

## Luke: Notes

### Table of Contents

Notes on the Introduction.....	1
NOTES ON THE FIRST CHAPTER, Verse 5 ff.....	25
NOTES ON THE SECOND CHAPTER.....	30
NOTES ON THE THIRD CHAPTER.....	35
NOTES ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER.....	38
NOTES ON THE FIFTH CHAPTER.....	44
NOTES ON THE SIXTH CHAPTER.....	48
NOTES ON THE SEVENTH CHAPTER.....	56
NOTES ON THE EIGHTH CHAPTER.....	59
NOTES ON THE NINTH CHAPTER.....	63
NOTES ON THE TENTH CHAPTER (TO VERSE 37).....	68
NOTES ON CHAPTER 10: 38 TO CHAPTER 11: 54.....	72
NOTES ON THE TWELFTH CHAPTER.....	78
NOTES ON THE THIRTEENTH CHAPTER.....	82
NOTES ON THE FOURTEENTH CHAPTER.....	84
NOTES ON THE FIFTEENTH CHAPTER.....	86
NOTES ON THE SIXTEENTH CHAPTER.....	89
NOTES ON THE SEVENTEENTH CHAPTER.....	92
NOTES ON THE EIGHTEENTH CHAPTER.....	95
NOTES ON THE NINETEENTH CHAPTER.....	101
NOTES ON THE TWENTIETH CHAPTER.....	103
NOTES ON THE TWENTY-FIRST CHAPTER.....	105
NOTES ON THE TWENTY-SECOND CHAPTER.....	108
NOTES ON THE TWENTY-THIRD CHAPTER.....	115
NOTES ON THE TWENTY-FOURTH CHAPTER.....	118
EDITIONS OF AUTHORS USED.....	126

(E. E. Whitfield)

(Appendix to 'An Exposition of the Gospel of Luke')

### Notes on the Introduction.

§ 1.

1 The third Gospel, exclusive of the Prologue or Preface, may be divided into *four* sections (*cf.* Moffatt): (i.) Luke 1: 5 - 4: 13, the preliminary period; (ii.) Luke 4: 14 - 9: 50, the Galilean Ministry; (iii.) Luke 9: 51 - 18: 30, the Ministry in Samaria and Perea; (iv.) Luke 18: 31 — end, the closing Judean Ministry with the last supper, the Lord's trial, crucifixion, resurrection and ascension.

It also admits, including the Prologue, of division into *seven* parts (*cf.* Garvie): (i.) Luke 1 and 2,

the annunciation, the birth and childhood of the Baptist and of the Lord; (ii.) Luke 3: 1 - 4: 13, early preaching of the Baptist, and the Baptism and Temptation of the Lord; (iii.) Luke 4: 14 - 9: 50, the Lord's Galilean ministry; (iv.) Luke 9: 51 - 18: 30, His ministry in Galilee and Perea; (v.) Luke 18: 31 - 21: 38, closing Judean ministry, including the Prophecy on Olivet; (vi.) Luke 22 and 23, the last supper, trial and death; (vii.) Luke 24, the resurrection and ascension. Godet would make the fourth of these end at 19: 28, and the fifth begin, accordingly, with Luke 19: 29 (so R. G. Moulton, "Modern Readers' Bible").

Renan's praise of this Gospel as "the most beautiful book in the world" ("The Gospels," p. 283) has often been reproduced. As Westcott says, the "narrative begins with hymns and thanksgivings, and ends with blessings and praises." It is the Gospel which has the fullest details of the Lord's life on earth: often circumstantially informing us (when the first Gospel does not) the occasion upon which He spoke the words recorded (*e.g.*, "the Lord's Prayer"). Most readers are struck with the frequency of the mention of Prayer (Luke 3: 21, Luke 6: 12, Luke 9: 18, 29; Luke 10: 2, Luke 11: 13, Luke 24: 49), as also of the Holy Spirit (Luke 1: 41, 67; Luke 2: 25, 27; Luke 4: 10, 14, 18; Luke 10: 21, Luke 11: 13, Luke 24: 49). For other links with John's Gospel, like the last named, as in Luke 9: 51, Luke 11: 42, Luke 12: 21, Luke 22: 26 *f.*, see Harnack, "Luke the Physician," p. 224 *ff.* Readers of Bernard's "Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament" (pp. 42-44) will know of the distinction made between Luke and Matthew and Mark, that while these set forth the kingdom with reference rather to the past and present respectively, this Gospel views it largely in the light of the future.

"Christ," says Canon Wilson, "is seen here as the teacher of *individual* souls" ("Studies," etc., p. 66); but that the same writer goes too far in stating that the parables here have no bearing on the Kingdom (p. 67) will be shown in notes below.

Being the Gospel of the "Son of Man," it is characterised, as the Expositor remarks, by many specially *human* traits, such as the development of the Lord's mind and body. Differences in character are portrayed, as Herod's curiosity and Pilate's indecision. Dante has spoken of the writer as "the scribe of the gentleness of Christ," his tenderness comes out in sympathy with women and children (Luke 7: 12, Luke 9: 38, 42; Luke 23: 28 *f.*), as well as with the poor. The expository literature upon it is exceedingly rich, and this Gospel has always been a much used instrument in the hands of preachers.

## § 2.

2 Three questions arise in connection with study of any Book of the Bible: (i.) as to the authorship and the materials ("sources") used by the writer, to which those engaged in the higher internal criticism address their inquiries; (ii.) as to the authority attaching to the Book, which is concerned with inspiration, and also with interpretation; (iii.) as to its genuine text, which is the inquiry of textual, external criticism (*cf.* Barry, p. 28). To each of these topics some remarks will be devoted, as introductory to such study of the Gospel.

First, as to the *authorship* of the third of the Gospels, which, like the rest, is anonymous. This has been traditionally ascribed to LUKE; in the manuscript copies that have come down to us, the shortest form of title, "according to Luke," is borne by the two oldest, the so-called "Sinaitic" (A) and "Vatican" (B). The Apostle Paul names in his Epistles, as a close companion in his labours, a *Luke*, described by him as "the beloved physician" (Col. 4: 14). Comparison of the Preface to the Gospel with the introductory words of the "Acts of the Apostles" — also traditionally connected with the name of the same writer — in which (Luke 1: 1) reference is made to a "former treatise," seems to determine the authorship without dispute, for, although the later book does not name its writer, the common style

and dedication support the belief that these two books were produced by one and the same person, each of them affording indication that he was a *physician*.

It was not until the last century that the traditional view was questioned, as by De Wette and Baur of a past generation, and by Jülicher amongst living scholars, who have contended that the writer of the Acts could not have been the Luke intimate with Paul (Col., *ibid.*, Philem. 24, 2 Tim. 4: 11), because of the alleged contrast between the Apostle's own account in his Epistles of his attitude towards the Jewish party and the way in which that is presented in Acts 15, alongside of the fact, practically acknowledged by all, that the two books were from the same hand (see Bp. Hervey, Lect. 4, on "The Authenticity," etc.). The traditional view, however, has within the last few years received the unhesitating support of Harnack; of old it would seem never to have been doubted. The Muratorian Fragment (*circ.* 170 A.D.) calls Luke the writer of this Gospel, and a "*Medicus*"; Irenaeus (*circ.* 180), in his treatise against Heresies, iii. 1, says that "Luke, Paul's companion, recorded in a book the gospel preached by him"; and Tertullian (*circ.* 200), in his treatise against Marcion, iv. 2 and 5, speaks of Luke as author. So also the contemporary Clement of Alexandria.

The name Lucas (Lucanus) is not to be confounded with Lucius (Acts 13: 1). Eusebius ("Ecclesiastical History," iii. 4) describes our Evangelist as by birth, "of those from Antioch" (*cf.* Jerome, "Life"); but see Westcott, "Introduction to Study of Gospels," p. 233, note. Eusebius' words may mean only that Luke had a family connection with that city; so Ramsay ("St. Paul the Traveller," p. 389), who supports Renan's suggestion that he was a native of Philippi, and regards the Evangelist as having been the "man of Macedonia," of Paul's vision, comparing this with Paul's previous vision as to Ananias, and Peter's as to Cornelius. Harnack, however, favours the older view that he was an Antiochene, and thus was familiar with the origin of the name "Christian" ("Expansion," vol. i., p. 347, note).

Titus, as not being mentioned in the Acts, some have supposed was a near relative of Luke. *cf.* 2 Cor. 12: 18 (τόν, his).

Beza's M S. (D) in Acts 11: 28 has "When we were assembled"; but, from the text represented by most MSS., the Apostle and the Evangelist seem to have first met at Troas, in 53 A.D., during Paul's second missionary tour. After using "they" in Acts 16: 8, the writer in verse 11 changes to "we"; but in Acts 17: 1, he reverts to "they," which seems to show that Luke was left behind at Philippi (*infra*). Then, in connection with the Apostle's return to Troas, during his third missionary journey, we meet in Acts 20: 5 with "us . . . we"; whilst in Acts 21: 19, the narrative is resumed in the third person; but from Acts 27: 1 *f.* we learn that Luke had rejoined Paul at Caesarea.

The "beloved physician" — described by Wilson as a "layman" (*op. cit.*, p. 83) — and he alone (2 Tim., *ibid.*), remained with the Apostle to the end of so much of Paul's life as is covered by the New Testament. Harnack treats the reference to him there as cold ("Expansion," i., p. 170), which English readers more happily regard as commendatory. He is probably the "true yokefellow" of Phil. 4: 3.

Luke's medical knowledge is disclosed by various passages in our Gospel, as Luke 4: 38, Luke 7: 44, Luke 10: 30, Luke 21: 34. This has been worked out by Hobart ("The Medical Language of St. Luke"), whose book has been turned to account by Harnack. The Evangelist's treatment of cases of demoniacal possession is important in this connection: he does not regard them, according to modern notions, as merely physical disorders.

As Col. 4: 11 is usually understood, Luke was by birth, not (as Roberts and Hahn have thought) a Jew, but a Greek. He may have been a "proselyte," and so have ranked as a Hellenist. Dalman supposes that he did not know Hebrew or Aramaic ("Words of Jesus," p. 32); but see Jerome, "De Vir.

Illust.," ch. 7. Neubauer treats the Evangelist's quotations as derived from an unwritten "Targum" or Aramaic paraphrase (Essay in "Studia Biblica," vol. i., p. 67); whilst Harnack and others have to assume that Luke was not unacquainted with Aramaic, if he was to translate, as they suppose he did, from an Aramaic document for the first part of Acts. His familiarity with Greek is easily recognisable; and for his use of the Septuagint, see Hawkins, "Horae Synopticae"; indeed, his vocabulary is largely drawn from the Apocrypha (Abbott).

From the fourth century, he was thought by some to have been one of the Seventy (chapter 10); but this is now generally discredited. This affords some ground for the belief that he was the unnamed disciple of ch. 24: 18: his withholding the name has significance for readers of juridical training.

Finally, Origen and Jerome believed that this "physician of the soul" was the brother whose praise in the Gospel is through all the churches (*cf.* the Collect for St. Luke's Day with 2 Cor. 8: 18), in the sense that Luke had then already published his Gospel. Although Erasmus reproduced this idea in his Latin translation of the Gospels (1520), it meets now with as little support as does the idea that it is to this Gospel the Apostle refers in 2 Tim. 2: 8; *cf.* Rom. 15: 19; Gal. 2: 2 (see also note 100 below). Another statement of Jerome, that Luke lived to the age of 84 and remained unmarried, Harnack supposes goes back to the third century. The Evangelist's death is variously reported to have been by martyrdom, or peacefully; some saying in Bithynia, others in Boeotia.

W. Kelly has regarded Luke as a *prophet*: see "Exposition of Mark," p. 2. Hippolytus prefixed a quotation of 18: 2-5 by "as the *apostle* and Evangelist says" ("On Antichrist," in Ante-Nicene Christian Library, vol. x., p. 33).

In seeking to determine the *date* of the composition of this Gospel time must be allowed for the attempts made by others of which the Prologue speaks. Followed by the Book of Acts, which does not record Paul's death, the Gospel might seem to have been completed before 64 A.D. (Blass, after Eusebius: by at least 60). So the late Bishop Hervey and Dr. Gloag; whilst Keim puts it at 66; Godet, between 63 and the last-named year. Writers such as Jülicher (p. 336), influenced by the idea that the language of Luke 19: 43 *f.* as to the overthrow of Jerusalem imports composition after the event, would say after 70; and so Zahn, about 75; Plummer and Sanday, 75-80; B. Weiss, Abbott, Ramsay, about 80; McGiffert and Bacon, following Harnack's former opinion (down to 1897: see below), decide for 78-93; Wernle and Moffatt, for *circ.* 90. In the same way it has been argued that Deuteronomy could not have been of Mosaic date, because of the contents of the last chapter: but in either case allowance may be made for editorial accretions or modifications after the original record was put in writing. As to grounds for belief that Luke's Gospel was put forth before the year 70 of the era, see Pullan, in Murray's "Bible Dictionary," p. 487.

The extreme views range between the last decade of the first century and the year 120 (Jülicher), In considering such opinions one must work back from about the year 160, *i.e.*, from the time of Justin Martyr. While not naming our Evangelist, Justin speaks of "the Gospel," a term current in his time for all four records, which make up the "Diatessaron" of his pupil Tatian, an English translation of which may be seen in J. Hamlyn Hill's "The Earliest Life of Christ" (1910). Thirlwall (Introduction to Schleiermacher's "Essay of Luke," p. lxiv. *ff.*) considered that Justin's looseness in quotation (dwelt on by Cassels in "Supernatural Religion") was due to his regarding the New Testament as a commentary on the Books of the Hebrew Canon, which he quoted more carefully (p. lxxiii.). Somewhat earlier was Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, whose date is put by Harnack at 145; by Stanton, at 140; by Abbott, at 115-130. The testimony of this old bishop is of less account because he avowedly preferred oral to written accounts. But in *Marcion*, son of a bishop of Synope in Pontus, who was at Rome about 140

A.D., we have a witness of prime importance, because the substance of a Pauline gospel put forth by him is manifestly drawn from some recension of our third Gospel: see Westcott, on the Canon, chapter iv. Akin to Marcion's doctrinal system was that of his fellow Gnostic Valentinian (*circ.* 130), who, with Basilides, a contemporary heretic, seems also to have been acquainted with the contents of Luke's Gospel. We are thus carried back to the early years of the second century; and then, for the last decade of the first, are met by the question whether Luke had read Josephus' Antiquities (published in the winter of 93-94) because of similarity in the language used by the Evangelist and by the Jewish historian.

Holtzmann, Keim, Hausrath and Burkitt, after Krenkel, hold that Josephus' work was known to Luke, and accordingly date this Gospel after 93 (Clemen: 94 or 95) A.D. Zahn, Sanday, Salmon, Wellhausen, Harnack and Moffatt discredit all this. The words employed by the two, of course contemporaries, were undeniably in common use: each drew from the LXX., and thus sometimes used an identical vocabulary.

Reverting to the yet earlier critical dates, that of "about the year 70" maybe taken as a moderate conjecture, in probably large acceptance. In this the present writer can acquiesce, only so far as it may mark the limit of editorial revision, as to which see Wright, "Composition of the Gospels," p. 117. The process of construction is represented by the more advanced critics as completed later: thus Loisy's date is 90-100: Schmiedel's, 100-110.

The last-named writer (§ 110). after Pflleiderer (*cf.* Bruce, "Kingdom of God," p. 337), finds in this Gospel in its settled form certain opposite tendencies:- Pauline universalism associated with Jewish particularism (Luke 1: 68; Luke 2: 10; Luke 5: 30; Luke 7: 16; Luke 13: 16; Luke 19: 9; Luke 22: 30), referring such to different editorial "working over"; but in the present Exposition these will be found explained as part of the Divine design of which the Evangelist himself was the instrument. The fact is, Luke's Gospel was not intended specially for either Jews (as Matthew's) or for Gentiles (as Mark's), but equally for both. Whatever actual revision there was connects itself with the extended or completed publication, and not the original issue, of the Gospel, which may quite well have been before the year 70, as formerly believed by all later readers. Harnack (*supra*) in his recent book on the Acts in particular finds it difficult to think that Luke in Luke 21: 32 regarded the destruction of the city as past at the time of his writing (E. T., p. 293). He now thinks that a date soon after the year 60 is credible.

3 Theophilus ("Friend of God"), whose name (Origen: "a man whom God loves") may have been given to him at his baptism, and used only among Christians, seems to have been of equestrian rank, and saluted as "most excellent" (κράτιστε, *cf.* our "Right Honourable"), from being a ἡγεμῶν, like Felix (Acts 23: 26) and Festus (Acts 26: 25). He can have been no such fictitious person as Origen supposed, by reason of this very designation. With the Expositor's remarks on the social position of this friend of the Evangelist, compare note on Luke 6: 20.

4 The Gospels called "Synoptic," *i.e.* as together representing the same general view (*cf.* note 3 on Mark), can have been composed under one or other of the following conditions. I. To each Evangelist was separately revealed that which he had to write, independently of the rest (*cf.* note 10 on Mark). Very few Biblical scholars since Greswell have committed themselves to this theory, but it was that of the Expositor himself, and very much the view of Dr. Harvey Goodwin, when writing contemporaneously as Dean of Ely, before becoming Bishop of Carlisle. II. Each Evangelist reduced oral tradition to a written form in the light of his special purpose and in his own way. Such has been the view of English scholars who followed Gieseler: since the early sixties it has been represented by

Westcott, in particular, and by Abbott, Wright and Salmon; in Germany by Zahn, etc. III. Some written record long defunct lies behind all the Gospels in their existing form — the view of Eichhorn and his followers. IV. One of the Gospels is a main source of the rest; the second and the third used one or more additional sources no longer separately extant. During the last preceding generation this has been the view most accepted. The first, the ecclesiastical or "traditional" view, which satisfied most minds from the fifth to the eighteenth century, means that "all the differences between the Gospels were taken as individual variations of a divine type, each variation perfect in its kind" (Nash, pp. 61, 155). The second will be considered here in sections A., B. Whatever is true in the third is generally deemed to be included in the last of the views above stated: these together rely on the notion of *dependence* as governing the development of the Gospel records (sections C. — F.).

Hug, amongst Roman Catholics, was one of the eighteenth century scholars holding that each successive Evangelist used his predecessors. The theory which has given rise to views of dependence may be seen stated in Westcott, "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels," p. 183. There will be found an account of the "supplemental" view, according to which each successive writer *added* something to his predecessor's account: an idea first suggested by Chrysostom. Greswell has left a Dissertation on the subject.

In principle there can be no objection to the belief that writers of the New Testament have drawn upon ordinary sources of information, *e.g.*, Acts 23: 25-30, and from one another: this last seems to have been done by the historical and prophetic writers respectively of the Old Testament. Tacit borrowing is noticeable in *Micah*, from Isaiah (if not *vice versa*); *Jeremiah*, from Hosea, Isaiah and Zephaniah; *Ezekiel*, from Hosea, Zephaniah and Jeremiah; *Joel*, from Jonah; *Haggai*, from Ezekiel; and *Zechariah*, from Isaiah. Girdlestone, referring to this "spiritual communism," remarks that "Inspiration does not imply *originality*" ("The Grammar of Prophecy," p. 10 *f.*). Whilst it may be unnecessary to go so far as to say that "the most simple faith and the keenest investigation are one and the same thing" (Thirlwall), we have certainly apostolic injunctions, on the one hand, to "prove all things" (1 Thess. 5: 21), and, on the other, to be on our guard against "spirits" not of God (1 John 4: 1). If both of these considerations be kept in view, investigation of this subject may be fruitful.

It is the two-fold effect of manifest independence (differences) in combination with apparent use of common sources (agreements) which has given rise to the "Synoptic Problem," for the history of the solution of which see H. Holtzmann, "Introduction to the New Testament," pp. 351-357. The well-selected passage by way of example from Luke 5 (verses 18-26), collated with Mark 2: 3-12, Matt. 9: 2-8, in Green's *Angus* ("Handbook to the Bible," p. 630), may be compared with that, in A.V., used by Rushbrooke ("Synopticon," p. 96). Upon the parenthesis each time, "He said to the sick of the palsy," of which use was made by H. Holtzmann in his earliest work on the subject, see comment of D. Smith (Introduction, p. xiv.).

This problem has been briefly considered in notes 6-12 appended to the "Exposition of Mark." In the present volume we shall start from a general statement of that which is suggested by the phenomena made by a truly devout and esteemed English Biblical student, the late Lord Arthur Hervey, Bishop of Bath and Wells, who in a lecture on the third Gospel expressed himself as follows:-

"The writer seems to have had three sources of information: (1) the *oral* teaching, as we see it in those parts which occur also, word for word, in Matthew or Mark, or both; (2) those living *eye-witnesses* whom he had personally known, and from whose lips he had taken down the various particulars related by him; (3) *written* records which he transcribed or otherwise used in the composition of his own narrative" (p. 99 *f.*). The subject, with special reference to Luke's Prologue

(Luke 1: 1-4), which is unique in the whole Bible, will be taken in the same order as the bishop's statement, in successive sections.

A. The word for "delivered" (παρέδοσαν) in Luke 1: 2 is etymologically connected with that for "tradition" (παράδοσις), which in the plural comes before us in 2 Thess. 2: 15. Such tradition might be either oral or written (*ibid.*); it is with the first that we are concerned at present. It originated with "the Apostle's teaching" (Acts 2: 42), and seems to have continued for about 100 years, as there are words about it attributed to Papias, who lived, it is believed, as late as at least 130 if not 140 A.D. He tells us that Christians of his time preferred "the living voice" to written statements, one reason perhaps for delay in production of our Gospels. "There appears," wrote Thirlwall, "to be no reason for supposing that written documents of any kind entered into the general plan of the Apostles for the diffusion of Christianity" (p. 121), and, as says Bunsen in his "Hippolytus" (i., p. 28), "Nobody was anxious to have a written biography of Him whose return was daily expected." To tradition we owe the names of the respective writers of the Gospels. One saying of our Lord outside their records has been rescued for us by Paul (Acts 20: 35), yet recorded by Luke himself. That this was in currency before the Apostle quoted it, may be seen by his word "remember." Other such sayings, which are credited, are found in Clement (of Rome), chapters ii., xiii., xlv., and Polycarp, chapter ii. (see Harnack, "Sayings of Jesus," pp. 187-190). Fragmentary notes may indeed have been taken by individual hearers of the Apostles' instruction.

Nearly all scholars are agreed that these three Gospels rest ultimately on oral tradition. "The written word marks a time when the first generation of Christians was passing away and the Lord still delayed His coming" (Green's Angus, p. 632). For a considerable time the Apostles laboured together in Jerusalem. But that which here is of chief importance is the Evangelist's reference to catechizing in verse 4; this has been turned to account by Wright (*cf.* Carr in *Expositor*, October, 1907). It must have been very much the instruction that now is given in Bible classes for adults and in Sunday schools or children's services. Timothy would engage in this (1 Tim. 5: 17). See further, notes 9 and 16 below.

As preceding continuous written records, the primitive believers, then, had at their command a fund of material which, through constant repetition of the same things by the same speakers, would "stereotype the words" (Bennett, p. 136). The Synoptic Gospels represent "written records of forms taken by tradition at the end of three diverging lines of development" (*ibid.*); or as Salmon, in his posthumous work (p. 27), says, "The most probable explanation of . . . three histories, so like one another yet so independent, is that we have preserved for us the oral gospel as delivered at three different centres" (Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch). But this explanation of variations from "lapse of memory" (p. 67, etc.) will not do. As another puts it, "The Evangelists were editors, not authors: they reduced the oral apostolic tradition to writing; and therefore it is that their books are entitled, not the Gospel of, but the Gospel *according to* Matthew," etc. (D. Smith, p. xiv). *Cf.* Godet, i. pp. 36-41. That which Hahn held as to Luke, Zahn maintains for Matthew — the belief that none but oral sources were used.

This floating tradition in the *Aramaic* vernacular Westcott and others have conceived was put into *Greek* before being committed to writing. Orr thinks that it was closely followed by Mark, and that the two other Evangelists "borrowed parts of the same tradition which they combined with material drawn from other sources."

Sir John Hawkins ("Horae Synopticae," p. 67) allows for other than documentary sources; and so B. Weiss in his "Life of Christ," i. 81, and "Sources of Luke's Gospel," chapter i.; but in his "Sources of Synoptic Tradition," chapter v., the venerable Berlin scholar seems practically to exclude it.

Whenever doubt may arise between oral and written sources, he would decide for the latter. Various objections to the oral theory are enumerated by Peake. That any substantial record was kept orally is discredited by Burkitt from supposed difficulty in memorising it; but this objection is disposed of by the younger Weiss, who says, "When we see how in the Talmud words of the Rabbins have been preserved for centuries, clearly with the utmost exactitude, we shall not doubt that the Lord's disciples also were able to retain the leading subjects for decades. These men had by far fresher and more practised memory than we children of a paper age. . . . Many people even now who cannot read much make up for it by their retentive memory of what they hear" ("Writings of the New Testament," p. 54). We have, of course, to add to this the all-important words of our Lord in John 14: 26. For Westcott as for Godet (see Introduction in his later French editions), apostolic tradition was the dominant factor. Besides Westcott ("Introduction to the Study of the Gospels"), reference may be made to Abbott, "The Common Tradition," Introduction, p. vi., Moffatt, Introduction, pp. 180-182, and Wright, "Synopsis of Gospels in Greek," Introduction, p. x. (*cf.* note 11 on Mark).

Before proceeding further, it may be convenient for the reader to be furnished with a list of passages *altogether* peculiar to Luke, which is transcribed from Wernle, "The Synoptic Question," p. 92:-

Luke 1, Luke 2; Luke 3: 10-14, 23-38; Luke 5: 4-9; Luke 7: 11-17, 36-50; Luke 8: 1-3; Luke 9: 51-56; Luke 10: 17-20, 25-37, 38-42; Luke 11: 5-8, 27-28; Luke 12: 13-21, 35-37, 47-49, 54-56; Luke 13: 1-5, 6-9, 10-17, 31-33; Luke 14: 1-6, 7-14, 28-33; Luke 15: 11-32; Luke 16: 1-12, 14-15, 19-31; Luke 17: 7-10, 11-19; Luke 18: 1-8, 9-14; Luke 19: 2-10, 41-44; Luke 22: 28-38; Luke 23: 6-12, 27-31, 39-43; Luke 24: 13-35, 36-53. Other portions of "The Single Tradition of Luke" (as in Luke 3, verses 1-2, 4-6, 15-16, 18-20) would be found in Rushbrooke's third appendix.

Difficulty has arisen among critics in arriving at agreement as to the source of the special passages, whether oral or written. Wernle himself, amongst others, treats them as derivable from that writer's *one* written "special source" supposed to have been used by Luke.

B. The Apostle Paul, converted, whether, as Harnack thinks, not more than a year, or as Ramsay, three years after the Crucifixion. has made use of the aid of "eye-witnesses" with reference to the death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord: 1 Cor. 15: 3, "Also I received," with which *cf.* "Also ye" in verse 1, and verse 23 with note 540 below. In 1 Cor. 15 there is no question of any appeal made to a written document (*cf.* Heb. 2: 3), in an epistle of which some still hold that Paul was the writer.

Besides Apostles (for John, see below) as eye-witnesses in general, who would be the originators of tradition dealt with in section A, there must have been private persons (see Acts 1: 21 *f.*) who supplied the Evangelist with information in answer to his inquiries (*cf.* note 7 below). The birth narrative could have been obtained from the Lord's mother. Her reticence as to His childhood has been recorded by Luke (Luke 2: 51): it has a bearing on her probably special disclosures to this Evangelist (Macalpine, p. 20).

For the Galilean and Perea records in particular there would be the evidence available of other women from that region; and for the respective relations of the Baptist and of our Lord to the court of Herod, that of Joanna (Luke 3: 1, Luke 8: 3, Luke 9: 7-9, Luke 13: 31, Luke 23: 7-12).

Luke was resident for two years in the house of Philip the Evangelist (Acts 21: 8; *cf.* Harnack, "Luke the Physician", p. 155 *ff.*), through whom he may have gleaned much that is recorded in chapters 9 - 18. Again, he may have obtained from such as Nicodemus details as to the Passion of our Lord (Barnes). We may also suppose that Luke had considerable intercourse with John the son of Zebedee; for affinity between his Gospel and the Fourth, see already note 1.

C. Reverting to what has been introduced at the beginning of the present note as to critical opinion going back to the last quarter of the eighteenth century, it is necessary to recall such views as Lessing's that common *written* material underlies all the Synoptics; and Eichhorn's, that an Aramaic original was used in the composition of the three existing Gospels, but that none of them saw the others' work. Unremitting study of the subject by many scholars during the last century has led to the now dominant conclusion: most critics find various strata or layers in all, indicating different stages of development in the form that the Synoptics have respectively taken (J. Weiss, p. 39 *f.*), resulting in part from inter-dependence (with this *cf.* Godet's conservative view, i., pp. 42-48, 53-71). And so of Luke's Gospel, that it depends primarily on one or other of its predecessors. We may, then, first consider the order in which these Gospels were written.

In the early Curetonian Syriac version, Luke's is placed last of the four Gospels, probably because it was the latest to be translated into Syriac. In the Western MSS. existing when Jerome began his study of the New Testament, as in the recently discovered Akhmîm Codex now at Detroit, U.S.A., although placed third (as already in the Muratorian Fragment), it follows John, and is before Mark. The order in which readers of the English Bible know it is that assigned to it by Origen, the great Christian scholar of the third century, in agreement with the majority of MSS. and versions that have come down to us. The view taken by some Germans in the middle of the last century that it was the first written is now much discredited. Indeed, Bishop Westcott's arrangement, 1 Mark, 2 Luke, 3 Matthew, has found support in Germany, as by Pfleiderer. But writers of such a different type as Professor Schmidt in America and Professor Orr in Great Britain dispute the priority of Mark to Matthew.

The question as yet remains, had the writer of our third Gospel seen the one going under the name "Matthew." The answer of Hug was that Luke made use of it, and the Roman Catholic professor was followed in this by Greswell, who held that Luke must have seen Matthew's record. A few writers, such as E. Holtzmann, Wendt, and Allen, think that he used it to some extent. The esteemed Roman Catholic professor Schanz adheres to the ancient view that Luke's Gospel was to a large extent derived from both Matthew and Mark.

But the view of most moderns, amongst them Ewald, Meyer, B. Weiss, and now Harnack ("Sayings," p. 112), is that the independence of Luke and of the present "Matthew" was established by Weisse (1838), after the great English scholar Thirlwall (Introduction to Schleiermacher's Essay) in 1825 had expressed the belief that neither of them could have known the other's account of the Infancy and the Resurrection. Current criticism favours the theory that it is the use by Luke of a document lying behind our Matthew which explains a considerable amount of matter being common to these two Gospels alone. This point will be discussed in section E. below.

With regard to the question whether Luke had seen Mark's Gospel, critical opinion, to a large extent, is very different. This must now engage attention.

D. Analytical comparison of Luke's Gospel with that attributed to Mark has revealed, especially in chapters 4 - 9 of the third Gospel, a similarity so close in order and wording in both Matthew and Luke to the parallel record in our second Gospel, as to lead many scholars to the conclusion that Mark's Gospel was used by each, with the necessary corollary, in keeping with the now prevalent opinion recorded in section C., that the shortest of the Synoptic Gospels was the one first written. This is a complete reversal of the view taken by Griesbach, Schleiermacher, Baur, Strauss, and Davidson, for whom the order was 1 Matthew, 2 Luke, 3 Mark (*cf.* note 2 in volume on Mark). Such are the vagaries of criticism previously illustrated by the paraded *late* date, as was supposed, of Deuteronomy,

which has given place to the priority, maintained with no less dogmatism, of that book to the so-called "Priestly Code." The now supposed priority of Mark to Matthew underlies the book entitled "The Synoptic Question (Problem)," by Wernle, and the more recent works of Harnack, which may be consulted in English translations, as also in the latest writings of Professor Bernhard Weiss, which have been reviewed in the German "Journal of Theological Literature" by Dr. Harnack.

The principal, more or less common, results worked out by these three scholars, in particular by Weiss in his "Sources of Luke's Gospel," will be set out in the present section, which is concerned with so much of the hypothesis now most in favour respecting the composition of the first and the *third* Gospel as pertains to the supposed relation between Luke's record and that of *Mark*.

The "common tradition of the Synoptic Gospels" (*cf.* section A.) is contained in the passages of Luke (as of Matthew) parallel to Mark, which are shown in Rushbrooke's "Synopticon," pp. 1-131, and is there exhibited by the aid of red type. The strict parallels (see margin of text of Exposition, *passim*) begin with Luke 3: 1 and end at 24: 11 of our Gospel. Examination of this material has shown that Luke has reproduced nearly three-fourths of Mark in much the same order (Harnack's "Luke the Physician," p. 87); this phenomenon is specially noticeable as far as chapter 9 of the third Gospel. A sample was given by Abbott thirty years ago in the "Encyclopaedia Britannica," which reappears in the introduction to the "Synopticon" (Matt. 23: 21-42: Mark 12: 1-11; Luke 20: 9-17); another may be seen in Green's edition of Angus's "Handbook to the Bible" (p. 630 *f.*; Matt. 9: 28; Mark 2: 3-12; Luke 5: 18-26). The following passages of Mark alone seem to have no equivalent in our Evangelist (*cf.* Wernle "Synoptic Question," pp. 3-40): — Mark 4: 26-29, 33 *f.*; Mark 6: 1-6, 45-56; 7 throughout; Mark 8: 1-9; Mark 10: 35-40; Mark 13: 20-23; Mark 15: 16-20 (here, however, *cf.* Luke 23: 11). Parts of these also absent from the Gospel of "Matthew" have been put in bold type in the "Exposition of Mark."

Incidents (the "matters," πράγματα, of verse 1 of the Prologue; *cf.* the "deed" of 24: 19), as distinct from the words of our Lord (see next section), make up a little over half of Luke's Gospel (Wernle states it as 52 per cent., p. 253), which may be verified by the aid of the Cambridge "Verba Christi" Testament. This is deemed the Marcan element in his record.

The idea that Luke (as "Matthew") made use of Mark's Gospel in an earlier form (the "*Ur-Markus*" or "Primitive Mark" of earlier criticism [*cf.* Barnes, p. 25; Moffatt, pp. 191 *ff.*]), had already been abandoned by its chief advocate, H. Holtzmann, before the recent books of Harnack and B. Weiss appeared. These writers agree in the belief that Mark's Gospel lay before the other Evangelists in turn in the same form as that in which his Gospel has come down to us. The following is a sample of the fanciful treatment of the subject in the hands of some critics: "The endeavour of Luke, as of Matthew, was to give renewed recognition to the Gospel of Mark by an enlarged and improved edition *in such a way as Mark himself would have freshened up his work in any second edition*" (J. Weiss, p. 36; *cf.* Harnack, "Luke the Physician," p. 158). Such is the fruit of a system from which Divine design is excluded. The following remark of an English writer is appropriate: "If Luke and Matthew made use of a written Mark, the book must have been frequently copied and widely circulated immediately after it was written. And yet, according to the now current theory, only one copy of St. Mark's Gospel existed at the time of his death and probably for many years afterwards" (Wright's introduction to "Gospel of St. Luke in Greek," p. 15)!

Salmon has left behind his matured opinion that Luke was not acquainted with Mark as a written document, but only with those portions of it which he had heard orally recited at Antioch (p. 26), before he became Paul's companion (p. 38). As far as Luke's Gospel is concerned, we may take into

account the intimacy between these two Evangelists. They may have conferred together on their joint labours, Luke being partly influenced by Mark's chronological arrangement (*cf.* note 12 below, and "Exposition of Mark," p. 3, and note 4 there), from his colleague's close connection with a prominent eye-witness (*cf.* "Exposition of Mark," pp. 1 and 2).

Prof. Schmidt in America, and Prof. Orr of Glasgow ("The Resurrection," pp. 63-72), are amongst writers of repute who repudiate the *Marcan* part of the documentary hypothesis, which Burkitt and Allen in this country fondly imagine to be "among the most assured results" of investigation of the Synoptic problem. Orr has written, "None of the critics defending *dependence* are able to do more than elbow out the difficulties created by the phenomena set out in Alford's 'Prolegomena.'" For the view of Thirlwall and De Wette, see note 6d below.

As it is, those who contend that Luke was dependent on Mark for his *narrative* portion have, on their own principles, to account for the large amount of matter, chiefly of course *sayings*, which is common to the first and the third Gospels, but without any equivalent in Mark. This presents itself for consideration in the section which immediately follows.

*E.* In an earlier section was foreshadowed that portion of the theory now in favour which, in particular, is supplementary to the portion of it dealt with in section D. Matthew and Luke also often agree closely when they do not follow Mark, that is, they have the same material within the limits of our second Gospel, which, nevertheless, has nothing corresponding to their parallels *inter se*. But neither Luke nor Matthew could have borrowed from the other, because the literary peculiarities of each remain the same as when following Mark (see section C. above).

The matter common only to Matthew and Luke is found to be a record chiefly of the Lord's *sayings*: see *λόγων*, verse 4 of the Prologue, R.V. marg. "words," and Luke 24: 19, where "things" is divisible between "deed" and "word," for which last *cf.* John 17: 8. The two are combined again in Acts 1: 1, "to *do* and to *teach*." The deeds of our Lord, as has been seen, are supposed to be accounted for by the *Marcan* material in Luke (section D.); for the sayings, Weisse propounded a theory, that in the composition of the Gospel of Matthew use was made of another document, which H. Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, B. Weiss, Harnack, etc., think Luke also has turned to account, each compiler being independent of the other in the process. This further phenomenon has already been introduced in the last paragraph of note 10 on Mark (p. 238). It is discussed in, amongst recent books, Hawkins' "Horae Synopticae," pp. 88 *ff.*; Wernle, "Synoptic Question," pp. 80-91, 224-233; Wellhausen, "Introduction," pp. 65-68; Harnack, "Sayings," and B. Weiss, "Luke's Gospel," chapter 2; "Sources of Synoptic Tradition," chapters 1, 2: and Moffatt, "Introduction," pp. 194 *ff.*

The critics' belief was suggested by a statement preserved by Eusebius, of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis (see note 1), which acquires importance for the study of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Papias speaks of a collection made by Matthew of *Logia* (λόγια) of our Lord in "the Hebrew dialect." From the use of this by the compiler of our first Gospel the name under which that goes is supposed to have been derived. Harnack, whilst himself of opinion (pp. 115, 171) that it is probable that this collection, which with B. Weiss he conceives lay *primarily* behind Luke's Gospel, was (as Salmon supposed) identically the same as that spoken of by Papias, thinks that it is a point which "can neither be proved nor disproved" ("Journal of Theological Literature," 1907. No. 5, p. 13 *ff.*). Weiss regards the compiler of the *Logia* as an eyewitness. To this hypothetical document the designation of "Q" has been given, as first letter of the German word for "source" (*Quelle*).

This "double tradition" of Matthew and Luke may be gathered from the passages set out in Rushbrooke's first appendix, pp. 134-170, where the material common to these two Evangelists is

shown in capitals. The passages asterisked in the list of these below are considered by Wernle (§ 7) to be in historical order. The Matthew parallels (see again margin of Exposition) may be ascertained from reference Bibles, such as the Cambridge "Interlinear" or Bagster's. Cf. Hawkins, p. 107 ff.

Luke 1: 26-31, 34 f.; Luke 2: 39; Luke 3: 7-9, 17, 23-25, 31-34; Luke 4: 3-13; Luke 6: 20-23, 25, 27-49; Luke 7: 1-3, 6-10, 18-35; Luke 9: 57-60; \*Luke 10: 1-16, 21-24; Luke 11: 1-4, \*9-15, 19 f., 23-26, 29-32, \*34-44 [47-50]; \*Luke 12: 2-9, 22-34, 39-46, 51-59; Luke 13: 20 f., 23-29, \*34 f.; Luke 14: 1-6, 11, \*13-24, 26 f., 34 f.; Luke 15: 3-7; Luke 16: 13, 16 f.; Luke 17: 1, 3-6, \*23 f., 26 f., 33-37; \*Luke 19: 11-28; Luke 20: 18; Luke 22: 28-30.

It will be observed that in chapters 5, 18, 21, 23 f. nothing from "Q" is found noticeable. That document is thought to begin to be clearly discernible in the record of John's Baptism. According to Wernle's analysis, about 48 per cent. of our Gospel consists of discourses.

The text of "Q" as conceived by B. Weiss appears in chapter i. of his critical commentary. Harnack similarly furnishes a translation of it according to his own analysis. Weiss has always contended that it extends to narrative also; until lately his view has been supported by very few writers; but Harnack now finds in "Q" seven narratives, two of them miracles of healing (p. 163). Orr also has recently expressed his agreement with Weiss on this point. Cf. Schmidt, pp. 219 f., 227 f.

It is commonly believed that "Q" was written originally in Aramaic, the colloquial dialect (Wellhausen, p. 14, etc.), in which form Pfleiderer and Nestle think that it was used by both Evangelists; but Abbot, Resch, Briggs, and the Jewish scholar Dr. Gaster are more probably right (such also was the opinion of Delitzsch in his later years) in holding that Hebrew was the language of its composition. Aramaic does not seem to have been used in Palestine for *literature* so early.

The late Bishop Goodwin gave as his judgment in the sixties that "the common written materials used by the Evangelists were not originally in Greek, but were translated into Greek by different hands" (p. xxxii.). It is clear that some record in Greek would early be needed by the Greek-speaking believers of the Dispersion, when it is remembered that there are said to have been no less than three hundred synagogues for the Hellenists (cf. Acts 6) at Jerusalem alone. Although the question of variations arising from different translations (see Jülicher, p. 359) may present itself, as Harnack says (p. 92), in places like Luke 15: 4, "wilderness," compared with Matthew 18: 12, "mountains," yet this distinguished scholar supports in the main the view of Weiss, that one and the same Greek version of "Q" was used by Matthew and Luke, because their verbal agreements in this element of each Gospel are generally so close.

Wellhausen (pp. 73-89) assigns priority in time to Mark. But Weiss, dating "Q" in the year 67, thinks it earlier than Mark's record (so Harnack, p. 193 f.; cf. Sanday "Life of Christ in Recent Research," p. 157). From the fact that it includes no account of the Lord's death, etc., Salmon (p. 247) and Ramsay have revived a suggestion of Paley, the celebrated writer on evidences, that some record was kept in Christ's lifetime; as to this, Loisy ("Gospel Studies," p. 11) remarks that the Twelve were "more accustomed to the fisherman's rod than to the pen of a scribe"; but this would be inapplicable to Matthew, who, moreover, would know both Greek and Aramaic (Zahn). As far as concerns Greek, knowledge of that language must, it seems, be credited to Philip and Andrew (John 12: 20 f.) as well as to Matthew. A reason given by some who discredit Paley's idea is, that the vivid expectation which the disciples had of the speedy "completion of the age" would keep them from so recording the Lord's utterances (cf. Westcott Introduction, etc., p. 163). It has to be remembered, however, that the Lord's words about this came only at the end of His ministry. Whatever view be adopted, it must of course take into account the bearing of His words in John 14: 26. There can be little doubt that the prevalent

impression is that any record was oral only.

Godet (pp. 48-53), whilst admitting use of documents, questioned their being common to the different Evangelists, and Zahn does not support the view that any such document as "Q" was a dominant factor in the composition of Matthew and Luke, whilst, from what has been said in section A. of Salmon's judgment, the reader will be able to appreciate the Dublin scholar's opinion already recorded, that, although he joins others in thinking that Luke was dependent on "Q," our Evangelist obtained his knowledge of it, not by study of any document, but by having heard it read at the weekly gatherings of the Assembly in Antioch. A "Synoptic Table," according to the Two-source Theory, would be found in Holtzmann, Introduction, pp. 376-382. Although Schmidt, describing his own opinion as "in harmony with early tradition," holds that "the attempt to solve these problems by the so-called *two-source theory* cannot be regarded as successful" (p. 228 *f.*). Similarly Bartlet in "Oxford Studies," Burkitt ("Gospel History," p. 37), and Allen (Preface to St. Matthew, 7), following B. Holtzmann, as already stated, accept the theory as established before the recent works of Harnack and Weiss appeared. Moreover, currency has been given to it in this country by the Angus-Green popular "Handbook" which is put forth by the Religious Tract Society, so that it is no longer confined to the fraternity of the learned.

When material from the sources dealt with in the last two sections has been discriminated in Luke's Gospel, there is still a residue of its contents to be accounted for, which must be considered in the next section.

F. Parts of Luke remain discernible in every chapter of his Gospel, so as to amount to more than one half of it, which by modern critics are attributed to some *special* source or sources at his command (*cf.* Moffat, pp. 266 *ff.* and section B. above). Weiss ("Sources of Luke's Gospel," chapter iv.) — with whom Harnack essentially agrees — assigns these to a single source, which he has designated "L," and Bartlet "S" (Sondergut of Wernle). Whether there is more than one such source, Harnack describes as at present "the most important problem in Synoptic criticism."

"L" ("S") is rich in parables, such as that of the Good Samaritan and the parable of the Prodigal Son so-called. It is in passages so classified that the epithet "the Lord" occurs, applied characteristically in this Gospel to Christ, that we have the birth and childhood narratives, the genealogy, the version of the great discourse said to have been delivered on a "plateau," the raising to life of the young man of Nain, the healing of the Samaritan amongst the lepers, the parable of the Pounds, and our Evangelist's record of the Last Supper, the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension. In Weiss's treatment of this part of his analysis ("Sources of Synoptic Tradition," chapter iii.), writes Harnack, "that veteran has no predecessors." In chapter iv. of his treatise, "L" is regarded as of Judean, *i.e.*, strictly Hebrew-Christian origin, and a purely *written* source, so likewise Sanday, in his academical lecture (*Expository Times*, December, 1908). Wright finds three sources ("Luke's Gospel in Greek," p. vii. *f.*). Wernle discusses "L" in his "Synoptic Question," pp. 91-107 (*cf.* the English translation of his popular booklet, pp. 143-153).

The passages representing Abbott's "Single Tradition of Luke," as arranged by Rushbrooke, will be found in the "Synopticon," pp. 198-234. These, beginning with the first and ending with the last verse of the Gospel are:

Luke 1 and 2 throughout; Luke 3: 1-2, 4-6, 10-16, 18-20, 23-38; Luke 4: 14-30; Luke 5: 1-10, 12, 17-19, 39; Luke 6: 11 *f.*, 19, 24-26, 37 *f.*; Luke 7: 1-7, 10-21, 29 *f.*, 36-50; Luke 8: 1-3; Luke 9: 6, 30-32, 36, 43-46, 48, 51-56, 61 *f.*; Luke 10: 1-5, 7-11, 17-21, 29-42; Luke 11: 1, 5-8, 12, 21 *f.*, 27-29, 33, 36-41, 44-46, 53 *f.*; Luke 12: 1, 13-21, 32-38, 41, 47-58; Luke 13: 1-17, 22-27, 31-33; Luke 14: 1-33;

Luke 16: 1-31; Luke 17: 5-22, 25, 28-30, 32, 37; Luke 18: 1-14, 34, 43; Luke 19: 1-28, 37-44, 47 f.; Luke 20: 20, 26, 34-36, 38; Luke 21: 12-15, 18-26, 28, 34-38; Luke 22: 15 f., 23 f., 27-41, 43 f., 48 f., 51-53, 59-61, 63, 65-68; Luke 23: 1 f., 4-19, 22-25, 27-32, 34 f., 39-46, 48-51, 53-56; Luke 24: 3-53.

