence of testimony is signified by the term *καθόλικος* (universal), which Origen and his disciple Dionysius apply to the first epistle of John.⁵ And the idea that the second and third epistle of John are not *ὁμολογούμενα* but *ἀντιλεγόμενα*,⁶ is expressed by Origen thus: *οὐ πάντες γνήσιους φασὶ ταύτας*, i. e. they are not pronounced genuine by all. Now if these words contain a definition of *ἀντιλεγόμενον*, it follows by virtue of the antithesis, that *ὁμολογούμενον* must signify a book *ὃ πάντες φασὶ γνήσιον*, i. e. which all acknowledge to be genuine.

ILL. 4. *Proof that the testimony of Origen and Eusebius relative to the books termed homologoumena, refers specifically to their genuineness.*

It is evident that the passages, which Eusebius⁷ quotes from Origen, refer to the genuineness of the books of the New Testa-

¹ III. 24.

² III. 25.

³ p. 113, &c.

⁴ See Merkel's "Proof that the Apocalypse is a spurious book."

⁵ Euseb. VII. 25.

⁶ Euseb. VI. 25.

⁷ VI. 25.

ment, that is, to the question whether they are really the productions of the persons to whom they are ascribed. For in the passage just referred to, Origen speaks not only of the four Gospels, but of the authors of them, whom he individually names. He mentions for whose use, and for what purpose each apostle wrote, and expresses himself thus: Πέτρος μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλέλοιπε—Ἰωάννης εὐαγγέλιον ἐν καταλείπειν—ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν—καταλέλοιπε δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πάνυ ὀλίγων στίχων ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην ἐπὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ ΓΝΗΣΙΟΥΣ εἶναι ταύτας, i. e. Peter has left us one epistle which is universally attributed to him—John has left us one Gospel—he also wrote the Apocalypse—he also left us an epistle of very few lines; and perhaps also, a second and a third for not all agree in pronouncing the two last genuine.

Relative to the testimony of Eusebius himself,¹ it is certain that by terming these books (mentioned above in §. 2.) ὁμολογούμενα, he meant that they were unanimously received as genuine. For he distinguishes between these homologoumena, or books universally received as genuine, and the νόθα or ἀντιλεγόμενα, which were books whose genuineness was not universally admitted, but was disputed by some.

That Eusebius did not intend, by the term νόθα, to designate such writings as were universally regarded as spurious; but meant books whose genuineness was denied by some and acknowledged by others, is evident from the following considerations. In the first place, Eusebius, in his main passage, most explicitly distinguishes between the νόθα and a third class of writings, which were fabricated by heretics, αἱρετικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀναπλάσματα, and which deviated entirely from the true doctrines, τῆς ἀληθοῦς ὀρθοδόξιας ἀπάθοντα, (or are, as he elsewhere² expresses himself, remote from the true apostolical doctrines, τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ὀρθοδόξιας ἀλλότρια; and which he designates by the appellation παντέως νόθα i. e. altogether spurious. He expressly states, οὐδε ἐν νόθοις ἀντὶ κατακτεῖον, that they cannot be reckoned to the class of νόθων for they were treated with such contempt by all the writers of the church, that there was not even any dispute about their spuriousness. Secondly: Eusebius uses the terms νόθον and ἀντιλεγόμενον as synonymous. Thus in one place,³ he classes the epistle of James with the ἀντιλεγόμενα; and in another,⁴ he remarks of the same epistle ἰστίον ὡς νοθεύεται, which words must be rendered, It should be remembered, that it is regarded as not genuine by some. For immediately preceding this we read, “thus much of James, from whom the first of the reputed catholic epistles is said to be derived,

¹ See his main passage, Illustration I, of this §.

² III, 31.

³ III, 25.

⁴ II, 23.

τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰακώβου, οὗ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται. This λέγεται necessarily refers to those who ascribed this epistle to James. In like manner the Actus Pauli, the Pastor of Hermas and the epistle of Barnabas, all of which are classed with the νόθα in III, 25 are in other places, quoted as writings which are not ὁμολογούμενα, but disputed by some (ἀπρος τιῶν ἀντιλελεχται);¹ and he terms them ἀντιλεγόμενοι, as for example the epistle of Barnabas.² In addition to these evidences of the use of ἀντιλεγόμενον and νόθον as synonymes by Eusebius, two others of a decisive character, derived from the principal passage so often quoted, are adduced in the “New Apology for the Revelation of St. John.”³ The first is founded on the words ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατάχθω ΚΑΙ, i. e. among the books which are not received as genuine must also be numbered. Now what can this ΚΑΙ, also, signify, if the books which he had described as νόθα did not belong to the same class with those which he had immediately before mentioned as ἀντιλεγόμενα? The second proof is in the concluding words of the enumeration of the νόθων; “now all these may be classed with the antilegomena or disputed books.” ταῦτα μὲν πάντα τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων ἀν εἶη. These concluding words correspond with the phrase καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις (and these all belong to the homologoumena), which terminates a preceding enumeration of the ὁμολογούμενα in the earlier part of the passage; and they indicate that all the books which had been enumerated between these two phrases, belong to the same class of ἀντιλεγόμενων or νόθων. It is evident therefore that, in the phraseology of Eusebius, these are synonymous words. And this translation of the word νόθος as signifying “considered not genuine,” is authorized by a very customary mode of expression, according to which “to be genuine” is synonymous with “to be considered genuine.”⁴ It is indeed an opinion entertained by many learned men, that Eusebius in this noted passage makes a fourfold division, into (1) ὁμολογούμενα, (2) ἀντιλεγόμενα, (3) νόθα, and (4) ἄτοπα καὶ δυσσεβῆ (παντέως νόθα), absurd and impious (altogether spurious). But the arguments in opposition to this opinion, and in favour of a triple division, are fully stated and indicated in the “Dissertation on the Canon of Eusebius,” in Flatt’s Magazine;⁵ and by the author of the Comment. (Sup. cit. P. II. p. 3—10.) who adopts the triple division, and remarks, “that Eusebius may have used the milder term ἀντιλεγόμενα in reference to the Canon of his own church at Caesarea, in which the five catholic epistles are contained;

¹ III, 3. ² V I, 13. ³ Note 16. § 4. p. 28, 29.

⁴ See Observations ad Analogiam et Syntaxin Hebraicam pertinentes, p. 14. n. 2, Tübingen, 1776.

⁵ Flatt’s Mag. vol. 7. p. 223—237.

and then, by the subsequent phrase *ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατετάχθω καὶ* may have intended to intimate that in his judgment the severer term *νόθα* might have been applied to those five catholic epistles, just as well as to the Acts of Paul, the Pastor of Hermas &c. which were enumerated after them." Nor is the explanation of *ὁμολογούμενα* and *νόθα* in the preceding pages, as signifying a genuineness that was acknowledged by all, and a genuineness that was disputed by some, inconsistent with the fact that Eusebius classes among the *νόθα* or *ἀντιλεγόμενα* (the books of disputed genuineness), the Gospel of the Hebrews; for this work was regarded as a genuine apostolical production by the Ebionites, or as Eusebius terms them, *τοῖς ἑβραίοις τὸν Χριστὸν παραδεξαμένοις*, the Hebrews who believed in Christ. And though it is certain that by some it was believed to be spurious; yet there might be others who regarded it as belonging to the homologoumena, so far as the ground-work of it was the authentic and universally received text of the gospel of Matthew. In regard to the works of Eusebius, *ἦδη δ' ἐν ταῦτοις τινες καὶ τὸ καθ' ἑβραίου εὐαγγέλιον κατέλεξαν*, although Michaelis considers it as uncertain whether *ταῦτοις* refers to *ὁμολογούμενοις* or to *νόθοις*.¹ I have no hesitation in considering it as referring to the former. For *νόθοις* is much more remote from *ταῦτοις* than *ὁμολογούμενοις* which just precedes it; and Eusebius was interested in detracting from the weight of the opinion of those who classed the Apocalypse with the homologoumena, which he accomplished by remarking, that the case of the gospel of the Hebrews was similar to that of the Apocalypse. But the fact that Eusebius himself (as Masch contends) did not class the gospel of the Hebrews with the homologoumena, but referred it to the antilegomena, is evident, partly from the circumstance of his not mentioning it earlier, whilst enumerating the homologoumena; and still more clearly from his own words, for he says that only *some* (*τινές*) have assigned to this gospel a place among the universally received books of the New Testament. And it is by no means a difficult matter to perceive how these *some* were led to assign it this place, if we compare the following passages of Jerome concerning this gospel. In the "Catalogus virorum illustrium," s. v. Matthaëus, he says: Matthew composed the gospel of Christ in the Hebrew language, and wrote it with Hebrew letters; but who the person was that subsequently translated it into Greek, is not satisfactorily known. There is, moreover, at present in the Cæsarean library, for which we are indebted to the distinguished zeal and industry of the martyr Pamphilus, a copy of the Hebrew itself. And it was by the Nazarenes of Beroea, a city of Syria, who use this book, that I was enabled to make a

¹ Michaelis' Introduction to New Test. III. ed. p. 893. IV. ed. 1033 &c.