*Cf.* the "Register" of B. Weiss in his "Sources of Luke's Gospel," pp. 10-12, and the margin of the text in the "Commentary on Luke," by J. Weiss ("Writings of the New Testament"), where "M" stands for Mark, "Q" for the collection of sayings, "S" for his father's "L."

The younger Weiss, after Pfleiderer and Wernle, regards "S" ("L") as an enlarged edition of "Q," applying this to "special" matter of either Matthew or Luke; but see Harnack's strictures in "Sayings," p. 185, note. Bartlet thinks that the "Q" element in Luke came to him already in "L" ("Oxford Studies," p. 360), and that this is largely parallel with Mark, where Luke's Gospel is (p. 361). Stanton likewise makes much of "L."

Harnack supposes, after Dr. Rendel Harris, that there was a written document entitled "Words of the Lord Jesus" (see Acts 20: 35), which he inclines to identify with the *Logia*.

Bishop Hervey and Dr. Sanday agree with German critics in the belief that there was an Aramaic written source of chapters 1, 2, the Oxford scholar remarking that "for a Greek like Luke there must have been many technical points" in the topics concerned (*loc. cit.*, p. 112). *Contra*, Ramsay.

Zahn (p. 104 of German edition) repudiates the idea of some critics (see Burkitt) that the canticles were simply composed by Luke himself.

B. Weiss believes that just when Luke had no chronological indication such as Mark often otherwise afforded him, our Evangelist arranged his "special" materials according to his own sole judgment. W. Kelly would have said, more happily: Luke in that, as in all else, was Divinely guided, with a moral design. See in particular his "God's Inspiration of the Scriptures," p. 105 f.

G. A succinct account having thus been given of the development to the present time of the "Synoptic Problem," a few words may be added by way of summary and appraisal of critical results. We have found that the hypothesis now prominently before students of the Gospels assumes the existence of at least two, most scholars think three, main sources of "Luke." Amongst indications of the synoptist's use in general of various sources is that afforded by what are deemed duplicate records (Weiss, "Sources of Luke's Gospel," p. 119); that is, two records of the same incident or discourse noticeable in Matthew, and even in Mark, in regard to which our Evangelist is believed, like John, to have exercised something like modern "criticism," at least discrimination: as to these "doublets" so-called, see Hawkins, pp. 80-107, if not Wernle, pp. 99-101. Luke 4: 16-30 might be compared with Mark 6: 1-6, or Luke 15: 4-7 with Matt. 18: 12-14: see Bennett, p. 141, Hawkins, *loc.cit.*, or Wernle, p.99 ff. Some, as H. Holtzmann (followed by Wernle), find "doublets" even in Luke, *e.g.*, the mission discourse in Luke 11 compared with that in Luke 10; 19: 26 with Luke 8: 18; Luke 21: 14 with Luke 12: 11. Such writers discredit the supposition that the Lord spoke or acted in the same or a similar way at different times, in diverse connections, with distinct purposes; but see Godet, l., p. 69.

Readers trained in evidence dealt with in English courts of justice, when they take up critical treatises by German theologians, are struck with the slender amount of *evidence* for their theories that satisfies these writers. *Cf.* Letter of the late Lord Chancellor Hatherley to the present Bishop of Durham (booklet of "Thoughts on the Resurrection"), and the weakness of the *reasoning* upon such evidence as they adduce. Hypotheses, each in turn "assured," supplant one another in rapid succession. Such has been the history of these literary investigations. Blass might well speak of "scientific"

theology so-called as "that untrustworthy guide of laymen" ("Philology of the Gospels," p. 35).

Use of earlier by later writers is suggested by agreements, and these "the documentary hypothesis" can account for, as Wright has owned ("Luke's Gospel in Greek," p. x.). But it is differences which most test the capacity of the inquirer. Divergences, as the same English writer further remarks, are not accounted for by the dominant critical theory. "The oral hypothesis rightly understood accounts for both" (*ibid.*). So, already, Godet, i., p. 70. Augustine may well be followed in his belief that a fusion of the two elements affords the best solution of an undeniably difficult problem.

4a None of the narratives referred to in the text, other than the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, both of which the Expositor excludes, have survived, at least in their integrity, as applicable to the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" (supposed by Lessing to be common source of the three Synoptics), and the "Gospel according to the Egyptians," to which latter the recently-discovered Oxyrhynchus fragments of *Logia* may have borne some relation. The Gospels commonly called "Apocryphal" were considerably later productions (*Cf.* Godet, vol. i., p. 56).

5 Origen, in his first Homily on Luke, says that such compilers did but attempt that which the canonical Gospels achieved. Those others worked "without the grace of the Holy Spirit." The word *επεχείρησαν*, rendered "undertaken," is the same as is used by the Evangelist in Acts 19: 13, of the Jewish exorcists.

5a As regards the word *πράγματα* rendered "matters," *cf.* its use in Acts 5: 4, where "thing" is equivalent to "action." Reference has already been made to the use of *λόγος* in the same connection (verse 4) and to like conjunction of *act* and *word* in 24: 19, and Acts 1: 1.

5b The word *πεπληροφορημένων*, which has been rendered "fully believed," as by Olshausen, Meyer, etc., Jerome (whom Godet, p. 58, Bishop Lightfoot and Blass follow), took as "fulfilled" (R.V. text) "come to pass." Orr would translate it "fully established" (R.V. marg.). *Cf.* its use in 2 Tim. 4: 5, 17, as rendered in R.V.

6 The subject of Authority, the second mentioned in note 2, goes to the heart of burning questions of religion at the present day. Already fifty years ago Dean Goodwin wrote: "The *inspiration* controversy has ceased to be the property of the learned." In Germany, some representatives of the theological faculties of the Universities have been giving what in England would be described as "University extension" lectures to audiences of such as Prof. Harnack would describe as "half-educated" people; and this with the idea of saving the position from pastors of the type of Frenssen and Kalthoff, if not from men of the calibre of Haeckel, alike deemed to poach on the preserves of the "scientific" theologians, who little regard "the man in the street." The pronouncements of such "pastors" are reproduced in this country through English translations circulated by the Rationalist Association for popular reading; so that the question is pressed on public attention.

Our English philosopher, Locke, wrote that "every one has to decide for himself what is REVELATION, and believe accordingly." The Apostle Paul, "that if any one thought himself a prophet or 'spiritual' (*πνευματικός*) he was to recognise the Apostle's words as from God" (1 Cor. 14: 37); and he evidently assumed that the persons whom he had in mind possessed some Divine afflatus, such as resided in the Ante-Nicene Church down to the time of Tertullian.

"*Revelation*," writes Stalker, "took place through the institutions, events, personages of a divine history" (p. 19). "*Inspiration* was the power of interpreting through history, putting its meaning into words" (*ibid.*). *Cf.* Bishop Boyd Carpenter's statement in pp. 89, 96, of his perhaps widely circulated

little book, published by Dent. The *bête noire* is what goes under the name of "verbal" inspiration, a leading writer upon which eighty years ago was the very able Alexander Carson. He, in "Remarks on Dr. J. Pye Smith's Theory of Inspiration" (1827), with reference to 2 Tim. 3: 16, asks, "What is a writing but *words written*?" (p. 32). Upon the disputed translation of that classical passage, Carson observes, "The substantive verb is naturally to be understood to each of the adjectives. What reason can be given for giving it to one and withholding it from the other?" *Cf.*, in defence of the A.V., W. Kelly's treatment of the same passage in his "Exposition of the Epistle," and also his "God's Inspiration of the Scriptures," pp. 25, 38 and 598 *f.*, as well as his exposition of 1 Cor. 2: 10-16, in the last-mentioned volume (pp. 22-25). There is no excuse for referring (as does Bousset) the Apostle's statement in 1 Cor. to the ecstatic language of tongues; the word λαλεῖν (verse 13) Paul used in Rom. 7: 1 definitely of the language of a letter.

All depends upon what is exactly meant by the phrase "verbal" ("literal") inspiration. In modern times it seems to have had its roots in Calvin's words "composed under the dictation of the Holy Spirit" ("Institutes," iv. 8, 6), and his speaking of the New Testament writers as "amanuenses of the Holy Spirit" (*ibid.*, iv. 8, 9), which his seventeenth century followers expanded, unhappily, into what has since been described as "mechanical inspiration" (Synod of Geneva, 1675).

Luther, rightly enough, gave no countenance to this last view. He doubtless, by his free treatment of Scripture, gave the impulse that has produced "higher-criticism," some of which he would certainly have repudiated.

With such language as that of the Swiss synod in his mind, Thirlwall, afterwards Bishop of St. Davids, speaking of "that doctrine of inspiration once [*i.e.*, for about 100 years, to the time of Lessing] universally prevalent — the sacred writers were *merely passive organs* or instruments of the Holy Spirit — abandoned by the learned, still a generally received notion . . . this doctrine of *literal* inspiration, etc.," admitted that all the hypotheses as to the composition of the Gospels were irreconcilable with a theory, which no intelligent Bible student seems any longer to hold: see W. Kelly's "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels" (1866), p. 288; *cf.* his chapter on *The Human Element* in "God's Inspiration, etc." At the present day no representative writer can be charged with maintaining that the inspiration of the Bible was on a plane with the Moslems', idea of the Koran — dictated word for word to a Prophet (see Margoliouth, "Mohammed and the Rise of Islam," p. 91 *f.*). It is, however, precisely that absurd system which Archbishop Temple ("what can be a grosser superstition"), Dean Farrar, Canon Wilson, and Mr. Gladstone (on Butler, iii. p. 17) have in turn criticised. What the meaning was of the reaffirmation of "plenary" inspiration by such Papal encyclicals as the document of 1893 may be left to writers of that communion to determine. We are concerned mainly with the sentiment of those not subject to the Roman obedience. That there is room for criticism of statements by Gausson, Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, Dean Burgon, and Archdeacon Lee is not questioned. Some of them have not allowed that the personality of a scripture writer could influence at all what he wrote; but words of Paul dispose of such ill-advised ideas: "I speak as a fool" (2 Cor. 11: 23). Tregelles, the eminent textual critic who held a healthy form of plenary inspiration, had weighed well what he wrote: "It is the *thing* and not the expression which I would maintain. The expression has been represented as if it implied some mere *mechanical operation*, while the thing really is that *all scripture is given by inspiration of God*, so that everything in it — narratives, prophecies, citations — are such as He saw fit to be there; and the whole — ideas, phrases, expressions, and words — was given forth exactly as was according to His mind and will" ("Remarks on the Prophecies of Daniel," p. 275). *Cf.* his "Hope of Christ's Coming" p. 94. This was but another way of stating the proposition of Carson: "It is of the words as containing the meaning,

and not of the meaning as distinguished from the words, that inspiration is directly and expressly asserted."

We may next record the position of Theodore of Mopsuestia, because he was the ancient protagonist within the Church of the now current *academical* view. It is thus stated by Barry (p. 216): "Theodore limited the meaning of inspiration by the mind of its organ; he could not tolerate a deeper than man's intention. So prophecy to him became ethics; Messianic passages were understood exclusively of their immediate objects; the words of the Bible did not proceed from God" (*cf.* Newman, on "Development," pp. 285-291, and Farrar, "The Bible," p. 71). Before him came Origen, who ventured to write that "God Himself introduced errors" (*De Princ.*, iv., 1; see Gwatkin's extract), following the Alexandrian Jew, Philo, who, though holding what crudely passes for "verbal inspiration," attributed by him to the Seventy, said that it contained "self-contradictory statements and ridiculous stories" (Watson on "Inspiration", p. 221). As to this the late Prof. Jowett wrote: "There is no more reason why imperfect narratives should be excluded from Scripture than imperfect grammar; no more ground for expecting that the New Testament should be Aristotelian in form than that it should be written in Attic Greek" (reprint of "Essay on Interpretation of Scripture," p. 20 *f.*). That "Reason excludes inconsistency" (Benn, "Rationalism," i., 131) is common ground for believers and unbelievers. It is always and solely a question of making good any inconsistency alleged. Chrysostom, in a homily on Matthew, says that collusion might have been imputed had everything tallied exactly (Schanz, "A Christian Apology," ii., p. 423, E. T.).

As to the objection raised from the several evangelists reporting the same thing in different words, see Carson, p. 39 *ff.* He selects as example the different wording of the inscription on the Cross (*cf.* note 349 in "Exposition of John" ). A living writer has remarked, "Jesus did not use both forms of expression at one and the same time . . . not that they are always literally and exactly the very words Christ used" (Orr on "Verbal Inspiration," and so W. Kelly, as cited above). The Glasgow professor illustrates his view by reference to Luke 6: 22 compared with Matt. 5: 11; Luke 9: 27 with Matt. 16: 28; Luke 12: 5 *f.* with Matt. 10: 28; Luke 23: 28 with Matt. 27: 37; also Mark 15: 26 with John 19: 19.

The inconsistency is flagrant of scholars who belittle "verbal" inspiration in the sense of this note, and yet insist on discriminating the exact force of particles, etc.

On the bearing of textual criticism on Inspiration, see note 17 below.

Many serious Bible students will join the present writer in here at least, following Augustine (quoted by Schanz from a letter of his to Jerome): "I firmly believe that none of their authors has fallen into any error," rather than Thirlwall (p. xv.) or Dr. A. Wright in Introduction to his "Synopsis of the Gospels," and that to his "Gospel of St. Luke in Greek," who rates the authority of Schürer more highly than that of Luke with regard to the Census: we are reminded of Carlyle's famous words about the Creation.

It is often said, disparagingly, of some Biblical record, that it is only given by *one* of the Evangelists: this, to say nothing worse, is really *uncritical*. Thus is Luke 23: 7-12, pronounced by some critics as unhistorical because not found in Mark, deemed by them superlatively reliable! Burkitt, himself ably representing "critical" principles, as to this sensibly remarks: "The story of the Gadarene swine rests really on no more evidence than the story of the blind man at Bethsaida; and similarly the parable of the seed growing secretly is really no more attested than the parable of the vineyard" (p. 132; *cf.* p. 138 *f.*).

We must ever consider the Biblical writers in a light relative to their respective periods. Smyth well remarks, "Even Moses, Samuel, and David may have had on some points lower spiritual

conceptions than some of the children in our Sunday-schools today, and yet their conceptions were so far above those of the people whom they taught that only Divine inspiration could account for them" (p. 172). Upon the Bible viewed as in Eastern book, see Barry, p. 18 f.

The official Roman Catholic position may be found stated in Schanz, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., chapter xiii. (p. 432 in particular); *cf.* Cardinal Newman's paper in *The Nineteenth Century* for Feb., 1884, and Barry, p. 17. The last-named writer states that verbal inspiration "is no longer made equivalent to verbal perfection, as though there must be a *divine style* recognisable by its human characters." The only reason why the Jesuits reject it is, that they seek to raise Tradition to the level of Scripture.

Christ's "power is made perfect in weakness" (2 Cor. 12: 9); this may explain the allowance of such a reference as that in Acts 7: 16, which perhaps falls under the principle stated by Barry: "We should be creating imaginary difficulties did we suppose that, because a volume is inspired, it must needs be written with a minute accuracy of quotation or incident such as no human author can achieve" (p. 19).

Schanz says. "Faith in Scripture will waver only if faith in the authority of the Church falters" (p. 391). This characteristically Roman position will be examined in note 13 below. It has a bearing on the "Modernism" that agitates Roman, and the "Higher Criticism" which burdens English, Church circles. "Anglican Churchmen have used the Church to lessen the strain upon the Scriptures; in other words, to take away the terrors of criticism" (Nash, p. 160 f.). See, *e.g.*, the series of Essays entitled, "Lux Mundi" (edited by Mr., now Bishop, Gore).

Unitarian sentiment is represented by the writings of the late Dr. James Martineau, as in the cheap reprint of his "What is Christianity?" (p. 17). It is largely what lies behind "advanced" criticism.

"The Bible," writes Nash, "must submit to the most searching examination." Left to speak really for itself, it has always done so. What about the converse process? (Heb. 4: 12). That is a vitally serious question which every reader "must" answer. "It is said," writes Tregelles, "whatever theory of inspiration a man may hold, it does not disqualify him from being a Christian. A parallel statement would be: Whatever theory of obedience to the laws a man may hold, it does not disqualify him from being a loyal and peaceable subject and citizen" (*op. cit.*, p. 278).

A recent writer has said, "Believers in the Apostles' day were independent of the written Word; but we can neither stand nor move without it." "Scripture is the crystallised breath of the Holy Ghost, and the Bible a telephone down the ages, at the other end of which is the Voice of God" (D. M. Panton).

Carson described the doctrine of verbal inspiration, rightly understood, as "one of the fortresses committed to Christians by Jesus Christ" (p. 49). This was re-affirmed by the Expositor's own words: "Scripture, like the Lord Jesus, is a grand moral test" ("God's Inspiration, etc.," p. 57).

*Cf.* note 13 on Mark, and also notes 11 and 13 below; besides a recent defence. of plenary inspiration by C. E. Stuart ("Outline of the Gospel of Luke," pp. 325-336).

6a Delivered; *cf.* Acts 6: 14; 2 Thess. 2: 15 (alike oral and written tradition).

6b "From the beginning" (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς). The meaning is fixed by Acts 1: 22, the baptism of John. See 4E above.

6c "Of the word" (λόγου), — ministry, as in Acts 6: 2. Wright takes the "ministers" of "catechists"; *cf.* the use of ὑπηρέτης in Luke 4: 20, where the *chazzan* of the *synagogue* is spoken of, whose function it was to give such instruction. The same two Greek words occur again together in

Acts 13: 5.

6d The same view was expressed with almost equal emphasis by Thirlwall, who wrote: "It seems nearly certain that if his document had been founded either on a document such as that imagined by Eichhorn (note 4) or on the works of St. Matthew and *St. Mark (infra)* he would have made some allusion to these sources. All that can be collected from the *Prologue* with certainty is that, at the time when St. Luke wrote, there were several documents relating to the transactions which form the subject of his Gospel, and that these were imperfect. To deduce anything more from his language requires a rather subtle and elaborate argument" (p. cx. ff.) Similarly De Wette (*ad loc.*), "Luke does not expressly say that he used his predecessors." Cf. "God's Inspiration of the Scriptures," p. 70 f. Cf. Godet, i. p. 85. Origen and Athanasius (*cf. Zahn*) took λόγος here in the sense of John 1: 1.

7 "Having thorough acquaintance . . . accurately." — The word παρακολουθεῖν means *personal* acquaintance. Calvin refers to its use by Demosthenes, "On the Crown," 53 (the passages may be seen in Alford), the similarity of whose language to several words of the Prologue is most striking. The famous commentator of the Reformation remarks that in the case of the Athenian orator and the Evangelist alike "each was in the same position as if he had been an eye-witness." Orr: "Luke himself, in contrast with the many, goes back to first-hand sources. This is his own account, with which any interpretation must harmonize" (p. 71). Cf. the use of the same word in 2 Tim. 3: 10.

The word ἀκριβῶς is used of exact scientific processes (Carr).

8 "All things." Whether Luke was acquainted with the Gospels of Matthew and Mark or not, he was, undoubtedly, with the facts that they recorded. Abbott writes, with reference to the words quoted by Paul in Acts 20: 35, "had the Evangelists known it as Christ's saying they could hardly have omitted it . . . almost certainly it did not come from His lips" ("From Letter to Spirit," § 997). This is like saying that either Luke did not know of the contents of Mark 6: 45 - 8: 26, because he has no clear equivalent, or that, aware of such a record, he discredited it, as is the wont of some writers on the Gospels. Luke's omission of, at any rate, most of that section is, in itself, a problem for critics.

9 "To arrange." ἀνατάξασθαι, rendered as equivalent to συντάξασθαι. The word employed by Luke is taken by Blass to mean, "reproduce, restore from memory." He cites Irenaeus for use of the same word as to Ezra's traditional restoration of the books of the Old Testament ("Phil. of the Gospels," p. 15). Cf. note 4A above, and note 16 below.

10 "From the outset." In Acts 26: 5, Luke has used ἄνωθεν in the same sense as here, of time.

11 "Seemed good." Cf. the same form of expression in Acts 15: 22, and in verse 28, "to the Holy Spirit and to us," where Divine direction and human motive are unquestionably linked together.

12 "In regular order"; as Ebrard, Meyer, Weiss, Hahn and Godet, understand καθεξῆς of *chronological* order (*cf.* 8: 1, Acts 3: 24); but Blass more as the Expositor, explains the word as meaning "uninterruptedly," "completely." Alford (after Westcott), "a moral or logical sequence." Cf. Salmon, p. 74, etc. Luke follows Mark's sequence of events as far as 9: 17 of his own Gospel, after which he seems never to return to it. While von Soden thinks that Luke has followed the order of "Q" more closely than Matthew, Harnack gives the other Synoptist's order the preference.

13 "Mightest truly know." Cf. use of ἐπιγνῶναι in Acts 24: 8. These words introduce the subject of Interpretation (note 2), which is ancillary to that of Inspiration (note 6).

It is still sometimes said, but chiefly by Romans and their sympathisers, that indiscriminate, popular Bible reading is productive of *heresy*, so-called. With regard to this, Girdlestone inquires,

"Who was to interpret St. Luke to Theophilus . . . to the elect lady, John's letter to her?" ("English Church Teaching," p. 10). It might seem as if a Romanist would attempt an answer to this by first inviting a distinction between Books of Scripture which afford "devotional and spiritual reading" (Clarke, "The Pope and the Bible," p. 43), and those from which the Church has developed its doctrine. Thus the R.C. "Penny Catechism," Ans. to Q. 360, names the "Gospels" *par excellence*, without any distinction between the Synoptics and the Fourth, as suitable for the purpose just named. But there Romanist and Protestant alike meet with inspired *teaching*; and in theory Roman dogma is grounded upon it. So that Clarke's idea of limiting the "general distribution" of the Scriptures to the above as "the sole object" goes by the board. Indeed, according to "a Roman Catholic, correspondent" writing to the *Guardian* (issue of 9th Dec., 1908), the Society of Jesus in France has tried to have the reading of Gospels prohibited, because of their suggesting Protestantism. Father Clarke has done his best to justify the prohibition, in 1229, of Bible-reading by the laity, but Voltaire's criticism (cited by Reinach, p. 423), is unanswerable: "It was to insult the human race to venture to say to it, We want you to believe, and would not have you read the Book upon which this Faith is based."

Memorable are the words, from his pulpit, of John Chrysostom, the great ornament of the ancient Eastern Church, whose canonization by Rome, awkwardly for her, no Pope has executed the feat of cancelling, as did Benedict XII. that of Clement of Alexandria. When the Church was rent, in the same way as now, by contending factions and discredited by corruption, the "golden mouthed" preacher in his Forty-third Homily on Matthew, declared that "there can be no proof of true Christianity, nor other refuge for Christians wishing to know the true faith, but the Divine Scriptures"; that "the Church of Christ is known in no way to those wishing to ascertain which is the true Church, but only through the Scriptures." Not a word does he add about note or comment.

"We cannot imagine," says a living Roman writer, "the Bible without the Church or the Church without the Bible" (Barry, p. 8). Observe here the "vicious circle": Bible and Church are made mutually to rest on each other. For Romans, the Church has a living *magisterium* or teaching office (Schanz, ii., p. 389), and claims monopoly of right "interpretation" (*cf.* note 2, above). This, however, traverses the testimony of the Holy Spirit in 2 Tim. 3: 15, as to the "Holy Scriptures," there said to be able *per se*, to make wise, etc.

Again, Catholics rely on the "consent of the Fathers," which is very much a mirage, as Barry frankly witnesses: "Diversities make the unanimous consent of Fathers in an identical exegesis *rare*" (p. 15). He takes, for example, Basil's and Augustine's different interpretations of Gen. 1.

Once more listen to Clarke: "What effect has Protestant Bible-reading on the lives of the readers? . . . No one can read the books of modern infidels and agnostics without observing how familiar to them is Scriptural language" (p. 46). The moral of this is that such people, whether trained as Protestants or Romanists, need to be *evangelized*; Canon (now Bishop) Gore's relations with the late Dr. G. Romanes illustrate this. Which precedes the other in Eph. 4: 11, the teacher or the evangelist?

Here arises the question whether the Church is or is not the source of ministry. That it was so primitively is an untenable proposition. The Church was called and formed already by evangelization, one form of ministry. Hence the flaw in Dr. Hawkins' principle, that "the Church teaches, Scripture proves"; see his Bampton Lectures (Sermon II.), and Newman's letter to Froude, in Miss Mozley's "Life and Correspondence" (II., p. 126), of the Provost of Oriel's more famous colleague, who has referred to it also in his "Apologia." Again, as well might hostile critics of the New Testament be right in holding that our Lord's Resurrection was progeny of the Apostolate as for an Anglican writer,

Vernon Staley, to speak of the Bible as "the child of the Church" ("The Catholic Religion," p. 343), instead of the Church as *Witness* to Holy Writ, which derives no *authority* from it. So Leslie, quoted approvingly in Bishop van Mildert's Bampton Lecture, p. 327, whose position supplies the antidote to Augustine's famous saying: how it was that he believed in the Gospel, which was quoted at the Council of Trent.

The "ruin of the Church" as a whole, a view of which W. Kelly was a leading exponent, would not impair the credit of its witness to Holy Writ, — to the canon arrived at by it, because we have to distinguish between the mass in early times and the "faithful men" referred to in 2 Tim. 2: 2, by whose influence, under the hand of God, such questions were determined.

Is it not throwing dust into people's eyes to go on telling them that "the Church *wrote* the inspired books?" (Staley, *loc. cit.*). To whom then, any intelligent reader might inquire, were the books *addressed*? "Historical Christianity," which gave birth to such a theory, was for the Expositor a system too circuitous and vapoury.

And so for Bishop Gore's suggestion ("Lux Mundi," p. 339 *f.*) that it is "irrational, considering the intimate links by which the New Testament canon is bound up with the historic Church, not to accept the mind of the *Church* as interpreting the mind of the Apostolic writers," which was probably suggested to him by Newman's like argument with regard to ecclesiastical miracles. The worthlessness of the bishop's remark has been shown by Sir R. Anderson's parody of it: he transfers the idea to the Old Testament canon as determined by the Jews, whose interpretation of the Messianic prophecies their descendants might similarly call upon us to accept ("The Bible or the Church," p. 73 *f.*).

The well-worn misapplication of 2 Peter 1: 20 would be found corrected by Bishop van Mildert (*op. cit.*, p. 180 *f.*). The observations of that bishop on p. 153 *f.* as to dispensational differences might well be re-affirmed in the present generation — so much neglected still is the principle concerned.

As to the exaggeration of the pregnancy of Scripture by the system of Cocceius (Vitranga the Elder, etc.), see Conybeare's Bampton Lectures, pp. 263 *ff.*

See further, notes below on 5: 1 and 6: 39, and Sir R. Anderson's trenchant chapter 6.

14 "The certainty (ἀσφάλειαν) *Cf.* Luke's use of τὸ ἀσφαλές in Acts 22: 30. A man, to impart certainty, must first himself command it. How can any with show of reason, question the Evangelist's claim? Dr. Abbott ventures to say that Luke is "probably the least authoritative of the four." Marcion's judgment, strange to say, was the exact opposite of that of our modern English scholar, whose saying that Luke "defeats his object" by adapting, improving, and reconciling, rests upon question-begging.

One sometimes hears it said that inspiration is not required for writing true history. Even those who say so, if candid, admit that scriptural history at what they would call its worst is incomparably above ordinary records. *Cf.* it only with Church histories, most affected by the writers' bias. It has only been in our own time that "historical science" has been cultivated.

Luke was not himself a witness. "Scientific" critics hold, further, that *none* of the writers of the other Gospels were; that their records are founded on testimonies no longer available. The effect of this is that the historical JESUS is beyond our apprehension (Reinach, p. 332), *i.e.*, in any merely human way. His very *death* belongs to the same category as all else. Divine testimony, and faith in that, are needed throughout. *Cf.* note 6 above, and notes 450 and 589 below.

15 "The things" (verse 4). As to λόγοι here and πράγματα ("matters" in sense of "acts") in verse 1, see note 4, especially section E.

16 "Thou hast been instructed" (κατηχήθης), that is "catechised," as said of Apollos in Acts 18: 25. Cf. 1 Cor. 14: 19; Gal. 6: 6; Wright: "Did the Gospel originate in the pulpit or in the schoolroom?" He supposes that Mark's Gospel was used for the instruction of Apollos; but Blass thinks that Apollos may have derived his information from reading the document as itself the instructor.

Goodwin: "St. Luke does not purpose to enlarge the knowledge of Theophilus, but to confirm it." In other words, the Evangelist does not, as sometimes alleged, propose to communicate to the addressee all that the writer himself knows.

### § 3.

17 The question of textual (external) criticism — third of those enumerated in note 2 — which has been briefly dealt with in notes 14-16 on Mark, must here receive development, because of its relatively greater importance in connection with Luke's Gospel.

The English Authorised Version (1611) of the New Testament was mainly derived from what was afterwards called the Received Text, based on a recension of the original Greek called "Byzantine" by Griesbach, and contained chiefly in relatively late MSS. (such as L $\Delta$  among uncials and cursive 1). The Revised Version (1881) is founded on a more ancient text (ABC, etc.) allied to that which the same critic named "Alexandrian," but, as limited by Westcott and Hort, the most influential members of the committee in textual matters, has been called "Neutral." The views of these English scholars rapidly received general support, and the dominance of their system of selection has only within the last few years been shaken by those critics who incline towards greater recognition of a third recension, known as the "Western" or "Syro-Latin." As Sir R. Anderson has written, the Westcott-Hort "mutilation of the Gospels" by rejection of the indirect evidence afforded by the united voice of versions (such as the Old Syriac and Old Latin) and Fathers in favour of the direct evidence of "certain of the oldest manuscripts," was not likely to commend itself to adepts in the science of evidence. ("Pseudo-Criticism," p. 5.) The leaders in the reaction are German critics, Blass and Wellhausen in particular. Sanday continues his allegiance to the Cambridge scholars, whilst Weiss adheres to a modified form of the Westcott-Hort criticism, regarding the cursives somewhat more than those English scholars have done, and internal evidence always, but sometimes following B even when Hort has not done so, as in 5: 18, whilst Harnack is disposed to apply the drag to the rapidly radical departure from it.

Westcott and Hort, developing predecessors' classification of the Greek copies, arranged the MSS, as follows:-

i. The Syrian group (previously called Byzantine) that of most copies headed by the Alexandrine ("A," in the British Museum), which have been compared, in particular, with Chrysostom's quotations and radiated from Antioch.

ii. The Western, typified by Beza's MS. ("D," at Cambridge), compared with Latin Patristic quotations, and proceeding especially from Rome and Carthage.

iii. The "Neutral," so called from being thought comparatively free from corruptions, which are best represented by the Vatican MS. ("B," at Rome), compared especially with Origen's quotations, and derivable, probably, from Caesarea, if not Alexandria.

The theory of the Cambridge scholars (Hort in particular) was that the text underwent a Syrian revision by editors acting under episcopal supervision, from about the middle of the third to almost the middle of the fourth century. Interpolations (*inter alia*) were deemed to characterize more or less the two other groups, the first especially, so that note was taken of any Western non-interpolations — *i.e.*,

omissions of what is, accordingly, placed by these editors under suspicion. Example: Luke 22: 44 *f*.

"B" was accorded the first place in excellence among "Neutral" MSS. as being least of all influenced by other copies, unlike A and C affected by "" (Sinaitic), or LAM by "D."

The Swiss professor Wernle expresses preference of one combination above another, thus: "BCL together are more reliable than D Ital Syrr cu sin" (p. 9).

Scrivener discussed the theory in chapter 7 of the third edition of his "Plain Introduction" (1883), describing it as "destitute of historical foundation."

Godet's critical apparatus in his commentaries was discredited simply because, as Schanz says, he was "no friend of the Alexandrines." The esteemed Swiss scholar himself wrote: "Criticism inclines to the documents of the Alexandrian text as blindly as it did formerly to the representatives of the Byzantine . . . the Alexandrian text cannot deprive criticism of the right of free examination in each particular case. Very often the true reading has been preserved by the representatives of the two other texts combined, or even by those of one of them." (3rd French ed., 1888, p. 80 *f*.)

The copies of the *Western* group are marked by tendency to adopt additions from non-canonical sources — *e.g.*, at Luke 6: 5, and Luke 23: 53; to harmonizing, noticeable in Luke 24: 6, 12, 36, 40; to paraphrase (Luke 24: 53), or to elucidation of the sense, as in Luke 14: 5 (D adds "sheep") and Luke 24: 51 *f*.

Such authority as was possessed by "D," Hort thought to be derived from its being read in the Assembly at Rome. As the only uncial which has the Western text, he depreciated it. This codex exhibits more variations in Luke's writings than elsewhere, which Hort accounted for by supposing that it had, naturally, a large circulation among Gentile Christians at trade centres widely distant from one another. Its peculiarities have since been discussed by Professor Rendel Harris and Prof. (now Bishop) Chase. Dr. Rendel Harris (in "Texts and Studies," edited by Dean Robinson, vol. ii., pp. 1-272) regards the Western text as a "readjustment of an earlier text to the *Latin* versions." He suggests that "D" has passed through Montanist hands (chapter xiv). If so, its reading in Luke 11: 2, "Let Thy Holy Spirit come in," is the more interesting. *Cf.* the "Ante-Nicene Christian Library," vol. vii., p. 289. The bishop, in his "Syro-Latin Text," regards the Western as "Moulded on a *Syriac* text." See further in Kenyon's "Handbook," pp. 73-82.

It is the textual work, however, of the late learned Dr. Friedrich Blass, Professor of Classical Philology at Halle, which has most recently attracted the special attention of students of the New Testament. Blass was not restrained by any such theory as Hort's from following *merely* Western authority. He has explained the many variations of "D" in Luke's Gospel and the Acts by supposing ("Philology of the Gospels," chapters vii. and ix.) that there were two editions of each, and that while the codices "" and "B" represent the earlier and shorter recension, followed in this scholar's own edition of the Gospel, "D" has preserved to us the later edition of it, which was that read by Theophilus (p. 103). Another view taken is that the shorter text represented in our English Bible is a later, revised one. In the idea of two editions Blass was anticipated by the view of Le Clerc in the seventeenth century, revived by the late Bishop Lightfoot in his "Fresh Revision of the New Testament," p. 29. It might account for additions or omissions, as in Luke 9: 56; Luke 22: 43; Luke 23: 34; but would fail in some other respects. Whilst Nestle, Salmon (p. 497), and a few more scholars have favoured Blass's theory, it is discredited by B. Weiss, W. Holtzmann, Zahn, Jülicher, Bousset, Ramsay, and Kenyon (see pp. 291-304 of his "Handbook").

There is a balanced account of the Western text in the *Interpreter*, Jan., 1908. 150 *f.*, by Prof.

Swete. Wellhausen, in his "Commentaries on the Gospels," favours the recension. "D," he remarks in his "Introduction, etc.," "often contains Semitisms which were removed in B and ." The Western text also finds appreciation in the article on "The New Testament Text," by C. H. Turner ("Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary," p. 575). The latest Continental textual investigator, Prof. von Soden, manifestly inclines to it. See an account of his researches and theory in Lake, pp. 100-103 (4th ed.).

Upon the connection of the Synoptic with the Textual problem, see Salmon, p. 108 *f.* Had Luke's Gospel been a mere enlargement of Marcion's, the canonical document would have been as late as 130 A.D. Scholars now commonly agree that Marcion mutilated it for dogmatic purposes, although a few cling to the idea that he used the first or shorter edition. See further, Thirlwall, pp. li. — lxiv.

Dr. Rendel Harris writes: "Of the books in the New Testament which have undergone revision, the two which have suffered most are the Gospel of Luke and the Acts ("Studies, etc.," p. 286). And Orr: "The text of the Bible during its long literary history has been subject to vicissitudes, to interpolation, explanatory annotation, editorial revision, for a special purpose (*e.g.* Temple use of Psalms, etc.)." There is no real excuse, however, for such words as those of Mede: "It is patent that, once we know the elementary facts of the history of the text, it is utterly impossible that there can be any question of verbal inspiration" (p. 77). Tregelles, of course, had a familiarity with the whole textual problem beyond all comparison with that of the Theosophist writer, and to his remarks, reproduced in note 6 above, reference may here again be made. It is only superficial prejudice that would resist the proposition of W. Kelly "Various readings belong to the distinct region of *man's responsibility*" ("God's Inspiration," p. 598). As to critical "emendation" of the text, it may suffice to refer to Scrivener, *op. cit.*, p. 490.

Prominent for textual criticism of this Gospel among recent discoveries are a copy in the Monastery of the Laura on Mount Athos, of the eighth or ninth century, which is lettered , and the Akhmîm from Egypt, of the fourth or fifth century, in the possession of C. L. Freer, at Detroit, U.S.A.

The witness of the following fragmentary copies of Luke's Gospel will be recorded in the footnotes where variant readings calls for it.

(i.) Those of Codex Zacynthius, lettered ξ, in the library of the British and Foreign Bible Society; a palimpsest of the eighth century with marginal commentary, published by Tregelles in 1861. It contains less than one-fourth of the Gospel, viz., Luke 1: 1-9, 19-23, 27 *f.*, 30-32, 36-66, 77-80; Luke 2: 1-19, 21 *f.*, 33-39; Luke 3: 5-8, 11-20; Luke 4: 1 *f.*, 6-20, 32-43; Luke 5: 17-36; Luke 6: 21-49; Luke 7: 1-6, 11-37, 39-47; Luke 8: 4-21, 25-35, 43-50; Luke 9: 1-28, 32 *f.*, 35,41-62; Luke 10: 1-18, 21-40; Luke 11: 1-4, 24-33. Six-sevenths of its agreements with , A, B, and C are with the "Vatican" uncial.

(ii.) Those of Codex Nitriensis, lettered "R" by Tischendorf, a palimpsest of the sixth century (Scrivener, *i.*, p. 145). It is shown in Case C of Biblical MSS. at the British Museum, and contains about one-half of the Gospel, *i.e.*, Luke 1: 1-13, 69 — Luke 2: 4 (visible in B.M. case), 16-27. Luke 4: 38-5: 5. Luke 5: 25-6: 8. Luke 6: 18-36, 39, 49 — Luke 7: 22, 44, 46 *f.* Luke 8: 5-15, 28 - 9: 1. Luke 9: 12-43. Luke 10: 3-16. Luke 11: 5-27. Luke 12: 4-15, 40-52. Luke 13: 26 - 14: 1. Luke 14: 12 - 15: 1. Luke 15: 13 - 16: 16. Luke 17: 21 - 18: 10. Luke 18: 22 - 20: 20. Luke 20: 33-47. Luke 21: 12 - 22: 15. Luke 22: 42-56. Luke 22: 71 - 23: 11. Luke 23: 38-51 (all recorded in Tischendorf's eighth edition).

Seven-ninths of its agreements with ancient copies are with "B."

The term "conflation," which will sometimes be used in the footnotes, is that used by Westcott

and Hort for *mixtures*, where scribes having before them a marginal alternative reading, copied it as well, *e.g.*, in the last verse of Gospel, where before "blessing" (εὐλογοῦντες) "D" added "praising" the (αἰνοῦντες), reproduced in A.V.

Besides literature referred to above, reference may be made to Burkitt's article on the "Text of the New Testament" in the "Encyclopaedia Biblica," vol. iv. (1903), to Kenyon, in Hastings' "One Volume Dictionary," and to the American Professor Vincent's "History of Textual Criticism"; whilst readers of German might derive aid from consulting Prof. B. Weiss' study of Luke's text in the "Texts and Investigations," edited by Gebhardt and Harnack, new series, vol. iv. (1899), pp. 1-246. Reference is sometimes here made to this last in critical notes.

18 With regard to *translation*, some students regret our not having possession of the actual Aramaic background of the Greek text. There is, however, one advantage acknowledged in the fact that an impress of the Aramaic thought remains in the Greek, which was happily reproduced in the translation published in 1611, the cherished inheritance of English-speaking peoples.

Mr. Kelly's critical notice of the R.V. of Luke's Gospel would be found in "The Bible Treasury," vol. xiii., p. 302, and that of the American renderings in vol. xiv., p. 335.

## NOTES ON THE FIRST CHAPTER, *Verse 5 ff.*

19 Luke 1: 5. — "Judea." This seems to stand for the whole land of Israel, as manifestly in Acts 10: 37, and in the Gospel at Luke 6: 17, Luke 7: 17, and Luke 23: 5. In Luke 2: 4, Luke 5: 17, however, it probably represents the limited territory of Judah (see verse 39).

20 Luke 1: 13. — There are seven pieces of dialogue in this and the chapters following, which are more or less rhapsodical utterances, and go under the name of "canticles." Margoliouth says: "The evidence is strongly in favour of their having been originally in Hebrew verse" (address on Synoptic Gospels at University College, London). *Cf.* note 4 F with reference to the suggestion of Schleiermacher (p. 25) and others (as Burkitt), that these are Luke's free compositions; see also Godet, *i.*, p. 216 *f.*, and Sanday, "Outlines of the Life of Christ," who regards chapters 1 and 2 as "the most archaic thing in the New Testament" (p. 166), and Briggs' "of the first degree of historic importance" (p. 164 *f.*).

The passages are: — (i.) Luke 1: 13-17; (ii.) Luke 1: 28, 30-33, 35-37 *f.*; (iii.) Luke 1: 42-45; (iv.) Luke 1: 46-55; (v.) Luke 1: 68-79; (vi.) Luke 2: 10-12, 14; (vii.) Luke 2: 29-32, 34 *f.*

21 Luke 1: 15. — For Nazarite vows, see Num. 6, and *cf.* Matt. 11: 18.

22 Luke 1: 17. — Plummer refers to Ecclesiasticus 48: 10 (see R. V.), languishing of parental affection. Augustine's idea (adopted by Calvin) was that by the "fathers" is meant, the patriarchs (see Isa. 29: 22 *f.*; Isa. 63: 16).

"Disobedient," *i.e.*, to God, so Schanz, referring to Titus 1: 16, Titus 3: 3; *cf.* Rom. 1: 5.

"To (for, by) the wisdom" (A.V.) came from Mal. 4: 6.

23 Luke 1: 19. — "Gabriel." Tobit 12: 15, speaks of seven archangels (naming "Raphael"). The Book of Enoch adds "Uriel." These are the sources of Milton's nomenclature. In canonical Scripture (but see Rev. 1: 4, Rev. 3: 1, Rev. 4: 5) not more than two archangels are named, Gabriel (Dan. 8, 9), herald of goodness, and Michael (Dan. 10, 12; Jude 9; Rev. 12: 7) of wrath. The Jews have said that "Gabriel flies with two wings, Michael with one."

24 Luke 1: 25. — "Reproach" (see Gen. 30: 23).

25 Luke 1: 26 *ff.* — We here enter upon the Birth story, as to which Harnack ("What is Christianity?" p. 31) says, "The oldest tradition knew nothing of any stories of Jesus' 'birth.'" The whole question of the Virgin birth will be discussed below at verse 34 *ff.* As to "Nazareth," see note 46.

26 Luke 1: 27 *f.* — Mary as a name represents the Old Testament "Miriam," in Aramaic "Mariam," as in Greek here. According to the Protevangelium of James, she was fifteen years of age at the time. The ancient belief was that she died in the year 64.

The question has been raised whether the words "of the House of David" go with "Virgin" (B. Weiss, Godet) or with "man" (De Wette, Meyer). Chrysostom and Bengel say with both. *Cf.* verse 32 and note there; also verse 69, and see note in chapter 3 on the Genealogy. Its being said of Joseph would have no meaning in this connection, when actually applied to him, in Luke 2: 4, it is introduced as something fresh. *Cf.* on verse 32. On the infancy, see Nicoll, "The Incarnate Saviour," chapter i., pp. 14-16, in particular.

27 Luke 1: 31. — "Jesus." The name (*Jeshua*), Neh. 8: 17, was very common among the Jews of the time. In Col. 4: 11, mention made of a Jesus, surnamed Justus, one of the Circumcision. One of the Lord's ancestors, according to the flesh, bore the same name, see Luke 3: 29 (R.V.). The Talmud, in order to get rid of the original meaning of "the name" (James 2: 7), although using "Jeshua" of all others bearing it, regularly speaks of the Lord by the clipped name *Jesu*.

28 Luke 1: 32. — "The Highest." The O. T. *Elyon*. It was the usual designation of GOD among the Hellenistic Jews of the Dispersion. Again in verses 35, 76.

"His father David." Mary was probably of the tribe of Judah (B. Weiss).

29 Luke 1: 34 *ff.* — Five verses here enshrine Luke's narrative of the supernatural (virgin) birth of the Lord Jesus.

Schanz forsakes his usually sensible exegesis — but what is a Roman writer here to do? — by taking Mary's words as a vow of virginity, which is excluded by verse 27.

"The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee," etc. *Cf.* Acts 1: 8. For the "overshadow," see Ex. 40: 34. Pfleiderer: "It is not God himself, but God's Holy Spirit, who begets Jesus" ("Primitive Christianity," ii., p. 117 *f.*), a remark certainly not derivable from the exact words of the Evangelists, which represent the Holy Spirit's action only as the procuring cause. The article is absent, as again in Luke 2: 13.

30 "Shall be called Son of God." The "therefore" shows that we have not here the Eternal Sonship. The Messiah (see note on Luke 2: 11) had to be, transcendentally, *Son of God* (verse 35); next, Son of *Man* (see note on Luke 5: 24), if He was to take up the Davidic claims; and child of a *virgin* (verse 27).

i. As Son of God, He should be both Priest and Victim (L. A. Sabatier, "The Atonement," p. 53, comparing John 17: 19, and Heb. 8: 2), and fulfil at the same time the types of "burnt offering" and "sin offering."

Ritschl has well said that the distinctive N. T. name of GOD is "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," Eph. 1: 3.

The *Christadelphian* theory that the Sonship began with the birth of the Lord, so as to preclude

His pre-existence, is but a *popular* echo of unbelieving "scientific" theology. Its advocates are materialistic Unitarians. *Swedenborgians*, on the other hand, confess the pre-existence. For Loisy's assertion ("Synoptic Gospels," vol. i., p. 194) that this idea is "not expressly formulated nor even suggested in the Synoptic Gospels," see note on Luke 10: 22.