transcript of it."¹ Now, agreeably to the context, this "ipsum Hebraicum" can refer to nothing else than the gospel of Matthew. Again in his Dialog. contra Pelagianos we read: "In the Hebrew gospel according to the apostles, or as is generally supposed, according to Matthew, which is indeed written in the Syro-Chaldaic language, but with Hebrew letters, which the Nazarenes use even at the present day, and which is found in the library at Cæsarea,"² &c. Again; "In the gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which I lately translated from Hebrew into Greek, and which is by most persons called the authentic gospel of Matthew," &c.³ Now as Jerome professes that the gospel of the Nazarenes is the Hebrew gospel of Matthew, ipsum Hebraicum, authenticum Matthæi, juxta Mattheum, and yet himself quotes passages from the Nazarene gospel, which are not found in our Matthew; we are led to suppose that the original text of Matthew was the ground work of the Nazarene Gospel, but that additions had been made to it. And as far as the text of Matthew was the ground work of the gospel of the Nazarenes or Hebrews, it might have been ranked by some among the homologoumena. Schmidt does indeed suppose that Jerome at first believed the Hebrew gospel which he transcribed and translated, to be the Hebrew gospel of Matthew; and that he subsequently changed his opinion. But if Jerome, according to the first of the passages above quoted, in which he calls the gospel of the Hebrews "ipsum Hebraicum Matthaer," did transcribe it and had already translated it into Greek and Latin, as we learn from the preceding passage in the context; it follows that he must at that time have been intimately acquainted with it.

We would yet remark, that it was not the intention of Eusebius, in his main passage quoted in III. 1, to give a general catalogue of all the homologoumena, that is, of all the writings of Christians which were acknowledged to be genuine; (among which, for example, the first epistle of Clemens must be classed; for this he elsewhere also calls *ὁμολογουμένη ἐπιστολή*⁴ and *ἀνωμολογουμένη παρὰ πᾶσιν ἐπιστολή*, and *ὁμολογουμένη γραφή*) but his object was to enumerate only those homologoumena, which belonged to the col-

¹ "Matthæus—Evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit: quod quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus Martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaraeis, qui in Beroea urbe Syriæ hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit."

² "In Evangelio juxta Hebræos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Mattheum, quod et in Cæsariensi habetur bibliotheca," etc. Dial. cont. Pelag. Lib. III. 2.

³ "In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræico sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi authenticum, etc. Comment. in Matt. XII. 13.

⁴ Euseb. III. 16.

lection of the books of the New Testament, δηλωθεΐσαι ΤΗΣ ΚΑΤΑΝΗΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΗΣ γραφαί. But the question in this place is not what opinion had the ancient Christians of the divine authority of certain books, and according to what principles did they decide on their admission into the canon, that is, into the number of divine books; but our sole object at present is to establish by their testimony the position that these are genuine books. And most assuredly their testimony does establish, firmly and indisputably, the fact that the homologoumena of the New Testament are homologoumena indeed; that is, that they are writings which are, beyond all doubt, the productions of those persons to whom they are ascribed; and that the reason why they were adopted into the number of the religious books of the church, and received as authentic records of the history and doctrines of christianity, was no other than this, that they were universally believed to be the genuine productions of those disciples of Jesus whose names they bear.

ILL. 5. *Fragments of earlier writers; and proof that they actually regarded the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen epistles of Paul, and the first epistle of John, and first of Peter, as the genuine productions of those disciples of Jesus to whom they are ascribed.*

Of these relics, some are entire books, which were written before the time of Origen; others are single passages of more ancient writers, which are found as quotations in later authors, especially in Eusebius. Eusebius himself informs us,¹ that in the perusal of earlier writings, he was attentive to the information contained in them relative to each individual book of the holy Scriptures; but that he noted, with particular care, the passages quoted from those books of the Christians which belong to the antilegomena. Some of the few written documents of the earlier christian age, which have been preserved entire, are of a polemical nature, being directed against the Pagans or Jews, who were but partially acquainted with the books of the New Testament; and others are so small as to contain but a few pages. It would therefore be unreasonable to expect that we should be able to adduce many passages, from very ancient writings, for the authenticity of the homologoumena; especially, as we shall appeal only to those ancient writings of whose integrity we have no doubt; and even from these, shall adduce only such passages as quote the homologoumena, not in an indefinite manner, but with the express mention of the author's name. For such quotations as contain passages of a book of the New Testament, without specifying the name of the author, may indeed evince the antiquity of the book,

¹ Ecc. Hist. III, 3.

but can never be advanced in support of its genuineness. These passages are collected by Professor Less, in his work entitled "Ueber die Religion, ihre Wahl and Bestätigung." Among the ancient witnesses for the homologoumena, who quote them specifying the author's name, are the nine following.

1. *Polycarp*, the bishop of Smyrna and disciple of St. John. He ascribes the epistle to the Philippians, and the first epistle to the Corinthians to Paul. For in his letter to the Philippians, he expressly states, that Paul wrote to them. In § 11. he quotes 1 Cor. 6: 2, adding: sicut Paulus docet, i. e. as we learn from Paul. He elsewhere makes quotations also from the epistle to the Ephesians and the first epistle to Timothy, and the first of Peter, and of John, but without specifying the author's name.

2. *Papias*,² bishop of Hierapolis, quoted by Eusebius,³ testifies, that Mark, the disciple of Peter, and Matthew recorded the actions and declarations of our Lord. He says: "Mark, who was the interpreter of Peter, made an accurate record of whatsoever he recollected; though not in the order in which the things were said and done by Christ. He was particularly careful, neither to omit any thing which he had heard, nor to insert any thing which was false. Matthew wrote his gospel in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted it as well as he could." Eusebius informs us, in the part of his work above referred to, that Papias also made quotations from the first epistle of Peter and first of John. But it may be questioned whether he ascribes them to those apostles by a specific mention of their names. For Eusebius asserts, in like manner, that Polycarp quoted some passages from the first epistle of Peter; and yet we learn

¹ Part I. page 503, &c. On the citations of the N. Test. contained in the most ancient ecclesiastical writers, vide Hug's Introduction to the N. Test. part I. § 7. p. 29—31, Andover ed.

² [Papias flourished, according to Cave, A. D. 110; or as others contend, about 115. He is said by Irenaeus, to have been a companion of Polycarp and one of St. John's hearers. S.]

³ Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. III. 39, the end.

⁴ Μάρκος ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψε οὐ μόνον τὰς τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ προχθέντα—ἐνός ἐποιήσατο πρόγονον, τοῦ μηδὲν ὄν ἤκουσε παραλείπειν, ἢ ψευσαθεῖν τι ἐν αὐτοῖς—Μακδασίος ἑβραῖδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο ἡρμηνεύσει δ' αὐτὰ, ὡς ἠδύνατο, ἕκαστος.

⁵ That *λόγια* here signifies gospel or written narrative of the history and doctrines of Jesus is evident partly from the customary use of the word, and partly, from the correspondence of the *λογίων* of Matthew with the written record of the actions and declarations of Jesus, made by Mark, *ἔγραψε τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ προχθέντα*. In the work (of Dr. Storr) "On the objects of St. John's Gospel, the author proves that *λόγια* or *λόγοι* (λογία) is synonymous with *ρεσ*, p. 250.

from the epistle of Polycarp itself, that the name of the author is not annexed to the passages cited.¹

3. *Justin Martyr.*² From the writings of Justin, it may be inferred that the gospel of Mark belongs to the apostle Peter, whose disciple Mark was; but that the gospel of Luke was derived from a disciple of some apostle, who, according to collateral evidence, could have been no other than the apostle Paul. Moreover the *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων* or Memorabilia of the apostles, (the gospel to which the aged Justin had been accustomed in his own country, Samaria,) presupposed not only the high antiquity of the gospel of Luke, but also the early existence of our gospel of Matthew; just as the apocryphal gospels, in general, of which Justin's is one, are not an evidence against the antiquity of our gospels, but very clearly establish their age; because it is evident from all the apocryphal gospels which have descended to us, that their authors were acquainted with our gospels.³ Nor will the fact, that Justin quotes almost exclusively such books as were known in his native country, (although, in the course of his travels, he doubtless became acquainted with other apostolic epistles,) appear any longer strange, when we recollect that none of his works have reached us, excepting such as were addressed to the enemies of his religion. For other apologists of Christianity, especially Tertullian, rarely quote the N. Test. in their apologies and polemical writings, (except the historical books to which they were compelled to appeal in support of facts,) yet Tertullian often cites the homologoumena in his other works. Had the production of Justin, entitled *De monarchia Dei*, reached us entire, in which, as Eusebius informs us,⁴ he quotes not only Pagan but also Christian writings, *τὰς παρ' ἡμῶν γραφάς*, i. e. our Scriptures; or had his work against Marcion, whom he could not refute without a reference to St. Paul, escaped the ravages of time; we doubt not that we should have it in our power to adduce Justin as a witness for others of the books of the New Testament.

In the work "on the Object of the Gospel and Epistles of St. John,"⁵ the author shows that the gospel which Justin used, and which he commonly termed *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*, and

¹ Euseb. IV. 14. Polycarp, Epist. §§ I. II. VIII.

² [Justin, surnamed the Martyr, was, as Methodius states, not far removed from the apostles either in time or virtue. Fabricius supposes he was born about A. D. 89; and the time of his martyrdom is variously fixed by the learned, from A. D. 164 to 168. He was born at Sichem, the well known city of Samaria. S.]

³ Vide Paulus' Supplement to commentary on the New Testament, p. 81 &c.

⁴ Lib. IV. c. 18.

⁵ § 69. p. 363—375.

sometimes *εὐαγγέλιον*, and which Justin moreover says was composed by apostles of Jesus and their followers, *ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν αὐτοῖς παρακολουθήσαντων συνετάχθαι*,² was a Harmony of the gospel of the Hebrews and of the gospel of Luke. The following are the principal arguments. First: it is certain that the gospel of Matthew was the groundwork from which Justin's gospel was composed; and that the latter contained additions, which are not found in any of our gospels; but which agree with additions found in the gospel of the Hebrews; as Stroth has proved in the Repertory of Biblical and oriental literature part I. Secondly; Justin was a native of Palestine, where the gospel of the Hebrews was current; and it was there that he was converted to christianity. Thirdly: the name of Justin's gospel, *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*, coincides with the appellation "Evangelium secundum apostolos," by which the gospel of the Hebrews is also denominated. Fourthly: it is an indisputable fact, that Justin's gospel contained many passages from Luke; as Paulus has proved in his "Exegetisch-critische Abhandlungen." Fifthly: on the contrary, it cannot be proved that any passages from the gospel of John were inserted into the *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*, the Memorabilia of the apostles. Sixthly: Justin does not quote the passage Mark chap. III verse 17, from the *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*, but from the gospel of Mark itself. His words are:³ "And when it is said that he (Christ) denominated one of the apostles Peter, and when this is also recorded in his Memorabilia, together with the fact that to two others, who were brethren, the sons of Zebedee, he gave the name sons of thunder" &c. The word *αὐτοῦ* must refer to Peter, and designate in this case the gospel of Mark.

Stroth thinks the gospel of Justin was the same as the gospel of the Hebrews: Paulus regards it as a Harmony of our four gospels: Münscher⁴ thinks it was a Greek translation of the gospel of the Hebrews, to which some additions were perhaps made from the gospels of Matthew and Luke. Eichhorn, who collected the fragments out of Justin's gospel entire,⁵ believes that it was formed⁶ out of the original gospel; that it resembled our Matthew in matter and contents, but was earlier and less perfect. Schmidt is of opinion

¹ Dial. cum Tryph. Jvdaeo, Justini. opp. ed. Colon p. 227.

² Dial. cum Tryph. ed. cit. p. 331.

³ Καὶ τὸ εἶπεν μετωνομακῆσαι ἑνὸν Πέτρον ἐνὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγραφεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι ΔΥΤΟΙ καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς, υἱούς Ζεβεδαίου ὄντας, μετωνομακῆσαι ὀνόματι τοῦ βροντήρας, &c. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 333.

⁴ Handbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, I ter theil, 2te auflage, Marburg, 1802 p. 296 &c.

⁵ Introduction to N. Test. part I. p. 513 &c.

⁶ p. 141 &c.

that it was framed by an enlargement of our Matthew, which at that time had not fully acquired its present form.¹ The Reviewer of Eichhorn's Introduction, pronounces Justin's gospel to be the gospel of Matthew enlarged from Luke; and observes, that those additions in Justin's gospel, which are not found in Matthew or Luke, are never marked as quotations. Hug maintains, that the *ἀπομνημονεύματα* of Justin were the canonical gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke; and supposes, that Justin's citation of facts from the New Testament was not literal, but free and² unrestrained. And finally, Feilmoser endeavors to prove, that the facts in the life of our Saviour mentioned by Justin, in some instances are not adduced as citations, and in others are narrated in terms which contain only the sense of the corresponding passages in our gospels, and may also in some cases be viewed as marginal glosses.³

4. *Irenaeus*,⁴ who lived in the second century, in his books against the Gnostic sects of christians, quotes very many passages from all the homologoumena, and frequently specifies the names of their authors: only from the epistle to Philemon he quotes no passage, which is easily accounted for by the contents and brevity of that epistle. As an evidence that we do not attach too high importance to the testimony of Irenaeus, (which acquires the greater moment from the fact of his connexion with the churches in Asia Minor, which had shortly before been under the care of the apostle John, and even in the time of Irenaeus embraced some who had been contemporary with the apostles,) we shall adduce a few proofs.

For *Matthew*, see Lib. III. contra Haereses c. 9. § 1, 2.

For *Mark*, the same. c. 10, § 6.

For the gospel of *Luke*, Lib. III. c. 10. § 1. c. 14. § 3.

For the gospel of *John*, Lib. III. c. 11. § 1. Compare the Repository for Biblical and Oriental Literature, part XIV. p. 136 &c.

For the four *Gospels*, Lib. III. c. 1. § 1. c. 11 § 8. c. 15. § 1.

For the *Acts* of the apostles, Lib. III. c. 14. § 1 c. 15. § 1.

For the epistle of Paul to the *Romans*, and both epistles to the *Corinthians*, Lib. III. c. 13. § 1. c. 16. § 3. 9. c. 18. § 2. 3. Lib.

IV. c. 26. § 4.

¹ Introd. N. Test. § 51. p. 120 &c. and 124 note 1.

² Introd. to the books of the New Covenant, Inspruck 1810, § 62. 153 &c.

³ Introd. to N. Test. part II. § 23. p. 74—80.

⁴ [Neither the birth nor the death of Irenaeus can be determined with precision. But "we have good reason," says Dr. Lardner, "to believe that he was a disciple of Polycarp, that he was presbyter in the church of Lyons under Pothinus, whose martyrdom occurred A. D. 177, and that he succeeded Pothinus to the bishopric of that church." "Irenaeus," says the same excellent writer, "though his writings may not be free from imperfection, has given such proofs of learning, good sense and integrity in the main, that all good judges must esteem him an ornament to the sect he was of." Lardner's Credib. pt. II. B. I. c. 17. S.]

For the epistles to the *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, and *Colossians*, Lib. III. c. 7. § 2. c. 13. § 3. c. 16. § 3. c. 18. § 3. Lib. V. c. 13. § 2—4. Lib. III. c. 14. § 1.

For both epistles to the *Thessalonians*, Lib. V. c. 6. § 1. Lib. III. c. 6. § 5. c. 7. § 2.

For the epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, Preface to Lib. I. § 1. Lib. III. c. 3. § 3. c. 14. § 1, c. 3. § 4.

For the first epistle of *Peter* and first of *John*, Lib. IV. c. 9. § 2. Lib. V. c. 7 § 2. Lib. III. c. 16. § 5. 8.¹

The credibility of Irenaeus' testimony to the genuineness of the books of the N. Test. is vindicated in the New Apology for the Revelation of St. John,² against objections founded on some unguarded expressions contained in his books against the Gnostics. In a work published since the appearance of the Apology, and entitled "a Dissertation on the true and secure grounds of belief of the principal facts in the history of Jesus; and on the probable origin of the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles," Eckermann has attempted to invalidate the evidence of Irenaeus in favour of the genuineness of our four gospels.³ The works in reply to this Dissertation are, "Reflections on the origin of the four gospels and the Acts of the apostles;"⁴ and a communication by Professor Süsskind, in *Dr. Flatt's Magazine*,⁵ in answer to the question "What were the grounds on which Irenaeus received our four gospels as genuine?"

Eckermann, in the work above referred to, attempts to invalidate the testimony of Irenaeus by saying: "Irenaeus, in the first place, appeals in general terms, to the unanimous testimony of the apostolical churches, from which and on whose authority the gospels were received. But this unanimous testimony of the christian churches, is nothing but the results of the first councils, held between A. D. 160 and 170; and which agreed in receiving our four gospels, because they unanimously believed them coincident with the doctrinal traditions of the apostolical churches, and thence concluded there could be no reason to doubt the fact, that these books were actually the

¹ It is unnecessary to quote the words of Irenaeus in the passages which are here referred to, and in which he cites the individual books of the N. Test. with a specification of the author's name; as there can be no dispute about them. They are contained, together with others, in Camerer's Theologischen und kritischen Versuchen, Stuttgart 1794. 2nd Dissertation on the canon of the N. Test. § 7.

² p. 142—164. and the work Ueber den Zweck der evang. Geschichte Johannis etc. p. 89—94, 247—249.

³ Theologische Beyträge Vol. V. pt. 2. 1796. p. 171—176. 184—197 comp. p. 124—135.

⁴ "Staudlin's Contributions to the history of the doctrines of religion and morality," p. 185—192, where the testimony of Irenaeus is vindicated.