The Lord is spoken of as "Son of God" in this Gospel (1) by others, in Luke 3: 22; Luke 4: 3, 9, 41; Luke 8: 28; Luke 9: 35 and Luke 20: 9. (2) By Himself in Luke 10: 22 ("The Son") as in Luke 22: 70 in answer to the high priest's adjuration. He speaks of God as His "Father" in Luke 2: 49; Luke 9: 26; Luke 10: 21 *f.*; Luke 22: 29, 42; Luke 23: 34, 46; Luke 24: 49.

ii. That JESUS should be legal heir of Joseph belongs rather to the consideration of Matthew's narrative; but see note on the Genealogy below, and also that on Luke 8: 20, with regard to indispensable requirements of such a claim.

iii. The virginity of Mary is also developed by Matthew, who cites Isa. 7: 14, attaching to that prediction a meaning not previously given to it by the Jews; so that Dalman, who notes this little-known circumstance, treats it as supporting the truth of the narrative, on the ground that a virgin-birth was not looked for ("Words of Jesus," p. 276). As D. Smith says, "the history was not as sceptics insinuate, adapted to the prophecy, but the prophecy to the history" (p. 528). Pfleiderer (*op. cit.*, ii., p. 346) in connection with Mark 3: 21 (*cf.* note 41 in "Exposition" of that Gospel), objects that Mary could not have joined His brethren in treating JESUS as out of His senses if she had known of a supernatural birth. But there is absolutely nothing in Mark's text to show that she did participate in their impression. The Marcan incident does not clash with her attitude in verse 34 here.

J. H. Newman, preaching on the Incarnation (Sermons, vol. ii., p. 35), said: "As in the beginning woman was formed of man by Almighty power, so now, by a like mystery, but a reverse order, the new Adam was fashioned from the woman. . . . He had no earthly father; He abhorred to have one." The great recent German theologian, Dorner, has remarked: "As Son of Man, the Lord cannot have been the son of any particular man:" see his "Christian Doctrine," ii., pp. 446-451.

Nowhere in the Old Testament is there any mention of a human father of the Messiah (Delitzsch, "Messianic Prophecies"); *cf.* Ps. 22: 10.

The Syriac of Sinai, in Matt. 1: 16, has "Joseph begot Jesus"; that version, however, in the same context speaks of Mary as a virgin; so that its "begot" must be understood in a juridical sense, as manifestly in the Greek of verse 8; "Joram begot Uzziah," and of verse 13, "Zerubbabel begot Abiud." The Curetonian Syriac follows the traditional text.

The status of betrothal was in the eye of Jewish law the same as that of marriage: Deut. 22: 23 *f.*

The stages in the New Testament view of the Lord's Person are doubtless three, as stated by Lobstein (p. 65 *f.*):-

(1) In Mark, corresponding more to the popular Messianic belief or theocratic view of the Divine Sonship. Such would supply, according to his parable, the "green blade of the doctrine." As to Mark's being said not to have heard of the Virgin Birth (Menzies, Clodd, etc.), see note 57 in "Exposition" of that Gospel. Critics are careful to say as little as possible about Mark's "silence" as to Joseph which, however, so impressed Baur that he maintained the critics' first Evangelist was acquainted with the Virgin Birth.

(2) Of the independent records of Matthew and Luke, either of which would be alien to the Jewish mind, Matthew's is the more objective (public) account, proceeding, it seems likely, from Joseph;

Luke's, the more subjective (private) account, probably derived ultimately from Mary (*cf.* Godet, i., p. 162 *f.*), through her son James (as suggested by Bishop Chase, referring to Acts 21: 18). Although he "begins with the Jew" (Exposition) and so corroborates Matthew's specially Jewish testimony, his record was designed for Gentile readers, many of whom would be familiar with legendary stories of virgin-births (Pfleiderer, "Early Christian Conception of Christ," pp. 35-43), as of Buddha (Paul Carus), who would not be alienated by the representation of such a supernatural event. Here the Church would receive the "ear" of Mark's parable.

(3) In the Prologue of John's Gospel. As to the fourth Evangelist's supposed silence upon this subject, see Neander, "Life of Christ," p. 17, and note 21 in the Exposition of the last Gospel; also note 42 there, on Gardner's fancy ("Exploratio Evangelica," p. 239) that John meant to protest against the Virgin Birth, or that writer's notion that the words to Nicodemus in John 3: 6 could be used against it. This last stage would represent the "full blade in the ear."

And so of the Apostle Paul, as in Rom. 1: 3 *f.* "Paul," writes Pfleiderer, "is anything rather than a Jew in his Christological exegesis of the Old Testament. *Here* he leaves all Jewish tradition on one side and gives vent to his mythological vein; whence he derives it, it would be hard to tell. No road leads up to the divinity (*sic*) of Christ from the Old Testament" (*op. cit.*, ii., p. 115). Such a theory as this we may hold, with Orr, "is the death of all its predecessors in its admission that the idea of the V.B. was familiar to Paul" (see 1 Cor. 15: 47; also Gal. 4: 4, γενόμενος, "come," rather than, as in Luke 7: 28, of the Baptist, γεννητός, "born") and the early Christians. (*Cf.* chapters 3, 5, of Dr. R. J. Cooke's "The Incarnation and Modern Criticism" (1907)). It is because of the difficulty felt in being consistent in this respect that negative critics have fallen back on the device of tracing the belief to Gentile *myths*, going back to Babylonian (Orr, p. 27 of pamphlet); but Harnack, to his credit, dissociates himself from this part of the business.

The miraculous conception is recognised first, outside the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, in the Letter of Ignatius to the Ephesians, and in the recently recovered Apology of Aristides. It begins to be denied by Cerinthus (Irenaeus, i. 26), probably within the lifetime of the Apostle John (*cf.* above under *Gardner*). So repugnant must it have been to the severely austere morality of Jews, that "the mere fact that it arose on *Jewish* soil is a singular attestation of the Evangelic story" (D. Smith, p. 52, after Neander, p. 15). Orr, referring to present-day criticism allied with the system of the Jewish "Ebionites," remarks: "It is a curious irony which makes the narrowest and most retrograde of Jewish-Christian sects (the ancient Nazarenes, or more tolerant party, accepted the belief) the true representatives of Apostolic Christianity" ("The Virgin Birth," p. 164 *f.*).

This matter forms an essential part of the larger question as to the distinction which is made between the "historical Jesus" and "the Christ of the Creeds." Thus Pfleiderer: "Primitive Christianity has transferred the *Jesus of history* into the *Christ of faith* . . . has identified the 'self-existing Christ' with the *heavenly Son of Man* of the Apocalypse and the *Son of God* and *Logos* . . . has finally brought this eternal heavenly Being down to earth to become man, to die, to return to Heaven, there to share the throne and sovereignty of God until His future coming to judge the world" ("Early Christian Conception," p. 160 *f.*). Again Schmidt: "He (*i.e.*, JESUS) would have been utterly bewildered by the Nicene creed" (p. 383); and Gardner: "There is no demonstrable connection between the 'Jesus of history' and the Christ of Christian experience." These are typical expressions of what goes under the name of the "New (Modern) Theology" from three countries of "modern civilization." But listen to one who, advanced critic as he is, is careful in his statements — Wellhausen — who writes, "The historical Jesus, like a leading card, has been played against *Christianity*. . . To divorce Him from the effect of His history is to be unjust to Him. Whence came faith in Him as religious Ideal save from

Christianity? . . . We cannot go back even if we would." ("Introduction to the First Three Gospels." p. 114.)

H. Holtzmann and Harnack question the two verses, as if an interpolation. On the same side, besides Lobstein (above) write Drummond, Wernle (pp.81-83 of booklet in E. T.), and Schmiedel ("Encyclopaedia Biblica" art. "Mary"), J. Weiss, etc.; whilst in defence of the V.B. the following, besides Orr, may be consulted: — Dorner, B. Weiss, Godet (pp. 213-216), Zahn, Fairbairn, Bruce, Gore, and Sanday, etc. See further, besides notes referred to above, those on Luke 2: 41 and 48; Luke 4: 22; and Luke 18: 19.

30a The "holy thing" (*cf.* Matt. 1: 20). This distinctly traverses Dr. Boses' saying that the Lord was "not holy *by nature*" ("The Gospel in the Gospels," p. 163). The position taken by the American professor is a curious comment on his countryman Prof. Foster's claim as against "orthodox" scholars, to "intellectual" honesty. JESUS was from the outset "holy," *cf.* John 10: 36, although "made of a woman" (Gal. 4: 6); see Job 25: 4. On the connection of this with His sinlessness, see Orr, pamphlet on the "Virgin Birth," p. 29. A pulpit, if not academical, utterance of Schleiermacher should be noted: "It is the experience of all without exception that in everyone who has appeared on earth, endowed only as the children of men, sin has sooner or later developed. So it would have been in the Redeemer Himself if he had been from His birth like other children. . . . If Christ had been a sinner even in the least degree, could He have been our Saviour?" ("Selections from Foreign Pulpit Literature," vol. xvi., p. 279 *ff.*).

Bruce has well said: "A sinless man is as much a miracle in the moral world, as a virgin birth is a miracle in the physical world" ("Apologetics," p. 410, in criticism of the view taken by Abbott in "Onesimus," bk. iii., par. 7).

For the translation of verse 35, *cf.* American Revision.

31 Luke 1: 37. — *Cf.* verse 35, and note on 2: 11 (*Theotokos*, *cf.* note 51).

32 Luke 1: 42. — *Cf.* Judith 13: 18.

33 Luke 1: 45. — These words Bunyan represents as coming to the remembrance of Christiana and her party as soon as they had crossed the "Slough of Despond" (*Pilgrim's Progress*, Pt. ii.).

34 Luke 1: 46-55. — The "Magnificat." The Virgin was familiar with the Old Testament Scriptures, especially the Psalms, where compare Ps. 45: 3; Ps. 98: 3; Ps. 107: 9; Ps. 132: 1, 6, 7, 15. That Luke resorted to the vocabulary of the Seventy (note 4 F) to record the Aramaic utterances of Mary (verse 48) in Greek may be readily believed; but to say that he freely composed them (*cf.* note 20) is another matter. Ryle aptly refers to Col. 3: 16 for the lesson conveyed by this beautiful canticle. Hort's marginal reading "Elizabeth" instead of "Mary," in verse 46, is that of three old Latin MSS., and was known to Origen. It seems to have no support from Greek copies.

35 "Soul . . . spirit." *Cf.* Ps. 103: 1; "all that is within me" (Maclaren). How closely connected, and yet distinct, "soul" and "spirit" are, is shown by Heb. 4: 12. The difference broadens in the adjectives, "soulish" and "spiritual" in 1 Cor. 15: 46. "All through Scripture," writes Professor Laidlaw, "*spirit* denotes life as coming from God; *soul*, life as constituted in the man" ("Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible," iv., p. 167). The "spirit" is the *energy* of a man. As for the soul, in it "lies the centre of his personality" (Orr, "God's Image in Man," p. 51). The view, however, of the writer last quoted, that "spirits that never had bodies could not be called *souls*" (*ibid.*), is questionable, as "soul" in Scripture has not "always" the connotation of *body*; see Lev. 26: 11; Judges 10: 16; Isa. 42: 1. If that were so, there could be no objection taken to Kautzsch's saying (*ibid.*, art. "Religion of the Old

Testament") that in pre-prophetic times Jehovah was conceived of as having bodily form — a remark apparently based on such passages as Ex. 33: 23.

For the tripartite organism of man see Gen. 2: 7. It is brought out clearly in 1 Thess. 5: 23. "Breath of lives" in Genesis seems to suggest a continuity for the spirit which science recognizes in respect of the body. If this be so, the Creationists and Traducianists (see Liddon, "Elements of Religion," pp. 98-104), represented by Romanists and Lutherans respectively, share truth between them.

36 Luke 1: 56. — Here comes in Matt. 1: 18 *ff.*

37 Luke 1: 59. — The word ἐκάλουν is well rendered by Carr, "were for calling." The naming of a child was by Jewish custom independent of its circumcision.

38 Luke 1: 68-79. — The "Benedictus." For the vocabulary here, *cf.* Ps. 18: 2; Ps. 132: 17. This canticle seems specially modelled on the prophets (Plummer). In verse 77 "salvation," not found in Matthew and Mark, is a link with John's Gospel (*cf.* note 1). "Since the world began"; American Revision, "of old."

39 Luke 1: 72. — "To fulfil" (ποιεῖν), *cf.* 10: 37 ("show," see note there), and in the Old Testament, Gen. 21: 23; Joshua 2: 12; Judges 1: 24; Ps. 119: 65.

39a Luke 1: 74. — See Dr. Chalmers' sermon on "The Right Fear and the Right Faith."

40 Luke 1: 75. — "Piety," ὀσιότης, Carr: "A conscientious obedience to God. . . . a wider word than δικαιοσύνη, obedience to law."

41 Luke 1: 77. — "Deliverance"; or "salvation" (σωτηρία). *Cf.* Psalms of Solomon 17: 36: Messiah's removal of sin by His powerful word.

"Zacharias and Elizabeth" forms subject of a discourse by Dr. Whyte in his "Bible Characters," No. LXXII.

42 Luke 1: 80. — Some think that here, as at Luke 2: 40; Luke 2: 52; Luke 4: 13; there is mark of the conclusion of a separate document each time. The idea is discredited, amongst others, by Ramsay, p. 86 *f.*

## NOTES ON THE SECOND CHAPTER.

43 Luke 2: 1. — "Habitable world." This is practically equivalent to the whole area of Roman dominion. Strabo uses οἰκουμένη of the Mediterranean lands. The word is found in the LXX. sometimes for the Hebrew *tevel*, or *éretz* in the sense of "earth."

43a "Cyrenius" is the Greek, "Quirinius" (R.V.) the Roman form of the name.

44 Luke 2: 3. — "Own city." Observe that the same expression is used for Nazareth in verse 39 as here for Bethlehem, which should restrain criticism that, since at least the time of Schleiermacher, has sought to set this Evangelist at variance with Matthew. Thus, after German writers (*e.g.*, Soltau, p. 18), the article by Gardner in the "Encyclopaedia Biblica," in which it is said to be "*historically* probable that Jesus was born at Nazareth." Now, Matthew starts with Bethlehem, but not so as to imply that the habitual residence of Joseph was there; Mark speaks only of Nazareth; and then Luke deals with both, taking Nazareth as his starting point (ἄνωθεν). Matthew discloses that Joseph thought of *settling* at Bethlehem on his return from Egypt, but was divinely restrained. In introducing mention

of Nazareth he describes it, just as one would expect on the first occasion, in the same way as Luke the first time. Matthew, as John, shows how Messiah was rejected in Judea before, as an infant, He was in Galilee at all. Cf. Godet, i., pp. 217 ff., with O. Holtzmann ("Life of Jesus," p. 65). Bethlehem is about five miles south of Jerusalem.

45 "To be enrolled." On the difference between the present tense of verse 3 and the aorist in verse 5, see Ramsay. Already in verse 1 we are introduced to what has been a hunting ground of writers adverse to the inerrancy or accuracy of Scripture, nothing being known from secular records of any *general* census at this time. "Advanced" critics, accordingly, arraign the Evangelist of "carelessness" in making the Nativity synchronize with a census, with the correct date of which it is nevertheless of necessity admitted that he was acquainted: see Acts 5: 37, comparing Josephus, "Antiquities," vii. 13, 5. The question resolves itself into whether Quirinius discharged any administrative functions at the earlier date or not (see below).

When Herod died (750 A.U.C., i.e., 4 "B.C.," Quintilius Varus was imperial legate of Syria. Luke's statement is not at variance with this. By the researches of Augustus Zumpt, founded on Tacitus, "Annals," iii. 17, which have been followed by Mommsen's interpretation of an inscription at Tivoli, turned to account by Schürer, it has been rendered highly probable that a surmise of Grotius (followed by Neander, Hahn, B. Weiss, etc.) was correct, that Quirinius was in office twice, first as a commissioner in 750-753, and afterwards as legate in 760-765. Luke's word ἡγεμῶν (cf. note 3), accordingly, may be understood to speak of Quirinius' earlier functions as a "procurator," subordinate to the legate. Justin Martyr (Dial. c. Tryph. Jud., p. 303), describes him in the same way. The duties of this official, to which Luke refers, would then be limited to statistical (Hahn) or domestic (Ramsay), as distinct from financial and imperial functions. Some, therefore, would say that he completed as legate that which he had begun as commissioner; others, that he carried out what was begun by his predecessor. Ramsay has shown from the *papyri* found in Egypt some twenty years ago, that successive enrolments must have been habitually made there after intervals of fourteen years. None of the early opponents of Christianity, such as Celsus or Porphyry, impugned Luke's accuracy. The A.V. of verse 2 has the support of Ebrard, Hofmann and Godet.

46 Luke 2: 4. — "Galilee." This comprised the old territory of Naphtali and Asher; but Nazareth itself was in that part of the hills of Zabulon within the borders of Issachar. The modern town, *En-Nasîra*, is about fourteen miles (Merrill, "Galilee in the Time of Christ," p 123: "five hours") from the Lake of Tiberias, twenty-one miles from the Mediterranean, and sixty-six miles (Merrill: "three short days' journey") from Jerusalem. Sepphoris (now *Safed*), the capital of Galilee until 28 A.D., was about one hour and a half from Nazareth. The older form of this, *Nazara*, is read by Westcott-Hort and Weiss in 4: 16, as in Matt. 4: 13.

47 Luke 2: 5. — Professor Haupt, of Baltimore, in order to discredit the Evangelist's account of Mary going up to Bethlehem as well as Joseph, holds that it was not requisite that she should do so for the purpose which took Joseph there. He might as well say that of the Passover (verse 41), with reference to Deut. 16: 16; and yet attendance of women at the great Feast was recommended by Hillel. The American professor's theory that there were no people of Jewish blood in Galilee after 161 B.C. (on the slender foundation of 1 Macc. 5: 15), is discredited by all sensible scholars of right and left alike. As to historical connection between Nazareth and Bethlehem, see Ramsay, "Education of Christ," p. 56 f.

47a The best Greek MSS. have "betrothed"; an old Latin copy has "wife" whilst the later Greek copies have "betrothed wife."

48 Luke 2: 7. — "First-born son," πρωτοτόκος, but when Luke speaks of an only son, he uses μονογενής: Luke 7: 12, Luke 8: 42, Luke 9: 38. Cf. note on Luke 8: 20.

Dionysius the Little, at the beginning of the sixth century, reckoned the year of the Birth as 753, after the foundation of Rome; but it is certain that Herod died, as stated above, in 750. Hence three or four years have to be deducted from 753; and so 749, *i.e.*, 4 "B.C.," as Ellicott; whilst 5 "B.C." is taken as the date by Godet for the fifteenth year of Tiberius. Kepler, however, who has been followed by Alford, calculated that the Nativity took place in 6 "B.C." Cf. Turner, "Chronology of the New Testament," in "Hastings' Dictionary," *i.*, p. 415, and Gilbert, "Student's Life of Jesus," pp. 95-99.

"Christmas," as supposed season of this event, was substituted as a festival for the birthday of Mithra, the Sun-God (Neumann, p. 31).

For the views of independent British scholars on the place and time of the Lord's Birth, see Ramsay, "Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?"; and Rendel Harris' paper in *Expositor*, March 1908. It probably took place in the autumn (Sept.), about the time of the Feast of Tabernacles (Lev. 23: 34), under the Full Moon, five months after the birth of the Baptist, which would be about Passover.

49 Luke 2: 8. — For the word χώρα, "country," see Ps. 132: 6, in the LXX., and verses 12, 16 there, for "ye shall find" (verse 12). Mithra was likewise said to have been seen as a newly-born babe by shepherds.

49a Luke 2: 9. — "Stood by," ἐπέστη, used by Luke, also in Acts 23: 11, of the Lord.

50 *Shekîna*, the Talmudic and Rabbinical word for this, which has passed into Christian terminology, was drawn from Onqelos' Aramaic paraphrase of Deut. 12: 5. Cf. note 20 on John.

51 Luke 2: 11. — "Saviour": first occurrence in the New Testament. "Christ" is from the Greek *Christos*, which in Hebrew is *Mesiah*, and in the language of the time *Meshicha* (John 1: 41, "Messias").

Our Lord, in this Gospel, refers to Himself as "the Christ" in Luke 4: 18 *f.*, Luke 20: 41, Luke 21: 8, Luke 22: 67 *f.*, Luke 24: 26, 46. In the following passages, besides this, others so speak of him: Luke 2: 26, Luke 3: 15, Luke 4: 41, Luke 7: 19, Luke 9: 20, Luke 23: 2, 35, 39. He is called "Son of David" in Luke 1: 27, 32 above, and in Luke 3: 3, Luke 18: 38 *f.*, Luke 20: 41, 44.

"Christ (the) LORD" (R.V. margin, "the anointed Lord") in combination, is found only here in Scripture, although found in Psalms of Solomon, 17: 36, 18: 8. Its use there excludes the suggestion that it is an erroneous translation of the Aramaic. In the *Papyri* κύριος stands for "God," being used of any deity (Deissmann, "New Light," p. 79). It is distinct from "the Lord's Christ" in verse 26 (see note there), *cf.* Luke 23: 2, "Messiah (Christ) a King" (R.V. margin, an anointed King).

It was from such passages as this that the theological term *Theotokos*, "Mother of God," as used of the Virgin (*cf.* Luke 1: 35, 37) was drawn, which the Council of Chalcedon, happily, did not endorse. See, notwithstanding, the "Catholic" Catechism, p. 74. Our Lord, according to Mark 3: 35, provided against undue emphasis being put on the mystery of the Virgin Birth (see note above on chapter 1).

"Born . . . Christ." See note in volume for John, on "Gnosticism," which denied His birth as such, holding only the natural birth of "Jesus," upon whom "the Christ" was supposed to have descended at His baptism; that is, it denied the Godhead of JESUS, and the humanity of the CHRIST.

Reference may be made to Stalker, "Christology," pp. 127-167; and to notes here on "Son of

God," "Son of Man," as well as corresponding notes in "Exposition of Mark."

51a "Child." This inspired Luther's hymn, written (1540) for his little son, Hans, in "Lyra Germanica" (Newnes' ed., pp. 9-11).

52 Luke 2: 14. — "Good pleasure"; or "complacency" (εὐδοκία). The cognate verb is used in 3: 22 in connection with the Baptism of the Lord.

The determination of the reading, whether εὐδοκία or εὐδοκίας, depends on the construction of the words following "peace." Is εἰρήνη to be isolated, a stop being understood? The A.V., followed by Field, so took it, reading εὐδοκία, in support of which has now to be added the testimony of Syrsin (see further in Scrivener, ii., p. 344 ff.), whilst the Revisers (see Westcott-Hort, Appendix, p. 52 ff.) read εὐδοκίας, making two clauses only, which show "parallelism." The R.V. is "(men) in whom He is well pleased"; Westcott renders "(men) of well pleasing"; Evans, "(men) of His counsel for good" (or "His gracious purpose"), after Alford had explained it, of "the elect people of God," at which Canon Cook took umbrage. These renderings are all based on supposed connection of εὐδοκίας with ἄνθρωποις.

It is clear, however, that Origen took εὐδοκίας read by him, not with ἄνθρωποις, but with εἰρήνη ("peace"): see Benedictine edition of his Works, vol. iii., p. 946. Origen says, "that peace which the Lord does not give upon earth [xii., p. 49 f.] is not *the peace of goodwill*." In keeping with this view, and for doctrinal accuracy, it is best, if this reading be adopted, to render "peace of complacency in the midst of men," understanding by "peace of complacency" CHRIST (Luke 3: 22, cf. John 17: 23). This removes Field's objection to εὐδοκίας, founded on its being connected by the above-named scholar with ἄνθρωποις: he remarks (referring to Ps. 119: 24) that it would require ἄνδρες, not ἄνθρωποι.

Peace between God and man was not realized by the Incarnation, as many imagine, who adhere to the A.V. reading and rendering: cf. note 126 on John.

On the Nativity there are sermons of Luther; of Bishop Latimer, from verse 7 of Dr. Isaac Barrow, on verse 10; of H. Melvill on verse 13 f.; and of Dr. Chalmers, on verse 14; besides a "Contemplation" of Bishop Hall on verse 6 f.

53 Luke 2: 15. — "Let us make our way," cf. Ps. 132: 7.

53a Luke 2: 19. — "Pondering, etc." Luke would learn this from Mary herself, cf. Mark 14: 72, "when he thought thereon," which Mark would similarly learn from Peter, and both passages with 1 Cor. 2: 11.

54 Luke 2: 21-24. — Cf. Lev. 12: 6, 8, Gal. 4: 4, and for verse 21 in particular, Col. 2: 11.

"*Their purification*," referring to that customary with *the Jews* (Edersheim, "Life of Jesus, etc."); not to the parents (as J. Weiss and Vincent take it). It was thirty-three days after circumcision, *i.e.*, when a boy-child was forty days old. For a girl it was longer (as among Hindus still). The redemption-money was five shekels (Num. 18: 15 f.), corresponding to the later value of the old English "mark," or 13s. 4d.

55 "Jerusalem." The modern Arabic name is *El-Kuds*, "The Holy Place."

56 Luke 2: 25. — The "Consolation of Israel" was a Jewish name for Messiah. In John 14: 16, the "another" presupposes that the Lord was already "Paraclete."

57 Luke 2: 26. — See Lam. 4: 20. Some have needlessly suggested that the Aramaic behind verse

11 (see note there) may have been the same.

57a Luke 2: 29 *ff.* — The "Nunc Dimittis." *Cf.* Gen. 49: 18; Neil: "Simeon thinks of his death as his dismissal from servitude"; *cf.* Heb. 2: 15.

Romaine preached from these verses.

58 Luke 2: 32. — The reference here is rather to Isa. 25: 7 than to Isa. 49: 6 ("revelation to"; *cf.* 42: 6). The marginal rendering in R.V. (*cf.* the Vulg.) is preferable to the textual. *Cf.* John 8: 12 and 1: 79 here.

We meet with an echo of the words here in Acts 26: 23.

58a For Messiah as "glory of Israel," *cf.* Isa. 46: 13, and Rom. 9: 4. An imagined analogy in Buddhism may be found in Carus "The Gospel of Buddha," p. 30 *ff.*

58b Luke 2: 34 *f.* — See Tholuck's sermon "The Test of Every Heart," in series entitled "Light from the Cross"; also Whyte, *op. cit.*, LXXI. For the "falling and rising," *cf.* 2 Cor. 2: 16. The American Revision discards "up" after "rising."

59 Luke 2: 36 *f.* — The Syrsin curiously makes the meaning to be "had lived seven days only with her husband." As the R.V. shows, she must have been at least 105 years of age. For ascetic connection, *cf.* 1 Tim. 5: 9. See also "Catholic Catechism," No. 330. "Up to": Engl. Revv., "even for"; American, "even unto."

"Night and day." *Cf.* Acts 26: 7, and Mark 4: 27, 1 Tim. 5: 5. The Jewish ecclesiastical day of course began with the evening.

59a Luke 2: 38. — "Redemption," *cf.* Isa. 40: 2. Note that the critical text followed by Revv., is "of Jerusalem," *i.e.*, Messianic deliverance.

60 Luke 2: 39 (*cf.* note 44 above). — "Their own city, Nazareth." *Cf.* Matt. 2: 23, represented as irreconcilable with this. But Matthew must have regarded Bethlehem in the same light as Luke, who uses the epithet in various connections.

61 Luke 2: 40. — See Edersheim, "Sketches of Jewish Social Life," ch. 8; also Ramsay, "The Education of Christ."

As soon as JESUS could speak, He would learn passages like Deut. 6: 6, recited to him: at the age of five, the Hebrew characters would be learnt, for the *reading* of Leviticus (Edersheim, p. 130), followed by the rest of the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the poetical books in turn; when six, He would, under ordinary circumstances (see Grätz, "History of the Jews," ii. 148), have begun attendance at the synagogue school; and when ten, He would make acquaintance with the oral law, afterwards codified under the title of the "Mishna." But opinion will probably always be divided as to whether in His case all this was realized. *Cf.* note 65.

62 *Cf.* Thirlwall, note on Schleiermacher, p. 316. The Expositor was of opinion that the adoration by the Magi took place during a subsequent visit of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem on the occasion of a Passover: see volume on Matthew, p. 40.

63 Luke 2: 42. — The Lord would now be a "son of the Law" after "confirmation" (Schor, p. 84), beginning to wear fringes and tassels, and under obligation to attend the Festivals at Jerusalem (Ex. 23: 14 *ff.*, Deut. 16: 16).

64 Luke 2: 43. — "Fulfilled the days ": an octave, Ex. 12: 18.

65 Luke 2: 46 *ff.* — See notes 23 and 56 on Mark. JESUS would be independent of the subtleties of rabbinical instruction in so obscure a place as Nazareth (Delitzsch, "Jesus and Hillel," p. 14). A supposed Buddhist parallel to this visit to the Temple is used by Pfeleiderer, "Early Christian Conception of Christ," pp. 43-45.

"Thy father" (verse 48). In the case of a fatherless child, the person who cared for his education, we learn from a Jewish writer, was called his "father" (Grätz, *loc. cit.*).

66 Luke 2: 49 *ff.* — The Lord's first and last (John 19: 30) recorded words were about the work that God had given Him to do (D. Smith).

66a "Must," *cf.* Luke 9: 22, Luke 13: 33, Luke 19: 5, Luke 24: 44.

"My Father's business." Christ's familiarity with the Father characterized His life-long consciousness. To the end He used the address "Abba": see Mark 14: 36.

"Business," τοῦ κ.τ.λ. So Erasmus, Calvin, Ewald, McClellan, Pfeleiderer, Carr, and Weymouth. *Cf.* 1 Tim. 4: 15 and also Iren. Haer. v. 26.

Origen, Theodoret, Augustine, and most moderns take it as "House" (*cf.* John 2: 16); so Grotius, Bengel, B. Weiss, Schanz, and Field. Mary's word "sought" and the reply of JESUS taking up the word, are considered to favour this rendering (*cf.* "the zeal of Thine House hath consumed me"). But van Oosterzee seems to be right in saying that this narrows the fulness of the expression.

Syrsin shows "with My Father."

Dr. Whyte has a discourse on "Joseph and Mary," in *op. cit.*, No. LXX.

67 Luke 2: 52. — "Favour," χάρις, is found in the Gospels elsewhere only in verse 17 of John's "Prologue" ("grace"). Like characteristic Lucan words are σωτηρία (note 41) and εὐαγγελίζειν (i. 19, etc.).

This closes the record of the Holy Childhood as furnished by the canonical Gospel. *Cf.* Edersheim, "Life of Jesus the Messiah," i. 226-234; Nicoll "The Incarnate Saviour," chapter iii.; and Hughes, "The Manliness of Christ," pp. 35-60. Apocryphal accounts, like the "Gospel of Thomas," allege working by the youthful JESUS of no less than sixteen miracles: see Orr, "Apocryphal Gospels," p. 122. Such conduct, however, as these portray, would be "as unlovely as shocking" (Rush Rhees, p. 57).

Again, His alleged words "I am the *Logos*," or "I have always been perfect" (Pseudo Matthew, chapter xviii), are on a par with such sayings put down to young Gautama, as "the chief I am of all the world." Contrast Matt. 11: 29.

## NOTES ON THE THIRD CHAPTER.

68 Luke 3: 1. - "The fifteenth year." This, according to the prevalent view, which takes the reckoning from A.U.C. 765, when Augustus made Tiberius joint-emperor, would be A.D. 26, see Ramsay, "Paul the Traveller," p. 386 *f.*; *cf.* John 2: 20, according to which the first Passover of the Ministry fell in A.D. 30, forty-six years from A.U.C. 734.

Philip, son of Cleopatra, and married to his niece Salome (*cf.* note on verse 19).

69 Luke 3: 2. — "Lysanias." Luke's accuracy here, at one time questioned, has been confirmed by Schürer (div. i., vol. ii., Appendix 1), guided by inscriptions (*cf.* O. Holtzmann, p. 111). There had

been another prince of the same name, who died sixty years before this (Josephus, "Antiquities," xv. 4, 1).

70 "Annas." He was now "Sagan," or Deputy, although titular high priest (Acts 4: 6), the designation applied to Caiaphas in John 18: 13. Annas had been deposed by Valerius Gratus fifteen years earlier; but as far as the Jews were concerned his influence was but little diminished.

There is a useful plate (vi.) at the end of Sanders and Fowler's "Outlines for the Study of Biblical History and Literature," exhibiting the political divisions of the land at this time.

71 "Came upon" (ἐγένετο ἐπί), *cf.* Jer. 1. 1. The Baptist seems to have begun his ministry in 26.A.D.

72 "The country about Jordan," *cf.* Gen. 13: 10 *f.* It is a phrase representing the depressed valley of that river.

73 Luke 3: 4 *ff.* — Luke cites Isa. 40 in the LXX., including at the close a part of verse 5 there, which Box, in his recent edition of the Prophet, has left out as "superfluous, and not agreeing rhythmically with the rest of the Prologue" — a curious instance of modern subjectivity.

"All flesh" (verse 6), *i.e.*, the main divisions of mankind — Gentiles as well as Jews (*cf.* Acts 2: 17).

"The salvation of God," *i.e.*, the *Messianic* salvation, *cf.* Ps. 1. 23; Luke 1: 69 above; and John 4: 22; also note 192.

74 Luke 3: 8 *f.* — "We have Abraham," etc., *cf.* John 8: 33, 39. Montefiore confesses that his ancestors at that time "were somewhat too confident of eternal life; all Israelites except determined sinners were believed to have their share in it" (Hibbert Lectures, 1892, p. 482).

On the words "not producing good fruit," see Maclaren, B. C. E., p. 45.

74a Luke 3: 14. — Strange use was made of the Baptist's words here by Pope Pius X. on the occasion of addressing a mixed company of British bluejackets, Catholic and Protestant, in May, 1908. "When it was asked," said the Pontiff, "in Holy Scripture what it was necessary for a man to do to be saved, the answer was, that it was sufficient for him to perform the duties to which he had been born. I repeat the same thing to you" (Reuter). Could such language be frankly endorsed by Catholic any more than by Evangelical sentiment?

"Oppress . . . falsely." American Revv., "Extort . . . by violence . . . wrongfully."

75 Luke 3: 15. — Here arises another question discussed by Germans — as to when our Lord's Messianic claim was first asserted. The present passage harmonizes completely with John 1: 19-27, as to which see note 27 in the volume for that Gospel.

76 Luke 3: 16. — "Fire" (*cf.* Luke 12: 49). The Expositor's explanation may be ranged with that of Origen, Neander, van Oosterzee, B. Weiss, Schanz, and H. Holtzmann. That the reference is to inner regeneration, was the view of Grotius, Bengel, and Godet.

77 Luke 3: 19 *f.* — Luke here follows the manner of O.T. chroniclers. *Cf.* the way in which Isaac's story is dismissed in Gen. 35: 28 *f.*; the patriarch did not really die then. And so in Luke 24: 50, which does not mean that our Lord ascended at that point.

"His brother's," *i.e.*, Philip's, Mark 7: 17. Herod I. had two sons named "Philip" (*cf.* note 68). The one here referred to was son of Mariamne (*ibid.*). Burkitt ("Earliest Sources," p. 86) speaks of Mark's

"mistake" being "silently corrected here." Now, while Josephus speaks of Antipas also as "Herod" ("Antiqq.," xviii. 5), the Jewish historian had previously (xvii. 32) spoken of Herod's "son Herod Philip by the high priest's daughter," a passage which the Cambridge professor must have overlooked.

"Added this also to all," so American Revv., with "them" before "all," instead of "added yet this above all," retained by the Westminster Committee.

See Whyte, *op. cit.*, for discourse on "John the Baptist" (LXXIII.).

78 Luke 3: 22. — "My beloved Son." Rather, "my son, the Beloved" as Allen (on Matt. 3: 17), treating "the Beloved" as a Divine name. *Cf.* note below on Luke 9: 35.

The solitary reading of "D." "This day have I begotten thee" (see Ps. 2: 7, used by Paul of the Resurrection, Acts 13: 33), arose out of the second century idea that Jesus became Son of God at baptism. Connected with this is the observance in the Eastern Church of the Lord's birth on "Epiphany" (6th January) as also commemorating His baptism. What is clear however, is that His baptism "marked His awakening of *all that was involved* in Messiahship" — a statement not weakened by the strictures of Stock (p. 58 *f.*, see Isa. 1. 4 *ff.*, Fairbairn, "Studies," p. 90 *f.*). This reading, recognized by Augustine, but supported only by some old Latin versions — not by the Syriac of Sinai; naturally suits writers such as Pfleiderer (*op. cit.*, p. 407; *cf.* Harnack, "Sayings," p. 311 *f.*) as militating against the miraculous conception.

"In a bodily shape like a dove," *cf.* Gen. 1: 2. This phenomenon would have the more interest for Luke, because of his probable early associations; in Syria the dove was a *totem*.

Bishop Andrewes preached from verse 21 *f.*, Hooker, on the Personality of the Holy Ghost, from verse 22.

79 Luke 3: 23 *ff.* — ἀρχόμενος. The R.V. "began [to teach]" gives effect to the explanation of Origen, followed by Bengel, De Wette, Meyer, and Alford.

"Thirty years old," *cf.* Num. 4: 3, etc.

The GENEALOGY. — ὡς ἐνομιζετο, as He was accounted, *i.e.*, in the eyes of the Law. The Revv. have followed Alford in making the parenthesis end with ἐνομιζετο, instead of after Ἰωσήφ as Wieseler, amongst others, followed by the Expositor, and since by Plumptre and Gloag. The curtailed parenthesis of course tends to produce the impression that the genealogy, like that in Matthew, is of Joseph. Several English writers (Lord A. Hervey, Alford, Farrar, etc.), with Germans such as Meyer and Hofmann, during the last fifty years have attempted to establish the Patristic view (of Origen and Jerome), which has actually encumbered the subject with needless difficulty. The difference of opinion has a curious history.

The Jews, in controversy with the early Christians, accepted that which seems to have been the primitive view, that the second of the genealogies concerns the mother of our Lord. The Talmud speaks of her as "daughter of Heli" (verse 23). They ignored Matthew's genealogy, which seemed to them to make for our Lord's being born in wedlock, whilst their aim — in a spirit of prejudice, and with motives of hostility — was to show that He was a child of shame. Hence Christian controversialists had recourse to the expedient of treating Luke's genealogy also as one of Joseph; it seemed to enable them to suggest that there was a Levirate marriage on the part of Jacob or Heli, who were supposed to have been half-brothers, sons of Matthan (Matthat), *i.e.*, the survivor of them, it was thought, married the other's widow: Euseb., "Eccl. Hist.," i. 7, 4; *cf.* Schleiermacher, p. 56.

This necessarily hypothetical position was not overcome until the closing years of the fifteenth

century, when the original view, so obscured by anti-Jewish feeling, was revived. This has been adopted by, amongst others, Godet, B. Weiss, Plumptre, Spence and Gloag. One objection raised to it is that put forward by De Wette (followed by Plummer), that women's registers were not kept, but proof to the contrary is afforded by the case of Judith (viii. 1), whose lineage is given for fourteen generations before her father. Women were respected much more in Israel than among other nations; disparagement of them (see Jewish Prayer Book, p. 6) is due to the Talmudists. Indeed, it would be difficult to understand how the Jews in early Christian times could with any plausibility have turned Luke's genealogy to account, had the public records regarded males alone.

Such is the irony of events that German critics, adverse to the idea of miraculous conception, deem it expedient to regard the genealogy in Matthew as dominating interpretation of that in Luke, just as of old it happened to be convenient for Jews to treat the second genealogy as applying the lineage of Mary.

B. Weiss well remarks ("Sources of Luke's Gospel," p. 198, note), that the Evangelist could not have committed the absurdity (in the eyes of Gentiles) of giving the genealogy of JESUS through Joseph (as Alford insists), if, as is clear he did, Luke considered Him only His foster-father's *reputed* Son. Luke was not writing for Jews, and therefore is as not under such limitations as Matthew.

The prophetic words in verse 23 are not those of an interpolator, as most contemporary German writers suggest, but those of Luke himself as editor: so even Renan.

Mary's being spoken of as "of the house of David" (Luke 1: 27; *cf.* note 26) finds its justification in this genealogy (*cf.* Rom. 1: 3). Joseph is here scarcely mentioned: the Evangelist could not have come in contact with one so long dead. It is not Joseph's but Mary's hesitation that he dwells upon.

The Davidic claim (verse 31, *cf.* 2 Sam. 5: 14, Zech. 12: 12) of Solomon's line represented by *Jeconiah* was barred by that king's childlessness (Jer. 22: 30), so that the succession passed to that of Nathan, represented by *Salathiel*, whose actual father was Neri (verse 27).

Difficulties arising from comparison of the two genealogies are due chiefly to a mistaken *ecclesiastical* standpoint. Any reader may see that, whilst these mechanically agree from Abraham to David, they do not from David to Jeconiah. "Rhesa" in verse 27 is now known to have not been a personal name: in Aramaic it stood for some "prince" of the captivity whose name seems to have been Abiud (Matt. 1: 13), son of the most notable descendant of David since the exile — Zerubbabel. See further the helpful note of Plumptre, *ad loc.* in Ellicott's "N.T. Commentary for English Readers." "[The Son] of God" at the end bears a double sense (see verses 32 and 35 of Luke 1).

There seems never to have been any actual error discovered, as distinct from "constructive" mistake alleged, in either genealogy. Men like Celsus (*circ.* 150 A.D.) and Porphyry (*circ.* 300 A.D.) did not question them when these records had an importance which they do not possess for our age. Tatian's omission of them altogether is an eccentricity of his "Diatessaron," due, of course, to his difficulty in "harmonizing" them.

Reference may further be made to Gloag, p. 253 *ff.*, and to W. Kelly's "God's Inspiration, etc.," p. 61.

## NOTES ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER.

80 Luke 4: 1-13. - The TEMPTATION.

"By the Spirit." Luke has ἐν τῷ πνεύματι (American Revv., "in the S."); Matthew, ὑπὸ τοῦ

πνεύματος. Comparison of the Evangelists suffices for exclusion of any such idea as the Unitarian, that the Lord's own spirit alone is here meant, according to which the conflict must have been purely mental. "In the Spirit" means "in the power of." Cf. its use in 11: 15, and Weymouth there.

If there were no personal devil (verse 2), then our Lord would have been tempted from within (Norris); and this is what the suggestion comes to — made, amongst others, by J. Weiss (p. 51) — that it was a mere vision like that in Ezek. 8: 3, or Isa. 6, or 2 Cor. 12: 1-4. Cf. note on 22: 31.

There are three sermons on this subject by Adolphe Monod, and an "Exposition" by Maclaren (vol. i., pp. 78-85).

81 Luke 4: 3. — Note the order: Body, Mind, Spirit (most subtle). Edersheim records the then popular notion that Messiah would feed His people, as Moses did, with manna. Cf. the miraculous feeding of thousands, with Ps. 103: 5, Ps. 105: 40, Ps. 132: 15, each time of Jehovah.

81a Luke 4: 4 ff. — Luke's, as compared with Matthew's, statement shows abbreviated quotation of Deut. 8: 3.

Dr. Arnold preached from verse 4, on Fasting.

With verse 5 f., cf. John 8: 44, 2 Thess. 2: 11.

82 Luke 4: 6. — Cf. John 12: 31, John 14: 30; Rev. 12: 3.

83 Luke 4: 7 f. — The difference of order (see note 81) from that in Matthew, Zahn would explain by supposing that what JESUS told His disciples about it they repeated differently from memory ("Introduction," ii., 403 f., German); but such an exposition as W. Kelly's is more in accordance with the inspiration of the Evangelist. Zahn shares Alford's idea that Luke could not have had Matthew's account before him.

"It is written." Bettex sententiously remarks, "Satan is silent. For him there is no Biblical criticism" ("The Book of Truth," p. 125).

84 Luke 4: 9. — "Jerusalem" represents Matthew's "holy city," in keeping with the distinction (B. Weiss) between our Evangelist's use in the original Greek (e.g., at Luke 1: 22), cf. *Hierosolyma* and *Jerusalem*. Ramsay's discrimination of "geographical" and "hieratical" (as here) would render a reference to "different sources" (Weiss) quite needless.

85 "Edge," πτερύγιον, a word common to both Evangelists recording this, and at the same time peculiar. Weiss deems conclusive for his theory of a common source ("Sources of Luke's Gospel," p. 100).

Norris: "Faith allied to self-will passes into presumptuous fanaticism."

86 Luke 4: 13. — "Season." Wesley (as the Expositor) takes this as referable to the scene in Gethsemane (Luke 22: 53). The other view, according to which our Lord was more or less subject to Satan's subtle enmity in this way throughout has been based on Luke 22: 28. But indeed the form of the Greek, "every temptation," shows that no form of testing set forth in 1 John 2: 16 can be excluded. Cf. John 6: 15, Mark 8: 11, Matt. 16: 23.

As to the Lord's incapacity for sin, see Trench, "Studies in the Gospels," p. 28.

For the Buddhist parallel adduced (as by Pfleiderer, "Early Conception, etc.," pp. 51-53), see "Sacred Books of the East," iv. p. 204.

A difficulty is sometimes raised about no one having witnessed this scene. There is none,

however, in supposing that the Lord communicated it to His disciples, if not during the Ministry (Garvie suggests, at Caesarea Philippi), at least during the forty days before His Ascension.

Sermons on the Temptation have been preached by, amongst others, Luther (p. 299), Bishop Andrewes (series of seven), and G. Whitefield.

Between this and the next verse a place may be found for events recorded in John 1: 19 - 4: 42, in the interval, that is, between the Temptation and the Galilean ministry of Mark's framework. This would seem to have embraced a visit to Galilee before the imprisonment of the Baptist, and a return to Judea for ministry there, with (Briggs suggests, p. 4) the sons of Zebedee.

87 Luke 4: 14 *f.* — Reference may be made here to Farrar on "Jesus as He lived in Galilee," "Life of Christ," chapter xxii.; and for Synagogues, to Edersheim, "Jewish Social Life," chapter xvi. *f.*

As Stock says, it is not likely that any of the teaching (*cf.* verse 31) here referred to preceded that at Nazareth (verse 16 *ff.*). He helpfully compares Matt. 4: 13 (p. 70).

88 Luke 4: 16-30. — Upon the question whether Christ was twice rejected at Nazareth, consult Rush Rhees, p. 292 *f.*

89 Luke 4: 17. — This affords illustration of the Lord's familiarity, by training, with the *Hebrew* Scriptures. Synagogue rolls were not in *Aramaic*. A *Haftara*, or section of the Prophets, was read on Sabbath after the reading of the Law.

90 Luke 4: 18. — The quotation is made up of Isa. 61 and 58: 6.

"Anointed," see Zech. 4: 6, 14. "Thus early did He claim to be Messiah" (Stalker, p. 131). Prophecy prepared men for a Messiah working miracles, *cf.* Luke 11: 20.