⁵ No. 6. p. 95—139.

productions of the persons to whom they were ascribed. And since the time of these councils, the major part of the christian churches acknowledged them as the gospels of the persons whose names they bear. Secondly: Irenaeus himself appeals to the coincidence of the four gospels with the doctrinal traditions, which were the best source and the appropriate criterion of the truth.—Thus the force of the evidence for the genuineness of our gospels must at last rest on their coincidence with the oral tradition of doctrines, which came down to them without interruption from the lips of the apostles. Irenaeus does not mention the churches, from which an account of the genuineness of our gospels was derived; nor does he name any individuals who obtained such information from the lips of an apostle, or from one personally acquainted with an apostle. It is therefore, impossible that such *traditiones ecclesiasticae* (traditions of the church) should have any weight before the tribunal of impartial historical criticism. For they are too young to afford valid evidence of such a fact: and they are moreover not only contradicted by learned critics, such as Marcion; but it can be evinced from satisfactory testimony,¹ that at the commencement of the second century, these written accounts were not regarded as so unquestionable but that the oral accounts of persons conversant with the apostles, were preferred to them, as more indubitable sources of information.”

The principal arguments by which these objections of Eckermann are met in the works above referred to, are the following. *First*, no passage can be found in Irenaeus, from which it might be inferred with even the semblance of truth, that he received our four gospels, on account of their coincidence with the doctrinal traditions. *Secondly*, the object of Irenaeus, in his books against the Gnostics, is not to establish the genuineness of the gospels, but their validity. Their genuineness he presupposed as admitted; for the heretics against whom he was contending did not deny the genuineness of the gospels; but disputed the authority of some of them. Thus in the case of Marcion, the assertion that he denied the genuineness of the gospels is demonstrably false, as appears from the most explicit passages of Irenaeus and Tertullian. *Thirdly*, but even admitting the fact that Irenaeus rather assumes than proves the genuineness of our gospels; still it cannot be doubted that he had good historical ground for this assumption. The assumption itself may therefore, without doubt, justly be regarded as important historical evidence. *Fourth-*

¹ The testimony alluded to, is that of Papias, who says: οὐ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοῦτον μὲν ἀπέλκυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὅσοι τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ μενοινῶν; i. e. I did not think that I should be profited as much by what I could learn from written records, as by the oral instructions of living persons.

ly, the hypothesis that Irenaeus received the four gospels as genuine on the authority of certain councils, rests on a mere fiction. For, the supposition that the reception of the historical books of the New Testament was agreed on in the councils which met between A. D. 160 and 170; and by this agreement became a dogma of the whole catholic church; is not only utterly destitute of proof, but is in itself, in the highest degree improbable. But even if this pretended fact were true, still such a choice of our gospels would be entitled to a very high degree of respect; because it could not be supposed that a traditional opinion relative to the origin of the gospels, which was a mere unfounded report very recently sprung up, could have been disseminated universally and without alteration, and have exerted an influence on all the provincial synods inducing them to make one and the same selection of books.² *Fifthly*, Irenaeus was connected with several churches. At Lyons, in Gaul, he was first Presbyter and then Bishop; and according to Eusebius,³ he and his church maintained a correspondence with the Roman church. Irenaeus attached peculiar weight to the opinion of the churches at Smyrna and Ephesus; of the former, because Polycarp, who was the disciple of the Apostle John, and had personally known him in his early youth, (ὁν ἐσθλάκαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ,⁴) was bishop of Smyrna; and of the latter, because the apostle John resided at Ephesus until the time of Trajan.⁵ And it is very probable from the passage referred to, as well as from Euseb. V. l. 3, that even when he resided in Gaul, he still was connected with these churches in Asia Minor. He moreover sometimes appeals to the testimony of persons who had personal intercourse with St. John and other apostles.⁶ And consequently, in an age only 60 or 70 years remote from the apostolical, he had abundant opportunity to

¹ Compare “Reflections on the origin of the gospels and Acts of the apostles,” in Staudlin’s Beyträge Vol. V. p. 195—201. Schmidt’s Introduction to the N. Test. part I. § 13. “Montanism took its rise soon after the middle of the 2nd century, and in a short time spread from Phrygia to Gaul and Carthage. The Montanists and their opponents could certainly not have combined for the purpose of raising the same books to canonical authority. But as they both used our gospels, it is evident that they must have been received as canonical at an earlier date. And the history of the contentions concerning the exact time when Easter should be kept, evinces that in the second century, no synods possessed sufficient influence to effect a harmony of opinions among christians; and hence it cannot have been, that to the synods of this century we are indebted for the settling of the canon.”

² See the author’s Dissertation on the Question “Did Jesus profess that his miracles were a proof of the divinity of his mission?” in Platt’s Magazine, Vol. IV. p. 236, etc. ³ Hist. Eccl. V. 4:24.

⁴ Iren. Adv. Haeres. III. c. 3. § 4. Compare the epistle of Irenaeus to Florinus, preserved in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. V. c. 20.

⁵ Advers. Haeres. lib. III. c. 3. § 4.

⁶ Adv. Haereses L. II. c. 22. § 5. Lib. V. c. 30. § 1.

obtain satisfactory and indisputable testimony on the genuineness of our gospels. And even if he does, by some incredible narratives, prove himself an injudicious historian, he may nevertheless be regarded as a perfectly valid witness when the subject of investigation is the simple historical question, whether a particular book of the New Testament was acknowledged or assumed to be genuine, by persons and churches who must have had a knowledge of the fact. Sixthly that our gospels are supposititious, can by no means be inferred with any justice from the words of Papias, *οὐ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσούτων με ὠφελεῖν ὑπέλαμβανον, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης*, i. e. I thought I should not be profited as much by what I could learn from written records, as by the oral instructions of living persons; for which purpose this is quoted by Eckermann in the extract given above. For it would be a rash conclusion indeed to infer from the declarations of Papias, the universal opinion of the Christians of his day. Again; the very passage, part of which is above quoted, contains a very respectful and circumstantial testimony for the genuineness of the gospels of Matthew and Mark. Moreover, the fact that Papias does not quote the gospel of St. John which was very probably published at rather a late period in Ephesus near Hierapolis, where Papias was bishop, is very easily accounted for; because it was the object of Papias in composing his five books, to take his materials not from written but from oral accounts: and because he had it not in his power to state anecdotes relative to the origin of this gospel, as he did of that of Matthew and Mark, since it had been but lately published in this country. Finally, it is not probable that Papias intended our gospels by the written records, from which he did not anticipate as much profit as from the oral accounts of the contemporaries of the apostles. It is highly probable that St. John, when he composed his gospel in Asia Minor, presupposed in his readers a knowledge of the other three evangelists Matthew, Mark and Luke; as is proved in the work "On the object of the gospel history of John" §§ 70. 71. These three gospels then must have circulated and have been known in Asia Minor; and consequently the object of Papias in the composition of his five books, could not have been to repeat those incidents and sayings of Jesus which had long been rendered familiar by those gospels. And hence, as his professed object was to collect accounts relative to Jesus which were not yet generally known, he had no occasion to inform us that he could make more use of oral accounts than of the written gospels, for the gospels contained no such accounts. But this remark of Papias is a favourable one, if the idea which he meant to convey was this: that he preferred ob-

¹ Euseb. Hist. Eccl. III. 39.

taining his information personally from the contemporaries of the apostles, who were yet living, rather than from the Apocryphal gospels, whose authors were unknown and for whose statements he was not able to vouch.¹ But even admitting that by written records he actually meant our gospels, still his words would not express his disapprobation of them, but only assert that the oral accounts of the contemporaries of the apostles were more interesting to him individually and personally; and how perfectly natural is this in a person who was fond of anecdotes!²

It appears therefore that the objections to the testimony of Irenaeus possess but little force, and that its validity remains unshaken.

5. *Theophilus*,³ of Antioch, in the second century. He mentions John as the author of a gospel;⁴ and he also composed a harmony of our four gospels, if we can credit the words of Jerome.⁵ Theophilus (he says) Antiochenae ecclesiae septimus post Petrum apostolum Episcopus, qui quatuor Evangelistarum in unum opus dicta compingens ingenii sui monumenta nobis dimisit, etc. i. e. Theophilus, the seventh bishop of Antioch after the apostle Peter, has left us a specimen of his genius in his production, combining the contents of the four gospels into one work.

6. *Athenagoras* of the second century, ascribes both of the epistles to the Corinthians to an apostle, whom Hermias calls Paul, in his work against the heathen philosophers, entitled *ἑρμηνεία τῶν ἐπιτομῶν φιλοσόφων*, i. e. ridicule of the philosophers, without the church. Athenagoras, de Resurrectione,⁶ says, It is therefore clearly evident, according to the declaration of the apostle, that this corruptible and dissolvable must put on incorruption, in order that, being quickened by the resurrection of the dead, and the parts which were separated and scattered about every where being again united, each one may justly receive the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad.⁷

¹ Vide the Dissert. sup. cit. in Flatt's Magazine Vol. IV. p. 245, etc.

² See the dissert. in Staudlin's Beiträge, Vol. V. p. 176, etc.

³ Theophilus was the seventh bishop of Antioch after the apostle Peter, as Eusebius informs us, and was made bishop A. D. 168. His predecessors were Eusebius, Ignatius, Heros, Cornelius and Eros; and his death occurred shortly after A. D. 181. S.]

⁴ L. II. ad. Antolyceum.

⁵ Epist. ad Algasiam Quæst. 6.

⁶ page 61. edit. Coloniensis.

⁷ Εὐδὴλον παντὶ τὸ λειπόμενον διὰ δὲ κατὰ τὸν ἀποστόλου, τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο καὶ διασκεδαστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, ἕνα ζωοποιηθῆναι ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ πάλιν ἐνωθῆναι τῶν κεχωρισμένων ἢ καὶ πάντη διαλελυμένων, ἕνα σπὸς κολληθῆται διὰ καίνας, ἃ διὰ τοῦ σώματος ἐπραΐον, εἴτε ἀγαθὰ εἴτε κακά.

The words $\rho\acute{o}\text{-}\alpha\phi\theta\alpha\gamma\acute{o}\iota\alpha\upsilon$ and $\tau\upsilon\alpha\text{-}\kappa\alpha\acute{\nu}\alpha$, are taken, the former from 1 Cor. 15: 53, the latter from 2 Cor. 5: 10.

7. *Clemens of Alexandria*, in the second century makes very copious citations from all the homologoumena, excepting only the epistle to Philemon.

8. *Tertullian*, presbyter of Carthage, in the second century, attributes the historical books of the New Testament, the twelve epistles of Paul, (which Irenaeus also cites as productions of Paul,) the epistle to Philemon and the first epistle of Peter and first of John, to the same persons who are commonly regarded as their authors.

Tertullian, of Western Africa,¹ being the most ancient Latin writer that has reached us, is entitled to particular attention.² Among the important passages for the genuineness of the writings of the New Testament, are the following.

First; concerning the historical books of the New Testament, he says: "In the first place, I consider it as established, that the productions termed the gospels, were written by the apostles to whom the Lord himself committed this charge of publishing the gospel; but if companions of the apostles were also concerned in them, they nevertheless did not act alone, but in conjunction with the apostles, and following them as guides; because the publications of the disciples of the apostles might be exposed to the imputation of ambitious views, if the authority of their instructors, yea even that of Christ himself, which made their instructors apostles, did not support them. In a word we are taught the faith by the apostles *John* and *Matthew*, and it is confirmed to us by their disciples *Luke* and *Mark*."³

In another passage he says: "In short, if it is evident that that is the more true which is the more ancient, and that the more ancient which is from the beginning, and that from the beginning which was derived from the apostles; then it will in like manner be evident, that what the apostolical churches held as inviolably sacred; they received from the apostles.—I assert therefore, that the Gospel of *Luke*, which I defend⁴ to the utmost, was from its first publication, in possession of these (churches); and not only of the apo-

¹ Schmidt sup. cit. p. 26.

² Compare *Hanlein's Manual*, being an Introd. to N. Test. Erlangen, 1794, part. I. p. 85—87.

³ Constitutum in primis, evangelicum instrumentum Apostolos auctores habere, quibus hoc munus evangelii promulgandi ab ipso Domino sit impositum; sit et apostolicos, non tamen solos, sed cum apostolis, et post apostolos; quoniam praedictio discipulorum suspecta fieri posset de gloria studio, si non associata illi auctoritas magistrorum, imo Christi, quae magistros apostolos facit. Denique nobis fidem ex apostolis Johannes et Mattheus insinuant, ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant." Lib. IV. adv. Marcionem, c. 2.

⁴ He defended the unadulterated Gospel of *Luke* against the spurious one of *Marcion*.

tolical (churches) but also of all which are united with them in the bonds of a common faith.—The same authority of the apostolical churches support also the other Gospels, which we have likewise received through them, and in the form in which they had them; namely the Gospels of *John* and of *Matthew*; and likewise that of *Mark*, which is ascribed to Peter, whose interpreter *Mark* was.—And thus the digest of *Luke* is commonly ascribed to *Paul*; for it is customary to ascribe to the teachers, what their students published.¹—The Acts of the Apostles is quoted by *Tertullian* under the title of *Acta Apostolorum*,² and *Commentarius Lucae*.³

Eckermann, who quotes⁴ this testimony of *Tertullian* for the genuineness of our Gospels, makes an attempt to invalidate its force. He says:⁵ "Before such an appeal to the testimony of the apostolical church can possess any weight, it is necessary that it should be specifically stated, that according to the tradition preserved in some particular church, *Luke* did, at a specified time deliver the Gospel into the hands of that church; or that some friend of *Luke*, seeing the Gospel and the Acts of the apostles in the hands of *Luke*, heard him declare, with his own lips, that he actually wrote them," etc. But the principal ground on which *Tertullian* builds all that he says, is this: "The testimony of the church must be regarded as infallible; and she has decided in favour of the four Gospels. The truth of the traditionary opinion of the apostolical churches is based upon the fact that the apostles were their first teachers; as though it would follow that after the lapse of 150 years, every thing in them were still apostolic."⁶

In opposition to this, the author of "Reflections on the origin of the Gospels and Acts of the apostles"⁷ remarks, that *Tertullian* appeals, not to the doctrinal, but the historical tradition of the churches, which the apostles founded, and to which they committed their writings. This the whole connexion shows. In this very context, he says: "We have also the support of the churches of *John*; for although *Marcion* rejected the Revelation of *John*, the whole succession of bishops from the beginning, will testify that

¹ In summa, si constat, id verius, quod prius, id prius, quod et ab initio, ab initio quod ab Apostolis, pariter utique constabit, id esse ab apostolis traditum, quod apud Ecclesias apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum.—Dico itaque apud illas (ecclesias,) nec solum jam apostolicas, sed apud universas, quae illis de societate sacramenti confederantur, id evangelium Lucae ab initio editionis suae stare, quod cum maximo tuemur. Eadem auctoritas ecclesiarum Apostolicarum caeteris quoque patrocinabitur evangelis, quae prouida per illas et secundum illas habemus, *Johannis* dico et *Matthaei*: licet et *Marcus* quod edidit, *Petrus* affirmatur, cujus interpres *Marcus*. Nam et *Lucae* digestum *Paulo* adscribere solent; capit magistrorum videri quae discipuli promulgarint. Lib. IV. adv. Marcionem, c. 5.

² Adv. Marc. V. 1.

³ De Jejunio c. 10.

⁴ Sup. cit. 202—205.

⁵ Sup. cit. 204 &c.

⁶ Ständlin's Beytragen, Vol. V. p. 192 &c.

John was the author."¹ In order to prove that the Marcionite Gospel of Luke is spurious, he remarks in the same passage: "But Marcion's (Gospel of Luke) is unknown to most persons; and it is known to none but as originating with him."² Of the other Gospels he says: "We have received them from the apostolical churches, and have precisely their text of them."³ It appears therefore that there is nothing said relative to a *decision* of the apostolical churches, in favour of the Gospels; but of the transmission of those writings, which they originally received as the productions of the apostles, unaltered, to other churches. The passage of Tertullian cited below⁴ may also be consulted as proof that he refers to historical tradition.⁵ But Eckermann has himself retracted the above-mentioned objections against the force of the tradition of the church, in the preface to his work entitled "Explanation of all the obscure passages of the New Testament."⁶ He says: "The fact can admit of no dispute, that in the churches founded by the apostles, it could be known, which reputed writings of an apostle were genuine and which were spurious. And it is a remarkable fact, which places the integrity of the witnesses for the genuineness of our canonical Gospels in the clearest light, that there have been transmitted to us but two Gospels composed by apostles, and two others composed by disciples of apostles. Had the names under which they were submitted to the world, been fictitious, why were not all the Gospels ascribed to apostles, rather than to persons who had only been their scholars?"⁷

One other objection raised against the validity of historical tradition as supporting the homologoumena, is this: that in the earliest times, tradition supported as genuine and apostolical some books which were afterwards proved to be supposititious; and therefore it can possess no weight in the balance of historical investigation. A reply to this objection the reader will find in Flatt's Magazine.⁷

Secondly, as to the Epistles of Paul. The two epistles to the Corinthians, the two to the Thessalonians, the first to Timothy, and those to the Galatians, the Romans, Ephesians and the Colossians, are quoted, by Tertullian, *De pudicitia*, c. 13—19. The second epistle to Timothy is cited, in *Scorpiacum contra Gnosticos*,

¹ *Habemus et Johannis ecclesias alumnas. Nam etsi Apocalypsim ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recens in Johannem stabit autorem.*

² *Marcionis vero (Evangelium Lucae) plerisque nec notum; nullis notum, ut non eodem natum.*

³ *Habemus per ecclesias apostolicas, et secundum illas.*

⁴ *De præsceptis, haereticorum, c. 36.*

⁵ *Compare Flatt's Magazine, Vol. IX. p. 31—33. 6 Vol. I. p. VII.*

⁷ *Stück IX. s. 2—47.*

c. 13. The epistle to Titus, in *Præscriptiones haereticorum*, c. 6. And that to the Philippians, in the fifth book against Marcion, c. 20. And throughout the whole of this fifth book, the epistles of Paul are frequently quoted.