Henry Venn preached from verse 18 *f.*, on "The Work of Christ."

91 Luke 4: 19. — "Acceptable year of [the] LORD," *cf.* 2 Cor. 6: 2. As to the break between the "acceptable year" and the "day of vengeance" in Isa. 61: 2, see note below on Luke 21: 25.

A question that has been discussed since the Patristic period is, Of what duration was our Lord's ministry? The present, verse was of old supposed to indicate that the Synoptic ministry lasted only one year.

The Synoptists nowhere say that the ministry extended over only a single year. On the other hand, when Jülicher says that it is "childish" to use 13: 7 of this Gospel in support of a three years' ministry, it would be none the less so to understand the present passage as so limiting it. By comparison of the third and the last Gospels, we may venture to say that the

First Passover (John 2: 13) synchronizes with Luke 4: 13, A.D. 26-27

Second Passover (John 5: 1) synchronizes with Luke 5. A.D. 27-28

Third Passover (John 6: 4) synchronizes with Luke 9. A.D. 28-29

Origen, Jerome, and Augustine, allowing for a Fourth Passover in John's Gospel (*cf.* note 53 on John), concluded that the period was from three years to three years and a half. Turner (art. "Chronology of the New Testament" in Hastings' "Dict. of the Bible") makes it "between two and three years."

Blass has observed that Mark (Peter) would not so readily report in Jerusalem what had happened there, as that which the Jerusalemites could not know. Similarly Matthew, and also Luke if he

composed any part of his Gospel in Judea. With reference to Luke 13: 34, the Halle Professor has written: "It is John who first clears up the passage and justifies it" (*Expository Times*, July, 1907). Luther and Lightfoot had already made use of it.

92 Luke 4: 21. — Here is the Lord's first *direct* statement to Israelites of His Messianic claims: *cf.* John 4: 26. See Whyte, "Walk, Conversation, and Character of Jesus Christ our Lord," chapter x.; "Our Lord's First Text"; also chapter xxix., "Our Lord and the Bible." Frennsen, a recent German revolutionary writer, has made use of this passage of Luke in his "Holy Land," chapter xxvi. (E. T., p. 315). C. Kingsley's sermon, "The Message of the Church to Labouring Men" is from this passage.

92a *Cf.* Rev. 5, 6.

93 Luke 4: 22. — "Words of grace," *cf.* Ps. 45: 2. Westcott "To substitute gracious words [A.V.] would be to obscure the truth" ("Some Lessons, etc.," p. 33): *cf.* Acts 14: 3; Acts 20: 32.

94 "Joseph's son." Mark, although reliance is placed on Mark 6: 3 for modern denial of the Virgin Birth (*cf.* note 57 on Mark, note 30 above, and see Wright, "Introduction to Synopsis, etc.," p. xli.), speaks of the "carpenter, the Son of Mary," whilst Luke, who is discredited when he records it as a miraculous event, in his parallel to Mark has the above description. It would be absurd to have to suppose that Joseph is regarded as dead at the point of the narrative of the one Evangelist, but still alive by the other. Again, it is in Luke that we meet with "His parents" and "Thy father." Accordingly, critics can but conceive editorial variations in each Gospel, all of which suggestions (*e.g.*, Wright's "Trito-Mark") must be taken for what they are worth. Anything like proof in the sense of our English High Court of Justice (see note 56 on Mark, *ad fin.*) is rare indeed.

95 Luke 4: 23. — For this proverb ("parable"), see Talmud, "Bereshith Rabba," sect. 23. It is still current amongst Jews in the form "He is a physician for others, not for Himself."

"Capernaum." It would not require the training of a critic to see that, from the reference to great deeds there, this section is out of *chronological* order.

96 Luke 4: 24. — There is a clear instance of our Lord's repeated use of the same proverb: see John 4: 44.

"Our country." *Cf.* Matt. 19: 1, and see note on Luke 2: 3 above.

97 Luke 4: 25. — "Three years and six months," as in James 5: 17: *cf.* 1 Kings 18: 1. The period of drought may have been so stated according to a symbol of misfortune (Dan. 12: 7); so De Wette, followed by Weiss.

98 Luke 4: 30. — Here is another link with the Gospel of John (John 9: 59).

99 Luke 4: 31-37. — From here to 6: 16, Luke's account is in close touch with that of Mark: see Harnack's "Luke the Physician," p. 87 *ff.*

100 Marcion's recension of Luke begins here. He passed over the Baptist as one belonging to the Old Dispensation. Marcion may be regarded as the first Biblical critic (Harnack, "History of Dogma," pp. 237-240; *cf.* Bebb, art. in Hastings' "Dict. of Bible," and Burkitt, chapter ix.). What we know of him, (*cf.* notes 14, 17, above) comes chiefly from Tertullian, Adv. Marc. v., and Epiphanius, Haer. xlii. Irenaeus says that he "mutilated the Scriptures . . . curtailing the Gospel according to *Luke* and the Epistles of *Paul*" (iii. 12, 12). Semler suggested that our Gospel and Marcion's were compiled from the same original source; and after his time arose the idea that the Gospel according to Luke was an expansion of that used by Marcion; but critics seem now all to have returned to the old view. The

passages omitted by this Gnostic are enumerated in Gloag's work.

Marcion's system was strongly Anti-Jewish; he questioned our Lord's speaking as in Matt. 5: 17 (Tertullian, Adv. Marc. iv. 7, v. 14; but *cf.* Luke 16: 17). The third Gospel was the only one that he seems to have recognized; and the use which he made in connection with it of some of the Pauline Epistles, may have sustained the impression that there is a strong Pauline cast upon Luke's record. See Godet, "New Testament Studies," p. 44. This Pauline colouring has been specially investigated by Resch in vol. xii. (1904) of the New Series of Monographs edited by Gebhardt and Harnack (see in particular p. 571 *ff.* of his Dissertation). *Cf.* Swete, "St. Paul assimilated that side of our Lord's teaching which this Gospel has specially preserved" ("Studies in the Teaching of our Lord," p. 119). It is generally admitted that there are passages in LUKE alien to parts of the Epistles, *e.g.*, Luke 12: 35 compared with Eph. 6: 14; Luke 18: 1 with 2 Thess. 1: 11; Luke 21: 34 with 1 Thess. 5: 3; Luke 24: 34 with 1 Cor. 15: 5; whilst Luke 21 may be read throughout alongside of 1 Thess. 5. As for Luke 10: 7 (*cf.* 1 Tim. 5: 18 and 1 Cor. 9: 14) see note there. The Expositor, it will be seen, compares Luke's Gospel with the Epistle to the Romans.

The attempt of H. H. Evans to establish Paul's authorship of this Gospel and of the Book of Acts (1884), although it has been commended by some German writers, seems to have attracted little attention in this country. Evans brought out the interesting fact that of 1750 words peculiar to LUKE amongst the Evangelists, one-half are found in Paul's Epistles; also that 250 words occurring in both this Gospel and the Acts are not to be found elsewhere in the New Testament outside the Apostle's writings (p. 20 *f.*; *cf.* note 29 above).

The interest of this subject now lies in its connection with the cry "Back to Christ!" expressed by Carpenter as "transfer of the centre of interest from Paul to Christ" ("The Bible in the Nineteenth Century," p. 341) as if the Reformers were not radical enough in contenting themselves with recovery of Pauline truth (and that, as the Expositor would have said, to a very limited extent). It is true that our Lord's teaching was "the word of the beginning of the Christ" (Heb. 6: 1), and that Luke "had in mind the Lord Jesus Christ as the risen Saviour" (Bruce, Introduction to "Expositor's Greek Testament," i.); but, as Fairbairn has said, "What gives to the Gospels their peculiar significance is that they are lives of Jesus by men who believed that Christ had created Christianity. The struggle of the modern spirit is to get behind the faith of the Evangelists and read the history they wrote with the vision they had before their eyes were opened" ("Philosophy of the Christian Religion," p. 306); *cf.* note 30, *ad. fin.* (Wellhausen).

101 "Capernaum," *cf.* note on verse 23. See Delitzsch, "A Day in Capernaum." Matt. 4: 13 tells us that it *became* the Lord's place of residence, so far as He had one, in Galilee. *Cf.* note 22 on Mark ("His own city").

102 Luke 4: 32. — *Cf.* 1 Cor. 1: 18, and note on Mark 1: 22, besides that on Luke 5: 17 below.

103 Luke 4: 33. — "Spirit of unclean demon", *cf.* Luke 6: 18; Luke 11: 24, "unclean spirit." Lightfoot (Horae Hebr., on Luke 13: 11, "spirit of infirmity") records a distinction made between spirits causing disease and "evil spirits," occupied with sorcery and accordingly called "unclean." Probably Luke's "unclean" was adapted to Gentile thought, for that recognized a distinction between good and bad "demons." Zech. 13: 2 and Rev. 16: 13 *f.* show the connection of unclean spirits with false prophets.

Renan speaks of the wilderness as "haunted according to popular belief by demons." *Cf.*, however, Maurice, "Not in deserts, but in places of concourse, in the synagogues we hear of them." "Let us fly from superstitions", says the critic. "We do not hear less of spirits . . . in this day than in

former days. I do not perceive that even scientific men can point to deliverance from a superstition . . . not a few succumb," etc. (p. 62 *ff.*). A notable instance was Lord Herbert of Cherbury, a deistical apostle of "the philosophy of common sense" who looked for a sign if he was to publish his "*Tractatus de Veritate.*" of course, he heard a sound from heaven such as he desired.

104 Luke 4: 34. — "Nazarene," see note on John 18: 5. "Matthew," writes Weiss, "always has *Nazarean*, Luke nearly always has *Nazarene*" ("Sources of Luke's Gospel," p. 12).

105 Luke 4: 35. — "Having thrown him down." This does not conflict with Mark's *tearing* him; the convulsions left no evil effect (Darby-Smith).

106 Luke 4: 36. — The word θαύβος is peculiar to Luke (5: 9; Acts 3: 10 "Wonder").

107 Luke 4: 37. — This miracle is one of the seven performed on Sabbaths, the rest of which are — in verse 38 here, Luke 6: 6 *ff.*, Luke 13: 10 *ff.*, Luke 14: 1, and two in John (John 5: 9 *ff.*, and John 9: 1 *ff.*).

The temper of our age is, of course, adverse to MIRACLE. No "intelligent man" is expected any longer to rest the truth of Christianity at all upon operation in times past of "the powers of the age to come," at the dawn of which Christ's words in 18: 8 of this Gospel will have their application. We may not be far off that time now. The American Professor Foster writes: "An intelligent man who now affirms his faith in miraculous narratives like the Biblical, can hardly know what intellectual honesty means" (p. 132). But do not sensible men in all countries correct their logic by their experience? *Cf.* Kaftan, "The Truth of the Christian Religion," vol. ii., p. 130 *f.*; also Orr, "The Bible under Trial," p. 152. Indeed, Ritschl, with all his dislike of metaphysics, has said: "Every one will meet the miraculous in his own experience" ("Instruction in the Christian Religion," p. 189, note. *Cf.* Wesley's note on Mark 16: 18; it seems to have been derived from Bengel's Gnomon, "Even at this day in every believer faith has a latent miraculous power." Those who imagine that belief in miracle is not essential to Christianity, if consistent, must surrender prayer in the Christian sense. Huxley has amended Hume's argument upon miracles, which in his revised form — consonant with the views of J. S. Mill — makes it all a question of *evidence*, whilst it is by the aid of Hume's own philosophy that Fairbairn has criticized the eighteenth century writer's treatment of the subject ("Philosophy of the Christian Religion," p. 25 *ff.*).

Harnack, in an unwonted manner, goes almost into rhapsody over the sure ground afforded by agreement of "Q" with Mark ("Sayings," p. 249). It is certain that "Q," if ever it existed, harmonized with the same canonical Gospel as regards the large amount of Christ's "supernatural energy" — this is generally conceded.

A medical writer in the *Hibbert Journal* (April, 1907) has confessed that many of the disorders recorded could not have been cured by moral therapeutics (auto-suggestion).

The Biblical miracles seem to have closed with the incidents of the last chapter of the Acts, when Paul definitely gave up his testimony to the Jews, for whom they were intended (*cf.* 1 Cor. 1. 22), in fulfilment of Isaiah. Contrast the case of Epaphroditus (Phil. 2: 25 *ff.*): "Why did not the Apostle heal him?" (*Cf.* Sir R. Anderson, "The Silence of God," p. 57 *f.*)

Besides Butler's "Analogy," part ii., chapters ii., vii., in this connection, the following recent literature well repays consultation: — Mozley's Bampton Lectures (6th ed., 1883), Westcott's "Gospel of Life" (chapter vii.), Sanday's "The Life of Christ in Recent Research" (section viii.), Boyd Kinnear's "The Foundation of Religion" (chapter x.), Dr. Jas. Drummond's "The Miraculous in Christianity" — candid like all that he writes — Bettex's "Modern Science and Christianity" (E. T.,

1903), pp. 162-185; and not least Dr. L. von Gerdell's pamphlet on "Miracles before the Forum of Modern Thought" (still only in German; see note 52 on John and the *Christian* of 12th Oct., 1911, p. 17). For the connection of the transcendent character of JESUS with His miracles, see Rush Rhees, pp. 249-269.

An extract from Illingworth may close this note: "Miracles flow naturally from a Person . . . at home in two worlds. . . . We cannot separate the wonderful life, or the wonderful teaching, from the wonderful works. They involve and interpenetrate and presuppose each other" ("Divine Immanence," p. 90).

There is a classification of the Lucan Miracles in Westcott "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels," p. 392 *f*. See further, notes 27 and 58 on Mark.

108 Luke 4: 38. — Another illustration (*cf.* note on verse 23) of Luke's non-chronological order; nothing hitherto has been said about Simon, who is introduced abruptly.

108a Luke 4: 39. — For the compound imperfect in the Greek, *cf.* verse 44 and Luke 5: 16 *f*. See also note 108 on Mark.

109 An instance of the Evangelist's special medical knowledge (*cf.* note 2). "Great fever" describes *typhus*. See again Luke 8: 41, etc.

110 Luke 4: 40. — *Cf.* Mark 1: 32, where critics pounce upon "many" as if improved upon here by "all," "every one." Mark may mean "many they were that," etc., in the modern manner.

111 Luke 4: 41. — Here is the point of contact with the other Synoptists.

112 Luke 4: 42. — "Coming out" is understood by De Wette as from Capernaum,

113 Note the imperfect tense: "Would have kept — were for keeping — Him back."

114 Luke 4: 43 *f*. — The reading "Judea." Godet has remarked that this "neutral" reading should have been a lesson to Westcott and Hort. If it be accepted, it must mean the whole land, as in Luke 1: 51 (see note there). For the ministry in Judea proper, *cf.* Luke 13: 34, Luke 19: 31, Luke 22: 14, Acts 2: 9, Acts 10: 37.

115 As to the "Kingdom of God," regarded by Ritschlians as the centre of Christ's teaching, see note 21 on Mark, and *cf.* notes below on Luke 12: 31, Luke 17: 20 *f.*, and Luke 19: 12.

Some conceive that verse 43 marks the end of a section in one of Luke's sources (Zahn, p. 373).

## NOTES ON THE FIFTH CHAPTER.

116 Luke 5: 1-11. — As to the difference between this scene and that in John 21, see Harnack, "Luke the Physician," p. 227, and note 380 in the volume on that Gospel. Wright's statement that "St. John's account contradicts St. Luke's" ("Synopsis," p. 271), is itself contradicted by German opinion, that St. John's, is "unhistorical." The way in which such nine-pins are set up to be knocked down is very unedifying.

"The earlier event," writes Bruce, "served the purpose of winning Peter to the life of discipleship: the later, of inspiring him to devotion to the heroic career of apostolate" ("Miraculous Element, etc.," p. 229).

117 Luke 5: 1 *f*. — Dr. Abbott, by way of distinguishing the two Evangelists' respective accounts,

observes that in John 21, "there is only one boat mentioned" (art. in "Encyclop. Bibl.," § 32); but in verse 8 mention is made of the tender (τὸ πλοιάριον) as well as the πλοῖον of verse 3. When it suits negative critics to insist on distinction in words, they are not slow to do so. The real differences are too many to support the idea of a discrepancy, as if there were duplicate accounts. If doctrinal insight fail, ingenuity must likewise: and so of Dr. Wright's remark (*loc. cit.*, p. 12) on verse 4, that if Luke "were *ignorant* of the visit to Galilee after the Resurrection, upon which he is silent, he would the more infer that the draught of fishes belonged to the earlier period of the ministry."

118 "The Word of God." — *Cf.* Luke 8: 11, Luke 11: 28. "As used by Luke," writes Harnack, "*the Word* did not mean Church doctrine; it did not mean even the Bible; it meant the message of the free grace of God in Christ" (*op. cit.*, p. 274). *Cf.* Acts 8: 11 where "the Word" and "the Scriptures" occur together. In Matt. 15: 6 (R.V.), and Mark 7: 13, it certainly means Old Testament Scripture, as again in Rev. 1: 2.

What used to be called "proof-texts" of Scripture were singly *a* word (ῥῆμα) of God; but in Evangelical parlance by *the* Word of God is meant the whole of Scripture (Hofmann, "Scripture Proof," part. i., p. 96 *ff.*). See Acts 20: 32 for like use of λόγος; Heb. 6: 5, and Heb. 11: 3, for the employment of ῥῆμα.

The following extract from Scholten expresses a now unhappily common idea, represented in England by the writings of Dr. James Martineau. "There is a difference between the Scripture and the Word of God. The latter is what God reveals in the human spirit concerning His will and Himself. The writing down of the communication is *purely human*; therefore the Bible cannot be called *Revelation*." The effect of this is that the Scriptures have come to be regarded as a mere *record* of Revelation. As to this, see note 6 above, comparing note 69 on Mark and also note 115 on John.

It is the fashion, on the part of those who disparage the unlimited *authority* of the Bible, to taunt with "Bibliolatry," *i.e.*, superstition, such as adhere to the view of inspiration stated in note 6 above, with making the same "fetish" of Scripture that others make of the Church. Well, the Word of God commends those who tremble at it (Isa. 66: 2, 5): who dare not abate their reverence for it, because for them at least it enshrines CHRIST, so that impairing its plenary inspiration is nothing more nor less than taking Him "away." As to our Lord's having merely "the first place," see "the Bible or the Church," p. 213 *f.*

Are we to say that the authority of Scripture is "of the past alone," that it is "a fossil stored carefully in a museum," as Grubb ("Authority and the Light Within," pp. 28, 37)? Or rather, as the writer to the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 4: 12, with which *cf.* verses 4 and 7), that Scripture is "living," as God Himself? Do we not "hear" inspired Apostles, and so God, in their writings; 1 John 4: 6, Rom. 7: 1? Scripture is not merely compared to a "two-edged sword," but is said to transcend that: it deals with Past, Present, and Future alike, so that its penmen did not serve only their own generation (Acts 13: 36).

Archer Butler has a sermon, taken from the present passage, on "The Word of God" (vol. ii.).

119 Luke 5: 5. — "Master," ἐπίσῑατα This word (as κύριος) in Luke is used by disciples; διδάσκαλος by others (*e.g.*, Luke 21: 7).

120 "Depart . . . sinful man, Lord." Here we have the disciple's impression as to the Lord's sinlessness. Norris compares the lesson of the Transfiguration. As to sin, see note on 11: 4; and for the word "sinner" in this Gospel, *cf.* Luke 7: 37, Luke 13: 2, Luke 15: 10, Luke 18: 13. For "Lord" in this connection, *cf.* John 13: 13.

"The Character of Peter" is the subject of Dr. Whyte's discourse LXXV., in the series entitled "Bible Characters."

120a Stock discriminates seven steps in the call and appointment of the first disciples, as to which see his "Talks," p. 85.

121 Luke 5: 14. — "To tell no man." So only prescribed in Galilee, perhaps because it was the headquarters of the "Zealots," as to whom see note 146.

122 "Moses ordained." A confirmation by our Lord of the Mosaic authorship of that which is by critics called the "Priestly Code," *cf.* Luke 20: 37, Luke 24: 44. May not one fairly say that discrediting writings which on the face of them claim to be those of Moses is to disbelieve them? The Lord's words in John 5: 47 find striking illustration in our own day. It is not, as alleged, believers who are responsible, by appealing to His utterances, for any surrender of confidence in Him.

123 Luke 5: 16. — "Withdrew." Wesley's note draws attention to the *compound imperfect* here: "He did so frequently."

124 Luke 5: 17-24. — This paragraph serves as Harnack's second illustration of Luke's supposed use of Mark's record ("Luke the Physician," pp. 90-92).

125 Luke 5: 17. — "Pharisees." *Cf.* in particular, Luke 11: 42-44, and see Edersheim, "Sketches of Jewish Social Life," chapter xiv. "The power of the Lord." *Cf.* 1 Cor. 1: 24.

126 Luke 5: 19. — "Tiles": Luke's adaptation to the way in which a Roman house was constructed (Ramsay).

Weiss is alone in following B, which has "all" instead of "Jesus." This he thinks was conformed to "Him" in verse 18. There may be no other way of accounting for B's reading.

126a Luke 5: 20. — See sermon from this text, by D. L. Moody, on Faith.

127 Luke 5: 24. — "The Son of Man" (*cf.* Matt. 9: 6, Mark 2: 10). This title of our Lord has been merely touched on in note 30 above.

To the Old Testament passages named in note 30 on Mark (2: 10) may be added Num. 23: 10.

As by other Synoptists, it is put by Luke in the mouth of the Lord alone, and in the following passages, beside the present: — Luke 6: 5, 22; Luke 7: 34; Luke 9: 22, 26, 44, 58; Luke 11: 30; Luke 12: 8 — where Matthew 10: 32 has "I" — Luke 12: 10, 40; Luke 17: 22, 24, 26, 30; Luke 18: 8, 31; Luke 19: 10; Luke 21: 27, 36; Luke 22: 22, 48, 69; and Luke 24: 7.

For its use in the Jerusalem Talmud (*Taanith*, 656), see Streane's edition of Laible, pp. 10, 50.

Opinions vary according as scholars consider the title to describe the Lord as -

i. The promised Seed: so Erasmus, after Gregory Nazianzen. Allied to this view, is that which makes it mean Last Adam and Second Man (Beyschlag and Fairbairn).

ii. The ideal or representative man: Schleiermacher, Neander, Godet, Westcott, Stanton, Sanday (for "Humanity": see "Life of Christ in Recent Research," pp. 126-132).

iii. "Man" as such, according to Syriac. as in 1 Cor. 15: 45, of Adam ("*Barnosho*"): H. Holtzmann, Martineau, Wellhausen, Nöldeke, Bevan, Marti (see Stalker, p. 72 *ff.*). This view has been questioned by Dalman. Indeed, as Abbott says, "The thought, not the word, is the important and really only feasible thing, for Aramaic did not preserve the distinction between *Adam* and *Ish*" ("Notes on

New Testament Criticism," p. 141).

Allied to the last-named view is that of Nösgen and Wendt, according to which "Son of Man" would stand for lowly and weak (which Westcott has questioned): and so one reaches such an idea as that of D. Smith (p. 49 *f.*), that it was a nickname for one of the common folk (p. 53), a name of scorn (*cf.* Luke 9: 58), which the Evangelists, accordingly, who loved the Lord would not themselves use of Him.

That it stands for "Man" in general, a single passage will negative: this is, found in both Luke 7: 33 *f.*, and Matt. 11: 18 *f.*, where the Lord and John the Baptist are contrasted. According to that theory, the Baptist would not be a man at all!

Most think that it originated from Dan. 7: 13. Charles holds that it came from the pre-Christian similitudes of the Book of Enoch (vi. 46, etc.). He, with Meyer and Schürer, treats it as having been a current Messianic title; but such is not the opinion of the majority. In Daniel (after Ps. 8: 5 and 80: 17. in the LXX.), in the Apocalypse and John 5: 27, it is used without the article, and in the Synoptics, accordingly, becomes a new title: see Westcott's note in his posthumous "Commentary on the Gospel of John in Greek," p. 74 *ff.*

As used by our Lord Himself, some, as B. Weiss, H. Holtzmann, Harnack, and Dalman, regard it as meaning *Messiah* (*cf.* Wellhausen on Luke 6: 5). This is only admissible as we qualify it with *rejected* (*cf.* note 565). So Fairbairn: "It was the Messiah conceived as the suffering Servant of God" ("Philosophy of the Christian Religion," p. 397 *f.*).

For an effective reply to Friedrich Delitzsch, who has assigned a Babylonian origin to the name, see König, "The End of the Babylonian Captivity of the Bible," p. 77 *f.*

Montefiore has a long note on this title in vol. i., pp. 93-106, of his recent work.

128 "To forgive sins." As to the idea (broached by Germans, followed by Drummond and Schmidt) that forgiveness here means between man and man, it may be said, had the Lord meant no more than that, He would have made it plain, to avoid a charge of blasphemy.

Again, Mason observes that "One might as well say that every man is homeless, or each man's death may have redemptive value for others" ("Camb. Theological Essays," p. 450 *f.*). Upon the topic of forgiveness of sins in general, see below at Luke 11: 4 (note 285).

129 "He said to the paralyzed man." These *parenthetical* words, as they occur in all the Synoptics, have been deemed proof of use of a *written* source (H. Holtzmann and his followers). Inspiration is not impaired by such things (note 4): Divine guidance of the Evangelists determined retention, change, or omission of words.

129a Luke 5: 30. — Pharisees of either the "Catholic" or "Evangelical" type, if consistent, would have had to condemn our Lord here for infringing their bugbear of looseness. But, as the Expositor remarks in this chapter, Christ "did not choose His company." Such choice for His followers is "heresy" (ἁίρεσις) as to which *cf.* 1 Cor. 11: 19 (parties). *Cf.* 6: 40. and note 147 C, *ad fin.*

"Their scribes." *Cf.* Acts 23: 9. Some men of this class seem to have belonged to the Sadducean faction also; of them the Temple would be the stronghold, as the Synagogue that of the Pharisees. *Cf.* note 23 on Mark, and on the Pharisees of the school of Shammai, note 310 below.

130 Luke 5: 32. — *Cf.* "Prayer of Manasseh," 8.

131 Luke 5: 33. — See note 32 on Mark.

132 Luke 5: 34. — "Sons of the bridechamber," the bridegroom's invited friends.

133 Luke 5: 35. — This is the Lord's first public announcement of His death, after He had spoken of it privately to Nicodemus (John 3: 14). See, further, Luke 9: 22, 31, 44; Luke 12: 50; Luke 13: 32 *f.*; Luke 17: 25; Luke 18: 31-33; Luke 20: 9-18; Luke 22: 14-22; besides Luke 24: 7, 26, 46.

Words of Wesley, in his Journal (7th April, 1763) upon Fasting, have a voice for the present day: "Is not the neglect of this plain duty one general occasion of deadness among Christians? Can any one willingly neglect it and be guiltless?" *Cf.* W. Kelly's "Lectures on Matthew," p. 166

134 Luke 5: 36-39. — This parable, in two parts, is the first recorded by Luke. See special note at 8: 10. The variations in the other Gospels should be compared. J. Weiss thinks that Luke has "misunderstood" what he found in Mark, and "stunted" the meaning. See, on the other hand, Wellhausen. The fault is in interpreters not sufficiently regarding the immediate context. *Cf.* Neander, p. 220 *f.* (following Chrysostom), and Carr's notes.

Luke 5: 37 *f.* — The passage shows how, on the one hand, doctrine is cemented by rite; on the other, how rite is worthless without doctrine: our Lord here shows their necessary connection. *Rome* has robbed the Gospel of its simplicity by her multitude of rites; the *Society of Friends* has shorn it of rite altogether: such is the evil of extremes. We should not deviate from God's way either to the right or to the left. Manning's hesitation, on the eve of his "verting" to Rome, between Romanism and Quakerism singularly illustrates this twofold tendency. Barclay of Ury in his "Apology" uses the logic of the Jesuits, from whom he received his early education.

As to the words *καινός* and *νεός*, see Trench, "Synonyms of the New Testament."

135 Luke 5: 39. — The reading *χρηστός* must be understood as doing the work of a comparative.

## NOTES ON THE SIXTH CHAPTER.

136 Luke 6: 1. — The operation referred to at the end of the textual note goes by the name of "dittography." It is Meyer's explanation, and *cf.* Field *ad loc.* Salmon characterizes such explanations as "complicated and lame." Neander, Winer, De Wette, and Hahn uphold the common reading.

136a Delitzsch: "In the interpretation of this I agree with John Lightfoot, understanding the first Sabbath after the second Easter day, the second Sabbath after the day of offering the barley sheaf (Lev. 23: 15), the second Sabbath with *sephirah ha'omer* (computation of the omer)." That is (*cf.* Lev. 23: 4), the omer offering on the morrow after the first great Sabbath (second day of unleavened bread). "It seems, therefore, to have taken place a week after Passover" (Briggs. p. 14). Wellhausen has recently written, "It does not rest merely on a blunder."

137 Luke 6: 2. — "Not lawful on the Sabbath." See Mishna, "Sabbath," vii. 2, and Bennett's whole chapter v. We learn from this passage how the Lord put an end to the whole *taboo* of the Sabbath, as, in Mark 7: 19, He did to that of meats.

138 Luke 6: 5. — The added words in "D" are shown in transcript opposite to p. 32 of Paterson Smyth's "How we Got our Bible." James and Paul both use the words, "transgressor of the law" (*παραβάτης τοῦ νομοῦ*). Only Blass among Edd. (see his "Philology of the Gospels," pp. 153-155) has ventured to print the insertion in text, as 5a between verses 10 and 11.

139 Luke 6: 6-11. — Neander observes that "the accounts of this event in Matthew, Mark, and Luke were written independently of each other" ("Life of Christ," p. 275).

140 Luke 6: 6. — "Right hand." Dr. Belcher ("Our Lord's Ministry of Healing," p. 123) notes this as mark of a physician's exactitude. For some "advanced" writers it has only the value of an accretion in the manner of tradition. But see Harnack.

141 Luke 6: 7. — Observe the use of παρατηρεῖν, as to which see note on 17: 20.

142 Luke 6: 8. — Another link with the fourth Gospel.

143 Luke 6: 11. — "Scientific" critics find a discrepancy in the fact that Mark 3: 5 exhibits JESUS as angry with the Pharisees. The psychology of such writers is very much at fault.

For the independence of the Synoptists of each other in verses 6-11, see C. E. Stuart, p. 68 *f*.

144 Luke 6: 12. — As to the definite article before "mountain," see note 39 on Mark (3: 13). It is not a particular mountain, as Wetstein and others have supposed. Wellhausen recognizes the principle, illustrated by some modern languages, in his "Introduction," p. 26. As to *prayer*, see note 28, and *cf.* Rom. 12: 12.

145 Luke 6: 15. — In "Zealot" we have substitution of a Greek for a Hebrew name. Matt. 10: 4 has "Cananaean." The Zealots were the most extreme and violent of the Pharisees (Joseph. "Antiqq.," xviii. 1, 6). The Jewish historian states that they originated in Galilee (*cf.* note 121).

146 Luke 6: 16. — "Judas," so John 14: 22. The same, it is supposed, as Matthew's "Thaddeus," "was the"; American Revv. rightly "became a" (or, "proved," ἐγένετο).

147 Luke 6: 17 *ff.* — The corresponding passages in Matthew (5-7, 107 verses) of the so-called Sermon on the Mount should be compared throughout with those of Luke (30 verses only in this chapter) in the following order:

Luke 6: 20-23 with Matt. 5: 3-12; Luke 14: 34 *f.* with Matt. 5: 13; Luke 8: 16 and Luke 11: 33 (critics' "doublet") with Matt. 5: 15; Luke 16: 17 with Matt. 5: 18; Luke 12: 58 *f.* with Matt. 5: 25; 16: 18 with Matt. 5: 32; Luke 6: 27 with Matt. 5: 44; Luke 11: 1-4 with Matt. 6: 9-13; Luke 11: 34-36 with Matt. vi. 22 *f.*; Luke 16: 13 with Matt. 6: 24; Luke 12: 22-31 with Matt. 6: 25-33; Luke 12: 34 with Matt. 6: 21; Luke 6: 37, 38, 41*f.* with Matt. 7: 1-5; Luke 11: 9-13 with Matt. 7: 7-11; Luke 13: 24 with Matt. 7: 13; Luke 6: 43 *f.* with Matt. 7: 16, 20; Luke 6: 45 with Matt. 5: 37; Luke 6: 46 with Matt. 7: 21; and Luke 6: 47-49 with Matt. 7: 24-27.

In aid of detailed comparison of the two records, reference may be made to Salmon, pp. 109-145.

This most notable of the Synoptic discourses raises the question of the relation of Morality to Religion, and of this to Theology. Each of these, accordingly, will be discussed in the sub-sections immediately following.

A. RELIGION in general has already been briefly considered in note 9 on John. As distinct from Theology, which is the *study* of Religion, the one is "subjective" or personal, the other is "objective." Unhappily, the two are often confounded.

For the source and nucleus of Religion as conceived by the late Herbert Spencer, see his "Principles of Sociology," vol. iii., p. 6, "The Religious Idea," § 584: "Belief in a being of the kind we call supernatural — a spirit." This he describes as "The essential element of a cult."

Auguste Comte has divided the history of Religion into three stages: 1. Supernatural. 2. Metaphysical. 3. Positive (his own system, the "Religion of Humanity": *cf.* note 450).

"One of the strongest implications of the doctrine of Evolution," writes Fiske, "is the Everlasting

Reality of Religion" ("Through Nature to God," p. 111). Cf. Max Müller, "Origin and Growth of Religion," Lect. ii. Spencer (*op. cit.*, vol. i. § 146) and Tylor ("Primitive Culture," p. 428) alike discredit the entire deficiency of any tribe of mankind in religious ideas. At the root of Religion lies *Faith* (see note on 18: 8), with both emotional (the dominant) and intellectual elements, crude forms of which pass under the name of "Superstition." The form of religion at the same time highest and deepest is called "Mysticism" (see "Psychology of Religion," pp. 154-173, 244 *f.*), one expression of the Christian form of which is found in Paul's words, a "life hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3: 3: cf. Gal. 2: 20). This has nothing to do with the "Mysteries" or worship of pagan deities of the Earth or Sea, as to which see Sir W. Ramsay's article in "Encyclopaedia Britannica," or Sir R. Anderson's "The Bible or the Church," ch. 8 and the late Archdeacon Cheetham's Hulsean Lectures on "The Christian Mysteries."

A recent masterly book on Christian Mysticism is that of Dr. Rufus Jones, the American Quaker scholar. A man's religion, as the word is used by Christians, is that which expresses, from his own point of view, his relations to a supernatural Being. All the leading religions, beginning with Judaism (see Abrahams, ch. vi.), have produced mystics, whose tone of mind in the Christian element is described as "spiritual."

"Control of the individual," writes Grubb, "by a knowledge larger than his own, is what we call authority," and "Every one who can see farther than others into the truth of things speaks with some authority" ("Authority and the Light Within," p. 11 *f.*).

The "Seat of Authority" in Christianity is variously determined by different "schools": those of the Catholic type find it in the *Church*; Unitarians, in the individual *Conscience*; whilst those roughly described as "Evangelical" refer everything to *Scripture*. The last-named position, of course that of the present volume, is well represented by Sir R. Anderson's above-named book, the writer of which insists on the difference between "The Christian Religion" and "Christianity" ("The Bible or the Church," p. 94 *f.*). It is, of course, true that Christianity is not strictly a "religion" in the sense in which this word was used by Archbishop Laud.

Where any religion has borrowed from another, there is said to be "Syncretism" (mixture). Fairbairn has observed, "The last religion one could describe [Gunkel does] as syncretism is the Christian" . . . "its founders too ignorant," he adds, "of other religions . . . it was a living organism" ("Philosophy of the Christian Religion," p. 518 *f.*).

Religion as represented by large communities of men or nations had always to the time of Christ been mixed up with Politics, by which, as in Mohammedanism, it is still much affected. Thus the seventeenth century philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, regarded Religion only as a department of the State. The English "Free Church Council," representing six denominations, in 1909 emphasized "the claim of political activity upon the Nonconformist conscience": this "militant" attitude doubtless, however unhappily, does but express the logical outcome of the Puritan policy in the seventeenth century. But what a far cry from our generation to that of Cromwell, to say nothing of Calvin, or Savonarola, referred to at the Swansea Conference by S. Horne! We "live and learn."

The fundamental ideas and practices (in particular, worship) of Religion, in its highest element, as commonly understood, start from recognition of the claim of some Higher invisible Power on man in this life, which is therefore regulated by the principles of his religion in view of rendering account after death. And so Hobbes found the natural cause of Religious anxiety about the future (Routledge's edition of *Leviathan*, 1904, p. 68). For the Jew, such principles are found in the scriptures of the Old Testament; for the Christian, in the whole Bible; whilst the faith and conduct of the Moslem are

referable to the Koran, and so on. Hence, throughout the various forms of Religion — the monotheistic in particular (witness Mohammed's reiterated confession of need of forgiveness of his sins) — runs the idea of SIN (in conflict with "Holiness"), its consequences and remedies, which will be dealt with in note on Luke 24: 47 below. "Ethical Religion" — to which Buddhism is akin — affects to dispense with this idea altogether (sub-section B).

Comte's "metaphysical" religion is simply Theology (sub-section C); whilst his "positive" state is doubtless the precursor of the worship of the Apocalyptic "Beast." At present it is but a sublimated form of Herbert Spencer's genesis of Religion, *i.e.*, the apotheosis of deceased heroes, such as Romulus among the ancient Romans. According to this, Jehovah (*Yahveh*) should have been no more than Emerson's "superman" (plagiarized by Nietzsche).

"Theosophy" is a jumble, registering the *occult* ideas of the world in general. In this country it is chiefly advocated by women; many of its Society's publications are written by them. Thus amongst books "recommended for beginners" are *Elements of Theosophy*, by Lilian Edger; *First Steps in Theosophy*, by Ethel M. Mallet; and *The Path of Discipleship*, by Annie Besant, the most prolific writer of all. The system is Eastern in the main.

"Religion," strange as it may seem, is still "the special sphere of Satan's influence" ("The Bible or the Church," p. 162 *f.*).

Höfdding is a standard writer on the "Philosophy of Religion," as T. H. Green and Dr. John Caird in this country, with whose works rank that of Max Müller, "Introduction to the Science of Religion." None of these writers, however, able as they were, can be said to have gone to the heart of the matter, which the last-named reached only in his closing days. Liddon's "Elements of Religion" introduces its reader to a more Biblical element, as does Fairbairn's valuable work. An article by McPheeters, in Hastings' "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels," deals with *authority* in Religion. On the distinctly so-called "liberal" side there is "Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit," by Auguste Sabatier.

The study of *Comparative Religion* has been usefully served by the series of "Sacred Books of the East," edited by Max Müller, with which intending Christian Missionaries in that part of the field do well to make themselves familiar. Reinach's recent book entitled "Orpheus" affords a handy *répertoire* of information, which has been followed by Gilmore's article in Schaff-Herzog, vol. iii. CHRISTIANITY, of course, is for its adherents the absolute and final religion (John 14: 6), which alone brings humanity to "the City of God" (MacCulloch, "Comparative Theology," p. 2). Its most formidable rival at present is *Islam*.

B. MORALITY, from being largely concerned with men's relations to one another ("Righteousness"), is by those who disclaim adherence to any form of supernatural Religion regarded as covering and meeting the whole of their higher needs. For writers such as Leslie Stephen its very genesis is "simply from the felt need of human beings living in society" ("Science of Ethics," p. 107). Nevertheless, as far back as History goes, Morality (Conscience) is, in fact, found connected with Religion (God consciousness) as its parent (*cf.* Anderson, "The Bible or the Church," p. 16); and amongst the old Greeks, Morality was first detached from religion by Aristotle, in the fourth century B.C., whose "Nichomachean Ethics" remain unsurpassed as a system of purely mundane DUTY, the performance of which is now being substituted for recognition of GOD. Such it was with Emerson, the American sage ("superman"). *Cf.* the "Ethical Hymn Book," No. 327, which makes use of the canticle in the second part of Ps. 19, but substituting "Duty" for "Jehovah."

In the East, Confucianism is regarded as merely Chinese State morality. And so with the religion,

such as it is, called "Shinto." of the Japanese. Both these nations of the yellow race, however, acknowledge a future state of existence, in connection with which reverence (worship) of ancestors is cultivated, as expedient for the present life at least. In Japan, writes Baron Kikuchi, they "talk very little of rights," Duty being paramount. Buddhism is purely ethical, on the lines of morality expounded in the West by writers like David Hume, who distinguished the various types of national morality (not ignored by Christians).

For the Jews, Religion and Old Testament morality remain intertwined. Abrahams says: "Pentecost celebrates . . . the inseparable conjunction of the service of God with the service of man" (p. 55).

Christians for the most part are guided by the Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount and Apostolic precepts developing it, which together constitute their Code of righteousness: this teaches beyond all question (Acts 10: 35) that righteousness is what Stanton Coit describes as "the holiest reality" ("Ethical Lecture on the Ten Commandments," p. 6).

The morality of Moslems is derivable from their sacred book.

Outside the Bible, writers in countries of Christian civilization who have surrendered their allegiance to Gen. 3, trace the *origin* of Morality to parental affection. Thus Fiske: "The relation between mother and child must have furnished the first occasion for the sustained and regular development of the altruistic feelings" (*op. cit.* pp. 121, 133 *ff.*). Cf. Hume's judgment of Society, expressed as "self-judgment" (Fairbairn, p. 66). By such writers treating sense of Duty as a *social* feeling implanted in the breast, "The Mosaic Record of the Fall" and of the acquirement of Conscience is deemed an allegory and nothing more, so that Morality is *for them*, from first to last, a human creation, in no wise proceeding from Revelation. The present writer has heard a lecturer of a London Ethical Society attempt to dispose of the doctrine of original Sin so-called by reference to a child's treatment of its doll; no distinction being made between the sexes; no allowance for the working of anticipated maternal instinct in a girl; and the derivation of the name of the fetish from "idol" ignored, if indeed apprehended.

The Biblical idea of Sacrifice, that of the individual for the race — so well understood by the Christian soldier, C. J. Gordon — is purloined by the votaries of "Ethical Religion."

Bishop Butler wrote: "Duties arise out of relations" ("Analogy," part ii., book ii., § 2). Secular Ethics, on the other hand, as expounded by such as Tolstoi, "makes Duty flow from man's moral power" (supposing that man is able to do his duty if he will) (W. Kelly, "Exposition of the Epistles of John," p. 190). Butler was followed by Kant, who, at the close of his "Critique of Practical Reason," declared himself impressed by (1) the heavens above, (2) the moral law — the moral faculty or conscience within. By writing that work he signified his sense of the insufficiency of his previous classical treatise on Pure Reason. For his bringing the religious element back into the calculation, Kant has been denounced by the nineteenth century Nietzsche as an "idiot"; that is, by the man who could write that "God is dead," and yet became himself in his last days definitely insane: this should afford reflection for Agnostics enamoured with his "Zarathustra." Harnack brings man back to saner sentiment: he has described virtuous Agnostics as "parasites, living on the faith of others."

Socialists have attempted to enlist the "Sermon on the Mount" in the service of their nostrums. But, to speak only of Property: Christ's words as to *sacrifice* suppose individual ownership. "Christian Socialism" was a plank in Bishop Westcott's platform: in his "Social Aspects of Christianity" he speaks of the saving, not only of men, but of the world (p. 86). Again, the Bishop of Truro (Dr. Stubbs), in his "Vox Clamantium," would make the object of the Church the reorganization of society

(p. 355). For healthier teaching, see D. M. Panton, "Socialism and the Sermon on the Mount."

Notable are words of George Washington in his last presidential address: "National morality cannot prevail in exclusion of religious principle." Of the so-called "Ethical Religion" imported into England from America (its prophet was Emerson), Prof. Foster, of Chicago, redeeming some earlier utterances, has written: "What does it mean that a society of religionless men are to be the Religion of the Future? On the basis of history it is a fact that moral ideas have always found access and evinced their power in the life of peoples only in connection with the corresponding religious ideas" (*The American Journal of Theology*, April, 1908, pp. 118, 122). Again, Prof. Michael Sadler, in his paper contributed to the Proceedings of the International Congress on Moral Education (1908), has expressed his settled conviction that "there are certain parts of moral education necessary to the good life which are inseparable from one or other form of religious belief." The recent controversy, however, in connection with a Parliamentary Education Bill, lay rather between advocates of moral training of the "Positivist" type and representatives of *Theology*, of what is called "definite" religious instruction: this comes in for consideration next.

The case from that point of view has been ably presented by Ernest R. Hull, S.J., in his pamphlet, "Why Should I be Moral?" Upon Synoptic teaching as to Righteousness, see Stalker, "The Ethic of Jesus," chapter iv.

C. THEOLOGY (*cf.* Kattenbusch, in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia, vol. xi., pp. 394-397), concerned with systematic, logical development of TRUTH (see Fairbairn, p. 263), as a process collects and formulates religious ideas; in the form of "Biblical" Theology doing this for Revelation in the light of the periods during which that was vouchsafed; in the form of "Symbolic" Theology treating of the fundamentals of the Faith as these were investigated in the age of the first Church Councils, which issued "Catholic Creeds" (*cf.* note on Luke 18: 8); whilst "Dogmatic" Theology has to do with the development of such doctrine in the light of spiritual experience; and so on.

By a "Theologian" in the narrower and strict sense of the term is meant one who is scientifically, as distinct from ecclesiastically, "dogmatic." Origen led the way among Christians; with him may be classed Maimonides amongst Jews. Origen has been followed by Athanasius, the Cappadocian "Fathers" (Basil and the brothers Gregory) and Augustine; by Calvin, Hooker, Jonathan Edwards, Newman, Martineau, Dorner, Dale, etc.

By "dogma" in the ecclesiastical sense is meant a truth to which submission is due (Kaftan, Gore, etc.); or, as expressed by Orr, "doctrine ecclesiastically sanctified." Harnack, its great living historian, calls it Doctrine which is held by the CHURCH as such. Those who conform to what is current in their own generation are by their contemporaries deemed "Orthodox." Höffding has observed that "within the Protestant Churches it is the laity, far more than any Church authorities, who control the orthodoxy of the preachers" (p. 320). They go by what they were taught in their youth and resist "innovation." There is, unhappily, an indisposition to view Truth like "a growing tree" (J. N. Darby).