The same book, c. 21. contains a remark relative to an epistle, which, though Philemon is not named in the text, could have been no other than that addressed to him. "This epistle alone was shielded by its brevity from the falsifying hands of Marcion. Yet it is strange, as Marcion received this epistle to an individual, that he should reject the two to Timothy and the one to Titus."¹

The first epistle to Peter is cited, in *Scorpiac.* c. 12. 14. and the first epistle of John, *de pudicitia*, c. 19. In addition to these passages, we will insert that above mentioned, contained in his *Præscript.* *Haereticorum*, c. 36. "Pass through all the apostolical churches, in which the seats of the apostles are still filled, and in which their genuine² epistles are publicly read, by which their voice continues to sound, and their countenances are still exhibited. Is Achaia nearest to you? Corinth is not distant. If you are but little removed from Macedonia, Philippi is there. If you can go to Asia, you have there Ephesus. But if you adjoin Italy, Rome is at hand."³

Fragments of Caius, who lived in the beginning of the third century. According to Eusebius,⁴ Caius, attributed thirteen epistles to Paul: whom he terms (*ισοὺν ἀπόστολον*) the holy apostle.

ILL. 6.—*The internal evidence is wholly in favour of the genuineness of the books of the New Testament:—they contain nothing incongruous with the age or other circumstances in which they were written.*

Michaelis has clearly shown, that the style of the books of the

¹ *Soli huic epistolae brevitatis sua profuit ut falsariae manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit (Marcionem) quod ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum, recusaverit.*

² *Schmidl (Introd. N. Test. II. 30.) doubts whether the ἀποστολικὰς epistolai be meant here. Hug, (Introd. I. 93.) thinks the phrase "literae authenticæ" signifies genuine unadulterated epistles; and appeals, in support of this signification of the word authenticæ, to the passage de monogamia, c. 11. [The learned Dr. Lardner (Works, v. 11. p. 167—8. ed. 8vo.) expresses his opinion thus: "Tertullian, by 'authentic letters,' does not mean the original epistles. Nor does he mean letters in their original language. But by authentic, he seems to mean certain, well attested; the Greek word is so used by Cicero: and by authenticæ literæ we are not to understand authentic letters or epistles, but 'scriptures,' so the word ought in my opinion to be rendered." And in support of each of these propositions, he as usual adduces his reasons. S.]*

³ *"Percurrere ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsae adhuc cathedrae apostolorum suis locis praesidentur, apud quas authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur. sonantes vocem, representantes faciem. Proxima est tibi Achaia: habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippum. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiae adjiceris, habes Romanam."*

⁴ *Hist. Eccl. VI. 30.*

New Testament is an internal proof of their genuineness;¹ and he has proved, that the historical data of the New Testament accord, even in the most minute circumstances, with the history of the time in which they were said to be written.² He has likewise answered several objections, derived from the actual or apparent contradictions between other historians, especially Josephus, and the narratives of the New Testament. Compare on this subject, the very complete enumeration of the internal evidences for the genuineness of the New Testament writings, in Hänlein's Introduction to the New Testament,³ and in Kleuker's "Full investigation of the evidences for the genuineness and credibility of the original records of christianity."⁴ These internal evidences for the genuineness of the writings of the New Testament, are compressed into a narrow space, in Griesinger's Introduction to the books of the New Covenant;⁵ and select remarks on this subject, may be found in Hug's Introduction.⁶

The Gospels of *Matthew* and *Mark*, like the other Gospels, contain nothing which can be regarded even as an inferential, negative proof of their spuriousness. Eckermann, in his "Theologische Beiträge" has, indeed, attempted to prove the Gospels and Acts not genuine, by internal evidence. But his arguments are refuted, in the "Reflections on the origin of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles;"⁷ and in the Dissertation of Storr, on the question: "Did Jesus represent his miracles to be a proof of the divinity of his mission?"⁸

The principal objections of Eckermann, together with the answers to them contained in these dissertations, are the following:

Objection 1. The illiterate disciples of Jesus could not well have possessed any skill in writing. Matthew alone, having been a publican, may have been an exception.

Reply. We have no authority for asserting that the disciples of Jesus were wholly unable to write; although their artless narratives may prove that they were not acquainted with the artificial rules of composition.⁹ Again; they may, like Paul, have dictated their works to others, who served as their amanuenses.¹⁰ Eckermann is inconsistent with himself; for he admits that the groundwork of the

¹ Introduction to N. Test. § 4. 10. 11. 12.

² See also Hug's Introduction to the N. Test. p. 12—24. Andover ed.

³ Pt. I. § 3—6. p. 41—70.

⁴ Vol. I. and Vol. III. pt. I. p. 32—104.

⁵ p. 7. 8. Stuttgart, 1799.

⁶ Pt. I. § 3—5.

⁷ Staudlin's Beiträge, vol. V. p. 156—163.

⁸ Flatt's Mag. pt. IV. p. 234 etc.

⁹ Staudlin's Beiträge, sup. cit. p. 156 etc.

¹⁰ Flatt's Mag. sup. cit. p. 230. Staudlin's Beiträge, p. 157.

Gospels of Matthew, Luke and John, like that of the Acts of the Apostles, was the composition of those very men; though he supposes they were re-written at a subsequent period, and much enlarged by spurious additions.¹

Objection 2. Prior to the commencement of the second century, there was no necessity for written records of the life and doctrines of Jesus.

Reply. The inference of the non-existence of a thing from the fact of its being unnecessary is, in general, not legitimate.² But the contrary fact has been proved by Griesinger, in his Introduction to the New Testament, p. 99, and by Eichhorn, in his Introduction to the New Testament, vol. I. p. 3, who state the causes why such a written record was necessary. Again; must the apostles be supposed to have provided only for cases of absolute and indispensable necessity? May there not have been many christians, who were desirous of possessing circumstantial narratives of the life of Jesus? The opponents of christianity, even in the apostolical age, may have rendered it necessary, on many accounts, to commit to paper the history and doctrines of Jesus.

Objection 3. It is evident from the whole tenor of both dissertations of Eckermann, that the principal ground on which he builds his hypothesis of the spuriousness of the historical books of the New Testament, is this: The Gospels are not written in the spirit of Jesus and his immediate disciples; for Jesus and his disciples would not, by any means, have belief in their doctrines founded on signs and miracles. Now as there are passages in the Gospels, in which signs and miracles are presented as proofs of the divine mission of Jesus, e. g. Matt. 11: 20—24. 2—6. Mark 16: 11, 18. Luke 10: 13, etc. John 2: 11, 23. 6: 26; we must believe that all such passages, and indeed, whatever is either itself miraculous, or is confirmed solely by miracles, are the additions of later christians, who altered and corrupted the publications of Matthew, Luke and John, about the end of the first century.

Reply. Without recurring to either the internal or external proofs of the genuineness of the Gospels, the principal facts in the life of Jesus (the truth of which Eckermann admits) would themselves lead us to conclude, a priori, not only that Jesus himself believed in the extraordinary agency of God, but that he would refer his readers to miracles and signs as proofs of his divine mission. Consult "Philosophical and historico-exegetical Remarks on the Miracles," in Flatt's Magazine, pt. III. § 35—38. Moreover, the assumption that Jesus and his apostles would not have a belief in the

¹ Staudlin's Beit. sup. cit. Flatt's Mag. p. 249.

² Staudlin's Beiträge, p. 157.

doctrines of Jesus to be founded at all on miracles, is false: nor does a single one of the passages which Eckermann adduces, afford the least ground for such an assertion. Compare the dissertation "Did Jesus declare his miracles to be a proof of the divinity of his mission?" in Flatt's Mag. pt. IV. § 3—5.

Again, if every thing miraculous in the history and doctrines of Jesus contained in our Gospels, originated with superstitious christians, who first appeared about the close of the first century; how comes it that our Gospels obtained such a general reception throughout the christian church? Or if it was a universal mania for miracles, which produced this effect; how comes it that some churches at least did not prefer one or other of the apocryphal books, in which the biography of Jesus is still more replete with miracles? And if the much older fact, that Matthew, Luke and John left certain books behind them, was known till after the middle of the second century; how happens it that the far more recent fact, of the revision and enlargement of them, was at the same time unknown? And why was not the least reference made to it, when our Gospels were universally received as canonical?¹

Objection 4. If Matthew had himself written the Gospel which bears his name, he would certainly have given us more of those excellent and instructive discourses of Jesus, which are now found only in Luke and John.

Reply. It was inconsistent with the object of Matthew, to insert into his Gospel those things which he omitted and which are found in the other Gospels. See this proved in the work "On the Object of the evangelical history of John," § 62, 64, and in Stäudlin's Beiträge, p. 166.

For a literary view of the late works and dissertations, in which the genuineness of the Gospel of John has been either disputed or proved; by internal and external evidence, consult Wegscheider's Complete Introduction to the Gospel of John, Göttingen, 1806. p. 76, etc. and Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Test. Vol. II. p. 239. ed. 1810. The latter work contains likewise a refutation of the latest objections, as advanced by Cludius in his "Ursichten des Christenthums," p. 50—59, Altonae, 1808.

The Gospels of Matthew and Mark contain clear internal evidence, from which the positive inference may be made, that the former was written by Matthew, and the latter by a disciple of Peter. The internal mark in the Gospel of Matthew, which supports the opinion that Matthew is the author, is the narrative which he gives of his own call to the apostolic office, chapter ix. 9—13. This subject is discussed in the work "On the Object of St. John," p. 355 and 303.

¹ Vide the Dissertation quoted, in Flatt's Mag. 4. p. 237—239.