When this takes the form of attempting to *supersede* the Revelation of the New Testament (2 John 9), faithful Christians refuse "Development." But that any have been entirely free from this tendency, as allied to the dictates of experimental expediency, Newman was right in denying. Very many non-Catholics could agree with him in regarding Infant Baptism, in whatever form it has presented itself, as a product of Development. This aspect of Truth is connected with that which has given rise of late to "Pragmatism," an apostle of which was the late Prof. William James in America. The Pragmatic method he speaks of as the "interpretation of a notion by the light of its supposed practical consequences" ("Lectures," p. 45). "Truth in our ideas means their power to work" (*ibid.*, p. 58). Thus

the propounder of a theory as to the χαρίσματα of the first Corinthian Epistle, in a conversation related by him to the present writer, with the late Professor Tholuck, to whom it was personally explained, was told by that distinguished man that he was of the same opinion, but that he doubted if it would work; to which J. N. Darby rejoined: "Have you ever tried it?" Of course, difference will exist in each case as to the measure of success obtained. For an attack by Nietzsche on those who have "theological blood in their veins," see his "Antichrist," § 9.

148 Luke 6: 18. — The distinction again appears here between disease and demoniacal possession, which modern inquirers are loath to admit. Carpenter, because of "the vast accumulation of evidence from the ages both before and after Christ" (*cf.* the works of E. B. Tylor, and, in particular, art. Demonology in "Encyclopaedia Britannica"), says that "the hypothesis of a peculiar outburst of demoniac energy in the time of Jesus falls in complete collapse." One has, however, only to read such books as Mrs. Howard Taylor's Memoir of "Pastor Hsi" to learn how prevalent it is in our own day in certain quarters. On this topic, *cf.* Orr, "The Bible under Trial," pp. 222-224.

149 - Luke 6: 20. — "Lifted up His eyes." This, B. Weiss observes, is an expression characteristic of the source that he has named "L" (note 4 *f.*), rather than of "Q" ("Sources of Synoptic Tradition," p. 256).

As to glib acceptance of the teaching here, Maclaren remarks: "The people who say, 'Give me the Sermon on the Mount — I don't care for your doctrines, but I can understand it,' have not felt the grip of these Beatitudes" ("Expositions," etc., vol. i., p. 128).

149a "Poor," without qualification, *cf.* 2 Cor. 6: 10, James 2: 5. For the personal element in this Gospel, *cf.* Luke 22: 20, and see note on verse 22 below. Some (as Schmiedel, art. Gospels, in "Encyclop. Bibl.," § 123; *cf.* his "Jesus in Modern Criticism," p. 70 *ff.*) have suggested Luke made use of an Ebionite source here, and for verse 35 *f.*, Luke 11: 41, Luke 12: 33, Luke 14: 21 *f.* and 33, Luke 18: 22, Luke 19: 8. This idea is discredited even by Jülicher (Introduction, §27, p. 206, E. T.). "The Ebionites' system would be far too unpalatable to an Evangelist for him to resort to their literature. It should be observed that according to 7: 1, the Lord is addressing a miscellaneous audience. The Apostles themselves, as Salmon says, were not chosen from the very poor, but belong at least to the "lower middle class" (p. 116; *cf.* Ramsay, *Expositor*, April, 1909, p. 306). One must not exaggerate this aspect. The thought in this as in Matthew's Gospel is based on Old Testament passages, such as Ps. 32: 2, Prov. 9: 23, Isa. 57: 15 ("an established Old Testament principle," Schlottmann, Compendium, § 148), with which Gentile readers could familiarize themselves from the LXX. Nevertheless, it is true that the soil in which Christianity at first was sown was characteristically that of poverty, in Greece as well as in Judea: see Deissmann, in *Expositor*, February, March, 1909.

Again, an attempt has been made to connect the teaching here with the system of the Essenes (alien to Buddhism), as to whom see Lightfoot on "Colossians," pp. 158-179, Edersheim, "Sketches, etc.," chapter 15, and Harnack, "Missions," i. 337). Eusebius (iii. 27) seems to have referred the name of this sect to the poverty of their intellect in observing sabbaths and other Jewish rites.

By "rich" must probably be understood the Pharisees: see Luke 16: 14. The opinion of some (as Harnack), founded on Luke 6: 24, Luke 16: 19, Luke 18: 24 *f.*, that Luke had a bias against the wealthy, is negated by cognate passages in Matthew (as Matt. 19: 21) and Mark (as Mark 10: 23). With just as much reason might it be said that Mark had a bias in the contrary direction, because of Mark 14: 7.

150 Luke 6: 21. — Our Lord was for Nietzsche the great type of aristocratic morality, a joyful rather than a suffering Christ!

151 Luke 6: 22 *f.* — "Separate," usually taken as from the synagogue (John 16: 2) but De Wette took it, like the English translation, as from their society in general.

"Cast out" spread abroad, *i.e.*, bring you into bad repute (Wellhausen).

Son of Man: Matthew's parallel has "my" (verse 11): *cf.* note on Luke 12: 8 below.

"Rejoice": as did the excellent John Chrysostom who, when dying, said, "Thanks be to God for all" the persecution he suffered (*cf.* 1 Thess. 5: 16-18).

152 Luke 6: 26. — Wesley in his Note asks, "But who will believe this?"

153 Luke 6: 27-36. — For Ritschl, GOD is LOVE, and nothing else, *cf.* Pfleiderer, "The Development of Theology," E. T., p. 186. As to Montefiore's strictures on our Lord's invective against the Pharisees, see note on Luke 7: 40.

154 Luke 6: 31. — *Cf.*, of course, Matthew's form of words (Matt 7: 12), and also, Tobit, iv. 15. This golden rule was called by Hillel "the quintessence of the Law" (*Pirgé Aboth*); but *he* stated it negatively (Murray, "Christian Ethics," p. 66 *f.*), as did also the Chinese sage Kung-fu-tsé (Legge, "The Religions of China," pp. 137-139).

155 Luke 6: 32. — "Thank," or "grace" (χάρις): Vulg. "gratia." Matthew (Matt. 5: 46) has "reward," for which in verse 24 Luke has "consolation."

155a Luke 6: 33. — Such also was a maxim of Lao-tse, contemporary of Confucius (*cf.* note 154).

156 Luke 6: 35 *ff.* — "Hoping for nothing in return": so Vulgate (followed in A.V.). Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Wetstein, Godet and Meyer take ἀπελπίζειν as "despair," after Old Lat. (*cf.* LXX. of Isa. 29: 19); the Revv., in the sense of lack of faith in God's own recompense (Humphry). Field, however, supports A.V. with the remark, "The context is too strong for philological quibbles."

"Ye shall be (prove) sons." *Cf.* Ecclesiasticus iv. 10. It is a question of character, as in Rom. 8: 14.

Plato regarded the object of the life of man as becoming like God.

156a The closing words of this section (*cf.* Matt. 6: 14 *f.*) bear on the question of communion between God and any who have entered into the relationship of children upon initial Repentance and Faith.

With verse 36, *cf.* Ps. 111: 4, Ps. 112: 4.

157 Luke 6: 38. — "Shall be given." Strictly, "They shall give." As in the Aramaic of Daniel, the passive is avoided, so that the agent has not to be expressed. *Cf.* verse 44 and Luke 12: 20, Luke 14: 35, Luke 18: 23, Luke 23: 31.

"With the same measure": see Deut. 25: 15, and *cf.* Zech. 5: 8 *f.* "The very instrument which the woman used for her unholy work was to be the means of her confusion" (C. H. H. Wright *ad loc.*). The same sentiment is in the Mishna ("Sotah," i. 7: *cf.* Bennett, p. 116).

158 Luke 6: 39. — As to blind leaders, *cf.* Matt. 15: 14. It alludes to shepherds' custom, when angry with their flock, of giving them a blind sheep as a leader. And so of bad administrators of a town (Neubauer, in "Studia Biblica," vol. I., p. 52, note). These words have a bearing on the subject of Interpretation of Scripture. As to which see note 13 above.

158a Luke 6: 40. — "The disciple, etc." *Cf.* Luke 22: 64 with Acts. 23: 2; Luke 23: 1 with Acts 22: 30; Luke 23: 2 with Acts 24: 5; Luke 23: 4, 14, 22 with Acts 23: 29; Luke 25: 25 and Luke 26: 31

respectively, as showing "resemblances very marked" (Moffatt, p. 264, note). See also 2 Tim. 3: 17 and note 129a above.

For these two verses reference may be made to Luther's discourse in "Sermons," pl. 49, and Spurgeon's Sermon, No. 1248.

158b Luke 6: 45. — *Cf.* 2 Cor. 6: 11.

159 Luke 6: 46 *ff.* — See Spurgeon's Sermon, No. 1702.

## NOTES ON THE SEVENTH CHAPTER.

160 This chapter exhibits no link whatever with the Gospel of Mark.

161 Luke 7: 3. — "Sent." Abbott ("Encyclopaedia Biblica," col. 1774) remarks Matthew and Luke differ irreconcilably. Matthew says that the man did come to Jesus. And so, as the present writer has been informed by a member of the Burmese Commission, would a Burmese say not taught otherwise by Western magistrates. An Eastern calls himself the principal when acting only as agent. "Elders" are called "rulers" in Mark 5: 22. *Cf.* "overseers" in Acts 20: 28, 1 Peter 5: 2; and "guides" in Heb. 13: 7.

162 Luke 7: 5. — "*The synagogue.*" Remains of this still extant may be found described in various books.

163 Luke 7: 9. — For *wonder* attributed to the Lord, *cf.* Mark 6: 6; there at unbelief; here at belief.

164 Luke 7: 6-9. — The wording of these verses is compared with that of Matt. 8: 8-10 by Harnack, "Luke the Physician," p. 94 *f.*

"*I also,*" implying that he acknowledged the Power behind the Lord, at his appreciation of which Christ marvelled (Morison on Matt. 8: 9).

165 Luke 7: 10. — This section should not be confounded — as by some moderns — with John 4: 46 *ff.*, which is entirely distinct.

166 Luke 7: 11. - How paltry some of the criticism that is bestowed on the Evangelist's geography or topography, finds illustration in Hausrath's objecting to the description of Nain as a city. See "New Testament Times," iii. 410, and Hahn *ad loc.* What, for example, did Hausrath know of Nazareth as it was then in the days of Christ?

Scripture speaks similarly of "streets" in Jerusalem, etc., but these are not what we so call: any visitor to the old part of Jerusalem could confirm this: there you have only open spaces.

167 Luke 7: 12. — "Only son." For another case, see Luke 9: 38, and see note 48, above.

168 Luke 7: 13. — "The Lord" (ὁ κύριος). See again in Luke 10: 1 [Edd., 39, 41], Luke 11: 39, Luke 12: 42, Luke 13: 15, Luke 17: 5 *f.*, Luke 18: 6, Luke 19: 8, Luke 22: 31, Luke 24: 3 (before "Jesus") and 34, all in this Gospel of the "Son of Man." In John's Gospel it occurs only four times: John 4: 1, John 6: 23, John 11: 2, and John 20: 20. It is not found in either Matthew or Mark.

169 "Weep not" or "do not go on weeping," the continuous present, as in John 20: 17, "do not go on clinging."

170 Luke 7: 14. — "Bier": as to Jewish manner of burial, see Joseph. "Antiqq.," xvii. 197*f.*, Life,

323, or Edersheim, "Sketches of Jewish Social Life," p. 109 ff.

171 Luke 7: 15. — Cf. 1 Kings 17: 23.

172 Luke 7: 16. — "Visited." Cf. i. 68 and 19: 44, where also it is merciful visitation (ἔπισκόπη). The word for "visitation" in the sense of *vengeance* is ἐκδίκησις, as in Luke 21: 22.

173 Luke 7: 17. — "Judea." Meyer, Ewald, Weiss and H. Holtzmann take this of the whole land (cf. note 114); Hahn, who holds that it is nowhere in the New Testament so used, observes that the Lord's opponents were chiefly in the South (so Plummer on the present passage).

174 This incident of raising the dead is intermediate between that of Jairus's daughter, not carried out for burial, and the raising of Lazarus when already buried. Difference in the significance of the three cases as typical of stages the process of conversion was suggested already by Augustine, Sermon XCVIII., whom Wordsworth follows.

The publicity of this case, which is not recorded by Mark, might supply such critics with food for reflection as attach greater historical value to our second Gospel. Cf. O. Holtzmann, p. 274, for candid recognition of the circumstances of this miracle; also Wellhausen's note *ad loc.* ("before many witnesses").

175 Luke 7: 19. — As to the Jewish idea that there are two Messiahs, one the "son of David," the other the "son of Joseph," see Lightfoot, "Horae Hebr." The Baptist would at least know that JESUS was the suffering one.

The Expositor's view of John's state of mind is that taken by Tertullian, Neander, Meyer, De Wette, Olshausen and Godet: the Baptist had real (not, as Stier, simulated) doubt, and that increasing, not (as some moderns) declining. See further Godet *ad loc.*, as to the Baptist's state of mind being characteristic of the old dispensation.

175a Augustine, Hilary, Chrysostom, Calvin, Wordsworth, and Ryle suppose that the mission of John's disciples was meant by him to aid *their* faith.

176 Luke 7: 22. — We have here a summary of Messiah's work: "Poor evangelized." Wesley offers a characteristic comment: "The greatest mercy and the greatest miracle of all."

177 Luke 7: 23. — Observe that nowhere in the Gospels are the Scribes and Pharisees represented as challenging the Lord as to miracles: this alone might show that they were actually performed. The Talmud adds confirmation by the very explanation that it offers (cf. note 107 above).

178 Luke 7: 27. — This quotation (as in Matt. 11: 10; Mark 1: 2), from neither the Hebrew nor the LXX., illustrates the belief of the late Adolf Neubauer, that Aramaic paraphrases lie behind quotations in the Gospels from the Old Testament.

179 Luke 7: 28. — "Born of women." Chrysostom, whom Sadler follows, explains that our Lord excluded Himself from the number of those so described. It is noticeable that the word is γεννητός, not, as in Gal. 4: 4 (cf. Phil. 2: 7), γενόμενος ("come"). In verses 23, 29 of the same chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians the Apostle uses, of Isaac and Ishmael, verb forms cognate to γεννητός.

"Little." Bishop Basil Jones: "less," explaining it as, "than John in gifts and power." Augustine and Chrysostom, although happily followed by very few (as Spence), take this of the Lord Himself.

Farrar: "The smallest diamond is made of more precious substance than the largest flint."

The last words of the Lord here about John are, of course, very offensive to the Mandaeans, or

modern disciples of the Baptist, settled to the south of Bagdad (Reinach, p. 107).

180 Luke 7: 29 *f.* — Syrsin here has "justified themselves to God." These verses are taken by the Expositor as parenthetical; that is, as Luke's own comment. So Field and Adeney; whilst Meyer, Bishop Basil Jones, B. Weiss, Spence, and Plummer regard the words as proceeding from the Lord. But, as Norris says, the tenses used indicate that it is the Evangelist who speaks. Besides a parenthesis is in his manner: see Luke 13: 7, and Acts 1: 18*f.* Compare, further, Matt. 21: 32.

181 Luke 7: 31. — "This generation." Meyer, Hofmann and Hahn understand by this, the Pharisees.

182 Luke 7: 35. — "Is justified" (ἐδικαιώθη). Burton (§ 43) calls this a "gnomic aorist," to which effect was given by the English version, retained by the Revv.; whilst Winer (Moulton's ed., p. 346) held that this does not occur in the New Testament. *Cf.* like use of ἐβλήθη in John 15: 6, and note there.

Dorner finds here germs of our Lord's pre-existence (Luke 1: 1, 61). *Cf.* Luke 10: 23 *f.*, Luke 11: 49.

"Children." The reading of , "works," may have come from Matt. 11: 19. "All" is omitted in *corr* D, *Syrca*.

183 Luke 7: 36. — "One of the Pharisees." Not the same as Simon the leper (Mark 14: 3).

As to the better side of Pharisiasm, see Murray's "Handbook of Christian Ethics," p. 67.

Venn preached from this passage (Sermons, p. 217), as Augustine long ago (Library of the Fathers, vol. i. of "Sermons on the New Testament," p. 387).

184 Luke 7: 37. — "A woman . . . a sinner." The chapter-heading of Bibles still in use and the "Pilgrim's Progress" have given currency to the idea of Latin Fathers (Augustine, etc.) that she was the same as Mary of Magdala: to this Farrar was inclined to adhere on the sentimental ground of its associations in sacred art! But see B. Weiss and Norris.

184a Luke 7: 38. — "Kissed," *i.e.*, covered with kisses (κατεφίλησε).

"Behind." The Lord at the time was recumbent, His head forward, with His feet backward.

185 Gregory "the Great" ("Works," i. p. 1582), whose view was definitely accepted by the Church of Rome, supposed that she was identical with Mary of Bethany; as Grotius, Schleiermacher and H. Holtzmann also have done. But, to say little more, Bethany is described as a κώμη (Luke 10: 38); this place, a πόλις. *Cf.* the wording of Luke 8: 1, and note 192, *s. init.* On the Romish muddle here, see Stock, p. 126.

The Greek Fathers rightly distinguished all three cases. Schanz, although a Roman, regards the incident entirely from the Lucan standpoint.

185a Montefiore remarks (on Luke 6: 27, 35 etc.) that JESUS, had He carried out His own teaching, could not have called His enemies (Pharisees) "vipers" (Matt. 12: 34), and exultingly have consigned them to Gehenna. Note, however, the words of F. W. Robertson: "He blighted Pharisiasm, with irony and terrible invective. But to the actual living Pharisee, how tenderly did He express Himself! *Simon I have somewhat to say unto thee. . . .* So far as he is a *man*, he is an object of infinite pity and tenderness" ("Lectures on Corinthians," p. 72). Our Lord could not have used smooth words towards the system which Mr. Montefiore endeavours to defend. The Apostle Paul tells us that *love* is to be "without hypocrisy" (Rom. 12: 9).

186 Luke 7: 42. — "Forgave" (ἐχαρίσατο) is one of the Greek words that Luke shares with Paul (Rom. 3: 24; Eph. 2: 8 f.).

See Spurgeon's Sermons, 1739 and 2127. Gregory "the Great" said that as often as he read this narrative, he felt that he could better weep than preach.

187 Luke 7: 46. — For head "anointed with oil," see Ps. 23: 5, and *cf.* Amos 6: 6.

188 Farrar works out the rhythmic parallelism noticeable in these verses. *Cf.* Matt. 2: 7-10.

189 Luke 7: 47. — Her faith wrought by love: Gal. 5: 6. For the love accompanying faith which works manwards, see Matt. 5: 43 *ff.* *Cf.* Gore, "The Creed of the Christian," p. 53. As to Lucan Paulinism, see note 100 above.

189a Luke 7: 48-50. — Dr. Alexander Maclaren has preached from these verses. (Third Series of Sermons: "Love and Forgiveness.")

190 Luke 7: 50. — For "Go in (εἰς) peace," *cf.* Mark 5: 34, ὑπάγε εἰς εἰρήνην, Plummer: εἰς marks the subsequent life (lasting condition); ἔν (as in Acts 16: 36; James 2: 16), the moment of departure. *Cf.* Carr *ad loc.* Farrar in his Excursus gives quotations from the *Moed Qaton*. Maclaren, "His Word is like a living creature and fulfils itself" (vol. i., p. 214).

191 Frennsen has made use of this narrative in his "Holy Land," p. 376.

The views of some critics that it is a "doublet" of Mark 14: 37, which Luke omits, is rejected by J. Weiss. The parable of the two debtors, as Bruce observes, is an original element ("Apologetics," p. 462).

## NOTES ON THE EIGHTH CHAPTER.

192 Luke 8: 1. — "Throughout every city . . . village." Christ left, accordingly, His abode at Capernaum (Matt. 11: 1) and began an itinerant ministry. "The good news was not to be confined to places where there were synagogues" (Stuart, p. 92).

To "preach" (κηρύσσειν, to herald) "implies solemnity of announcement" (Darby-Smith). *Cf.* Luke 9: 2 and Acts 28: 31. When Luke speaks of the simple Gospel of Grace, he specially uses εὐαγγελίζειν: Luke 4: 18, Luke 7: 22, Luke 9: 6, Luke 20: 1. For "glad tidings of the kingdom of God," *cf.* Matt. 4: 23, etc.

In considering the relation of the "Kingdom" to the "Gospel," it is needful to grasp the bearing of a passage like Luke 12: 50 upon such as Luke 24: 27. As "Minister of the Circumcision" (Rom. 15: 8), our Lord limited Himself to the Jewish people. Even in the Fourth Gospel we find Him saying that "salvation is of the Jews" (John 4: 22). *Cf.* the Expositor's remark on verse 11 here. The Apostle Paul began his ministry with "the Gospel of the Grace of God" (Acts 20: 24) in its world-wide significance and scope; and it is in the form which that Gospel took in his hands that Christians of the "uncircumcision" have to set it forth. But "the Gospel of Christ," of which he says he was not ashamed (Rom. 1: 16), for him retained the double aspect of grace and works (Luke 3: 8), and was not divested of the second characteristic when it acquired its wider scope. It is lamentable how no less a writer than Calvin found in "Kingdom" only a synonym for "Gospel renewing men into God's image" ("Works," p. 185, quoted by W. Kelly in his "Exposition of Acts," vol. ii., p. 198).

On the relation of the KINGDOM to the CHURCH, as to which Professor Wellhausen and Bishop Gore really occupy the same unsatisfactory position, *cf.* note 21 on Mark. See, further, note on

18: 16 *f.*

193 Luke 8: 2. — "Mary Magdalene." Origen distinguished her from the woman of chapter 7. See notes above on Luke 7: 37. Wesley's comment shows that he followed Gregory "the Great."

"Out of whom went," etc. Bruce: "In the Gospels demoniacal possession is something quite distinct from immorality." "Seven demons" may be a formula. It often occurs in the Babylonian magical texts, some of which are exhibited in the British Museum. *Cf.* the "seven spirits" of Luke 11: 26, and also the same expression in Rev. 1: 4. Dr. Whyte has taken "Mary Magdalene" as subject of his discourse LXXXI. in "Bible Characters."

194 Luke 8: 3. — This explains Matt. 14: 2, where Herod is said to hear of Jesus.

"Ministered to Him their substance." The innkeeper Gaius in the "Pilgrim's Progress" says: "I read not that ever any man did give unto Christ so much as one groat; but the woman followed Him and ministered," etc. For "Joanna," again see Luke 24: 10. "Chuzas": American Revv., "Chuzas."

195 Luke 8: 4 *ff.* — Here Luke resumes the same thread as that of Mark's narrative, dropped at 6: 19. Farrar treats the present passage as an illustration of the Synoptists' non-use of each other's narrative or of a common source.

See Spurgeon's Sermons, 308, 1132, 1457, 2040; Maclaren, vol. i., pp. 230-241; also Irving's six lectures on the passage (Sermons, ii., p. 243 *ff.*). Augustus Hare has preached from verse 11 (Sermons, vol. ii., p. 17).

196 PARABLES. — A "parable" (comparison) serves the purpose of religious, as a *fable* that of moral, instruction. It may be very terse, as in Luke 6: 39 above. As to the design of our Lord's parables, see Bruce, p. 16, comparing A. P., Habershon, p. 3 *ff.*

On the interpretation, see Trench, chapter iii., also A. R. Habershon, p. 13 *f.* Jülicher questions the need of interpretation, regarding the Gospel parables as in general self-explanatory, and conceiving that every difficulty would disappear if the original connection were known. The Lord, he alleges, did not, as a rule, explain them. But see Mark 4: 34. The Marburg professor holds that it was the Evangelists who imported allegorical features into them. Trench's work, of course, is not to his taste (p. 300). Stevens (p. 43) is influenced by Jülicher's theory. Saneness of view is, happily, not in such a bad way in this country.

On the connection between the parables and the miracles (note 107 above) see A. R. Habershon, chapter xiv. The parables peculiar to Matthew are characteristically dogmatic and judicial; those solely special to LUKE, ethical and merciful.

Several writers offer a classification: *Westcott's* would be found in his "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels" (p. 393 *f.*), a work accessible to most readers.

*Godet:* (α) Parables referring to the Kingdom of Heaven (God) under the old dispensation, as that of the Fig Tree (Luke 13: 6-9); (β) to the new dispensation, as that of the Sower, here; (γ) the Kingdom as realized in individual life, *e.g.*, that of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10: 29-35).

Bruce: (α) Parables of the Kingdom, *e.g.*, the seven in Matt. 13, and in Luke 19: 12-27; (β) of the Gospel (goodness), as the three in Luke 15; (γ) those which are judicial and prophetic (righteousness), as the Barren Fig Tree of chapter 13.

Jülicher: (α) Strict, simple similitudes or comparisons, as in Luke 14: 28-33, the man intending to build a tower, and the king going to make war against another; (β) amplified comparisons (parables

proper), as the visit, to a friend at midnight, Luke 11: 5-8; (γ) exemplary narratives, as that of the Good Samaritan, Luke 10: 30 ff.

The number of parables is put by Trench as thirty; Bruce finds thirty-three; others, many more.

There is a suggestive paper on the Lucan parables by Swete in *Expositor*, Aug, 1903. These come under the following heads:-

(i.) *Salvation*: The Two Debtors (Luke 7: 41 ff.); the Great Supper (14: 22 ff.) the Lost Coin (Luke 15: 8 ff.); and the Lost Son (Luke 15: 11 ff.). (ii.) *Prayer*: the Midnight Visitor (Luke 15: 5 ff.); the Importunate Widow (Luke 18: 1 ff.); and the Pharisee and Publican (Luke 18: 9-14). (iii.) *Service*: the Barren Fig Tree (Luke 13: 6 ff.); the Ploughing Slave (Luke 17: 7 ff.); and the Pounds (Luke 19: 12 ff.). (iv.) *Social Relations*; the Good Samaritan (Luke 10: 30 ff.); the Rich Fool (Luke 12: 16 ff.); the Dishonest Steward (Luke 16: 1 ff.); and the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16: 19 ff.). All but one, it will be seen, belong to the section Luke 9: 51 - 18: 14.

There are no parables in the apocryphal gospels, one sign of their inferiority, as the multiplication of their alleged miracles is another.

196a Luke 8: 10. — "The mysteries of the Kingdom." Cf. Matt. 13: 11; and p. 284 of the *Expositor's* "Lectures" on Matthew. Cf. also note on Luke 19: 12, 15.

196b "The seed is the Word." Cf. James 1: 18; 1 Peter 1: 23.

197 Luke 8: 13 — "Rock," the "stony heart of flesh" in 11: 19, Ezek. 36: 26.

198 "With joy." So Bunyan's "Man in the Iron Cage," See Spurgeon's Sermon, 1132.

199 Luke 8: 14. — "Life," βίος. B. Weiss ("Manual Comm.") aptly refers to Mark 12: 44, comparing 1 John 2: 16. Bunyan selects Demas (2 Tim. 4: 10), as a Biblical illustration of the Lord's words here. See Spurgeon's Sermon, 2040.

200 Luke 8: 15. - "Honest and good," the Greek ideal, καλὸς κἀγαθός. The word ἀγαθός is like the Heb. *tou* (Wellhausen, Prolegomena to "History of Israel," p. 345), "good" as doing good; cf. Matt. 7: 17, Matt. 20: 15, Matt. 25: 21 ff. Καλός, "excellent," finds illustration in Mary of Bethany, as ἀγαθός in Joseph of Arimathaea (Bruce *ad loc.*).

Upon the understanding of this parable hangs that of all others. See Mark 4: 13.

201 "Keep." Matthew has "understand"; Mark, "receive."

202 "Patience" or "endurance." Cf. Rom. 2: 7, and for the whole verse, John 15: 2.

203 - Luke 8: 16. — See again at Luke 11: 33.

204 Luke 8: 17. — Cf. Matt. 10: 26.

205 - Luke 8: 18. — "How ye hear." Preaching upon 1 Cor. 8: 1 ff., F. W. Robertson has shown how much of what passes under the name of "definite religious construction" the Apostle Paul would have rated as *secular knowledge*. By, "knowledge," he says, "the Apostle meant not merely knowledge without Christian doctrine, but knowledge without Love" (p. 146). So must it be where the Spirit of God is not enlisted in the work. No Parliamentary legislation can really secure us against such a state of things. Even the teacher's *believing in* what he *teaches* does not suffice. Much of the current unbelief has either been generated or accentuated by "*a form of godliness without the power.*" "Many a person now zealous on this point of 'education' would be content if only the Bible, without note or comment, were taught. But St. Paul would not have been content; he would have calmly looked on

and said, 'This also is secular knowledge. This, too, is the knowledge which puffeth up.' It is the spirit in which it is acquired which makes the difference between secular and Christian knowledge. It is not so much the thing known, as the way of knowing it" (p. 147). How eminently true this is of the facts of our Lord's life. Cf. note 46 on Mark.

205a — Luke 8: 18. — "Seemeth." For R.V., "thinketh" (δοκεῖ), cf. 1 Cor. 10: 12.

206 Luke 8: 19 ff. — In Matthew and Mark this incident precedes the Parable of the Sower, already passed in Luke.

Comparing the passage in Mark just named with this, Carpenter comments on the earlier statement, as he interprets it, that Mary joined the Lord's "brethren" in an endeavour to put Him under restraint as being out of His wits, upon which Matthew and Luke alike are silent: he calls the conjunction of knowledge of the supernatural birth on her part with this attitude as "incredible." Some proof must first be offered that *she* was other than a passive instrument of the others whose ebullition is described. Cf. notes on Luke 1: 34 and Luke 4: 22

207 The names of our Lord's brethren are given in Matt. 13: 55 and Mark 6: 3; that of "James" first in each, to whom the Lord appeared after His resurrection (1 Cor. 15: 7): he was accounted a "pillar" of the Church at Jerusalem (Gal. 2: 9; cf. Luke 1: 19); and is prominent in Acts 15: 13 ff. The first description of him as "bishop" of that Church is in the "Clementine Recognitions," a theological romance of the second century.

"Jude" may have been the writer of the Epistle under that name.

Here arises the question, which has never ceased to be discussed, as to the parentage of these "brethren" of JESUS. There are three theories:-

(1) The Epiphonian — that they were sons of Joseph by an earlier marriage. So Origen, the late Bishops Westcott and Lightfoot and Dr. Salmon. It is the traditional, so-called "Catholic" view, by which the perpetual Virginity is maintained (as to which myth, see Sir E. Anderson, "The Bible or the Church," p. 256).

(2) The Hieronymian — after Jerome — that they were cousins of the Lord, as sons of Mary's sister. Few now support this view.

(3) The Helvidian — that they were our Lord's "uterine" brethren, that is, were children of Mary and Joseph. So Meyer, Alford, Godet, Weiss, Farrar, Andrews, Mayor (Introduction to his edition of the Epistle of James, and Papers in *Expositor* for July, August, 1908), W. Kelly, etc.

The first view, ably as it was championed by Bishop Lightfoot, is excluded by the fact that then one of Joseph's natural sons must have been his eldest son, and so by law his heir (Edersheim, "Life of Jesus, etc.," vol. i. p. 364). In his Homily quoted by Lightfoot, Origen says that Scripture nowhere speaks of Mary having other children; but he must have forgotten the Messianic Ps. 69: 8.

Those who follow Jerome think that "Judas of James" in Luke 6: 16 means "J. brother of J.," but Bishop Lightfoot was clear that it means "son."

208 Luke 8: 24. — Cf. James 1: 25, and verse 18 above.

209 Luke 8: 25. — According to Matthew's account, the Lord administered the rebuke before he stilled the storm.

210 Luke 8: 28. — "What have I to do with thee?" Cf. 2 Chron. 35: 21 in the LXX. version, added by Maldonatus. Here follow the words: "I do not come to make war on thee." And so here,

"Why shouldst Thou vex me?" (Carr).

"Son of God." (*Cf.* Matt. 8: 29; Mark 5: 7.) See Stalker, p. 98 *f.*, who effectively disposes of German denial of anything higher than the established theocratic sense of the title.

"Had commanded"; or (as American Revv.) "was commanding" (παρήγγελλεν).

211 Luke 8: 31. — See Trench, who shows consistency of this with Mark's statement.

"The abyss see Rev. 20: 1-3.

212 Luke 8: 32 *f.* — "Many." Mark says "two thousand."

"Choked ": American Revv. "drowned."

213 Luke 8: 35. — "At the feet of Jesus," not so much as a scholar (Weiss, after Meyer), as in token of the Lord's delivering power (Colin Campbell, p. 171, referring to verse 8).

214 Luke 8: 39. — Mark says "in Decapolis." *Cf.* the Lord's way of commissioning the leper, Mark 1: 41; the young ruler, Mark 10: 21; and the man in 9: 19. See also note 52 on Mark. There is a sermon of J. H. Newman on this incident, reproduced in Allenson's reprint (No. IV.).

215 Luke 8: 42. — (*Cf.* verse 49). See note 53 on Mark.

216 Luke 8: 43. — *Cf.* Lev. 15: 19. Some MSS. of the "Gospel of Nicodemus" give her name as "Bernice" in Greek, the "Veronica" of Latin.

217 Luke 8: 44. — "Tassel," the fringe (*zizith*) of Num. 15: 38, Num. 22: 12; Deut. 22: 12; See Schor, p. 85. Norris: "Faith, though disfigured by superstition, may still be blessed." As to this incident, see Whyte, "Bible Characters," No. LXXX.

218 Luke 8: 51. — "Peter, *John* and *James*." The order is peculiar to Luke here, and at Luke 9: 28; Acts 1: 13. These three were thrice singled out on special occasions (here; Transfiguration; Gethsemane).

219 Luke 8: 52. — Norris aptly compares Luke 20: 38.

## NOTES ON THE NINTH CHAPTER.

220 Luke 9: 2. — "Proclaim," κηρύσσειν, of the *Kingdom* (see note 192). Burkitt seeks to distinguish here between the style of Luke and that of Paul (p. 117, note); but see 1 Cor. 9: 27, where having used εὐγγελίζειν in verse 16, when the Apostle comes to the conflict connected with *reward* (*cf.* note on Luke 22: 16 *ff.*) he uses κηρύσσειν. *Cf.* Acts 20: 25 and the last verse of the same Book.

"To heal the sick." With the idea that some such power resides still in the Church, a "Guild of Health and Spiritual Healing" has recently been founded by some Anglicans. As to this topic, see art. by Dr. A. T. Schofield, in *Contemporary Review*, March, 1909, who calls attention to the Epistle of James 5: 14 (ἀλείφειν, medical, not χρίειν, sacramental).

221 Luke 9: 3. — "Money," *i.e.*, silver (ἀργύριον), because Luke is writing for Greeks; Mark has "copper," from writing for Romans (Farrar).

"Wallet": *cf.* that carried by Eastern beggars at the present day (Deissmann,

"Light from the Ancient East," p. 42 *ff.*).

222 Luke 9: 9. — "Sought the imperfect, equivalent to "would seek," as a habit: *cf.* Luke 23: 8.

Herod seems to have supposed there was a change of soul from an old body into a new one, as part of the current Jewish notion of *pre-existence*: cf. John 9: 2.

223 Luke 9: 10. — Richard Cecil wrote: "Christ's workmen must not live in a bustle . . . driving through the business of the day. I am obliged to *withdraw* myself regularly and say to my heart, 'What are you doing? Where are you'" Cf. Song of Solomon 1: 6, "Mine own vineyard have I not kept" (Ryle).

224 "Into," as εἰς is commonly rendered; but its use in Luke 19: 29 justifies the rendering of the preposition here as "towards": for the distinction between it and πρός, cf. note 65 on Mark. John 6: 5 shows that the incident took place *in the neighbourhood of* Bethsaida. Luke is not inconsistent, as alleged by Wright ("Gospel of Luke," p. 87). Some of those who suppose that there were two places with the same name distinguish this, in Galilee, from Bethsaida Julias in Gaulonitis (cf. note 40 on John). The reading of "D," "village," may indicate that this was the *site* of the Old Bethsaida (so Wellhausen).

224a "Spoke . . . cured." The Lord had both taught (Mark) and healed (Matthew). "Luke, treating so markedly of grace, calls attention to the double manner of its manifestation that day" (Stuart, p. 18).

225 Luke 9: 12 ff. - "The day began to decline": cf. Luke 24: 29.

This is the only miracle recorded by all the Evangelists. It took place in the spring, just before the Passover (John 6: 4).

"Victuals": American Revv., "provisions."

226 Luke 9: 16. — "Gave": again an imperfect (kept giving).

227 Luke 9: 17. — Matthew Henry: "None are sent away empty from Christ, but those that come to Him full of themselves," a reminiscence probably of Luke 1: 53; cf. Rev. 3: 17.

The translation in the "Exposition" of the close of the verse is that approved by De Wette, B. Weiss, and Plummer. Alford followed Meyer.

The κόφινος (hand-basket) appears in all the accounts of the feeding of the five thousand; whilst στυρίς (hamper) is used by Matthew and Mark in connection with the four thousand. Those laying stress on verbal analysis have to reckon with this when treating the later miracles as a "doublet."

228 Luke 9: 18 ff. — There is a rift in Luke's record compared with Mark's. Our Evangelist omits the story of the heathen woman, to the discomfiture of critics. J. Weiss: "We can only confess our ignorance." It were well if such a confession came oftener. Even an Apostle could write, "We know in part."

"Alone": American Revv., "apart."

"I" (verse 18), as Mark 8: 27. Matthew here has "Son of Man" (Matt. 16: 13). Cf. note on Luke 6: 22.

The verses down to 22, compared with the parallels in Matthew and Mark, tell us of the great crisis or turning-point in the Lord's disclosures; verse 20 being the revelation that he was Messiah; verse 22, a contemporary announcement, for the first time, according to this Gospel, of the coming Passion, and coincident with the introduction of His self-designation as "Son of Man" (see "Exposition"). For the surprise such association of ideas must cause to the Jewish mind, see Luke 1: 33, and John 12: 34. As to the critics' treatment of the Messianic claims, see note 82 f. on Mark.

Peter's confession here precedes (in Matthew follows) the saying, "All things have been delivered," etc. (Luke 10: 22).

229 Luke 9: 23 *ff.* (*cf.* Luke 14: 29 *f.*, etc.). — Around these words, found substantially in each of the Gospels (*cf.* Matt. 16: 25; Mark 8: 35; John 12: 25), gather all the thoughts of Thomas à Kempis' "Imitation of Christ." Self-sacrifice, suffering, is seen, by men otherwise so widely differing in their views as Dr. Martineau and Bishop Gore, to be of the essence of Christianity, which so far has no meeting-point with Buddhistic "illusion of self," at present so much in vogue; that idea and Christ's "denial of self," the suppression of sorrow and its transfiguring into joy, badly sort together.

As to difference between self-love and selfishness, see Murray ("Christian Ethics," § 116), and for the various "selves" represented in the individual man which are recognized by modern Psychology, James ("Text Book," chapter 12).

Noticeable is the travesty of the Lord's words here in R. T. Campbell's "New Theology," where salvation is said to lie "in ceasing to be selfish" (p. 210).

"Daily," not once a week. *Cf.* verse 26. "It is not at all a question of professional ministry any more than of monasticism" (see Catholic Catechism, No. 342). *Cf.* 1 Cor. 15: 31.

One modern writer tells us that JESUS "was not a Christian" (Wellhausen, Introduction, p. 113); another, that "there has been only one Christian, and he died on the Cross. There never have been Christians at all" (Nietzsche, "Antichrist," § 39). Is it not a truism, so far as regards this last pronouncement, that "there are none so blind as those who will not see"?

Some critics, enamoured of the idea of "accretion," declare that these words could not have been spoken *before* the Crucifixion. One would be glad to learn from such writers how they conceive that the language could have originated after that event without misunderstanding. If "cross" and "lose his life" here are to be understood, the "daily" of Luke 14: 27, which is here represented by the present tense of the verbs, must be taken into account. The reader is urged to abide by Paul's interpretation (1 Cor. 15: 31), realized in that Apostle's experience, and by having his words in Rom. 12: 1 and Gal. 2: 20 burnt into the soul. Celsus said that, in his own day, Gal. 6: 14 was ever "in the mouth of every Christian of every sect." We are reminded here of "form of godliness without the power" (2 Tim. 3: 5), in days when anything like stern reality is decried as "enthusiasm," so prone are "the many" to lukewarmness.

We have here constantly repeated assumption of successive forms of self-denial or self-stripping, be it hand or foot or eye (Mark 9: 43-47), symbolic of the deeds of the body requiring mortification (Rom. 13).

230 Luke 9: 24. — "Life," *i.e.*, soul: see note 35 and *cf.* Luke 12: 19.

231 Luke 9: 26. — Fear of society's ridicule, not peculiar to one period of life, heads the list of hindrances to decided discipleship set forth in a "*Bulletin de l'Union Chrétienne de Jeunes Gens*" (Brussels, Feb., 1906).

232 "The Son of Man." Wellhausen, in his Introduction, p. 79, remarks: "Jesus here distinguishes Himself from the Son of Man." But *cf.* Matt. 10: 32 *f.* with verse 23 there, and see note 30 on Mark, *ad fin.*

"The holy angels": *cf.* 2 Thess. 1: 7.

233 Luke 9: 27. — For "taste of death" (γεύεσθαι τοῦ θανάτου), *cf.* the Talmudic *ta'am mîtha*.

233a The "Kingdom of God" instead of the personal "Son of Man" in the other Synoptics. Schmiedel remarks: "There is no longer any mention of the coming" ("Jesus in Modern Criticism," p. 33 *f.*), as to which observe that in each of these three Gospels the respective form of words is in the *same* context, that of the Transfiguration. We need not consult Jerome, Hilary, or Chrysostom to be assured that this vision was the one meant, and that it has no reference (as Sanday supposes) to Pentecost (Acts 1: 8, Acts 2: 4). On critical principles one would have expected transposition; so Wellhausen has to suggest that the story originated in a vision of the *risen* Christ. Awkwardly for such writers, the Transfiguration was recorded by Mark likewise; so that it cannot be said of Peter, as far as the Gospels are concerned, that he seems not to have known of it. Mark tells us that it was at the bidding of JESUS the three disciples did not disclose it until after His resurrection; and Matthew's like statement was doubtless derived from his fellow Apostle. The disciples would freely communicate to one another their several experiences, which thus became common property."

*Mark* speaks of "power" (Mark 9: 1). At 8: 38 of the record which, according to the critics is the first Synoptic, the same Evangelist has "with the holy angels," which *Matthew* has reproduced (Matt. 16: 27). But it is not the mention of these which explains the "power" peculiar to the shortest Gospel, in which JESUS is characteristically the Isaianic "Servant of Jehovah," who was "made a little lower than the angels" (Heb. 2: 9), to prove "much better" than they, as He "by inheritance obtained a more excellent name," that of the SON (*ibid.* 1: 4; *cf.* "This is my beloved son" in all three Synoptic accounts). Thus, it was to be "crowned with glory and honour," the passage first cited from Hebrews tells us, as by anticipation in this scene, *cf.* 2 Peter 3: 16 *f.* Hence "power" in the critics' first Gospel exactly expresses the transformation which the disciples witnessed.

234 Luke 9: 28 *ff.* — "Eight days." A fragment of a day at each end was reckoned in addition to the "six days" of Matthew and Mark.

As to a week being passed over here without any record of the ministry, see Stuart, p. 116.

235 Luke 9: 29. — The word λευκός, for "white," is used also in Rev. 1: 14.

236 Luke 9: 31 — Wright would have that "spoke" (ἔλεγον) means Moses and Elias *informing* the Lord of the details of His death ("Synopsis," p. 85). Does such exposition court serious refutation?

A really illuminative remark is that of Bishop Hall, in his "Contemplations" (vii. 5), that the appearance of Moses' body, hid in the valley of Moab, was for Christians to know that "their bodies are not lost but laid up, and shall as sure be raised up in glory as they are laid down in corruption."

"Departure" (ἔξοδος): *cf.* Acts 13: 34, for Luke's use of εἰσόδος, "entry." The word "exodus" is found again in 2 Peter 1: 15. As to such being the theme of the conversation, Dr. Torrey, in one of his London addresses, well asked, "Could anything make more for the fundamental importance of His death?"

237 Luke 9: 32. — "Oppressed with sleep," seemingly indicating that it was night; *cf.* verse 37.

238 "Having fully woke up." So Revv. text, Wellhausen, etc. The R.V. margin, "having kept awake," is in accordance with the usual sense of the word.

238a Luke 9: 33. — "Tabernacles." This seems to have taken place about the time of the Feast so named, in the autumn of the year preceding the Passion.

239 Luke 9: 34. — The reading ἐκείνους, as the pronoun in the second place, B. Weiss, in his critical dissertation, supposes was substituted for αὐτούς there in order to make the meaning clearer, that the disciples did not themselves enter the cloud. Blass puts a stop at "feared," which enables him

to connect "as they entered" with "a voice," etc. If αὐτούς be read, all six persons would seem to have been in the cloud (so Godet), unless (with Weiss) we take this αὐτούς as referring back to the one in verse 33. "Out of the cloud," in any case, makes for the disciples being outside of it.

240 Luke 9: 35. — "Beloved." The word ἀγαπητός seems to have become Biblically equivalent to μονογενής, "only begotten" (*i.e.*, "Only Son," Swete, "Studies," p. 167), from the way in which these words alternate in the LXX. version of *yachid*. *Cf.* note 90 on Mark, and Sir R. Anderson, "The Lord from Heaven," p. 30.§.

For the designation ἐκλεγμένος, "chosen" (R.V.), see Isa. 42: 1, and *cf.* Luke 23: 35. Observe, however, that by the prophets it is used of the Lord as παῖς, not as υἱός.

As to the glory of Christ making that of Moses and the prophets disappear, *cf.* the argument of 2 Cor. 3: 7-11.

240a Luke 9: 36. — The Transfiguration and the Lord's words leading up to it have no more to do with the Roman destruction of Jerusalem than with His ascension. The scene is a type, a shadow of the Millennial Kingdom.

For such as Loisy (i. 93, ii. 40), Wellhausen *ad loc.*, and in England, Carpenter (pp. 143-151), "told no man" does but mean that before the death of JESUS no one had ever heard of the Transfiguration! Historical criticism of this kind, will not stand the test supplied by sense of human character.

241 Luke 9: 37. — *Cf.* Ex. 34: 30. The Syriac of Sinai shews the same reading followed as by the Curetonian — "that" instead of "following" day.

242 Luke 9: 46 *ff.* — Self-assertion: *cf.* Luke 22: 24. In Mark 9: 29 the inefficiency of the disciples is attributed to lack of *prayer* (if not fasting also); whilst in Matt. 17: 20, faith in their very commission (verse 1 here), seems to have broken down.

"Should be": American Revv., "was."

"In My name" (verse 48). To the present day Arabic-speaking hospital patients in Palestine and Egypt use the name of JESUS in appealing for relief.

Jealousy comes out in verse 49 here; the more petty because of the man's success in contrast with their culpable failure.

243 Luke 9: 50. — *Cf.* Mark 9: 39 *f.* Here "you" replaces "us" of the earlier Gospel.

244 Luke 9: 51. — At this point we enter upon a record of the Lord's ministry which, with the exception of Luke 11: 14-44, Luke 12: 1-12, 35-40, and Luke 17: 1-4, is peculiar to Luke (see note 4 F), ranging from about the Feast of Tabernacles (October) — *cf.* John 8 — to about Passover of the year following (the spring), and covering the chapters down to 18 (verse 14), where the link with Matthew and Mark reappears, down to 19: 29. *Cf.* also John 7: 2 and John 10: 22, from the latter of which passages we learn that the Lord was at Jerusalem in the winter, and then retired "again beyond Jordan" (verse 40).

Wieseler, followed by Ellicott ("Historical Lectures," p. 241), regarded this portion of the Gospel as spreading over two journeys of Christ before the final one: the second of these would begin with Luke 17: 11, and end at 19: 29 (but *cf.* next note). It supplies that ministry of our Lord, loosely called the "Perean." Peraea was in the district of old called "Gilead." From the assertion of the *direction* always taken (Luke 13: 22 and Luke 17: 11, *cf.* Luke 18: 35), critics (Keim and followers, as

Wellhausen) have started the idea that the Evangelist was confused in his geography. As to this, Godet or Hahn may be consulted. A later writer, Spitta, has shown in his "Disputed Questions" that the criticism is baseless, for that the route from Galilee to Judea, (1) through Samaria, and (2) by way of Jericho, was customary.

"Receiving up," ἀνάληψις, which supplied a technical word for the Ascension. It is used here only in the New Testament; but for the verb, see Acts 1: 2, Acts 11: 22, besides 1 Tim. 3-16.

See Maclaren's sermon (Third Series), on "Christ Hastening to the Cross."

"To go to Jerusalem." Cf. Luke 13: 22, Luke 17: 11, Luke 18: 31, Luke 19: 38. There seems to be one journey in view throughout, of which there is a "threefold narrative": see paper of Col. Mackinlay in *Interpreter* April, 1911. *Three* may be seen to play an important part in the Book of Acts, where Paul's conversion is thrice described (Acts 9: 3 ff., Acts 22: 5 ff., Acts 26: 12 ff.), and Peter's visit to Cornelius in the same way alluded to (Acts 10: 1 ff., Acts 11: 4 ff., Acts 15: 7 ff.), whilst that Apostle's vision is said to have been threefold (Acts 10: 16). It is conceived that Luke had in his Gospel the same plan — to draw special attention to the particular incident in question.

245 Luke 9: 53. — For Jewish feeling toward Samaritans, see Ecclesiasticus, i. 25 f.

246 Luke 9: 54. — "James and John." Briggs supposes that the sons of Zebedee were the only Apostles with the Lord at this time ("New Light," chapter iv.). Carr notes that John was the first to give Apostolic blessing to the newly-founded Christian community of Samaria in Acts 8: 14 f. Bishop Jeremy Taylor preached from this verse.

246a Luke 9: 55. — The Lord wrought miracles in every element except fire, which is reserved for the consummation of the age (Bengel).

247 Luke 9: 57. — "One." Matt. 8: 19 informs us that he was "a scribe." Augustine has a sermon on this verse (*op. cit.*, p. 397).

248 Luke 9: 60. — "Let the dead bury their dead" is a saying still current in the East.

249 Luke 9: 61 f. - "Hand," not *hands* (Schor, p. 19 f.): It is the same in India at the present day. The ploughman requires the other hand for holding the pole with which he pricks the oxen.

250 "Fit," εὐθετος, as a question of conduct. Cf. use of the word in 14: 35, and of ἀδόκιμος in respect of work in Titus 1: 10: "worthless as to every good work." It is not a question of fitness for eternal life, which consists in acknowledgment before God of one's absolute worthlessness and need. Cf. Acts 13: 4 in that connection with 2 Tim. 3: 8, worthless as regards the *faith*."

With these two verses cf. Matt. 6: 33, Matt. 13: 44-46.

## NOTES ON THE TENTH CHAPTER (TO VERSE 37).

251 Some Judean ministry seems to be recorded in Luke 10 - 13: 21. As to this, see Professor Briggs' book, "New Light, etc." (Cf. note 53 on John.) It becomes most apparent as we reach verse 38, which, with the four following verses, will be taken in connection with chapter 11.

252 Luke 10: 1. — "Seventy." Luke was supposed by some of old to have been one of them (see note 2). References for that view could be found in Hahn's commentary, etc. The number has been variously taken as referring to the supposed number of nations at the time; to the seventy elders of the Jewish polity (Num. 15: 16); and, by "Catholic"-minded people (*cf.* the full college of seventy Roman

Cardinals), to the elders of the primitive Church.

As to the reading "seventy-two," see curious explanation of how the "conflation" may have arisen in Abbot, "Clue: A Guide through Greek to Hebrew Scripture," p. 137 *f*.

253 "Two and two," *cf.* Mark 6: 7 of the Twelve. Critics, as their manner is, imagine that Luke is following two different reports of the same mission (*cf.* Luke 9: 1-6); but you find them at other times saying that our Evangelist discards a report of some miracle or saying as a "doublet." So crooked are the ways of some writers that with them caprice runs riot.

254 "Every city and place . . . come." Carpenter treats this as an allegory: he would have it that no earthly visit is meant, but the advent of the glorified Messiah, as the Kingdom should spread among the Gentiles by the disciples' preaching. *Cf.* verse 16. Such is part of what the Expositor has elsewhere described as "the mythology of the nineteenth century."

255 Luke 10: 2. — "Indeed." The R.V. at Matt. 9: 27 retains the "truly" of A.V., but drops it here, although the Greek is the same (ὁ μὲν).

See Augustine's "Sermons on the New Testament," vol. i., p. 401.

256 Luke 10: 4. — "Salute no man," *i.e.*, abstain from that which, in the East (*cf.* 2 Kings 4: 29), is a prolonged ceremony. Ryle, "The man of God ought to have no leisure for any work but that of His Master." *Cf.* Prayer Book of British Jews, p. 186. Different counsel seems to be given now to the clergy by some diocesans.

257 Luke 10: 6. — "Son of peace." *Cf.* "child of wisdom" (wrath), "son of perdition" (death).

The αὐτόν may grammatically mean "him," and was so taken in the Latin.

For the last words of this verse, *cf.* Ps. 35: 13.

258 Luke 10: 7. — "The workman is worthy of his hire" (Matthew: "food"). *Cf.* 1 Cor. 9: 14 and 1 Tim. 5: 18. The Expositor, after Lewin (i. 393), with whom Bishop Hersey agreed, was of opinion that the Apostle in the passages named quoted this Gospel ("God's Inspiration, etc.," p. 18). Colour may be given to this view by the mention of Luke in the same connection as the "parchments" (2 Tim. 4: 11-13). As to 1 Cor., *cf.* Hausrath ("New Testament Times," iii. 70). Salmon thought that the words in 1 Tim. may have been heard by Paul from Luke's lips at a weekly church meeting. B. Weiss supposes that the words were known to Timothy as a familiar saying of the Lord. H. Holtzmann's view was that the Evangelist derived them from the Apostle (Introduction, p. 401). The simple truth seems to be that it was a current Jewish proverb, derived from Deut. 24: 14 *f*.

259 Luke 10: 8. — *Cf.* 1 Cor. 10: 27, Ecclesiasticus 31: 16.

260 Luke 10: 11. — The word κολλᾶσθαι, "cleave," is frequent in Luke's writings: see Luke 15: 15, and Acts 5: 13, Acts 9: 26, Acts 11: 23, and Acts 17: 34. Paul uses it in 1 Cor. 6: 17.

261 Luke 10: 16. — "He that hears you hears Me." *Cf.* John 16: 25, John 17: 20. The teaching of the "historical Jesus" is partly incomprehensible without the Apostolic interpretation. The Catholic Catechism, No. 228, resorts to these words.

262 Luke 10: 18. — "I beheld." *Cf.* Luke's use of θεωρεῖν, as here, in Acts 17: 16. That which the verse sets before us is not visionary (H. Holtzmann), but intuitive, Divine knowledge (Meyer, Schanz, Weiss, Hahn).

262a "As lightning." *Cf.* Matt. 24: 27.

262b "Fall," πεσόντα. All Germans seem to translate it as our A.V. The Revv., "fallen," after Bishop Basil Jones, etc., a rendering criticized by Evans, who explains thus: "Satan fell. I was there looking on." J. H. Moulton "I watched him fall" ("Prolegomena," p. 134; *cf.* Goodwin, "Moods and Tenses," § 148). "Fallen" suits πεπτωκότα alone, as in Rev. 9: 1. Falling, again, would be πίπτοντα. The form used here is, of course, the instantaneous, momentary aorist participle, which sets forth the act as a whole, not as in progress: contrast "rising" (R.V.) in Luke 12: 54.

It is "prophetic" (Godet); that is, anticipatory, see John 12: 31; Rev. 12: 10. Wellhausen's reference to Isa. 14: 12 *f.*, of course, connects itself with the fourth verse of Rev. 12. The Sura 72 in the Koran, which speaks of ejection of demons from heaven by meteors, does but caricature Old Testament predictions, with the substitution of Mohammed for our Lord. The real phenomenon will be fulfilled before the great Tribulation, and is distinct from that of Matt. 24: 29 (Mark 13: 25), which will precede the time of stress. The Fathers' view, represented in modern times by Cornelius à Lapide, was that it refers to the time when Satan first sinned: so B. W. Newton in his "Thoughts on the Apocalypse," p. 249; but see Trench, "Studies," pp. 227-230. It is not a fact accomplished, as Bruce states the matter.

263 Luke 10: 20. — "Names written, etc." *Cf.* Ex. 32: 32; Ps. 69: 28, besides Rev. 3: 4 *f.* — the Assembly's roll at Sardis, and its confirmation or otherwise in heaven. *Cf.* Matt. 5: 12, noting like connection of the word "rejoice."

264 Luke 10: 21 *f.* — For the Lord's requirement of faith in His Person, *cf.* Matt. 11: 25 *ff.* These twin passages, awkward for critics, those have to face who can but talk of "Christological development from Paul to the Fourth Gospel" (art. "Son of God" in "Encyclopaedia Biblica"). The fertility of imagination displayed by some is very unedifying. The background of the pre-existence of JESUS (Dorner: see on 7: 35) makes itself felt here, and must, accordingly, be explained away!

On Harnack's apparent misreading of the Lord's words here, Swete remarks: "It is His Sonship which enables Him to know, not knowledge which makes Him the Son" ("Studies," p. 79 *f.*). For the unique Sonship, *cf.* 2 John 3, "the Son of the Father," words which admit of only one interpretation.

265 The traditional reading, in every source of evidence ordinarily credible, is γινώσκει, "knows" (Matt., ἐπιγινώσκει). Schmiedel (art. "John son of Zebedee," in "Encyclopaedia Biblica," col. 2527) emphasizes the aorist ἔγνων which emerges in a few Patristic quotations: something that came about at a definite moment of time, within the period of the earthly life of the Lord. The subject has since been discussed by Harnack, "Sayings," pp. 19 and 196 *ff.*, where references will be found to Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, etc. For the use made by Marcion of these passages in the Gospels, see Burkitt, p. 308.

Will the "advanced" writers accept the Patristic reading ἐγεννήθη (instead of ἐγεννήθησαν) in John 1: 13? A thousand times, No! And yet, that variant is of like character to this from a purely scientific point of view.

Harnack observes that Luke could only have here omitted the words of Matt. 11: 28-30. But, speaking of the manner of critics, would our Evangelist's first readers have understood the "yoke" there spoken of, which is a Jewish conception (Acts 15: 10)? (*Cf.* Edersheim, "Life of Jesus, etc.," vol. ii., p. 142 *f.*, and Morris Joseph's work, "Judaism, as Creed and Life" (1903).

266 Blass has discarded the seven last words of verse 22 on the scanty evidence of "D" and three Old Latin copies. The words are unquestioned in Matthew.

266a Luke 10: 23 *f.* — See Sermons of Chas. Simeon ("Works," xii. p. 418) and of H. P. Liddon

in Allenson's reprint of selected series (No. X.).

267 Luke 10: 25. — "Lawyer." As to the class of scribes, see Neander, pp. 269, 401, and note below on 11: 43. The "tempting" was, of course, to test the Lord's orthodoxy (Stock).

267a "Everlasting" (αἰώνιος). Of the use of this in the Old Testament, Isa. 45: 17 is a typical passage. In Luke it always has a future reference; whilst αἰών, "age" is used for all three forms of time. As bearing on the lawyer's question, *cf.* Prov. 4: 13 and 1 Tim. 6: 12.

268 Luke 10: 27. — See the *Shema* in the liturgy for both morning and evening of the Jewish Prayer Book.

The scribes had decided that the *chief* commandment was enshrined in Lev. 19: 18.

The Old Testament original of Deut. 6: 5 speaks of man in his threefold nature — "might" standing for "spirit" (energy): *cf.* note above on Luke 1: 46.

On equal love of neighbour and self, see Murray, "Christian Ethics" pp. 27-32.

Luther preached from verses 23-27 on the "Difference between the Law and the Gospel" ("Sermons," p. 436).

Two of Bishop Butler's sermons were upon the Love of God and the Love of Our Neighbour respectively.

269 Luke 10: 29. — The aorist δικαιῶσαι means: to keep up for the nonce his reputation for righteousness; whilst the present δικαιοῦν would mean: to acquire standing justification.

270 "Neighbour": *cf.* Lev. 19: 18, "children of thy people."

See D. L. Moody's Gospel address on "Who is my Neighbour?"

271 Luke 10: 31. — "Happened." The phrase κατὰ συγκυρίαν may be rendered "by a coincidence."

272 Luke 10: 33. — "The story is full of tender touches by One who had lately been repulsed from a Samaritan village" (Lindsay).

273 Luke 10: 34. — Wellhausen curiously remarks: "In wounds oil is applied, but not oil and wine." The "pouring in" oil or *over* (ἐπιχέων) means for massage, as now amongst Arabs; the wine, to staunch bleeding. For a quotation from *Shabbath*, regarding their use in circumcision, see Farrar, in *Excursus*.

274 Luke 10: 35. — *Cf.* the Book of Enoch, 40: 5 (part of the Similitudes, xxxviii. — lxx.).

275 Luke 10: 36. — "Was," or "proved" (R.V.), for ἐγένετο.

276 Luke 10: 37. — "Shewed": lit. "did" (ποιήσας), a Hebraism peculiar to Luke in the New Testament. *Cf.* Luke 1: 72; Acts 14: 27, Acts 15: 4. It is taken from the LXX.

The words "do likewise" ground Jülicher's classification of this among the "exemplary parables" (note 196).

Spurgeon's Sermons, 473, 1360, are on this section of the Gospel.

For the allegorical interpretation as it has by different writers been worked out in detail, see the notes of Alford or Ryle.

Admirers of Buddhist Ethics compare with this parable the story by P. Carus, entitled "Karma," so

highly appreciated by Tolstoi.

## NOTES ON CHAPTER 10: 38 TO CHAPTER 11: 54.

277 Chapter 10, verses 38-42. — This section seems to be connected with a visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Dedication (in winter: John 9: 1 - 10: 12). *Cf.* notes 244, 251. The visit to this "certain village," understood as Bethany, cannot have belonged to the Passion period, but must be placed very early in the same year.

There are two sermons of Augustine on verse 38 (*op. cit.*); one of Richard Baxter on verse 41 ("Works," x. 407); and G. Whitefield preached on verse 42 ("Works," v. 456).

278 Luke 10: 39. — *Cf.* 1 Cor. 7: 34 *ff.* Carr suggests that our Lord's words were in the Apostle's mind. See also note on John 14: 23. Augustine says: "A man resting on faith, hope, and love needs not the Scriptures, except for the purpose of instructing others" ("On Christian Doctrine," i. 37: *cf.* his Epistles, xix. 82). Is it, however, to be supposed that he acted upon this himself?

279 Luke 10: 42. — Basil and Theophylact offer the feeble explanation: one dish only.

280 Luke 11: 1. — Here seems to begin the *second* narrative (see note 244) of the final journey to Jerusalem, extending as far as 14: 24.

"To pray." Luke has recorded in this place the dictation by our Lord of the formula which goes by His name, in order to bind together the two great supports of spiritual life, Christ's Word (Luke 10: 39) and Prayer: see the Expositor's — "Lectures on Matthew," p. 85 *f.*

The Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Divines has as Question 98, "What is Prayer?" Sabatier answers by "*Religion in act*" ("Philosophy of Religion," p. 27).

PRAYER has ever been regarded as an appropriate instrument of communion with the Unseen; as such it is the counterpart of His voice to us. The Scriptures and Prayer together fortify believers against mere Mysticism (147A) on the one hand, and against pure Rationalism on the other (*cf.* Ritschl, "Theology and Metaphysics," p. 476). For the Spirit as the power of such communion, see Rom. 8: 26, and Exposition of verse 14 *f.*

Pantheism (exemplified by Buddhism) makes no provision for prayer, which is alien to such systems. Some philosophers and scientists criticize the underlying conception of Prayer as irrational: to their objections Martineau's writings offer effective replies. "Does Prayer influence GOD?" is a common inquiry, to which the answer of S. D. Gordon is: "It does not influence His purpose; it does influence His action. He does nothing without our consent. When we learn His purposes and make them our prayer, we are giving Him the opportunity to act. Nature's laws are merely God's habit of action in handling secondary forces. They involve no purpose of God. His purposes are regarding moral issues. Emergencies change all habits of action. The world is in a great emergency through sin" ("Quiet Talks on Prayer," p. 54 *ff.*).

281 Luke 11: 2. — "Father." This is "*Abba*," Aramaic emphatic form of "father" used in Rom. 8: 15; Gal. 4: 6, and Luke's form of invocation.

Chrysostom and Augustine emphasized the Fatherhood of God as characteristic of the Christian dispensation: no Old Testament saint used the epithet save as member of a community. Maurice and other moderns have developed the idea.

*Cf.* Matt. 6: 6, "Thy Father," and verse 9 there, as showing that "our" even in that Gospel must be

so taken.

For omission of "in heaven," *cf.* Luke 6: 36; for those words, Matt. 6: 9 (as in verses 45, 48 there).

"Hallowed be Thy Name": *cf.* Lev. 24: 16, by misuse of which the Jews come to treat *Yahveh* (Jehovah) as *taboo*, and to employ it in the Temple services only, but in those of the synagogues *Adonay* (Lord) alone: see references in Schürer, *div. ii.*, vols. 1, 2. In common life they spoke of "the Name" (Aramaic: *Shema*) (Dalman, p. 149 *f.*). In the Tosefta "Sanhedrin" (xii. 25) we have, "He that pronounces the *Tetragrammaton* has no part in the future world." *Cf.* Joseph. "Antiqq.," ii. 276.

Stock (p. 28) compares the substitution by journalists of "the Founder of Christianity" for "JESUS," etc.

282 "Thy KINGDOM come." To this day the words find place in the *Kaddish* of the Jewish Prayer Book. *Cf.* in particular Luke 9: 27, Luke 14: 15, Luke 19: 11, Luke 21: 31, Luke 22: 16, 18, and Luke 23: 51, in each of which passages the "kingdom" is regarded emphatically as future. But these words evidently "keep the double aspect in mind" (Warman, "New Testament Theology," p. 23).

In Luke 22: 29 *f.* the Lord speaks of His own Kingdom in the same future aspect of manifestation: see notes on that chapter. For prayer that it may come, see Rev. 22: 20, almost the last words of the Bible.

His words about the "Kingdom" are everywhere pregnant. It is "(α) spiritual, (β) apocalyptic" (Stevens, p. 72). The scholars who, as Ritschl and Wellhausen, treat it as solely *present* are just as much mistaken as those who, with Meyer, J. Weiss and Bousset, regard it as wholly *future*. Of the latter class is Wernle, the following of whose words, however, so far as they go, are right. "From the beginning to the end of His ministry, not merely at the close (as in Luke 19: 11, Luke 22: 18), when He might be deemed disappointed as to His mission (Isa. 49: 4), the future is before the Lord" ("Beginnings of Christianity," p. 61). As to the present, mystic, by the Expositor described as "moral," sense of the term (Col. 1: 13), *cf.* note on verse 20 below, and Charles, p. 318, in connection with Luke 11: 20, Luke 16: 16, and Luke 17: 21. The term is first met with in the "Wisdom of Solomon," 10: 10, and appears also in Psalms of Solomon, 17: 4. For its use in the Targums, see Dalman, "Words of Jesus," p. 91 *ff.*

In the hands of Augustine, unhappily, the term acquired for mediaeval theologians identity with "Catholic Church": see his "City of God," and *cf.* note on 8: 1. A further turn was given to its meaning by Protestants, for whom it came to denote "the life of the redeemed after death," or, as the idea was expressed by Martineau, and rightly rejected by him, "the future state of the righteous," in the same sense ("Endeavours after the Christian Life," p. 218).

The perpetual use of this petition, from the Apostolic age to our own time, is of itself evidence that the Church in its truly healthiest mood never ceased to believe in what is now called "the eschatological background" of the Gospels (*cf.* note 546); and so, not even when Augustine sought to establish an identity of Church and Kingdom, from which misconception such an influential scholar as Wellhausen has not been emancipated. Prof. Mackintosh has written that the eschatological cast of our Gospels "could not be seen clearly till modern scholarship arose" ("Christian Ethics," p. 76), which is correct in the sense that ecclesiastical obscurantism prevailed until, not in Germany during the past few years, but in this country, early Patristic interpretation of the "Kingdom," stripped of its extravagance, was reaffirmed eighty years ago. This was in connection with the quickening among British Christians of the Church's Hope of the "Second Coming" of the Lord, in the light, not of learned theological disquisitions, but of effect being given to spiritual truth, seen in life, and practice

governed by Scripture alone. One may trust that the present trend of thought in Germany will receive like impulse; it will be so if the atmosphere of the *Gemeinschaften* prevail over that of the academical *Seminars*.

The various Scriptural aspects of the "Kingdom," besides that of its relation to the "Gospel" already touched upon (chapter 8, *sub init.*; *cf.* note on Luke 18: 16 *f.*), will be developed in successive notes on verse 20 of the present chapter, Luke 12: 31, 47*f.*, Luke 14: 14, Luke 17: 20 *ff.*, Luke 18: 16 *f.*, 24 *ff.*, Luke 21: 36, Luke 22: 16 *ff.* The attention once given to the doctrine of the CHURCH seems now being transferred to that of the KINGDOM. This is none too soon: for the latter topic provides "the key of knowledge" (*cf.* Luke 11: 52 with Matt. 23: 13). Again, Matt. 13: 52 cannot apply to the "Church," which is a purely *New Testament* disclosure (Eph. 3: 5). The absurdity of Rome's application of the "keys" in Matt. 16: 19 to the Church is palpable.

The true doctrine of the Kingdom is the most effective instrument in the hands of any Christian scribe who would really strive to serve the present generation, perplexed with so many problems, ecclesiastical and social.

283 Luke 11: 3. — "Give," δίδου, present; whilst Matthew has δός, aorist, as appropriate to σήμερον there.

"Us." The plural, Dr. John Lightfoot says, was used by Jews in their *private* prayers, as excluding any idea of the petitioner being apart from the congregation ("Works," vi., p. 426: xi., p. 143).

"Needed," ἐπιούσιος. "Daily" (A.V.) came from the Vulgate. The word here is quite distinct from that found in James 2: 15. Origen states that ἐπιούσιος was used nowhere else in Jewish literature. The Expositor (see his special pamphlet on "The Lord's Prayer, so-called," p. 29) follows the Peschito Syriac — as did Suidas, followed by Reuss, Godet, Arnold Meyer, etc. — taking it to mean *sufficient*. *Cf.* Prov. 30: 8, which Delitzsch has followed in his Hebrew New Testament. The Syrsin has "continual" (*amîna*): *cf.* John 6: 27. For the light thrown by the various Syriac versions on the actual Aramaic word used by our Lord, see Paper of Margoliouth in Expositor, April, 1910.

The Hebrew "Gospel of the Nazarenes" had *mahar*, "of tomorrow," with which must be ranged the view taken by Erasmus, Grotius, Bengel, De Wette, Meyer, Bishop Lightfoot ("A Fresh Revision," etc.), H. Holtzmann, with most modern scholars, that the form is derivable from ἐπιούσα, in the sense of, for the coming day. Olshausen and Stier, whom Plumptre followed, understood *spiritual* food.

284 "Bring us not into temptation," as the Spirit did JESUS (Luke 4: 1).

285 As to SIN and the initial forgiveness of sins, see note on Luke 24: 47, and a pamphlet by the present writer (same publisher). With the present passage *cf.*, of course, Matt. 18: 35, and see Saphir on the Lord's Prayer, Lect. XIII.; also Sermons of Augustus Hare (vol. ii.) and H. Melvill (vol. i.).

If the disciples ever offered this prayer during the period of the Lord's ministry, it could not have been *in His Name*: see John 16: 24. Whately contends that Christians do now implicitly so use it, as to which see W. Kelly's remarks in his special pamphlet (*s. tit.*). "It was intended for those who were true believers, but for whom redemption was yet prospective, and to whom the Holy Ghost had not been given" (p. 21; *cf.* p. 23). Reference may be made also to Bruce, "Training of the Twelve," where it is described as "for spiritual minors, for Christians in the crude state of Divine life" (p. 51).

Some happy remarks on grounds alleged for its disuse have been made from the usual point of view by Dr. Thirtle, in his Paper entitled "Form and Substance" ("Christian," 20th Jan., 1910). Much of the criticism bestowed upon it does but illustrate Luther's description of the Prayer as "one of the

greatest of Christian martyrs."

That it was not meant as a liturgical formula, the different wording in the two Gospels containing it should suggest to all intelligent readers: see Meyer and *cf.* Harnack, p. 64 *f.* This difference of scope and form in Matthew and Luke, J. Weiss (on Matthew, p. 286) speaks of as "striking a death-blow to belief in Verbal Inspiration." If such a thing were possible for critics of his school, it could only be by way of mechanical uniformity: the difference between Divine and human vanishes for them.

In defence of a written form of words for congregational prayer, Archbishop Whately made use of a curious argument in a "Letter to a Clergyman of the Diocese of Dublin" (1837). From our Lord's words in Matt. 18: 19, as to agreement about petitions made, he extracted an implication of exclusive use of precomposed prayers (p. 8 *f.*). Christians, however, who use extemporaneous prayer alone, outside of conventional prayers from Nonconformist pulpits, habitually so agree as to *subjects* of intended prayer. There is nothing in our Lord's statement governing the language of such petitions. Those who approve add their "Amen." As to their being, according to the Archbishop, merely "hearers" while not themselves voicing the mind of the company, *à priori* impressions are rectified by *experience*.

The New Testament is generally supposed to be silent as to any use being made, whether privately or publicly, of this formula, either during the lifetime of the Lord or in the period of Apostolic ministry. No answer has naturally been found to Bingham's inquiry, "When did its use begin?" ("Antiqq.," xiii. 7). It is first met with, outside the gospel of Matthew and Luke, in the *Didaché* (§ 8), and here in the Matthean form, with an injunction that it shall be said thrice daily. But as late as the time of Justin Martyr (Apol., i. 67) extemporaneous prayer (*supra*) was certainly recognized at celebration of the Lord's Supper (ἄσση δύναμις αὐτῷ), translated in Pusey's Library of the Fathers by "with all his strength." By the third century this formula had become "legitimate and ordinary" prayer.

*Cf.* Exposition by Maclaren, i. pp. 322-325. Reference should also be made, for comparison with this prayer, to the Prayer Book of British Jews (*Amidah*), pp. 44-54.

286 Luke 11: 7. — See Schor, p. 25.

287 Luke 11: 8. — *Cf.* Mark 11: 24. Abrahams says, with reference to the Rabbinic idea of prayer, "The man who prayed expecting an answer was regarded as arrogant and sinful!" (p. 147).

287a Luke 11: 9. — "This is the Magna Charta of prayer" (Neil).

288 Luke 11: 11. — "Shall give," *i.e.*, *in answer to him* (ἐπιδώσει)

289 Luke 11: 13. — "Being," *to begin with* (ὑπάρχων). This word is characteristically Pauline: it occurs again in Luke 16: 14, 23, and Luke 23: 50. As to the doctrine of "Original Sin," see note 617 below.

290 "Father who is of heaven," ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. *Cf.* 1 Cor. 15: 47, and Weiss, "Theology of the New Testament," p. 93; also his "Sources of Luke's Gospel," p. 73.

Wesley notes the gradation: friend, father, GOD.

291 "Holy Spirit." Syrsin has "good things." Harnack (as Wellhausen) speaks of Luke's change of words as *capricious* (Matt.: ἄγαθα), *e.g.*, his fondness for "spirit" ("Sayings," p. 10); but *cf.* verse 20, where our Evangelist has "finger" (δακτύλω) for Matthew's "spirit" (πνεύματι), as shown on the next page of Harnack's own book.

Our Lord's word, "good-things," recorded by Matthew, seems to belong to a different time or connection from "Spirit" here. As Dr. Campbell Morgan has said, the former was spoken by Him in the character of Jewish Messiah ("The Spirit of God," p. 172); but the same writer seems to have missed the point (*ibid.*, p. 94) in Luke's record, which regards efficiency in service, and that *now*, as well as in time yet to come, independently of dispensation. The esteemed minister of Westminster Chapel is right in guarding such passages from the interpretation put upon them by those who support the idea of a "second blessing." But is there any warrant for asserting that the disciples did never act upon the Lord's statement? The same might as well be said of the formula of verses 2-4 in the immediate context.

The omission of the article indicates that a faculty rather than the personal Spirit is spoken of (*cf.* Middleton on Matt. 1: 18, p. 126; Acts 19: 2; 1 Cor. 12: 31, 1 Cor. 14: 1, and Phil. 1: 19). As to gifts of the Holy Spirit already spoken of in Isaiah 11: 2, see "Catholic Catechism," p. 93, where these are set out.

Warner has described the Holy Spirit as "operative in the subconscious area" (p. 284).

291a "Ask": "The Son was given unasked, the Spirit to be given must be implored" (Neil).

292 Luke 11: 14 *f.* — B. Weiss treats these verses as parallel to Matt. 9: 32 *ff.*

293 Luke 11: 15. — "Beelzebub." The final letter is not shown as *b* in any Greek MS., but is derived from the Vulgate. The critical reading is "Beelzeboul." So in Matt. 12: 24-27; Mark 3: 22. As to the meaning of this name, see 2 Kings 1: 6, and *cf.* Dalman, "Aramaic Grammar," p. 137.

294 Luke 11: 19. — For the use made by Carpenter of these words, see p. 367 of his "Bible in the Nineteenth Century."

295 Luke 11: 20. — "Finger of God." See Ex. 8: 19; Ps. 8: 3. *Cf.* note 291.

296 "The Kingdom of God is come upon you." For  $\phi\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ , *Cf.* 1 Thess. 4: 15, where the word clearly has the classical sense of "to forestall." "anticipate," whilst in Rom. 9: 31 it means "to reach." Here it may have the first meaning, "to come unexpectedly" (J. Weiss: "to break," as the dawn), but a few writers labour under the impression, aided by the fact that Heaven and God were to some extent interchangeable in the language of the period (ch. xv. 21), that Kingdom of *God* and Kingdom of *Heaven* are equivalent terms (so H. Holtzmann). But the Kingdom of Heaven is not a mere "euphemism" (as Selbie, p. 85) for Kingdom of God. These are not co-extensive: see note 21 on Mark (p. 245). The "Kingdom of Heaven," as Allen states (on Matt. 12: 28, Matt. 21: 43), is a regularly eschatological term. It represents that which is described in expository literature as the "Millennium." from Rev. 20: 4. *Cf.* the Lord's "heavenly kingdom" in 2 Tim. 4: 18, and the administration of the "fulness of times" (Eph. 1: 10). In Matt. 13: the Kingdom acquires its *heavenly* character from the King being there, regarded as having returned to heaven. "The Kingdom of God" extends beyond the Messianic reign, being of endless duration (1 Cor. 15: 28).

297 "Panoply" This word is shared by Luke and Paul (Eph. 6: 11-13), and is peculiar to them.

298 Luke 11: 21 *ff.* — The late Count Tolstoi, in conversation with Dr. F. W. Baedeker (Memoir, p. 207), remarked that there would be no prisons — Baedeker had been visiting convicts as a missionary — if people were rightly taught; to which the rejoinder was, that so long as there is sin in the world there will be prisons, and this passage was quoted, of which the Russian writer, who has produced a book on "The Teaching of Jesus," avowed himself ignorant! "When everybody," he writes, "has understood the true teaching, then evil and temptations will come to an end"! (§ 39 *ad fin.*, E. T.,

p. 85).

299 Luke 11: 23. — *Cf.* Matt. 12: 30. Just as the first part of this "saying" regards every man's individual relation to the Person of Christ, the second concerns His Work (Hahn).

The principle derived by the Expositor from this verse is now better understood than at the time his comment was written; but there is still room for much improvement with regard to it in the Church "militant."

300 Luke 11: 24 *f.* — Martensen considers that the use which Luke makes of this *logion* bears upon seeming conversion ("Individual Ethics," E. T., p. 152). "An unclean spirit, *e.g.*, lust, is gone out. The man assumes a robe of piety; the unclean spirit returns in another form, *e.g.*, pride and censoriousness." It has been suggested that the exchange of Protestantism for Catholicism has often the character described in 2 Peter 2: 20 *ff.*

Dr. Arnold has preached on verse 25 ("Sermons on the Christian Life," p. 156).

301 Luke 11: 26. — *Cf.* Matt. 12: 45 for words not in Luke, and illustrating the different design of the Gospels ("Introductory Lectures," p. 325). As to the seven spirits, see note above on 8: 2.

There is a sermon on this verse by Isaac Williams.

302 Luke 11: 27 *ff.* — This, as some critics conceive, is Luke's equivalent for what he has omitted of Mark 7: 1 *ff.*

303 Luke 11: 29-32. — The attitude of critics towards *Typology* may be gathered from Schmidt, pp. 55-64. "The critical study of the Hebrew Scriptures has, eliminated types." "The reason why modern learning has abandoned typology is . . . it can find no place in history for many persons . . . regarded as types." So complete has become the confusion between the method employed by our Lord and his Apostles and the Patristic allegorizing. People who claim to be "scientific" may be expected to live up to their reputation, which is too often, however, a castle of cardboard. Evolution is *supposed* to have made Typology impossible!

304 Luke 11: 30 *ff.* — "A queen." "Men of Nineveh." The Expositor (as Westcott, "Some Lessons, etc.," p. 55) preferred the indefinite form of rendering.

305 Matthew, whose special use of the prophet's *adversity* is sometimes belittled, has also preserved the *preaching* of Jonah as the sign (Luke 12: 41).

306 Luke 11: 33. — "In secret" (W.-H., κρύπτειν, or, as Blass and Weiss, κρυπτήν), "in a vault." See Spurgeon's Sermon, 2109.

307 Luke 11: 35 *f.* — "The light . . . in thee." Grubb: "The light within is the power of a self-conscious person to enter into communion with God" (*op. cit.*, p. 93: see the whole of chapter 7, and on the relation of such light to the conscience, chapter 12 of his book). *Cf.* John 11: 10 with Gore, "The Creed of the Christian," p. 38 *f.*

Robert South preached on verse 35.

308 Luke 11: 37. — "Dine." This was the ἄριστον, or midday meal (breakfast, luncheon): see Acts 10: 9 *f.*, and *cf.* Josephus, "Life," see. 54. For the δεῖπνον (dinner, supper), see chapter 14.

309 Luke 11: 38. — "Washed (American Revv. 'bathed himself') before dinner." *Cf.* Mark 7: 4, and see Bennett on Mishna, etc., p. 33 *f.*

310 Luke 11: 39. — The PHARISEES. As to this party, see Bennett, chapter 9, and paper by Box

in *Churchman*, September, 1911. The *Expositor* (*cf.* his pamphlet on the Talmud) here sides with Farrar and Edersheim, against Deutsch and Montefiore. On Deutsch's own showing ("Literary Remains," p. 29) some language of the Talmud about them is just as severe as any in the Gospels.

See Augustine's Sermon in *op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 431.

311 Luke 11: 41. — "What ye have," ἐνόητα, as taken by Godet and Bishop Basil Jones. Whilst Wordsworth explains by "hearts," the R.V. text makes the word mean *souls* (*cf.* Matt. 23: 25 *ff.*); the margin (rejected by W. Kelly in his "Bible Treasury" review), the contents of the cups, which was the view of De Wette, after Theophylact. And so B. Weiss. *Cf. Expositor*, March, 1909 (p. 282 *f.*, Papyri).

312 Luke 11: 42 *ff.* — The *woes* Matthew has assigned to the Passion narrative.

313 "Love of God" (*cf.* Luke 10: 27, and note there). Save as in John 5: 42 (*cf.* Luke 8: 42 of that Gospel), this is peculiar to Luke. In Matthew, "mercy" and "faith." Augustine said that, "one can do anything if he love God." *Cf.* James 1: 25. Thomas à Kempis: "If thou didst know the whole Bible by heart . . . what would that profit thee without the love of God?"

As to this element in the Jewish *Chassidism* of the eighteenth century, see Abrahams, p. 76. For the Old Testament basis, *cf.* Deut. 6: 5 and Deut. 30: 20. The Divine claim of love is characteristic of Judaism and Christianity amongst religious systems, as to which see Bettex, "The Book of Truth," p. 676. On the love of God in the Synoptic teaching, see Stalker, "The Ethic of Jesus," chapter x.

314 Luke 11: 44 *f.* — *Cf.* Matt. 23: 27. According to the Received Text, the "lawyers" seem to distinguish themselves from the "scribes"; but the critical text omits "scribes" here. There can be no doubt that "scribe" was used of any man of learning. *Cf.* note on Luke 10: 25.

315 Luke 11: 49-51. — *Cf.* Matt. 23: 34. This passage is considered by Afford to be a paraphrase of 2 Chron. 24: 18-22; by Lindsay, as a paraphrase of Prov. 1: 20-31. *Cf.* Job 12: 13, Job 28: 23; Prov. 8: 22-31; Wisdom of Solomon, 7: 27; Rom. 11: 33, and 1 Cor. 1: 24; also note 125 above (Luke 5: 17).

Harnack supposes that an apocryphal Jewish writing is quoted ("Sayings," p. 103).

John 7: 38 and James 4: 5 are passages as to which the like question has arisen.

"Hath been poured out," ἔκκεχυμένον. If ἐκχυννόμενον (Tisch.) be read, future bloodshed will be included (Weymouth).

Observe the entail of hereditary guilt attaching to the Jewish people, forerunners of the "historical church" in a like connection (Anderson, "The Bible or the Church," p. 100).

316 Luke 11: 52. — "The key of knowledge," generally supposed to refer to the symbol of authority handed to new rabbis by the Sanhedrin when commissioning them. See, however, note on verse 2.

317 Luke 11: 53. — "To make him speak," ἀποστοματίζειν. McClellan: "to urge Him to answer offhand."

## NOTES ON THE TWELFTH CHAPTER.

318 This chapter resembles Matt. 5-7 so far as regards its *mosaic* construction: of its fifty-nine verses of *sayings* the contents of no less than thirty-five were delivered on entirely different occasions (Burton).

319 Luke 12: 1. — "In those (times)," "in which circumstances" (ἐν οἷς) as in Acts 26: 12.

"Myriads": *cf.* Acts 21: 20.

"Leaven": see note on Luke 13: 21.

"Hypocrisy." The remarks of Boehmer, *ad loc.* (p. 201 *ff.*), are specially worthy of attention.

320 Luke 12: 3. — See Schor, p. 28.

321 Luke 12: 4. — "Friends," in contrast with Luke 19: 27, "Mine enemies." In other respects it is Johannine.

"Fear": not Satan, who has to be *resisted* (James 4: 7).

322 Luke 12: 5. — "Gehenna," here alone in Luke, the valley of Hinnom: see Joshua 18: 6 in the LXX. The final *a* is that of the Aramaic ending *am* (Dalman). Jewish apocalyptic (*e.g.*, Apoc. of Baruch, xlix. 10) regarded Gehenna as the place, not of the final but of the intermediate punishment of the wicked. See further note 418 below.

The essential immortality of the soul, of which the Bible nowhere offers proof, is here recognized.

323 Luke 12: 6. - *Cf.* Matt. 10: 29. The "*assarion*" had two values (Kennedy art. "Money" in Hastings' "Dict. of Bible," § 5), and allowance must be made for local differences; but the "two farthings" would be equal to about one penny of our money. In Matthew the emphasis is on the smallness of the coin for which two sparrows were bought; in Luke, on the number of birds obtained (Weiss, "Sources of Luke's Gospel," p. 80).

324 Luke 12: 7. — On the doctrine of special providence, see Abrahams, p. 48.

There is a sermon on the subject, from this verse, by John Wesley ("Works," vi., p. 313).

325 Luke 12: 8 *f.* — "The Son of man"; Matthew has "I" (10: 32). The introduction of the title in this connection (*cf.* 9: 26 of the same type) is peculiar to Luke; but in Mark 8: 38 also the Lord has spoken of Himself as Judge in the character of Son of man. In the Synoptics He is described always as *the* Son of man; but in John 5: 27 (as in Rev. 1: 13, Rev. 14: 14) as Son of man without the article, where, as Westcott says, His judicial function attaches to His true *humanity* so emphasized, rather than His *personality*.

326 Luke 12: 10. — Here again is a *logion* in a connection different from that in Matthew (Matt. 12: 32).

Schmiedel has written: "Had Jesus possessed that exalted consciousness of his pre-existence and divine dignity which is attributed to Him in the Fourth Gospel, the declaration that blasphemy against Him was capable of forgiveness could never have been attributed to Him (art. in "Encycl. Bibl.," col. 2541). See, however, 1 Tim. 1: 13, and note 171 on John (John 8: 48 *ff.*).

As to such sin as does not admit of forgiveness, *cf.* 1 John 5: 16. It is an insuperable difficulty for all who conceive that mercy ever will *entirely* swamp judgment. Such seek relief, but hopelessly, in the thought of annihilation.

327 Luke 12: 11. — The Synagogues were used as Courts of Law.

328 Luke 12: 13-21. — *Cf.* Sirach. ii. 17 *f.*

329 Luke 12: 14. — The Syrrsin and Syrrcu omit "or a divider."

330 Luke 12: 15. — *Cf.* Ex. 20: 17; 1 Thess. 2: 5. For the *God-ward* aspect of covetousness, *cf.* Col. 3: 5.

"Life," the Johannine ζωή. *Cf.* Prov. 3: 25.

330a Luke 12: 17 *f.* — For the repeated "my," *cf.* 1 Sam. 25: 11; Hosea 2: 5 (Stock, p. 190).

331 Luke 12: 19 *f.* — "Soul." See note on 1: 46. It is language of a depraved *heart*. Ps. 14: 1. comparing Eccl. 2: 1, 5 *f.*, 24.

As to Buddhist denial of possession of *Atman*, the seat of personality, see Carus, "Buddhism and its Critics," p. 84 *ff.* In these latter days, Nietzsche, an admirer of that system, has gloried in the shame of such an attitude as that described by our Lord's words. "Remain faithful to the earth" spells his Gospel: see Prologue to his "Thus Spake Zarathustra." Probably no one would be led away by such literature who had read Dr. Arnold's sermon from this verse ("Christian Life," p. 99).

332 Luke 12: 20. — As to omission of the subject in the Greek, see note on 6: 38.

333 Luke 12: 21. — "Is not," "if he is not" (μή).

"Rich, etc.": *cf.* verse 33; 1 Tim. 6: 19, and Eclesiasticus 11: 18 *f.*

See also Latimer, "Dr. Baedeker in Russia," p. 207.

334 Luke 12: 22 *ff.* — Here come fragments of the sermon on the "plateau."

"Be not anxious." Such was the meaning of "*take no thought*" in the A.V., retained by the Revv. in 1 Sam. 9: 5.

335 Luke 12: 24 *f.* — "God feedeth them": *cf.* Ps. cxlvii. 9. For Luke's κατανοήσατε, "consider," Matthew has καταμάθετε, "take a lesson."

"Glory" (verse 27), that is, of his coronation.

336 Luke 12: 29. — "Be not in anxiety" (μετεωρίζεσθαι). Vulg.: "be not lifted up"; Weiss, explaining, "do not go to extremes in your demands." So, Wellhausen, referring to Sirach xxxiii. 4. The Hebrew "lift up one's soul" (Ps. 24: 4) was used with regard to vanity. The Roman Catholic joint writers Darby-Smith here follow the English Protestant version: "to be unsettled in mind" (as meteors).

337 Luke 12: 31 — "Seek His Kingdom," that of the Father, or heavenly department (Matt. 13: 45): see note on 11: 2. The seeking ("keep on seeking," ζητεῖτε, continuous present), by prayer, response to which may lie in the words of verse 32. *Cf.* the lines of Bonar:

"The kingdom that I seek  
Is Thine; so let the way  
That leads to it be Thine,  
Else I must surely stray."

"Little flock." *Cf.* "few chosen," which does not apply to the Gospel of pure grace, let unbelievers say what they will.

"Give," as sometimes used in Scripture, meaning *award*: *cf.* Gen. 30: 28; Ex. 2: 9, etc., with the verse following here, and 2 Tim. 4: 8.

It is not to be supposed that, whilst the Lord says, according to Matthew, "*Seek and ye shall find*"

(Matt. 7: 7) this is independently of God's righteousness (*ibid.*, 6: 33): Judas the traitor could lend an ear to the one, but the other was not to his liking. Just as with Eternal Life in the Fourth Gospel, so also for the Kingdom "life" of the Synoptics, *election* seems to operate: see 2 Peter 1: 10 *f.*, noting Hort's marginal reading ( A 69, Syrr., Vulg., etc.). "Give the more diligence through (your) good works," some of these authorities omitting "your." *Cf.* Eph. 2: 10.

The apostle Paul, before he passed away, acquired personal assurance of this: 2 Tim. 4: 6-8, with which *cf.* Heb. 6: 10 *f.*, as also Rom. 8: 24, where the hope is that of the coming of our Lord (Titus 2: 13). For His Kingdom and His appointment, see Luke 22: 29, which refers to the earthly department of the Kingdom to come, described in Matt. 13: 41 as "the kingdom of the Son of Man."

German writers discuss the all-important point whether the Kingdom is a *Gabe* (gift) or an *Aufgabe* (something to be worked out). With H. Holtzmann ("New Testament Theology," i., pp. 202-204) and Bousset ("Preaching of Jesus," p. 101) it is a gift in the absolute sense as understood by them here; whilst Ritschl, in his "Instruction," § 5, emphasizes its character as something proposed for the soul's attainment (a prize): see Col. 3: 24; Phil. 2: 12 (of the Messianic salvation), and Phil. 3: 14. Bousset's denial (*loc. cit.*) of this latter aspect is subversive of the Word of God, which exhibits both views, so that neither is exclusive of the other — one of many illustrations of the *twofoldness* of Divine truth, from neglect of which so many controversies have arisen and are still maintained.

Professor Denney has well remarked: "The Kingdom is not to be established" — as often asserted now — "by our energies at all. . . . We have to be ready for it, to make any sacrifice to secure our entrance into it" ("The Church and the Kingdom," p. 87 *f.*).