In the latter passage, it is remarked that the insertion of a circumstantial account of the reception of Matthew into the number of the twelve, and of other circumstances connected with it, in a Gospel which touches so seldom on the earlier history of the other Apostles, is best accounted for by the fact, that Matthew himself is the author of this Gospel.

Several internal marks, which prove that the author of the Gospel of Mark was a disciple of the apostle Peter, are stated in Dissert. I. in Libror. N. T. Historicorum aliquot loca, (Opusc. Academica, Vol. III. p. 10.) and in the works there mentioned. Thus, notice is taken, p. 60 etc. of the fact, that Peter is distinguished in the 16th verse of Mark III, by a deviation from the particular construction of the sentence which was commenced in v. 14, and afterwards continued from v. 17 to 19:—that although his name is not mentioned out of its proper place, still he is not mentioned expressly as the first:—the circumstance that, in Mark 8: 29, merely the confession of Peter is mentioned, and the answer of Jesus (Matt. 16: 17—19) which reflects such honour on Peter, omitted:—the fact that Mark, in imitation of Peter, (Acts 1: 21,) begins his account with the baptism of John:—and p. 64, note 107, it is observed, that Mark only (chap. 8: 22—26) gives the history of the blind man of Bethsaida, the birth place of Peter, (John 1: 45) which may on that account, have been more interesting to him. Compare Hug's Introduction to the New Testament, pt. II. § 27, p. 380 etc. where the passages Mark 1: 36. 5: 37. 13: 3. 16: 7, are considered with reference to this point.

The English divine, Dr. Paley, in his Horae Paulinae, published in 1790, advances a new and pertinent argument for the genuineness of the thirteen epistles of Paul, and for the credibility of the Acts of the Apostles, founded on their reciprocal relations and references to each other, which were evidently the effect, not of premeditation and design, but of accidental coincidence.¹

Supplementary note.—On the origin and reciprocal relation of the three first Gospels.

The principal opinions in regard to the relation of the first three Gospels, which have of late been advocated, are the following:

I. That the three evangelists copied one from another. The opinions are, that either,

Matthew wrote first; and Mark, when composing his Gospel, had Matthew's before him; and Luke had Matthew's and Mark's. See Hug's Introd. to N. Test. Vol. II. p. 349—420. Or

Mark formed his Gospel wholly from the two others. See Griesbach's "Comentio, quâ Marci evangelium totum e Matthei et

¹ This work was translated into German by Henke, Helmstadt, 1797.

Lucæ Commentariis decerptum esse monstratur." P. I, II, Jænæ, 1789, 90, printed in Commentt. Theolog. Ed. Velthusen, Kuinöl, Vol. I. Paulus' Commentary on the first three Gospels, and Introductionis in N. T. Capita Selectiora, Jænæ, 1799. No. IV. In the latter dissertation, the writer supposes that Matthew and Luke in the composition of their Gospels, had used detached and scattered Greek accounts of the life of Jesus, and that the same were used in part by both. Or:

Mark wrote his Gospel first; and Matthew and Luke made use of it. This opinion is stated in some of the writings above referred to. The similarity between Luke and our Greek Matthew is accounted for by the supposition, that the Greek translator of Matthew made some use of Luke. See "On the Object of the Gospel of John," p. 360. Or:

Luke wrote first; and Mark availed himself of Luke's Gospel; and Matthew of both the others. See Vogel. sup. cit. p. 34, etc.

II. The Evangelists derived their Gospels from one or more common sources, Aramaean or Greek; such as an original Gospel, or different editions and translations of it. Several more recent modifications of this hypothesis, (which refer to the number or nature or language of these sources, and to the use made of them by the evangelists,) are found in the following works;

In Hänlein's Introduction to N. Test. sup. cit. p. 270, etc.

In Marsh's Dissertation on the origin and Composition of the first three Gospels, p. 284, etc. of Rosenmüller's translation.¹

In Eichhorn's Introd. to N. Test. Vol. I. 1804. See also the Reviews of this Introduction in the "Tübinger gelehrten Anzeigen," for 1805, Nos. 18—20: p. 137—156. and in the "Haller. Lit. zeitung," for 1805, No. 127, etc. See also Hug's Introd. part. I. p. 64, etc.

In Schmidt's Introd. to N. Test. part. I. § 37—43. Several critical remarks on the views which have been entertained of the relation of our Gospels, are contained in § 24—43.

In Gratz's "New attempt to explain the origin of the first three Gospels," Tübingen, 1812.

ILL. 7. *The testimony of the earliest heretics to the genuineness of the homologoumena.*

The genuineness of the homologoumena was acknowledged, even by those heretics of the earliest ages to whose interest the authority of these books was extremely prejudicial; for they sought refuge in

¹ And in the original English work, Bishop Marsh's *Michaelis*, Vol. III. part. 2. p. 361, etc.

arbitrary interpretations of the odious passages; and did not presume to dispute the genuineness of the books. Among the Gnostics, for instance, there were some sects who admitted the genuineness of the New Testament, but distorted their meaning by their explanations, and maintained the necessity of giving an allegorical turn to all the declarations of the apostles. Irenæus says: "So great is this certainty in regard to our Gospels, that even the heretics themselves bear testimony in their favour; and all acknowledging them, each endeavours to establish from them his own opinion."¹ He adds: "But all others, (except the aforementioned Marcionites,) being puffed up by science falsely so called, do indeed acknowledge the genuineness of the Scriptures, but pervert them by their interpretations."² They moreover accused the writers of the New Testament of accommodation, when they were pressed by individual passages. "These lying sophists assert, (says Irenæus,) that the apostles hypocritically dispensed their instruction according to the capacity of their audience, accommodating their answers to the prejudices of the inquirers; teaching the illiterate such things as would gratify their ignorance, fostering the indolence of the lazy, and cherishing the errors of the deluded; and to those able to comprehend the ineffable Father, they explained the deep mysteries of religion by parabolic and figurative representations: so that our Lord and his apostles did not (according to their views) teach truth as it is; but hypocritically and in accommodation to the dispositions of men."³ And in chap. 12. § 6, where Irenæus utters similar sentiments relative to this Gnostic theory of accommodation, he makes the following impressive remark: "Superfluous and in vain would the advent of our Lord appear, if he came to tolerate and cherish the former erroneous opinions of men respecting God."⁴ The Va-

¹ "Tanta est circa Evangelia hæc firmitas, ut et ipsi hæretici testimonium reddant eis, et ex ipsis egrediens unusquisque eorum conetur suam confirmare doctrinam." Irenæus, Lib. III. c. 11. § 7.

² Reliqui vero omnes, falso scientiæ nomine inflati, Scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt, Ibid. c. 12. § 12.—Compare Schmidt's observations upon the Commentary of the Gnostic Heracleon on the Gospel of John; in his Introd. to N. T. part I. p. 238.

³ Dicunt hi, qui vanissimi sunt Sophistæ, quod apostoli cum hypocris fecerunt doctrinam secundum audientium capacitatem, et responsiones secundum interrogantium suspiciones, coecis coeca confabulantes secundum coecitatem ipsorum; languentibus autem secundum languorem ipsorum, et errantibus secundum errorem eorum;—his vero, qui inominabilem Patrem capiunt, per parabolas et ænigmata inenarrabile fecisse mysterium: itaque non, quemadmodum ipsa habet veritas, sed in hypocrisi, et quemadmodum capiebat unusquisque, Dominum et Apostolos edidisse magisterium." Iren. L. III. c. 5. § 1.

⁴ "Superfluous autem et inutilis adventus Domini apparebit, si quidem venit permisurus et servaturus unuscujusque olim insitam de Deo opinionem.—See also Carus: *Historia antiquior Sententiarum Ecclesiæ Græcæ de Accommodatione Christo imprimis et Apostolis tributa*," Lipsiæ, 1793. § 16.

lentinians, one of the Gnostic sects, were particularly attached to the Gospel of John.¹ But it appears they had also our other Gospels, and particularly that of Luke, or at least an abridged and perhaps an adulterated copy; as we learn from Origen and Irenaeus. The latter (after having adduced several parts of the history and doctrines of Jesus, which are contained only in Luke,) says: "And many other things which are found in Luke alone, are made use of by both Marcion and Valentinus:"²—"and consequently, they must either adopt the other contents of Luke, or reject these also."³ And Origen, in reply to the objection of his opponent, "that some of the christians altered the Gospel in three or four different ways, in order to evade objections;" makes these remarks: "I know of none who adulterated the Gospel except the followers of Marcion and of Valentinus, and as I suppose those of Lucian."⁴ It likewise appears, that to the original number of the gospels, they added another, termed "the Gospel of truth:" for, otherwise they could not have boasted of having more Gospels than the catholic church; as Irenaeus informs us they did: "The followers of Valentinus produce their own writings; and boast of the possession of more Gospels than really exist. Nay to such a pitch has their audacity risen, that to a production of their own, which has no resemblance to the apostolical Gospels, they have given the name of The Gospel of truth."⁵ And it seems that Valentinus, like Marcion, received the writings of Paul; from which the Gnostics are said to have taken proofs in support of their system.⁶ For Irenaeus distinguishes Valentinus and Marcion, from another sect who rejected the writings of the apostle

¹ Irenaeus says: "Hi autem qui a Valentino sunt, eo, quod est secundum Johannem, (evangelio) plenissime utentes, etc. L. III. c. 7. § 11. In the work "On the Object of the Gospel of John," p. 52, it is remarked, that the Valentinians probably derived many forms of expression from the Gospel of John, which were unknown to the elder Gnostics.