338 With verse 33 compare 18: 22, and note there.

339 Luke 12: 35 *ff.* — Here we have, as stated by Bruce, the germ of the Parable of the Virgins (Matt. 25: 1-13). Each passage emphasizes the looked-for coming of the Lord as the supremely practical tenet of the Church. *Cf.* J.H. Newman's "Parochial Sermons," vol. iv., under "Watching": this, he said, is "a suitable test of a Christian. Many . . . want the tender and sensitive heart which hangs on the thought of Christ and lives in His love." *Cf.* Luke 21: 36 and note there, besides Mark 13: 35.

On the "lamps," see Schor, p. 49.

340 Of such beatitudes as that in verse 37 *f.* Wernle rightly says that they are all promises (*op. cit.*); hence they are limited in their application.

341 Luke 12: 40 *ff.* — "Be," or "become"; and so "prove" (γίνεσθε).

342 With this passage Neander connects 1 Thess. 5: 1 *ff.*, observing that Paul had these words of our Lord in view (p. 350). *Cf.* 2 Peter 3: 10; Rev. 3: 3, Rev. 16: 15, and also Rev. 21: 34 below.

343 Luke 12: 42-44. — *Cf.* 1 Cor. 4: 1 *f.*, and see also Luke 16: 10 below.

344 Luke 12: 45 *ff.* — "Shall come," or "shall arrive" (ἔξει). "Unbelievers," ἄπιστοι, as in 1 Cor. 14: 23. It is clearly for these here more a question of their *conduct* than of their creed: they may be ever so "orthodox." The word is in contrast with πιστός, "faithful," of the steward in verse 42 (*cf.* 1 Tim. 1: 12); and so "unfaithful" as expressed by R.V. Observe Peter's inquiry in verse 41, and that it is not merely an *assumed* position of which the Lord speaks in the verse following that. We have here a solemn Scripture for all who are engaged in His service, to whatever communion they may adhere. The words admit of no toning down. If the rendering "unbelievers" be maintained, the issue becomes yet more grave!

344a As to the Kingdom being the time of recompense or award, see note 370, below.

344b Luke 12: 47 *f.* — The present chastisement of believers springs from love: Heb. 12: 6; Rev. 3: 19 (φιλῶ . . . παιδεύω). It is not this which is spoken of in verse 47 *f.* Tholuck in his "Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount" has spoken of the *partial unblessedness* which even they may inherit (p. 39) when the time of reckoning comes, from which none are exempt (2 Cor. 5: 10 *f.*). *Cf.* Mark 9: 45. Some will be saved "though as through fire" (1 Cor. 3: 15). And so 1 Peter 4: 18.

For the "many" and the "few" stripes (verse 47 *f.*), *cf.* Matt. 11: 22.

345 Luke 12: 49 *f.* — "What will I," etc. American Revv., "What do I desire," with marg. "How would I that," etc. The Evangelist supplies us here with a saying characteristic of this period of the ministry. Afford would refer it to Pentecost; but it is best taken hypothetically.

With verse 50 *cf.* John 19: 30 ("it is finished").

346 Luke 12: 51. — "To give": "D" has ποιῆσαι, "to produce," which Wellhausen seems disposed to take as equivalent to δοῦναι, although at Luke 15: 22 he questions whether the two verbs can be used as equivalents.

In our Lord's words here there is an illustration of the twofoldness of Divine truth: *cf.* Luke 2: 14.

"Division." *Cf.* Matt. 10: 34; and the Vulgate here, "separation." The cleavage is between those who stand with Christ and those who do not.

In 1 Cor. 1: 10, Paul beseeches the brethren there addressed to repress "divisions." asking, "is CHRIST divided?" The word μεμέρισται (verse 13) is connected with διαμερισμός here. When the σχίσματα come again before us in that letter, it is in Luke 11: 18, not in verse 19 as represented in a recent pamphlet entitled "There must be Divisions" (Melbourne, 1911). It is false that "truth has only been preserved by division." It is not true that ἄρρσις in the one verse is identical with σχίσμα (*cf.* John 7: 43) in the other. "The cream lies on the top," but one needs eyes with which to see it. It is a serious thing to trifle with Scripture. The "approved" in 1 Cor. 11: 19 are *manifestly* those who will not abet "divisions"; the disapproved, those by whom they are engineered. The "approved," the simple and childlike, give heed to Rom. 16: 17; the disapproved, such as airily and sophistically explain away, not only the Apostle's appeal, but the Lord's prayer to the Father (John 17: 21). Is it any wonder that the world does not believe?

347 Luke 12: 53. — Observe the different cases taken here by the preposition ἐπί.

348 Luke 12: 57. — This bears on Calvin's theory as to human depravity. He is silent in his "Commentary" about these words of our Lord, with which *cf.* John 8: 46.

349 Luke 12: 58 *f.* — *Cf.* Matt. 5: 25 *f.*, and for the question of Endless Punishment, note 42 on Mark; also recent pamphlet in Evangelical Alliance Series, entitled "Sin and its Consequences," by Webb-Peploe.

350 Luke 12: 59. — The mite (*lepton*) was the smallest coin.

## NOTES ON THE THIRTEENTH CHAPTER.

351 Luke 13: 1-9. — A notable passage, as bearing on sins of omission, for which *cf.* Matt. 25: 24-30.

352 Luke 13: 1 *ff.* — "There were"; or, "There came," παρῆσαν (with the news, ἀπαγγέλλοντες):

so Alford, followed by Field, who cites Acts 10: 21. The critical German Bible (Weizsäcker's version) takes it in the same way.

352a Luke 13: 3. — See Archbishop Leighton's Sermon on Repentance; also one of G. Whitefield from this verse. Repentance is essentially thorough change of heart and mind Godwards, and is closely connected with Renunciation earthwards (14: 33). For its relation to Faith, see Expositor's remarks in vol. on Mark, p. 65.

353 Luke 13: 7. — The three years may represent completeness (Spence). Anyhow, it is the time required by the fig tree for maturity. See Spurgeon's Sermons, 650 and 1451; also one of Augustine (vol. i., p. 451).

354 Luke 13: 8. — Euthymius and Theophylact, followed by Matthew Henry, regarded our Lord as being the vine-dresser. For the sequel to this, see Matt. 24: 32 *f.*, when He comes again.

355 Luke 13: 9. — "After that." The εἰς τὸ μέλλον Markland, followed by Field, would render "next year." The former cites Joseph. "Antiqq.," i. 11, 2. In 1 Tim. 6: 19 the same phrase means "against the Millennium." μέλλειν is used in the New Testament constantly for the future in that connection, as in "the age to come."

For the rhetorical figure here (called *aposisopesis*), *cf.* Acts 23: 9, Rom. 9: 22-24. In the Old Testament *cf.* Ex. 32: 32, etc. (Plummer).

356 Luke 13: 11. — "Wholly," εἰς τὸ παντελές. Used only here and in Heb. 7: 25, and exhibiting one of the many similarities between the language of that Epistle and the Lucan vocabulary.

357 Luke 13: 13. — *Cf.* Ps. 145: 14.

"Immediately": Maclaren happily remarks, "Where He is the physician, there is no period of convalescence" ("B. C. E.," p. 169). On "glorified God" the same writer says, "He did not substitute doing good to man for worshipping God" (as did Cotter Morison), ". . . but He showed us both in their true relations" (p. 167).

358 Luke 13: 16. — "A daughter of Abraham." For "a son of Abraham," *cf.* 19: 9. For connection between physical disease and sin, see Mark 2: 5-12, John 5: 14, and Acts 10: 38. For "bound," *cf.* Ps. 146: 7, and Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 88. See Spurgeon's Sermon, 2110.

359 Luke 13: 18 *f.* — For Luke's κηπος, Matthew has ἀγρός, Mark γῆ. Luke shares with Matthew ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις, for which Mark has ὑπὸ τὴν σκιάν.

360 Luke 13: 20 *f.* (*cf.* Matt. 13: 33). — The *mystery* lies in the leaven being hidden.

There are three forms of leaven of which our Lord speaks: (1) the leaven of the Pharisees, — hypocrisy, or false *worship*, 12: 17; (2) that common to Pharisees and Sadducees, false *doctrine*, Matt. 16: 6; (3) the leaven common to Pharisees and Herodians, — false *conduct*, Mark 8: 15.

To the reference to Aulus Gellius in Plummer, add that to Plutarch, in Rose's edition of Parkhurst's Greek-English Lexicon, under ζύμη, for the circumstance that no Flamen Dialis, or priest of Jupiter among the Romans, was allowed to touch leaven. "Leaven," says that old biographer, "both arises from corruption and itself corrupts the mass with which it is mixed."

With verse 22 *cf.* John 10: 22.

361 Luke 13: 23. — For οἱ σωζόμενοι, *cf.* Acts 2: 47. It was a recognized religious formula among the Jews (Carr. referring to 2 Esdr. viii. 1 and ix. 15 *f.*). As for the Canonical Books, the LXX.

use it in Isa. 37: 32 and 45: 20 (ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν). In 10: 20 of the same prophet that version has σωθέντες; in Jer. 51: 14, σεσωμένος (*cf.* Eph. 2: 8, and for the verbal form, Rom. 10: 9, 13). See Westcott, "Some Lessons," p. 161 *f.*, and Vaughan, "Sermons on the R.V.," p. 71, and especially a paper on "The Force of the Present Tense in Greek," one of "Occasional Papers on Scriptural Subjects," No. ii., p. 76 *ff.*, by B. W. Newton (who took a distinguished degree at Oxford in 1828).

Professor Burton, in his "Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek" (§ 125), rightly rejects "are (were) being saved" in passages in which forms of the present tense (as 1 Cor. 15: 2) or present participle (as Acts 2: 47) are used. *Cf.* the like usage of οἱ ἀγιάζομενοι etc., in the Epistle to the Hebrews; and for the Apostle Paul's use of οἱ σωζόμενοι, 1 Cor. 1: 18 and 2 Cor. 2: 15.

Godet takes it here of entrance into the Messianic kingdom. *Cf.* "We shall be saved from wrath, etc.," in Rom. 5: 9, referring to the apocalyptic judgments that are to fall upon the earth.

362 Luke 13: 24. — "Strive with earnestness." Carr, "Keep on striving." Application of this to the Gospel of Grace is excluded by such passages as John 6: 37 (*cf.* note 337). Maclaren: "The entrance gate is very low . . . it must be on our hands and knees that we go in" (B. C. E., p. 227).

There are sermons from verses 16-24 by Augustine, Luther, and G. Whitefield.

363 Luke 13: 25-27. *Cf.* Matt. 25: 10-12.

364 Luke 13: 28 *f.* — The Kingdom again in its future aspect, that of the "Kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. 8: 11). As to the "Messianic banquet" of Isaiah, see note on 22: 30.

365 Luke 13: 32. — For "Herod that fox," see Whyte, "Bible Characters," No. LXXXVI. Neil: "The only purely contemptuous expression of Jesus recorded."

Observe again the distinction which this Evangelist makes between casting out demons and healing disease (see note 148): critics are loth to recognize it.

For "I am perfected," *cf.* Ex. 29: 9 (filling of priest's hands in consecration) and Hosea 6: 2. The word is elsewhere used of our Lord, in Heb. 2: 10, alone. It is strictly middle voice: "I bring my work to an accomplishment" (Carr). American marg. Or, *I end my course.* *Cf.* Paul's use of the word in Phil. 3: 12.

366 Luke 13: 34. — For the motherhood of GOD, see Deut. 32: 18, and *cf.*, of course, Matt. 23: 37-39, where a lamentation over Jerusalem was uttered by the Lord in the city itself, similar to this placed in Galilee at an earlier time.

367 Luke 13: 35. — The "desolate," Harnack wrote ("Sayings," p. 30), was not left out by Luke because (as Wellhausen on Matt. 23: 38 suggests) at the time he wrote the city had raised itself up again. But for his latest view as to this see note 2, *ad fin.* Moreover, he does not see why ἀφίεται should not be taken as prophetic future (so the Latin, etc.). The Expositor, however (see his Lecture on Matthew, p. 472), takes this word to mean in the light of "your" that "it was *no longer* His house, or His Father's, but theirs." *Cf.* "having a form of godliness," without the power (2 Tim. 3: 5).

## NOTES ON THE FOURTEENTH CHAPTER.

368 Luke 14: 5. — "Ass." Wellhausen pronounces as "impossible" the reading "son" of W. H. (Revv., marg.), followed by Blass and Weiss. Although the diplomatic evidence is in its favour, Mill supposed that υἱός was developed from ὄς, "pig," through this being regarded as an abbreviation of it, or that ὄς was corrupted into ὄς "sheep"; and so Lachmann, followed by Dr. Rendel Harris

(*Expositor*, May, 1907, and "Side-Lights," p. 204 ff).

369 Luke 14: 13. — *Cf.* Tobit ii. 2 and iv. 7, 16.

370 Luke 14: 14. — "The resurrection of the just." *Cf.*, in particular, 1 Thess. 4: 16 *f.* In Matt. 25: 31 *ff.* there is no question of resurrection, because there we meet with a judgment of nations, living persons to whom the "Gospel of the Kingdom" is specially addressed at the "end of the age" (*cf.* Matt. 24: 14 and Rev. 14: 6).

Resurrection of just and unjust alike is clearly affirmed in John 5: 29 and Acts 24: 15, without distinguishing such resurrections in point of time. But the present passage is co-ordinate with Luke 20: 35 *f.* below, which speaks of an ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν: for this the Apostle Paul uses the yet stronger expression ἐξανάστασις ἐκ ν. (Phil. 3: 11). As to coincidence of the two, see B. W. Newton, "Aids to Prophetic Inquiry," p. 297. The final stage in New Testament terminology is reached in the Johannine "first resurrection" (Rev. 20: 5 *f.*). De Wette and Olshausen rightly identify the Lucan and Johannine terminology. This identification goes back to Irenaeus, who in his treatise "Against Heresies" (V., chapter 35) says that the Apocalypse speaks of a "resurrection of the just," one of the things, he adds, affirmed by the disciples of John.

The phrase "rapture of *the Church*" sometimes employed is better avoided, as not being Biblical. All believers "asleep in Jesus" and those alive at his *Parousia* will participate in the first resurrection (1 Thess. 4: 14, 1 Cor. 15: 23). We know that the Apostle Paul's desire as to the manner of his departure (Phil. 3: 11) was granted. Whether, however, resurrection *from among* the dead will be in every case for recompense in the sense of reward is another question. But the Lord has said of all such that "they cannot die any more" (Luke 20: 36 below).

The common idea of the ancient Pharisees, seemingly derived from passages like Ps. 1: 5 (see Heb., and *cf.* note 108 on John), was that resurrection would be a peculiar privilege of the righteous (Bousset, "The Religion of Judaism in New Testament Times," p. 356 *ff.*). Wellhausen, accordingly, whose mind is steeped in Semitic lore, regards our Lord's words here as confirming that limitation. In Luke 20: 35, however, where it is a question of being deemed worthy to attain, the resurrection spoken of is one that should be *from among* the dead; *i.e.*, some dead are to be left behind, to be dealt with later on. (*Cf.* Simcox on Rev. 20: 4.) Such is the explanation of Rabbi Manasseh ben Israel — whom Cromwell befriended — in his "Conciliator," ii., p. 443 *f.*, who says that the unrighteous will not rise *at the same time* as the righteous.

The mediaeval rabbinical scholar Maimonides held that resurrection did not extend to the body. Such is the view of some Jews of the present day (M. Joseph, p. 144), also of some "Christians," critics in particular, who have their representatives in this country. As to this, see note on Resurrection, at chapter 24.

371 Luke 14: 15. — "Blessed," etc.: *cf.* Rev. 19: 9.

For "eat bread," etc., see notes on Luke 22: 16, 30, and *cf.* John 6: with note 126 *f.* there.

372 Luke 14: 16 *f.* — On the fact that the Holy Spirit does not confine Himself to the actual words used by the Lord (see Exposition of Mark, p. 10 *f.*), Luke giving a "certain man," Matthew speaking of the "king," etc., and the reason for the differences in this connection, *cf.* "Lectures on Matthew," p. 453 *f.*

See sermon by Bishop McIlvaine, Spurgeon's Sermons, 578 and 1354, and an address by D. L. Moody.

373 Luke 14: 20. — "Married a wife." With regard to this, contrast Deut. 24: 5 with 1 Cor. 7: 29. See Spurgeon's Sermon, 2122.

374 Luke 14: 21. — This is the second part of verse 8: see A. R. Habershon, chapter on Double Parables.

375 Luke 14: 22 *f.* — Bengel: "Grace no less than Nature abhors a vacuum."

See Spurgeon's Sermon, 227.

376 Luke 14: 25. — This *third* narrative of events of the last journey to Jerusalem (see notes 244, 280) takes us back to just before the Transfiguration (Luke 9). It continues to Luke 20: 18.

For surrender of the world, even of life, *cf.* John 12: 24-26.

377 Luke 14: 26 *f.* — It is the first of our Gospels, observe, that softens the language here ("hate"). The word *μισῆ̃ν* means to renounce the claims or influence of the person or thing concerned (Hahn). Paley, on John 15: 23, "to be indifferent to." *Cf.* Matt. 10: 37, "He that *loveth* father or mother *more* than Me."

377a "Thorough-going Christians," says Maclaren, "may be disliked, but they are respected: half-and-half ones get and merit the sarcasms of the world" (B. C. E., p. 177).

The reader should note Luke's specification of "wife" (*cf.* Luke 18: 29), "brothers" and "sisters."

"His own life": *cf.* Matt. 8: 34, and see also note on Luke 9: 23.

There is a sermon from this place by Venn (vol. ii.).

378 Luke 14: 28-32. — See sermon by Trench in Westminster Series, and one of Newman's in Allenson's Selected Series, No. XI.

For "ask for terms of peace" (verse 32), see Ps. 122: 6 in the LXX., and *cf.* Luke 19: 42 here.

379 Luke 14: 33. — Francis de Sales: "We must live in this world as if the soul was already in heaven and the body mouldering in the grave" (quoted by Spence). *Cf.* note 352.

Julian the Apostate appealed to this passage when robbing the Church of Edessa (Robertson, "Church History," i., p. 343).

Dr. Arnold has a sermon from this verse (*op. cit.*, p. 88).

Mackintosh: "He does not admit the possible existence of second-rate Christians" ("Christian Ethics," p. 44).

379a Luke 14: 34. — See sermon of Dean Alford (vol. iii.).

## NOTES ON THE FIFTEENTH CHAPTER.

380 If the section containing Luke 15 - 17: 10 be chronological, it synchronizes with John 11: 54.

380a Luke 15: 2. — "Receiveth sinners": *cf.* John 6: 17, and the well-known hymn, "Sinners Jesus will receive," etc. ("Sacred Songs and Solos").

The late Professor Hermann Cremer of Greifswald never tired in lecture room or pulpit of saying that the forgiveness of sins is the *Alpha and Omega* of Christianity (Boehmer, p. 239).

381 Luke 15: 4. — "In the wilderness;" Matt., "on the mountains": see Harnack, "Sayings," p. 92, and *cf.* Weiss, "Sources of the Synoptic Tradition," p. 247.

Dr. Alexander Maclaren, in his second volume of "Expositions," has made effective use of this as an answer to sceptics' query as to the great GOD concerning Himself with this microcosm (p. 49 *ff.*).

382 Luke 15: 5. — "Having found"; Matt., "if it should come to pass that he find." Jülicher (followed by Loisy, "Synoptic Studies," p. 166) treats Luke's variation as capricious. The simple explanation is, that his record regards the matter from the standpoint of Grace, whilst Matthew's views it from that of Responsibility. Observe also the different connection in which the parable is introduced by Luke.

See Spurgeon's Sermons, 1801 and 2065. Luther also preached on the passage, as did H. Melvill.

Bossuet preached from verse 7 (vol. ix.); so also Toplady and Robert Hall.

382a "One repenting sinner." Warner: "The great goal of Christian endeavour is the individual unsaved life" (p. 357).

383 Luke 15: 8. — "Woman." The Expositor, as Stier and Alford, has followed Bengel in treating the woman as symbol of the Holy Spirit, the Hebrew word for which is feminine. Maclaren, however, on this and verse 4, observes that "the owner should be the seeker . . . Jesus" (B. C. E., p. 189). The "friends and neighbours" (verses 5, 9) seems to bear this out.

384 "Drachma," otherwise called "denarius," of the value of 8.5d.(A.D.1901). As to this picture, see Schor, p. 81.

385 Marcion discarded the Parable of the Prodigal Son, so-called, because of the consideration shown by the father to his elder son, the symbol of Judaism.

386 Luke 15: 16. - "To fill." American Revv., "to have filled." As to the "husks," see Trench on the Parables, and Schor (*loc. cit.*).

387 Luke 15: 17. — "Coming to himself." *Cf.* Acts 12: 11 of Simon Peter. Upon the question of sudden conversion, see Murray, "Christian Ethics," p. 170 *ff.*

388 Luke 15: 18. — "I will arise, etc." Swete: "*Repentance* is the sinner's return to the Father. . . . *Faith* makes the return possible" ("Studies," p. 178).

"Sinned, etc." *Cf.*, of course, Ps. 51.

"Heaven." Wellhausen notes this as the only case in the Gospels where it is so used of GOD. He seems not to regard Matt. 5: 34 as in point. Indeed, Zahn on Matthew will not allow that the terms are interchangeable. *Cf.* note 296. It is not to be supposed that our Lord countenanced *mistaken* reverence. "For the *anonymous God* . . . Christ substituted the Father" (Mackintosh, "Christian Ethics." p. 44).

389 "Ran." Aristotle had said that the "high-minded man" (μεγαλόψυχος) "will not be hasty . . . ought to move slowly" ("Ethics," iv. 3, 8). For the contrast, *cf.* Isa. 55: 8 *f.*

389a Luke 15: 21 *ff.* — Jülicher: "The Father does not receive the son by reason of Christ's death, but because He cannot help forgiving" (Parab. Discourses, ii., p. 365). In the same strain Bousset ("Jesus," p. 101), whose exposition is naturally welcomed by Montefiore ("Synoptic Gospels," ii., p. 990), and J. Weiss *ad loc.* But the whole chapter is to bring out why, rather than how, men are saved (A. R. Habershon). As the English writer just referred to observes: "The scope of the fifteenth of Luke is exactly as large and comprehensive as the word *sinner*" (*cf.* note 153). The German writers fail to

distinguish Grace from Love, see the excellent note of Dr. Whyte, in his Commentary (p. 46) on the "Shorter Catechism" (Q. 20).

It would seem that even for such a writer as Foster, "it is for the personality of Jesus that faith cares" (p. 405). That goes a long way; because a man who believes that He is "the CHRIST" is born of God (1 John 5: 1).

390 How unhappy is the result of neglect by textual critics (not by Weiss) of the internal evidence — in particular, the spiritual aspects of each question — may be seen from the foisting in, by W. H., of the further words that the prodigal had thought of using (verse 19) because of these curious documents *Σ* and "D," and apparently because with these MSS. "B" here agrees. Augustine notes their absence, and the versions are almost solidly against the repetition.

391 *Cf.* Ex. 3: 5. Wellhausen: "Hand without ring were as slavish as foot without shoe."

391a "Father . . . son." The idea of a personal, individual relation between God and man had already emerged in the apocryphal writings since the Exile: see Sirach, xxiii. 1, 4, li. 10; Wisdom. ii. 13, 16, 18, xiv. 3; Tobit, xiii. 4 (Enoch lxii. 11).

For the "Fatherhood of God," reference may be made to Fairbairn, "Philosophy of the Christian Religion," p. 350 (*cf.* p. 352); also to the chapter under this heading in Gore, "The Creed of the Christian"; but especially to Orr, "The Progress of Dogma." in which the doctrine is carefully and wisely stated. Swete observes: "It is only in the sinner that repents that the paternal love of God finds free exercise" ("Studies," p. 65). Both Pullan and Selbie remark that it was to the multitude, as well as disciples, that the Lord spoke as He did in Matt. 23: 9. What about His adversaries? See John 8: 42, comparing it with the first part of Luke 11: 23 above.

As to the father's interruption of the son (Wesley), Farrar aptly refers to Isa. 65: 24.

For the need of absolute change of *nature*, see Matt. 12: 33, another Synoptic passage, compared with John 1: 12 *f.*

392 Luke 15: 24. — "Dead." This word has a Pauline ring about it, whatever Harnack and others may say about the Evangelist's view of Forgiveness not being in line with the Apostle's doctrine of Redemption.

393 Luke 15: 25 *ff.* — Were Pfleiderer right in treating this as Luke's own addition to the Lord's words, we should miss in Christ's mouth the lesson which He designed for the Pharisees.

394 Luke 15: 28. — "Besought," or "kept beseeching" (*imperf.*). Adeney: "There is a Gospel even for the Pharisees."

395 Luke 15: 29. — "Serve." The verb is δουλεύειν, "to serve as a slave." *Cf.* Heb. 2: 15, "all their lifetime subject to bondage."

395a Luke 15: 30. — Contrast John 20: 17.

396 Luke 15: 31. — "Child" (R.V. margin), τέκνον.

397 Spurgeon preached seven sermons on a topic so near to his heart. These are Nos. 43, 176, 588, 1000, 1189, 1204 and 2236. See also Maclaren, "Expositions," vol. ii., pp. 59-74.

Massillon preached from verse 13.

This parable pre-eminently pictures to us, in Luke's characteristic manner, what the heart of man is Godward, and what God's heart is towards man.

Newman and Robertson have both misused it. The quondam Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, in his sermon on Christian Repentance (vol. iii. No. 7) said: "We must begin religion with what looks like a form": and he illustrated from the prodigal's begging to be made one of his father's servants! The famous Brighton preacher in his discourse on "The Word and the World" (vol. iv., No. 15) declared that "It is a matter of no small importance that a strict life . . . should go before the peace which comes of faith in Christ."

God will even own in His government, to their temporal advantage, the rectitude of all "whose life is in the right": such men are to be felicitated. But to make that the foundation of peace with Him is just as fatal as Antinomianism itself, which is abhorrent to every *bonâ-fide*, real disciple of Christ (*cf.* note 457a). From either point of view Death, not life, is annexed to Law as between men's souls and JESUS as *Saviour*: it will not harmonize with Grace — "the grace of life" (1 Peter 3: 7) — the glory (Eph. 1: 6) of which is impaired by supposed precedent human merit. Gal. 6: 7 *ff.* and many other like passages were addressed to those who had been "called in Christ's grace" (1: 6), and have to do with the "Kingdom." The words "sowing to the flesh" are more comprehensive than the "Litany," the pitch of which is relatively high. The highest standard must ever be before those "not under the Law but under Grace." Until we come to close quarters with God, the lesson conveyed to Job (Job 42: 5 *f.*) is feebly apprehended.

## NOTES ON THE SIXTEENTH CHAPTER.

398 Luke 16: 1-13. — The Expositor's treatment of this parable ranges itself with the general view taken by Athanasius and Augustine, Luther and Calvin. *Cf.* that by Maclaren, vol. ii., pp. 75-101.

399 Luke 16: 1. — It is important to note, for the lesson conveyed by the parable, whom the Lord has in view.

400 Luke 16: 2. — "What is this?" τί τοῦτο: *cf.* LXX. of Gen. 42: 28. So English Revv., with Schanz, H. Holtzmann, and B. Weiss. For the A.V. "How," *cf.* Acts 14: 15 ("why?"): so Luther, De Wette, Meyer, Weizsäcker, and Plummer here. See Spurgeon's Sermon. 192.

401 Luke 16: 4. — "I know," ἔγνων, "I am resolved": a *dramatic* aorist (Burton, § 45).

401a "I may be received": the passive again, to represent the active form with an indefinite subject, as often in Luke. So in verse 9.

402 Luke 16: 6. — "Baths," a liquid measure. Ten of these went to the *cor* (Ezek. 45: 14). See next note.

403 Luke 16: 7. — "Cors": a dry measure. It was the Hebrew *homer*, standard measure of capacity (Ezek. 45: 11), made up of ten ephahs: about eight English bushels.

404 Luke 16: 8. — "The lord," *i.e.*, the steward's master; not (as Wellhausen) JESUS. As Montefiore remarks, 18: 6 is not an adequate parallel (Syn. Gospels, ii. 993).

"Unjust steward" expresses Christ's judgment of the man. Not only the words of the second part of the verse, but all of it is a comment of our Lord Himself: the whole of it proceeded from Him.

This verse has formed the text of sermons by Dr. Arnold and A. Hare.

404a "Sons of this age." The same phrase occurs in Luke 20: 34, with which *cf.* the verse there following, "that *aeon*." It expresses adherents of the system that now goes by the name of "Secularism," of which Nietzsche constituted himself apostle.

"Sons of light": cf. John 12: 36. "*Children of light*" occurs in 1 Thess. 5: 5.

404b We have here a very noticeable instance of γενεά used morally. See note on 21: 32.

405 Luke 16: 9. — Jülicher, through rejection of its lesson as to wealth, has not caught the meaning of the parable.

There is a sermon from this verse by Augustine.

405a The "mammon of unrighteousness" has reference to material resources used as one's own, whereas they belong to GOD. That which is unfaithfulness in the one relation becomes fidelity in the other.

405b "Everlasting habitations (tabernacles)." Cf. "everlasting gospel" in the Apocalypse, which does not mean that the Gospel is to be preached endlessly. And so here we have a millennial connection, — Messianic blessing, as in Luke 19: 9.

The indefinite subject of the verb "receive" (see note on verse 4) is only indirectly the "friends"; Matt. 25: 40 helps to show that *the* subject is Christ Himself. Cf. Tennyson's "God accept him, Christ receive him."

The Catholic doctrine of almsgiving in the name of Christ is true when *not* applied to the life strictly endless.

405c Luke 16: 10. — See Maclaren's sermon in Series 1. "Faithful in Little," etc.; also one of Henry Melvill, "Equity of Future Retribution."

406 Luke 16: 11. — "Unrighteous mammon." Here it is ἀδίκωμ, *i.e.*, false in contrast with genuine riches. For the ἀληθινόν, cf. John 1: 9, John 17: 3; and see Matt. 13: 22, etc., "deceitfulness of riches."

407 "Your." The reading of "B" ("our ") is discredited by Wellhausen. It was a stupid blunder of a scribe who missed the point. Hort's adoption of it illustrates his partiality for that MS. Blass takes the reading τὸ ἐμόν, "mine," in cursive 151, to be equivalent to τὸ ὑμῶν, "yours."

Dean Vaughan explained "your own" as meaning "your *soul*" (sermon on the passage, p. 72), which is forced. Adeney has a good note *ad loc.*, connecting the parable with the Kingdom of Heaven.

408 Luke 16: 13. — "God," without the article, showing that θεός and ὁ θεός may be equivalent.

"Mammon." Ibn Ezra considered this was a variation of the word *hamon* (abundance) in Ps. 37: 16. There does not seem to be any proof for its being the name of any deity.

The parable is divisible into seven parts thus: verses 1, 2, 3-4, 5-7, 8-9, 10-12, 13.

A recent helpful book on the main subject is that of S. D. Gordon, entitled "Money: the Golden Channel of Service."

409 Luke 16: 14. — "Who were covetous," ὑπάρχοντες, *i.e.*, essentially. Cf. Ps. 10: 3, and Luke 20: 47 below. "Their theory and practice (were) different" (Edersheim, "Sketches," etc., p. 126).

410 Luke 16: 15. — "Highly thought of" or, "lofty" (ὑψηλόν).

"Abomination." Elsewhere, *idolatry* (Matt. 24: 15; Rev. 17: 4 *f.*, etc.).

411 Luke 16: 16. — "Is preached," εὐαγγελίζεται; the Gospel, as the A B C of the Kingdom; because "without faith it is impossible to please" God (Cf. 11: 2 with Heb. 11: 6).

"Forces his way," *i.e.*, through struggle of soul overcomes his self-love and resistance of the Holy Spirit: such must be the meaning of the words in Matt. 11: 12.

412 Luke 16: 17. — "The law": Marcion converted this into "My words."

413 Luke 16: 18. — See, in illustration of the Expositor's remarks, Carpenter, p. 236, resorting to the conventional stalking-horse of "different sources." In verses 14-18 J. Weiss finds three (L, Q, M).

Wellhausen characterizes verse 18 as "the quintessence of Mark 10: 1 *ff*" The example, he remarks, used by our Lord was well adapted to show that His drastic treatment of the law was its veritable fulfilment. *Cf.* 1 Cor. 7: 10.

414 Hillel, for example, taught ("Gittin," ix. 10) that a man might divorce his wife for burning his dinner or oversalting his soup.

415 Luke 16: 19 *ff.* — Colin Campbell: "In this parable is concentrated the whole Ebionite doctrine of the Gospel" (p. 274); but see note 149*a*. Moreover, our Lord does not describe this story as a "parable."

Tennyson has turned this passage to account in "In Memoriam," xxxi.

416 "Lazarus." This is the only parable — if indeed it be rightly so called (*cf.* Exposition) — in which a personal name is introduced.

416*a* Luke 16: 21. — "Napkins were not used for the hands. The guests wiped their hands on bits of bread and then threw the pieces under the table" (Montefiore).

417 Luke 16: 22. — Garvie: "The rich man's funeral was the last of his good things; the first of Lazarus' good things was his happy death."

Adeney: "Lazarus is supposed to be seated next to Abraham in the banquet of the blessed." *Cf.* John 1: 18. Our Lord here seems to recognize certain truth in the representation of the "separate state" contained in the uncanonical writings called Pseudepigrapha, which were familiar to His hearers. See convenient manual by W. J. Deane.

Dr. J. Lightfoot was of opinion that Paradise is the scene. *Cf.* "the Paradise" of Luke 23: 43, of which the pseudepigraphical writings had already spoken. The view of the Westminster Confession (xxxii.), as briefly stated in the, "Minor Catechism" (ans. to Q. 37), is that, "the souls of believers at death. . . do immediately pass into glory." So Weymouth, in note to his version of the New Testament at Matt. 16: 18, denying that believers at death enter Hades. The Expositor has expressed himself similarly in his remarks on 23: 43. Dalman considers that Lazarus here is conceived of as in heaven. See, further, note 585.

418 Luke 16: 23. — "Hades." Wellhausen would identify this with "Gehenna" (Luke 12: 5), the place of retribution (Tobit xiii. 2). Should we not rather say Tartarus? (2 Peter 2: 4). *Cf.* Enoch xx. 2, where "Uriel" is represented as its ruler. Sheol is likewise spoken of in connection with a flame in Song of Solomon 8: 6. For the Biblical representation of Sheol (Hades) the article by Dalman in Hauck's Encyclopaedia (the American "Schaff-Herzog") should be consulted.

419 The "torment" (βάσανος) of verses 23 and 28 has already set in, with doom to follow: *cf.* 2 Peter 2: 9, where κολαζομένων is rendered in R.V. by "under punishment." Similar must be the self-accusing thoughts of guilty persons during confinement preliminary to their appearance before a tribunal.

According to the old Greeks, judgment was to be at death; the belief of the Jews was that it is to

be at the end of things.

The "Catholic" theory is that everyone is judged at death, for which Heb. 9: 27 is assigned, as well as at the Last Day. According to the Catechism, No. 76, the so-called *general* judgment "will be held in the valley of Jehoshaphat," which is a curious confusion of Joel 3: 12 (living) with Rev. 20: 11 (dead).

420 Luke 16: 25. — Schmiedel ("Jesus in Modern Criticism," p. 72) and others object that the rich man is not said to be godless. Not much insight, however, is required for apprehending the sense of his impenitence: this comes out in his own words. The Bedfordshire tinker, by the word about Dives put into the mouth of the "Interpreter" in "Pilgrim's Progress," entered into this narrative better than the smart professor at Zürich; as Spurgeon also in his sermons, 243, 518. We are actually invited by Schmiedel to believe that "the unrighteous steward is admitted into the everlasting habitations" (*ibid.*). The same writer naively adds, "Jesus cannot have said such things." The canons of "modern criticism" surely need looking after.

Bishop Andrewes and Charles Simeon have preached on the verse.

421 Luke 16: 26. — B. Weiss compares Heb. 11: 29. As he says, the real lesson of the "parable," so-called, begins here.

Observe how the words of this verse exclude all thought of "Purgatory" (Neil).

See sermons on Eternal Punishment by Archer Butler and Dr. George Salmon.

422 Luke 16: 27. — For the Jewish doctrine of Purgatory, underlying the *Kaddish*, prayer for a departed father, see Abrahams, p. 86 *f.* In LUKE it is the deceased person who is the petitioner.

423 Luke 16: 30. — "Nay," or "No, no" (οὐχί).

424 Luke 16: 31. — *Cf.* John 12: 9-11. In the last of his useful notes on this chapter, Wellhausen remarks that "the motive of repentance here is not the Kingdom of God, but Heaven and Hell. The thought behind the story is that the Jews do not believe in the Risen Christ, from unbelief in the Law and the Prophets."

As to the critics' romance that we have here the germ of John's account of the raising from the dead of his "Lazarus," which is regarded as a development of this "parable," see note 205 in Exposition of the Fourth Gospel.

The whole of this passage of Luke is of importance in connection with what Delitzsch has described as the "False Doctrine" of "Soul Sleep": see his "Biblical Psychology," p. 490 *ff.*, where he shows the misuse that has been made of Jer. 51: 39.

Henry Martyn has a sermon from verse 31 on "Scripture more persuasive than Miraculous Appearances."

## NOTES ON THE SEVENTEENTH CHAPTER.

425 Luke 17: 1. — "Disciples": see note on Luke 16: 1.

"All are included, from the severest persecutor to the inconsistent believer" (Neil).

There is a sermon by Dr. Chalmers on this verse.

426 Luke 17: 2. — "It would be more profitable," λυσιτελεῖ, Matthew has συμφέρει, whilst Mark

has καλόν . . . μᾶλλον. Cf. note 98 on Mark.

426a Luke 17: 3 *f.* — Cf. Matt. 18: 21 *f.* — Robert Chapman: "The man who seventy times seven forgives injuries, is he who best knows how to protect himself" ("Choice Sayings," p. 148). F. W. Robertson had already said from his pulpit: "Judaism was the education of the spiritual child, Christianity that of the spiritual man. . . . Judaism said, Forgive seven times — exactly so much; Christianity said, Forgiveness is a boundless spirit — not three times nor seven — seventy times seven. It must be left to the heart" ("Lectures on the Epistles to the Corinthians," p. 130). Augustine has a sermon on verse 3.

426b Luke 17: 5. — "The only recorded instance of the disciples asking a *spiritual* gift of Christ" (Neil).

427 Luke 17: 6. — "Sycamine tree," Matthew and Mark have "mountain." Sanday: "He assumed the existence of the same power in His disciples as in Himself" ("Life of Christ in Recent Research," p. 223 *f.*). The American Revv. adhere to the Received Text ("D") "If ye *had* faith . . . it would obey you."

Chas. Simeon preached on verse 5 *f.*

428 Luke 17: 8. — See Schor, p. 49.

429 Luke 17: 9. — See note 91 on Mark.

430 Luke 17: 10. — Bengel: "Woe be to him whom his Lord calls unprofitable servant, happy he who calls himself so."

Mackintosh: "In the presence of the living God the very thought of *merit* fills away" ("Christian Ethics," p. 44).

As to Messianic reward, see Abrahams, p. 20, and with regard to merely mercenary motive, *cf.* the saying of Antigonus of Socho in *Pirgê Aboth*: "Be not as servants, who serve their master on the understanding that they will receive recompense."

See Spurgeon's Sermon, 1541.

431 Luke 17:, 11. — (*Cf.* John 12: 1.) Bengel by διὰ μέσον (μέσου) understood "between" (R.V., margin). So van Oosterzee, Hahn, and Plummer, that is, along the borders (American Revv.) of each, either as the Lord was journeying from Galilee to Jerusalem, or on some journey north from Ephraim back to Galilee, in order to make His final ascent with Galilean pilgrims. Upon the question of locality discussed by critics Luke 18: 15 may throw some light, because Matt. 19: 1, 13 and Mark 10: 1, 13 show that the incident there recorded took place in Perea *i.e.*, in the small strip of it shown in maps lying between Samaria and Galilee. *Cf.* Luke 9: 52 and Luke 13: 31.

Luther has a sermon on verses 11-19: Isaac Williams, one on verse 17.

432 Luke 17: 12. — Lev. 13: 45 *f.* The distance prescribed by "tradition" was 100 paces (Wetstein).

432a Luke 17: 15 *ff.* — The excellent remarks of Maclaren (B. C. E., p. 216 *f.*) should be consulted.

433 Luke 17: 20 *ff.* — This discourse probably gave rise to the questions of the disciples in Matt. 24: 3. Conjoined with Luke 18: 1-8 here, between which and the last section of Luke 17 there should be no break as in R.V., the discourse may be divided into seven parts: verses 20 *f.*, 22-24, 25-30, 31-

33, 34-36, 37, 18: 1-8.

434 "Observation." The word παρατήρησις and its cognate verb were used medically for watching symptoms of a disease, and so express preliminary investigation; also in astrology, for observation of the stars. Luke's employment of the verb (Luke 6: 7, Luke 14: 1, Luke 20: 20) is to indicate hostile intent: *cf.* Ps. 37: 12 in LXX., and Weymouth's note on present passage.

The idea that the Lord's words mean that the Kingdom would not be physically visible is excluded by the after context, where the emphasis is laid on the future (Wernle, "Beginnings," p. 68).

435 Luke 17: 21. — "In the midst of," ἐντός. So Syrsin, Grotius, Bengel, Meyer, Alford, Trench, Weizsäcker, B. Weiss (referring to Song of Solomon 3: 10), H. Holtzmann, Schanz, Farrar, Spence, Lütgert, Plummer, Wernle, and Loisy. *Cf.* Luke 11: 20. Wernle: "It is quite certain that the right translation is *among*" (*loc. cit.*). Warman "The Pharisees asked *when*, not *where*" ("New Testament Theology," p. 22 *f.*). Boehmer: "The Lord does not say 'already.' "

The A.V., "within," to which Revv. adhere in text, represents the view taken by Chrysostom, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Olshausen, Godet, Field, Candlish, Sanday, and Wellhausen. It is the rendering which has generally been favoured by mystics. Thus Fénelon recommends his reader who may perceive "natural impetuosity gliding in" to "retire quietly within, where is the kingdom of God." This rendering accords with the usage of ἐντός in Biblical Greek (Field); "among" represents its sense in the classical literature, with which this Evangelist must have been familiar. Wellhausen has to own that the sense of the present passage is different from the Matthaean passage as explained by him in commentary on that Gospel.

In whichever way the word be taken, it of course speaks of the Kingdom in its *moral* aspect (*cf.* Rom. 14: 17).

436 *Cf.* 19: 12 with note there.

437 Luke 17: 22 *f.* — "One of the days," etc.: *cf.* verses 24, 26, 30. Bengel, following Euthymius and Theophylact, took it as desire to recall one of the days of the Lord's life on earth, when it would be too late. See, however, Olshausen, Meyer and J. Weiss. Hahn (*cf.* Plummer) takes the μῶν as Hebraistic for "first ": *cf.* Luke 24: 1 and Acts 20: 7.

Least of all do these words mean, as Stevens represents, "epochs in the progressive development of His Kingdom" (p. 173). It is Luke's way of describing the παρουσία of Matt. 24: 3, 27, 37-39, the eschatological and abiding "presence" (R.V. margin *passim*).

438 Luke 17: 24. — As to the ἐπιφάνεια of the παρουσία (2 Thess. 2: 8), *cf.* note 134 on Mark and note 524 below; also Harnack, "Sayings," p. 106 *f.*

For "day" here (as also verse 30), compared with verse 22, see Gen. 2: 4.

439 Luke 17: 25. — "This generation," with a moral signification, as already in Luke 16: 8.

440 Luke 17: 26-30. — Here arises the question whether Lot's retirement from Sodom typifies the removal of Christians from this world in the sense of 1 Thess. 4: 13 *ff.*, or the deliverance of the future Jewish "Remnant" spoken of by the Apostle in Rom. 9: 27-29. Wellhausen (*ad loc.*) treats Noah and Lot as representing Christians, whilst owning that in Mark at least the admonition is to Jews. The Expositor's view is that of writers who explain it of the "Remnant." *Cf.* note 444.

"Is revealed." For the ἀποκάλυψις of the Lord Jesus, *cf.* 2 Thess. 1: 7; 1 Cor. 1: 7, and 1 Peter 1: 7.

441 Luke 17: 31. — The SON is here prominent, not "the Lord of the vineyard." See note on Luke 20: 15 *f*.

442 Luke 17: 32. — These are the words inscribed on the monument which Bunyan's. "Hopeful" and "Christian" met with after parting with "Demas."

443 Luke 17: 33. — *Cf.* Luke 9: 24, of which critics deem this a "duplicate." It is one of the sayings of the Lord found in all four Gospels.

444 Luke 17: 34. — B. Weiss rightly compares 1 Thess. 5: 2; Norris wrongly, 1 Thess. 4: 19. In παραλαμβάνειν the preposition serves as well for take *from* the side of as for take *to*, etc. (John 14: 3). Here it is *for*, not (as Plummer) *from* destruction.

## NOTES ON THE EIGHTEENTH CHAPTER.

445 Luke 18: 3. — "Came"; or, "kept coming" (imperf.). *Cf.* Ecclesiasticus xxxv. 14 *ff*.

446 Luke 18: 4. — "The creed of a powerful atheist" (Bengel).

447 Luke 18: 5. — "Completely harass" or "plague." *Cf.* R.V., "wear out," ὑπωπιάζειν. (*Cf.* 1 Cor. 9: 27.) Weymouth: "pester." D. Smith: "It is a pugilist's term and means *hit under the eye*."

448 Luke 18: 7. — The ἀποτῶς would be either, as the Expositor takes it, the "elect" Remnant (*cf.* Matt. 24: 22, Rev. 6: 9-11); or, the adversaries (*cf.* 2 Peter 3: 9). Field: "He deferred His anger on their behalf" (that of the elect). *Cf.* further, Ps. 13: 1 *f.*, Ps. 55: 17 and Ps. 94: 1-4; also Prov. 9: 11; Ecclesiasticus xxxv. 18.

For "and he" American Revv. have "and (yet) he."

449 *Cf.* Ps. 36: 1 and 94: 20, which latter some (as B. W. Newton) have understood as predicted of the Beast's legislation, but the Psalmist seems to speak there of judicial, rather than political oppression, "seat" representing *tribunal* (Jennings and Lowe).

450 Luke 18: 8. — See Isa. 60: 2, Matt. 24: 12, 2 Thess. 3: 2 and 2 Thess. 2: 10 of that Epistle for the few believers on the earth then. *Cf.* Bruce *ad loc.* Jowett of Balliol, in sermon at St. Mary's, Oxford (1872), paraphrased thus: "What prospect is there of any great moral or religious improvement among mankind?" Farrar well says that such faith as the Son of Man will find among men will be faith *in themselves*.