² Et alia multa sunt, quae inveniri possunt a solo Luca dicta esse, quibus et Marcion et Valentinus utuntur. Lib. III. c. 14. § 3.

³ "Necesse est igitur, et reliqua quae ab eo (Luca) dicta sunt, recipere eos, aut et his renuntiare. ibid § 4. And at the end of this section, after having again spoken of the Valentinians and the Marcionites and especially of the former, he adds: Si autem et reliqua suscipere cogentur, intendentes perfecto evangelio et apostolorum doctrinae, oportet eos poenitentiam agere.

⁴ Μεταγραφεύς δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἄλλους οὐκ οἶδα, ἢ τοὺς ἀπὸ Μαρκίωνος, καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Οὐαλερίνου, οἵμαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Λουκιάνου, Contra Celsum L. II. § 27.

⁵ Hi vero qui a Valentino sunt, suas conscriptiones proferentes, plura habere gloriantur quam sint ipsa evangelia. Si quidem in tantum processerunt audaciae, ut, quod ab his non olim conscriptum est, veritatis evangelium titulent, in nihilo conveniens Apostolorum evangelii.

⁶ Irenaeus, L. III. c. 2 § 1, and c. 7 § 1, remarks that the Gnostics appealed to both passages of Paul, 1 Cor. 2: 4. and 2 Cor. 4: 4.

Paul.¹ Tertullian says,² that Valentinus appears to have used the whole collection of New Testament books; and to have spared those which Marcion had lacerated. His only complaint is, that Valentinus perverted their meaning.³

ILL. 8. *The genuineness of the homologoumena acknowledged by the earlier heretics.*

The earlier heretics made alterations and erasions in the homologoumena; but acknowledged the genuineness of these books.— This is exemplified in the case of Marcion, a very ancient witness, who decidedly maintained that ten of Paul's epistles were genuine; but asserted that alterations and interpolations had been made in them, by some christians who were inclined towards Judaism. Accordingly, he undertook the task of restoring them to their primitive form; and actually published what he regarded as an improved edition of them. He believed the Gospel of Luke to have been written, not by Luke, but by the apostle Paul: and this too he undertook to improve. Now the very fact, that Marcion regarded the Gospel of Luke, which he used, as a production of Paul; evinces the existence of an earlier opinion, that Luke was the author of this Gospel. And this opinion it was, in connexion with the passage, Coloss. 4: 14, where Paul mentions the salutation of "Luke the beloved physician," together with other similar statements, which gave rise to the thought that the Gospel of Luke was alluded to by Paul, when he speaks of his Gospel, Gal. 2: 5, 7, 14, and in other passages. The unfounded opinion, that Paul participated in the composition of the Gospel of Luke, arose⁴ from a misapprehension of the meaning of εὐαγγέλιον in the words of Paul, (Rom. 2: 16, and 16: 25.) κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, i. e. according to my Gospel; for it was customary, early, to appropriate the word εὐαγγέλιον to biographies of Christ. Hence it was inferred, that Paul must have left a biography of Christ; and as there was none extant under his name, and as it was evident from the Acts of the apostles, (16: 20 etc.) and from the epistles of Paul, (Col. 4: 14. 2 Tim. 4: 11.) that Luke was his confidant; the Gospel of Luke was therefore termed Paul's Gospel. Accordingly, Eusebius remarks: "It is said, that Paul referred to the Gospel of Luke, when he used the expression, 'according to my Gospel,' as if he were writing con-

¹ Advers. Haeres. L. III. c. 14. § 3, 4, and c. 15. § 1. Eadem autem dicimus iterum et his, qui Paulum apostolum non cognoscunt &c.

² De praescriptionibus, c. 38.

³ See Hug's Introduction, pt. I. p. 57, etc. Andover. ed.

⁴ See "On the object of John," § 54, 56.

cerning a Gospel of his own.¹ In addition to this, it was a customary saying, that Mark's Gospel sprung from the sermons of Peter, and Luke's Gospel from those of Paul.² Thus Irenæus says: "Mark himself, who was the scholar and interpreter of Peter, transmitted to us in writing what Peter announced. And Luke, the follower of Paul, recorded the Gospel which Paul preached."³—Such observations would not have become current, had it not been well known that Gospels were extant bearing the names of Mark and Luke.

ILL. 9. *Testimony of the heretics. They acknowledged the genuineness of the homologoumena, while they denied the authority of their authors.*

The Ebionites rejected the epistles of Paul, not because they denied Paul to be the author of them, but because they regarded Paul himself as an apostate from the Mosaic law: "Ebionæi (says Irenæus) Apostolum Paulum recusant, apostatam eum legis dicentes." It was doubtless for the same reason, that they rejected the Gospel of Luke; because it was the production of a companion of the apostle Paul, and was commonly ascribed to Paul himself. See the preceding Illustration. The meaning, in the passage of Irenæus, which treats of the Ebionites,⁵ is not: "Those who reject the apostle Paul, (the Ebionites,) receive that portion of the Gospel history and doctrine, which is found in Luke alone; and therefore they are bound to admit what Luke testifies of Paul in the Acts of the apostles;" but the meaning of Irenæus was this: "The Ebionites who reject Luke, thereby rob themselves of many indispensably necessary parts of the history of Christ, which are found only in Luke; they therefore do not possess a complete Gospel history." He reasons thus: "If they reject the authority of the apostle Paul, then they must discard Luke, who in his Acts of the apostles, gives an account of the election of Paul to the apostleship; but if they discard Luke, they deprive themselves of those important parts of

¹ Φασι δὲ οἱ ἕτεροι κατὰ Λούκαν εὐαγγέλιον μνημονίαν ὁ Παῦλος εἰσάγειν, ὅτιννα οὐκ ἐπὶ ἰδίου τινὰς εὐαγγέλιον ἰσχυρὸν ἔλεγε κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου, Hist. Eccl. III. 4.

² Compare Schmidt's Introd. pt. I. p. 50.

³ Marcus discipulus et interpres Petri, et ipse quæ a Petro annuntiata erant per scripta (εὐαγγέλιος) nobis tradidit. Et Lucas sectator Pauli, quod ab illo prædicabatur evangelium in libro condidit. Adv. Hæreses, L. III. c. I. § 1.

⁴ Lib. I. c. 26. § 2.

⁵ Eadem autem dicimus iterum et his, qui Paulum apostolum non cognoscant, quoniam (quod) aut reliquis verbis Evangelii, quæ per solum Lucam in nostram venerunt agnitionem, renuntiare debent, et non uti eis; aut si illa recipiunt omnia, habent necessitatem, recipere etiam eam testificationem, quæ est de Paulo. III. 15. § 1.

the Gospel history, which are contained in Luke alone.¹ And as they cannot acknowledge the apostolic authority of Paul, because they reject the Acts of the Apostles; they are guilty of despising a choice made by Christ himself, which rests on the testimony of Luke. But that Luke's narrative is not true, is what they are unable to prove: for by the very fact, that God committed to Luke alone, the charge of recording (in his Gospel) a large and essential part of the history of Jesus, he confers credibility on his narrative of the history and doctrines of the apostles.²—Although the Gospel of Luke was held in no estimation by the Ebionites, in consequence of the person of its author, and although they used exclusively the Gospel of Matthew;³ still it will not follow, that the reason why they esteemed the Gospels of Mark and John so little, was either because they entertained no personal respect for these men, (for it is admitted that Peter, the tutor of Mark, and John, were held in the most respectful estimation by the Jewish christians;) or because they denied the genuineness of the Gospels which were attributed to John and to the pupil of Peter. Perhaps the Gospel of John was not admitted into the canon of the Ebionites, because it was published at a very late period, and thus was unknown to this sect of Jewish christians, till the time when they were prejudiced against all productions which came from the gentile Christians. The Gospel of Matthew was preferred to the earlier one of Mark, in consequence of its being written in the vernacular tongue of Palestine, the seat of the Ebionites.

Marcion, on the other hand, who admitted the authority of the apostle Paul alone, rejected the Gospels of Matthew, of Mark (or Peter) and of John; not however because he denied their genuineness; but because he denied their authors to possess any authority, they being apostles of the circumcision, whom Paul himself had rebuked. See Illustration 8th, note. In like manner, it must be supposed that the reason why Marcion rejected the Acts of the apostles, was not that he denied Luke to be its author; but because the Acts of the apostles was not ascribed to Paul, as the Gospel of Luke was; (See Illust. 8th); and because the book of Acts speaks favourably of the apostles of the circumcision, to whom Marcion was opposed. And this will remove the objection, which has been urged against the opinion that Marcion's Gospel was an adulterated copy of Luke's Gospel, viz. that if it were so, then Marcion would

¹ And that this was really the case, is evident from the fact that those, who according to L. I. c. 26. § 2. rejected the apostle Paul, used no other Gospel than that of Matthew.

² Irenæus, Lib. I. c. 26. § 2. III. c. 11. § 7.