Dr. Arnold has a sermon preached from this verse ("Christian Life," p. 20).

"The (or, that) faith," τὴν πίστιν. This is variously taken as (a) such faith as the widow's, typical of the Remnant (Exposition, and so very much B. Weiss); (b) personal faith in general; (c) Christianity (Canon Scott Holland, in sermon at St. Paul's). Dr. Frederic Harrison, presumably, would understand it of creeds in general. He closes his autobiographic "Memories" (1911) by saying, "Our age has no abiding faith in any religion at all," which should include that "of Humanity," of which he is himself the English prophet (note 147a).

The Mohammedan Seljuks of the thirteenth century originated a belief that Aissa, the saint said to have preceded the Prophet by some 500 years, will visit every country of Europe, England, and America, but find none faithful to his teaching, until he reaches the Lake of Tiburijeh (art. by Capt. von Herbert in *Hibbert Journal*, Oct., 1908).

FAITH. — For faith in the *word* of JESUS, see Mark 1: 15: for faith in Himself, Matt. 8: 10. *Cf.*

note 98 on Mark.

The "Catholic" definition would be found in the "Explanatory Catechism," No. 9. For Cardinal Newman's Theory of Belief, see the psychological analysis of it in Mellone, "Leaders of Religious Thought" (1902). According to Maher, a living Catholic professor, Newman's faith would be no more than *opinion* ("Psychology," p. 328). See the Cardinal's "Grammar of Assent," chapters 4, 6, 7. Another representative of Catholicism comes near to the Expositor's view in treating Faith as belief on Divine testimony (Rickaby, "First Principles," part ii., chapter viii.).

A recent work by Dean Inge deals with the psychological aspects of Faith. Sir W. Hamilton wrote: "Knowledge is a certainty founded upon insight; belief is certainty founded upon feeling. The one is perspicuous and objective, the other obscure and subjective."

The theological aspect of Faith has been thus stated by Fairbairn: "Faith is an intellectual act, for it is a form of knowledge; it is an emotional attitude and activity, for it trusts persons and works by love; it is a moral intuition, for it sees obligation in truth and right in duty" ("Philosophy of the Christian Religion," p. 548). *Cf.* Rom. 1: 5, Gal. 5: 6, and note 9 on John, *sub init.*; and see also Stalker, "The Ethic of Jesus," chapter viii.

For a scientific appreciation of the present state of Religious Belief in "Christian" communities see Pratt, "Psychology of Religion," especially chapter viii. (p. 231 *ff.*). This writer's *third* class of believers is composed of those who by the Evangelist are regarded as *truly* such. A correspondence in the *Daily Telegraph* some years ago, which has since been republished in a volume edited by W. L. Courtney, revealed the many lights in which this vital subject is now regarded. One of the contributors referred to an aphorism which would be found in Nietzsche's "Antichrist" (§ 52), that "Belief means not wishing to know what is true." (*Cf.* Herbert Spencer on "Christian Scepticism.")

Newman, from his Oxford pulpit, spoke well when he said, "Unbelief is opposed to Reason . . . criticizes the evidences of Religion, only because it does not like it, and really goes upon presumptions and prejudices as much as Faith does."

In this connection it is odd that Hume, the protagonist of Doubt in the eighteenth century, avowed that he had never read the New Testament! Here it becomes a question of those who live in glass-houses not throwing stones.

Benn, in *Literary Guide and Rationalist Review*, Oct., 1908, has strikingly written, "Faith is no more than a particular application of Reason. It means confidence in the legitimacy of inferring the future from the past; the unseen from the seen; the unknown from the known." Christian thinkers would acquiesce in this, from passages of Scripture like 1 Peter 3: 15. The Bishop of Ossory, in Evidential Lecture at King's College, London, in the year 1909, expressed himself in a like sense; emphasizing, of course, the element of trust, which adheres to Benn's view *nol. vol.* But Christian faith is a gift of God (Eph. 2: 8), of which JESUS is originator (Heb. 12: 2; *cf.* Gal. 2: 20): and here lies all the difference.

*Cf.* notes 54 and 58 on Mark, and note 133, in particular, on John.

See Spurgeon's Sermons, 856 and 1963.

451 Luke 18: 11. — "The Pharisee." For the "Christian" counterpart, *cf.* Rev. 3: 17 *f.* As J. H. Newman in a parochial sermon said very truly: "The worldly man is a Pharisee."

"Stood." For σταθείς *cf.* 19: 8, of Zaccheus. Standing was, and remains, the habitual attitude of Jews in prayer: *cf.* Mark 11: 25. The scriptural attitudes are either standing (Abraham, in Gen. 18: 22:

*cf.* Jer. 15: 1, of Moses and Samuel), or kneeling (Solomon, Daniel, our Lord in 22: 41, Stephen, Peter, Paul). For the quaint expression "sat" in 1 Chron. 17: 16, *cf.* Matt. 4: 16: the Hebrew word and its Greek equivalent being used for abiding, tarrying. *Cf.* further Luke 21: 35.

452 Luke 18: 12. — "Twice, etc." That is, on Mondays and Thursdays, according to the Talmud. It is prescribed in Old Testament Scripture only for the Day of Atonement. The *Didaché* enjoined its observance by Christians on Wednesdays and Fridays (§ viii.).

453 Luke 18: 13. — "Was striking upon his breast." *Cf.* Neander's famous saying, "The breast makes the theologian," which carried the sympathy of Schleiermacher. The words of the writer of the well-known Church History were those of a man of genius.

"The sinner"; or, as A.V., retained by Revv., "*a* sinner." That is, "who is a sinner," the article being then regarded as equivalent to a relative pronoun, as in Rom. 7: 21.

The same words were on the lips, when dying, of Archbishop Usher and William Wilberforce.

There is a discourse of Bunyan on verses 10-13 ("Works," vol. ii.), also sermons of G. Whitefield and Isaac Williams.

454 "Justified," δεδικαιωμένος. Meyer, Godet, and Weiss suppose that it means Pauline doctrinal justification, a view which the Expositor's remarks were designed to meet. *Cf.* Wellhausen: justified *relatively*.

455 For verses 9-14, see "Pilgrim's Progress," part ii.: "Greatheart" to the pilgrims; also sermon of Whitefield, and Spurgeon's 1949.

Critics, as the manner is, suppose a duplicate here of Luke 14: 11.

456 Luke 18: 15. — The connection with Matt. 19: 13 *f.* and Mark 10: 13 *ff.* is here resumed.

457 Luke 18: 16 *f.* — The KINGDOM ("moral" aspect).

"To receive" (verse 17); or, "to accept," δέχεσθαι (active). Observe the distinct force of this word in 1 Cor. 2: 14, compared with verse 12 there; also 2 Cor. 11: 4, where both λαμβάνειν and δέχεσθαι instructively occur in the same verse. The Vulgate in Luke 18 has distinguished δεχ. in present verse from λαμβ. in verse 30.

Stock: "receiving is not exactly a passive thing" (p. 230).

As to *acceptance* of the Kingdom (God's Sovereignty, or Christ's Lordship), see Dalman, p. 91, and note 105 on Mark; for *entrance*, which in Scripture is regularly used of the time of recompense, Dalman, p. 95, and note 99 on the same Gospel.

The GOSPEL as popularly used (see note on Luke 8: 1) is only the scaffolding of the KINGDOM, not the building itself. Children of at least Christian parents obey them readily, from the heart, so far as they do respond to faithful "nurture and admonition." *Cf.* Rom. 1: 5, Rom. 6: 17, and Eph. 6: 4: in the last passage they are required to recognize the Lordship of Christ, to be subject to that. In the child as such there is no consciousness of merit; and so for those who entertain the doctrine of the Kingdom and enter upon the path which leads to its attainment.

"As a little child." See Nicoll, "Return to the Cross," pp. 201, 210, and chapter "The Theology of Little Children" (p. 142), quoting Bushnell: "It is the very character and mark of all unchristian education that it brings up the child for *future* conversion." This American writer also remarks, "Of the Moravian Brethren not one in ten recollects the time when he began to be religious" (quoted *ibid.*, p.

145); in other words, to *love* the Lord.

457a Luke 18: 18. — "Inherit": see note 106 on Mark, and in particular Rom. 8: 17, where a twofold inheritance is spoken of:-

(i.) "heirs of GOD," obtaining an endless inheritance *promised* (Titus 1: 2, Titus 3: 2; Heb. 9: 15; *cf.* 1 Peter 5: 10), which "fadeth not away" (1 Peter 1: 4 *f.*) and connected with Pauline justification, by FAITH, "of life" (Acts 13: 39; Rom. 5: 18), clenched by "this grace wherein (we) believers stand";

(ii.) "*but*," as Vulg. rightly: see Meyer, "joint-heirs with CHRIST, if so be . . . that we may be also glorified with (Him)," where a semicolon after "Christ" obscures the meaning. For this *cf.* Col. 3: 24; 2 Tim. 2: 12, and Heb. 3: 14 (Greek). In Rom. 8: 17 the  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  and  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  together make up the "but." This distinct inheritance, which is the prelude to the other (verse 30; *cf.* Rom. 2: 7), popularly confounded with it, is related to justification by WORKS in James 2: 18, 24.

It is sometimes said by apologists for crude "Reformed" doctrine that, because Paul alone uses "before God" (Rom. 4: 2), justification in James means before *men* (*cf.* Matt. 5: 16), and appeal is made to James 2: 24. But that the Apostle James uses the word "see" for ideal sight is proved by verse 11 of his Epistle. Bishop Bull's second Dissertation (chapter 1) on Justification has refuted what he describes as this "foolish scheme." That one believer's works are open to another's human appreciation is clear from James 2: 18; but James's reference to Genesis 22: 19 is different from that made by Paul (Gen. 15: 6): observe in Gen. 22: 15, "now I (Jehovah) know," when no men were on the scene but Abraham and his son. Luther (like Calvin, note 192) did not apprehend the truth of the Kingdom, any more than that of the Church, which together have come out more clearly during the last eighty years.

See further Luke 21: 36 and 1 Cor. 10: 12, which, in harmony with other passages, establish the standing in *responsibility* (obnoxious to Calvinists) alongside of that in *grace* (obnoxious to Arminians). The statement of Norris that Justification is complete, *though liable to be forfeited* ("Rudiments of Theology," p. 125), is misleading: *cf.* Rom. 8: 30 and 1 Tim. 2: 4, which strike one note with 1 Thess. 2: 12, which strikes another. "Probation," recognized in the New Testament (1 Cor. 9: 27, etc.), has to do with standing in responsibility. The Holy Spirit would jealously guard such a scripture as Acts 13: 39 from an interpretation admitting of antinomianism in any shape or form. See 2 Peter 3: 16; 1 Cor. 10: 11 *f.*, etc.

Controversialists, Roman and Protestant, High Anglican and Evangelicals, too often will but "see" one side of the case; whilst Higher Critics are wont to divorce Gospels from Epistles, and, from Lutheran tradition, to view these as in disharmony (*cf.* note 617).

Kingdom blessing depends, not on conformity to "the Law," as the term is used by the Apostle Paul (Gal. 2: 16, "the works of the Law": *cf.* Rom. 6: 14), but upon the believer's realisation of, and conformity to, New Testament requirements: see in particular Matt. 7: 24, Matt. 28: 20, and 1 Cor. 9: 21. The Kingdom in its manifestation will be the sphere of *recompense* for doing and suffering: see Luke 14: 14, comparing 1 Thess. 4: 14-17, Phil. 3: 10 *f.*

"Eternal life," as used by the "ruler," is the "life for evermore" of Ps. 133: 3, and so always by the Synoptists, who exhibit it in its historical limitations. Not that in the Fourth Gospel any more it is used as equivalent to the Synoptic "Kingdom," as says Garvie (after E. F. Scott). From Luke's treating the Kingdom largely from a "moral" point of view, bearing on the present dispensation (1 Cor. 4: 20), he has seemed to some German writers to lead up to what they suppose to be a merging, by the fourth Evangelist, of the Kingdom in Eternal Life; just as early "fathers" thought, on the other hand, that the βασιλεία swamps the ζωὴ αἰώνιος. This has resulted from an imperfect induction of passages. The

lineaments of the Synoptic Kingdom are engraved indelibly on John 15: 1-8, where not a word occurs about "life," and where the three stages of fruit-bearing in Mark 4: 20 are plainly recognizable. Again, the "abundant" life of John 10: 10 is as thoroughly Lucan as it is Petrine. *Cf.* notes 65, 66, and 66a on John.

When Wernle criticizes Hermas amongst sub-apostolic writers for the conviction that many Christians would forfeit Kingdom blessings, on the ground that the writer of the *Shepherd* "never got quit of Jewish uncertainty of salvation" ("Beginnings," ii., p. 303), it must be remembered that, whilst it is true that none of the spokesmen of that generation laid hold of the Biblical fact that the believer has a "purged conscience" (Heb. 10: 2 and 22), their imperfect understanding of Grace arose from the mistake above mentioned, which may have been accentuated by misunderstanding of 2 Peter 1: 11; this, notwithstanding critics' depreciation of the Epistles as a whole, has become classical.

458 Luke 18: 19. — The emphasis is on "good," not on "Me." *Cf.* Ullmann, "Sinlessness of Jesus," p. 148 *ff.* and note 107 on Mark, which deals with the point raised in such popular books as Schmiedel, "Jesus in Modern Criticism," p. 23. The limitations of the Lord's humanity we cannot determine outside Scripture (John 5: 19, etc.), they were incidental to His self-imposed humiliation. There is here no more avowal of imperfection than in 20: 41-44 a repudiation of his Davidic Sonship. It is noticeable that the Koran, whilst more than once recording Mohammed's sense of need of forgiveness of sins, nowhere attributes to *Aissa* any such confession, although apocryphal gospels, from which "the Prophet" received his information, are not free from insinuations of the kind.

For "good" (ἀγαθός) applied to the Lord, *cf.* John 7: 12. "Goodness" (ἀγαθωσύνη) GOD displays specially in sacrifice (verse 22; *cf.* Rom. 8: 32). Ethical religionists may talk of "sacrifice in behalf of the race," but JESUS first taught and practised it, as none other could or would do. Treasured have ever been words of the "judicious" Hooker in his great sermon on Justification: "We care for no other knowledge in the world than this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered; that God hath made Himself the sin of men, and that men are made the righteousness of God." Had Irving and others held to this fundamental truth, we should never have had the unhappy suggestion of *peccability* of the Lord intruded on the Church.

458a Luke 18: 20. — We have here, of course, a summary of the Ethical Code on its manward side, and that alone.

458b Luke 18: 21. — In the Talmud the inquiry is raised, "Why did God give so many commandments?" To which a rabbinical answer is, "To multiply Israel's merit"!

459 Luke 18: 23. — Matthew adds here, "he went away."

460 *Cf.* Gal. 6: 2.

461 Luke 18: 24 *f.* — Difficult as it may be for the affluent to accept the Gospel of *salvation*, still more is it for such, when already Christians, to conform their conduct to the principles of the Kingdom. But heavenly grace suffices for the one situation as for the other. The same Evangelist, who in this chapter of his record has commemorated the offering of the "poor widow," has in another (Luke 23: 50 *ff.*) told of the loving service rendered to the Master, when He was no longer on the scene to acknowledge it, by one of the class (*cf.* Matt. 27: 5, πλούσιος) here spoken of, "who was looking for the Kingdom of God" and, we may well suppose, will be awarded a place in it.

"Needle's eye." The small gate for foot passengers is not beside (Adeney), but within the larger one for animals (Schor, p. 30). Both words here (τρήμα, βελόνη) are medical terms: see Hobart.

462 "Saved." As to Messianic salvation, see note 361 (13: 23).

462a Luke 18: 27. — Cf. Mark 14: 36 in another connection.

463 Luke 18: 30. — "Manifold more." Garvie: "communion of saints instead of family relationships."

"In this time." Nietzsche: "Buddhism gives no promise, but keeps every one; Christianity gives any promise, but keeps none" ("Antichrist," § 42). This is the language of a man not understanding what he said (1 Tim. 1: 7) in either direction. The Buddhism that he so much lauded occupies novice and grey-haired men alike in a delusive struggle against suffering. Nietzsche wrote of Pascal, that the eminent French Christian's intellect was ruined by his faith; but this miserable man himself, as elsewhere stated, died insane. Again, Stanton Coit writes: "Many have asked and no one has answered, save where the prayer was overheard by some fellow man" ("The Lord's Prayer," p. 12). Myriads of men and women "in this time" can give the lie to this airy statement.

"Receive," λαμβάνειν (passive).

The "age to come" will witness the *initial manifestation* (cf. references in note 457a, following that to present verse) of the Eternal Life of the Fourth Gospel, which is, or should be, known morally by all believers now. Cf. 1 Tim. 4: 8, "having promise of the life to come" (μελλούσης, a word regularly used in millennial contexts [cf. note 355]); and for the *manifestation* of the *sons* of God, Rom. 8: 19.

The promise is made to those who have already acted as Peter says (Boehmer).

464 Luke 18: 31-34. — See note 220a on John (12: 1). Verses 31-43 appear in the "Lectionary" as *Gospel* for Quinquagesima, to accompany 1 Cor. 13: as the *Epistle*. "The one affords a transcript from actual life of that which the other exhibits as an ideal" (A. W. Robinson).

465 Luke 18: 34. — "Understood not"; or, "did not perceive," cf. 24: 25, 46 and John 12: 34. It is much the same in Christendom now as it was in the Churches of "Asia" to which Paul's declaration of "the whole counsel of God" was addressed, cf. Acts 20: 27 and 2 Tim. 1: 15.

"Know," *get to know* (γινώσκειν).

466 Luke 18: 35 ff. — The variations of the several Evangelists here are set out in Plummer, p. 429. As to the "supplementary theory," see Westcott, "Introduction," p. 183 f.

467 See note 111 on Mark. Luke agrees partly with Matthew and partly with Mark, a feature which is somewhat embarrassing to advocates of the current documentary theory.

Of the various explanations available, that seems to be most worthy of consideration which is derived from the fact that there were two Jerichos, the older site and the city then lately built, at a distance of 1.25 miles from each other. Excavations are being conducted by Prof. Sellin under the auspices of a German, archaeological society.

Nösgen, as the Expositor, has followed Grotius' explanation of ἐγγίζειν εἰς; but the present writer is not prepared to resist the suggestion of motion conveyed independently by the preposition (cf. the Greek of 19: 29), and agrees with the remarks *ad loc.* of Bishop Goodwin, p. 311. Chrysostom: "Such apparent discrepancies between the Evangelists do but tell for their mutual independence. The Holy Spirit has not been pleased to supply us with *all* the facts." The most satisfactory rendering seems to be the one followed in the present volume, which happens to agree with that of Wellhausen.

468 For Messianic passages on blindness, see Isa. 29: 18, Isa. 35: 5, Isa. 42: 7. Bartimaeus was

the first of those outside the apostolic band who addressed the Lord by His Messianic title.

A poem of Longfellow was derived from this narrative.

## NOTES ON THE NINETEENTH CHAPTER.

469 Luke 19: 2. — "Zacchaeus." His is a Hebrew name: see "Zacchai" in Ezra 2: 9; Neh. 7: 14.

469a Luke 19: 4. — "Sycamore": *cf.* Luke 17: 6, "sycamine."

469b Luke 19: 5. — "Must": *cf.* Luke 13: 38; also John 4: 1.

470 Luke 19: 7. — "Murmured; or, "began to murmur" (imperf.).

471 Luke 19: 8. — "Fourfold" see Ex. 22: 1.

"By false accusation." This rendering (A.V.) is defended by Field against Revv, ("wrongfully").

472 Luke 19: 9. — "Salvation," *cf.* Luke 2: 30.

"Is come," ἐγένετο: an example, cited by Burton (§ 46), of the frequent use of the aorist, expressed by the English perfect.

See G. Whitefield's sermon on "The Conversion of Zacchaeus."

473 Luke 19: 10. - *Cf.* 1 Tim. 1: 15, which these words may have originated.

D. L. Moody preached from this verse. See also Whyte's "Bible Characters," No. LXXVIII. (on Zacchaeus).

474 Luke 19: 11. — "As they heard these things," that is, in or near Jericho. The *similar* parable of the Talents was spoken in Jerusalem: *cf.* Matt. 24: 1, Matt. 25: 14.

"He in addition spoke," προσθεὶς εἶπε: a Hebraism which occurs again in Luke 20: 16 *ff.*, and seems to indicate use of a Hebrew source.

"Thought that the kingdom was about (μέλλει) to be immediately manifested." They evidently believed that the "Seventy Weeks" of Daniel were running out.

475 "Manifested." Again, the *future* aspect of the Kingdom: see note on Luke 9: 27.

476 Luke 19: 12. — "To return," ὑποστρέφειν, only in this parable, which is distinct from that of the Talents in Matthew (see A. R. Habershon, p. 309 *f.*). Jülicher gives a false lead in treating the one parable as a different version of the other. This may have been suggested by the embassy of Archelaus to Rome, and his slaughter of disaffected subjects on his return (Joseph. "Antiqq.," chapter 17; "Wars," chapter ii.). Like the parable of the Great Supper, it is in two portions: see note on Luke 14: 8, 21.

477 Luke 19: 13 *ff.* — "Minas." The "talent" of Matthew's parable was worth sixty times as much as Luke's "pound," which represents one hundred drachmas, or about £3 11s. *Od.*: *cf.* note 384.

478 "While I am coming." "This should be our view of our Lord's Advent; He is even now on His way hither" (Spurgeon's Sermon, 1960).

What the disciple has now he holds as a steward; but it will be his own on the Lord's return. In Matthew the talents are given to each according to his capacity (δύναμις). Whilst the χάρις in Luke is common to both parables, Matthew's talent is a χάρισμα in the Pauline sense of that word. The

thought has been well worked out by Lütgert (p. 162 f).

The case of Apollo strikingly illustrated the combination of "capacity" and "gift": *cf.* Acts 18: 24, 27 with 1 Cor. 12: 7.

479 Luke 19: 14. — *Cf.* Ps. 2: 3.

480 Luke 19: 15. — "Having received the kingdom": *cf.* Matt. 28: 18. These two passages enable us to determine when the Kingdom of Heaven enured. At present it is in "mystery." The ἐνέργεια of it will operate when Rev. 11: 15 (see R. V.) is fulfilled.

481 Luke 19: 22. — *Cf.* Ps. 18: 26; also verse 27 here, and note at Luke 13: 1. Wellhausen is one of those scholars who regard it as a mistake to suppose that Luke made use of Josephus.

482 Luke 19: 23. — "Received"; or "demanded (exactd)" *cf.* R.V.

483 Luke 19: 26. — For the issues of exercise, neglect or abuse of gift (χάρισμα: see note 478), *cf.* Matt. 25: 29; also 1 Cor. 3: 15, "he shall suffer loss."

484 Luke 19: 27. — For Messiah's vengeance on His enemies, *cf.* Ps. 21: 9. This is quite distinct from what comes before us in Luke 20: 13, 16, the action of the FATHER.

485 Luke 19: 28 ff. — *Cf.* Matt. 21: 1-9; Mark 11: 1-10. It was on Saturday the 8th Nisan that our Lord took supper with Lazarus. On the next day (Sunday) He presented Himself as Messiah by the procession into the city.

486 Luke 19: 31. — "The Lord." The man seems to have been a disciple, perhaps made such by the early Judean ministry. *Cf.* note at Luke 13: 34.

487 Luke 19: 30-36. — "A colt," as in Mark and John. Much inane criticism has been expended on Matthew's record that there were both an ass and her colt. See Zech. 9: 9, with regard to which it is needless to rely on the revised rendering of the *vav* (A.V. "and"; R.V. "even"). Matthew quotes the LXX.; some MSS., however, showing a second ἐπί in that Evangelist's account. The Apostle Matthew was an eye-witness, to whom knowledge of the structure of Hebrew poetry maybe credited as good as that of moderns. Observe that the two disciples had the Lord's direction to bring the mother, and therefore did not act from their own mere sense of prudence. Christ's use of the two may be ascribed to His tenderness: the restiveness from discomfort of the colt would be counteracted by the presence of its mother, whose movements may have been regulated by the Lord's hand resting upon her, that she might the better keep pace with the colt, on which He rode: this is probably all that the first of our Gospels means by, "He sat on them."

488 Luke 19: 38. — All four Gospels vary in the form given to this anthem. For Luke's arrangement of the words, *cf.* the Hebrew accents of Ps. 118 (117) 25, which connect "in the Name" with "Blessed" (see Westcott on John 12: 13).

The Lord at length definitely took the Messianic position; not from any development in His convictions, as some critics represent, but because there was no longer any danger of a popular rising. "the forces arrayed against Him being," from the human point of view, "too strong" for that (Adeney).

489 Luke 19: 41. — "Wept"; or "sobbed," "wailed" (ἔκλαυσεν), used of Peter in Mark 14: 72; whilst in John 11: 35 we have, of the Lord, ἐδάκρυε, "shed tears."

490 Luke 19: 42. — "This *thy* day"; see marg. of American Revision; and so for "*thy* peace."

"peace . . . hid." God's covenant of peace (Ex. 34: 25, Ex. 37: 26) *cf.* Ps. 122: 6 ff. and Isa. 48: 18,

and, in particular, Ps. 81: 13-16.

491 Luke 19: 43 *f.* — These verses critics have used for determination of the date of the Third Gospel. The statement is deemed so circumstantial that those of the "historical" wing imagine that Luke's record was written after the event. But prediction might in principle extend as well to detail as to any merely general statement, if the event could be foreseen at all.

*Cf.* Joseph. "Wars," v. 6, 2 and 12, 2.

For the "children," *cf.* Ps. 137: 9. For "visitation" (ἐπισκόπη), see note on Luke 7: 16 above.

492 Luke 19: 45 *f.* — J. Weiss differs from most other critics in defending the order shown by John's Gospel in this connection (p. 180).

The cleansing of the Temple (in the Court of the Gentiles) recorded in the Fourth Gospel and that here spoken of are not "duplicates" as critics dream. Ezek. 24: 13 refers to a double cleansing. In the last Gospel the Lord speaks of His Father's house; here of the house as His own. *Cf.* note 117 on Mark, and note 55 *f.* on John.

This was five days (John 12: 1, 10) before the Passover (the 15th of Nisan), and so, on the tenth day of the month, when lambs had to be procured, in keeping with Ex. 12: 3. The "Lamb of God" had become matter of traffic a few hours earlier on the same Jewish day (Matt. 26: 14).

493 Luke 19: 47 *f.* — "Was teaching day by day": the Wednesday could not have been spent, as often supposed, in seclusion, whereby all in chapters 20, 21 would be crowded into the Tuesday. *Cf.* 21: 37 *f.* His teaching here would be in the Court of the Women.

Luke uses the expression "principal men" also in Acts 25: 2. *Cf.* Luke 20: 20: the Lord's steps being dogged, and His words distorted (Ps. 37: 32, Ps. 38: 12).

There is a sermon of Luther on verses 41-48 (p. 335).

## NOTES ON THE TWENTIETH CHAPTER.

494 Luke 20: 1. — "One of the days." Mark shows that this was the Tuesday of Passion Week.

494a Luke 20: 2. — See note on Luke 11: 52.

495 Luke 20: 7. — Observe that in effect they own themselves "blind" (6: 39).

496 Luke 20: 9 *ff.* — See note 121 on Mark.

497 Luke 20: 13 *ff.* — See Spurgeon's Sermon, 1951.

498 Luke 20: 15. — "The Lord of the vineyard": this disproves Scott Russell's theory (*cf.* Bishop Westcott's views in his "Historic Faith") that the SON *came* with the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. Here "the Lord" (*cf.* Luke 10: 2) is the FATHER (*cf.* note 441).

499 Luke 20: 20. — Some have supposed that this verse introduces the Tuesday of Passion Week, but see note on verse 1. The whole of Luke 20 seems to belong to that day.

500 Luke 20: 21. — "Way." *Cf.* Acts 18: 26. The expression is not, however, peculiarly Lucan, as it is in each of the parallels. Instead of it, Syrrcu and Syrrsin have "word."

500a Luke 20: 24. — "Penny." The Roman *denarius* was equivalent to the Greek *drachma* (8.5*d.*). The latter of these (mentioned in Matt. 18: 28, and Luke 15: 8) survives to the present day.

501 Luke 20: 25. — Cairns attempts to show that the teaching of JESUS implicitly contains precepts for secular affairs, ethics of patriotism, etc. (chapter 4); but, as Höffding says, the Lord's words will not bear such strain put upon them.

502 Luke 20: 27. — *Cf.* Tobit iii. 15. For discussion by the Greeks of the resurrection of the soul, see Plato's "Phaedo."

SADDUCEES. As to this party, see Edersheim, "Sketches, etc.," chapter xxv., if not Schürer. They were Jewish Epicureans. Josephus attests their belief in extinguishment of the soul by death ("Antiqq.," viii. 1, 4).

503 Luke 20: 28. — A Mosaic, albeit Deuteronomic, text! See 25: 5 *f.* of that Book.

504 Luke 20: 34. — "Sons of this age." This expression occurs in the New Testament only in ch. 16: 8 and here.

505 Luke 20: 35. — "Shall have been deemed worthy," etc. *Cf.* 2 Thess. 1: 5; also Luke 14: 14 and note there. Van Oosterzee on the present passage writes: "The Messianic ἰών is here represented as coincident with the resurrection of the just. It is a privilege which will not be shared by all, but only by the elect." *Cf.* verse 11 of the passage in 2 Thess. with 1 Thess. 1: 4, which speaks of election on the side of "Eternal Life" as used in John's Gospel. In *obedience to Christ's words* the real motive will always be love to Him, regard for His glory: to this His love will respond at the βῆμα. "They . . . shall know that I have loved thee" (Rev. 3: 9).

One of the very few mistakes in J. Angell James's old book, "The Anxious Inquirer," is the statement that "it is a radical error to suppose that sanctification goes before justification" (p. 114).

Sanctification, which is always the work of the Spirit, in New Testament Scripture, is as an *act*:

(1) Absolute, objective, or imputed, as connected with "standing" in Grace (1 Cor. 1: 30, Rom. 5: 2), by virtue of which every true believer is a "saint" (1 Cor. 6: 11, Heb. 10: 10). This some Confessions, as the Westminster, fail to disengage from

(2) A work or process, which is subjective, practical and gradual, "inherent, but not perfect" (Hooker), to which, as a distinct "standing," responsibility attaches (1 Cor. 10: 12), being sometimes described as "state" or "condition" (ἀγιωσύνη): see 2 Thess. 2: 13, 1 Peter 1: 2 (ἀγιασμός), 1 Thess. 3: 13. (*cf.* 1 Thess. 5: 23), and 2 Cor. 7: 1. To this attaches the Apostle's declaration, "The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power" (1 Cor. 4: 20). See further Rev. 3: 7, 11: the Christian must ever remember that he has to do with a Master who is "holy and real" (ἀληθινός). Such holiness in conduct (reality), nevertheless, is founded not on Law but on Grace (Rom. 8: 2, Rom. 11: 20, Heb. 12: 28), so that pride of merit and cavil of unbelief are alike excluded.

Sanctification, as Calvin puts it, means *separation*: "that we may serve God, and not the world."

506 Luke 20: 36. — "Sons of the resurrection." *Cf.* such Hebraisms already met with, as "sons of the bride-chamber" (Luke 5: 34), "sons of peace" (Luke 10: 6), and "sons of this age" (Luke 16: 8). *Cf.* note 504.

Luther has preached on verses 25-36; and Dr. Arnold has a sermon from the last of these verses (p. 110).

507 Luke 20: 37. — "The God, etc." The Sadducees, as generally stated, acknowledged the *Torah*, or Pentateuch: hence the Lord's appeal to the book of Exodus (3: 6), in which the Law proper began.

508 "All live in." *Cf.* Rom. 6: 10, Rom. 14: 7 *f.* Here the Intermediate State in our Lord's teaching reveals itself, additional to the statement in the other Synoptics. It of course supersedes the Old Testament conception of *Sheol*, which was felt to be a negation of all that was worth the name of "life."

The Lord confines Himself to proof of the immortality of the soul. For the probable remaining links in the argument as regards resurrection of the body, see Neil, p. 289.

509 Luke 20: 41 *ff.* — See Isa. 11: 1, 10 and Rev. 22: 16. This resolves itself into, the Lord's being GOD and MAN in one, establishing His Messiahship. *Cf.* 2: 11.

Observe that "David *himself*" is referred to, and that Mark says that *he* spoke "in the Spirit." Yet modern critics (but not Ewald) question the Davidic authorship of Psalm 110, which is ascribed to an anonymous poet writing about 143 B.C., and celebrating the accession of Simon the Maccabee to priestly and royal dignity. It is a curious task for any to undertake — that of showing how the language of the Psalm (*e.g.*, verse 5) suits such an epoch. *Cf.* Maclaren on Psalms, vol. iii., p. 183 *f.*

An answer to the query of verse 44 Luke supplies in Acts 2: 31-36, where "Lord" represents *Adon* in Ps. 110: 1. *Cf.* 22: 69 here. Resurrection afforded the clue. Any reply that the scribes might have attempted must have required the use of Ps. 2, which speaks of Messiah's earthly, as Ps. 110 of his heavenly, kingship. They accorded the same recognition as Messianic to the one Psalm as to the other.

O. Holtzmann (p. 83; followed by L. Muirhead, "Eschatology," p. 10, and others — *cf.* Schmiedel, "Jesus in Mod. Crit.," p. 31) says: "He goes on to show that the opinion of the scribes was wrong." *Contra:* Spitta, "Disputed Questions," pp. 158-167. A sufficient reply to such as O. Holtzmann is (1) that the argument is of like nature to that in verses 2-8: this has been missed by Kennett in *Interpreter*, October, 1911, p. 45. The Lord's dialectic vein was of a different order from that, for example, of Socrates in the Platonic Dialogues: the one made for certainty, as the other for doubt. (2) Luke could not have forgotten Luke 1: 32.

Burkitt has essayed the remark that "The New Testament was needed, not to bring men to Christ, or as a means of grace, but as an instrument of criticism by which to correct the impression we derive of Christ through our fellow-Christians" (Church Congress Paper, 1908). This notion seems to have been broached in view of the GOSPELS. Now, those whom God does use in ministry of "the Word of His Grace" have ever themselves been brought to Christ directly or indirectly through some application of New Testament Scripture. Catechisms, Confessions, Liturgies, Ordinances — what good have these ever accomplished save as they have reflected the written WORD? To influence the lives of our fellows in either of the ways referred to by the Norrisian Professor requires, of course, other qualifications than those which any of us possess as literary "hewers of wood" or "drawers of water." Telling a Christian audience that the New Testament in none of its parts was designed as an instrument for individual blessing must surely have been as the proverbial water on a duck's back.

510 Luke 20: 46. — Here is another of the imagined "duplicates": *cf.* Luke 11: 43.

## NOTES ON THE TWENTY-FIRST CHAPTER.

511 Luke 21: 1-4. — "The Widow with the Two Mites" is the subject of Whyte's discourse LXXXIII., in "Bible Characters."

512 Luke 21: 5-36. — On Messianic prophecy, see Edersheim, Warburton Lectures ("Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah"), and as to the prophecy on Olivet in particular, Stuart, pp.

238-246; also note 126 on Mark. Jewish opinion may be learned from Abrahams' recent interesting book in Constable's series (chapter vii.).

For comparison with Matt. 24 and Mark 13, chapter 3 of a recent unpretentious but instructive little book, "The Time of the End, but the End not yet," by E. J. Thomas (Weston, 53, Paternoster Row), would be found helpful.

512a Luke 21: 5 *f.* — "Some." Wellhausen rightly calls attention to the fact that the question, as it appears in Luke's Gospel, proceeded from a wider circle than the disciples merely. This is borne out by verse 7, where the Lord is addressed as "Teacher" (διδάσκαλε), whilst the disciples in Luke's Gospel regularly use "Lord" (κύριε), or "Master" (ἐπιστάτα). *Cf.* note 119 above.

513 Luke 21: 9. — Down to verse 11 we have what Matthew and Mark describe as ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων, "beginning of throes." As to these "sorrows of Messiah," so-called, see Edersheim, *op. cit.*, p. 247. Tacitus supplies information about such events as are here referred to, in his History, i. 2, 1.

514 Luke 21: 12. — The order here is as in Mark 13: 9-13. *Cf.* Matt. 10: 34-42.

515 Luke 21: 13. — "Turn out," so Field, who refers to Phil. 1: 19.

515a Luke 21: 15. — Robert South preached from this verse.

516 Luke 21: 17. — "Hated by all." *Cf.* John 15: 19, Acts 28: 22, and see Tacitus, "Ann.," xv. 44.

517 Luke 21: 19. — *Cf.* Luke 17: 33, and see Dean Vaughan, "Authorised or Revised?" p. 67.

518 Luke 21: 20. — "Desolation." Schmiedel (§ 153) represents Luke as identifying, in the Evangelist's own mind, Titus' desolation of Jerusalem with Daniel's "abomination," which does but evidence that critic's ignorance of the scheme of Old Testament Prophecy. As the Expositor shows, it is characteristic of Luke that our Evangelist distinguished them.

"Luke's language here," Purves remarks, "is only an interpretation of Christ's words (*cf.* Matt. 24: 15, Mark 13: 14), designed to make their meaning clear to Gentile readers" ("Christianity in the Apostolic Age," p. 272).

519 Luke 21: 21. — "Flee to the mountains." Wellhausen, as others, speaks of Luke's bringing the prophecy "up to date." But some date for it before 70 finds support from these words, because the historical flight was to Pella, in the Jordan valley.

520 Luke 21: 22. — "Vengeance." The Greek (ἐκδίκησις) is the same as that of Hosea 9: 7. *Cf.* note on Luke 7: 16.

521 Luke 21: 23. — "Distress," ἀνάγκη (*cf.* 1 Cor. 7: 6). It is the θλίψις of Matthew and Mark.

522 Luke 21: 24. — "Trodden down," etc., by Romans, Saracens, Franks, etc., in succession.

522a The "times of the nations" run from Nebuchadnezzar to the Apocalyptic head of the revived Roman empire (Rev. 13: 1-10). It is a phrase to be distinguished from "fulness of the Gentiles" in Rom. 11: 25, which refers to the completion of the Church. In Tobit xiv. 5 we meet with the "times of that age": on the similarity of αἰώνων and ἔθνων in MSS. (*e.g.*, Rev. 15: 3). see Nestle, in *Expository Times*, March, 1909.

523 Luke 21: 25 - "And there shall be signs," *i.e.*, of the ἀποκάλυψις of Christ's Presence (παρουσία, Matthew, *cf.* next note): *cf.* Rev. 8: 12. The "and," introducing a detached narration, is analogous to a peculiarity of the conjunction (καί), of which Isa. 61: 2 affords one of the most striking illustrations in Old Testament Scripture. That passage was used by our Lord on the occasion spoken of

in Luke 4: 16-19. He stopped before the words, "and the day of vengeance," etc. (*cf.* Zech. 9: 9 *f.*). "Rejoice . . . the foal of an ass," and then abruptly, "And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim," etc. A long space of time may intervene between the respective incidents of such seemingly disjointed passages or portions of them; and so here, between verses 24 and 25.

To understand verses 25-33, it is necessary to see that here is taken up that which was suspended with verse 11. *Cf.* Luke 17: 22-37, which was anticipatory of the section now reached.

524 Luke 21: 27 (*cf.* note 498). — "Coming," ἐρχόμενον: *cf.* 2 John 7. This is, doubtless, the same coming as in Rev. 1: 7, referred to by Westcott ("Historic Faith," Lecture VII., p. 41), but the "Manifestation" and the "Presence" are *not* equivalent expressions; for Paul speaks of the ἐπιφάνεια of the παρουσία (2 Thess. 2: 8), showing that the παρ. is at first secret: *cf.* Ps. 27: 5. In the last-cited New Testament passage, "brightness" has in the hands of the Revv. given place to the true rendering.

The phrase "Second Coming" is sometimes questioned, but it is sufficiently sanctioned by Heb. 9: 28.

The word παρουσία was used in everyday Greek of the time for the visit of a prince to any locality, so as to mean where the "Court" was (Deissmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-273).

Charles, after H. Holtzmann and Wendt, writes: "That JESUS expected to return during the existing generation is *proved beyond question* by the universal hopes of the apostolic age" ("Encyclopaedia Britannica," art. "Eschatology," col. 1373). As the Fourth Evangelist belonged to that age, which closed with his death, are we to suppose that *he* conceived that the Master was mistaken? See John 21: 2, and *cf.* note 526 below, as to the disciples.

Montefiore here has a good note on the Jewish and the Christian conceptions of Messiah.

525 Luke 21: 31 *f.* — A comparison of verse 27 *f.* sets Matthew's "Son of Man coming in His Kingdom" (Luke 16: 28) in solid connection with Luke's record here of the future manifestation of the Kingdom.

526 "This generation." *Cf.* note above on Luke 16: 8, and notes 135, 136 on Mark. For the Jewish "moral" connection of the word, *cf.* Old Testament passages, such as Gen. 7: 1 and Ps. 12: 8; in particular, Deut. 32: verses 5 and 20, besides, in Lucan writings, Acts 2: 40. The Deuteronomic references seem not to have been duly weighed, with regard to their marked difference in time, by Zahn; they do not bear out his note on Matt. 24: 34. *Cf.* Jer. 7: 8, Jer. 8: 3, in the LXX. For *Gentile* connection, see, *e.g.*, Phil. 2: 15, cited by Hahn. The successive races of men since the Flood are in this light regarded by Scripture as *one* generation.

The word as used in this Synoptic connection has "a nearer and a farther meaning" (Farrar).

Cremer and Hahn regard the αὕτη, "this," as explained by verse 28. In any case, the words come in the *future* part of Luke's record.

There are some excellent remarks on the whole subject in Jowett's essay, "On Belief in the Coming of Christ." As to "that day" in Mark 13: 32, the writer asks: "Is it reverent or irreverent to say that Christ knew what He Himself declared that He did not know" (p. 88 of recent reprint). *Cf.* Horton, on the moral beauty of Mark's report, which commands adhesion to what the Lord said from His actual knowledge while on earth.

With regard to Charles's statement (*supra*), may it not be said that the Lord's words about "that day" recorded by Mark of themselves suggest that it would not fall in the near future? They rebut

critics' fancy that there is "confusion" in that Evangelist's record, by alleging which they do but *create* an inconsistency on his part.

Luke 21: 32 is only difficult to reconcile with verse 24 for those who take "generation" to mean a period elapsing between father and son, a sense it might indeed have borne had it occurred in the same context as 23: 38 "weep for yourselves and for your children."

Neander (p. 130, followed by various English writers down to Selbie) says that the early disciples were mistaken in their view. Rather, they did not fully apprehend the Lord's meaning: it was not intended that they should do so (1 Cor. 13: 9).

The whole question is trenchantly discussed by B. W. Newton in his "Prophecy of the Lord Jesus in Matt. 24 *f.* Considered," pp. 39-79 (3rd ed., 1879). As to the bearing of verse 32 on the question of the date of this Gospel, see note 2 above, *ad fin.*

527 Luke 21: 36. — "Praying . . . may be deemed worthy" (or, reading as Revv., *κατίσχυσητε*, "may be strong") ". . . to stand (be set) before the Son of Man." See note on Luke 20: 35, and for "to be set" (*σταθῆναι*), *cf.* Ps. 1: 5 (note 370) and Wisdom of Solomon v. 1. Resurrection is affirmed in the Hebrew of the Psalm: *cf.* note 108 on John, and see also Mal. 3: 2. This is not a judgment in the sense of John 5: 24 (*cf.* Ps. 143: 2), but the occasion of our Lord's assigning reward or loss (1 Cor. 3: 13-15) to those of the House of God (1 Peter 4: 17), when He holds His first inquest, reviewing the life of each disciple as such.

## NOTES ON THE TWENTY-SECOND CHAPTER.

528 Luke 22: 1. — "Which is called Passover." *Cf.* Joseph. "Antiqq.," xiv. 2, 1, from which we learn that the name was by this time applied to the whole season. The Paschal Feast and the Feast of Unleavened Bread had long been blended. *Cf.* Lev. 23: 5 *f.* and Num. 28: 16 *f.*, where they are distinguished, with Deut. 16: 1, 3 in which they coalesce, as here.

The words of Mark, "after two days," and "not on the feast day" (14: 16), Wellhausen considers Luke left out in order to avoid contradiction with that which had actually happened. The simple truth of the matter, whether critics will recognize it or not, is that the plan of the Jewish leaders was frustrated.

The "difficulties" felt in connection with the Evangelists' several accounts of this celebration — in particular, the circumstance that the Lord observed the Passover before the Judean conventional hour — have been discussed in note 142 on Mark, and in notes 336, 346 on John. Here may be added that the different ways of determining the new moon, of which Khodadad in his pamphlet speaks (p. 21), occasioned letters of Gamaliel the Elder to the Galileans, referred to in "Tosefta: Sanhedrin," chapter ii. *Cf.* notes 531, 533.

529 Luke 22: 4. — "Captains." For these *στρατηγοί*, *cf.* John 18: 12; and see Schürer, 11. i. 265, or Edersheim, "The Temple, etc.," p. 389 *ff.*

530 Luke 22: 6. — "Agreed fully." Field, "fully consented."

531 Luke 22: 7. — "The day of unleavened [bread]." Provision of ἄζυμα (Ex. 23: 15) began, as we should say, with 6 p.m. (*cf.* verse 14) on the Thursday, when the 14th Nisan set in (*cf.* Matt. 26: 17; Mark 14: 12), *i.e.*, the Eastern Friday eve, but our Thursday night. The theory, occasioned by comparison with the Fourth Gospel, that the Lord anticipated the ceremony by one whole day (Neander, Godet, Westcott, etc.) seems to be already excluded by the Evangelist's words "the day . . .

in which the passover had to be killed." It was simply the darkness of one half of the technical day that divided the Lord's celebration from that of the Jerusalemites in general.

532 Luke 22: 10. — As to such an unwonted sight, see Schor, p. 43.

533 Luke 22: 13. — "Prepared the passover," *i.e.*, the initial Paschal meal. This preparation must not be confounded with the παρασκεύη, a word of different formation, spoken of in Luke 23: 54 in closest connection with the *Sabbath*, although it was a name given to the whole time between one sunset and the next succeeding in each recurring week. *Cf.* note concerned on chapter 23.

534 Luke 22: 14. — The disciples, observe, did not on this notable occasion partake of the Paschal feast with their families, "showing how they had forsaken all for Christ" (Carr).

535 Luke 22: 16. — "I will in no wise drink." Apparently, so far as regards the present occasion, because the cup of which *He* must drink is to be that of God's wrath against sin, in contrast with the joy symbolized by the ritual of the Passover. This will be celebrated throughout the Millennium (Ezek. 45: 21).

Burkitt would extend the Lord's words here into meaning that the meal described was not a Passover at all (*The Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1908, pp. 569-571), thus understanding the opening words, of deep Hebrew colouring, in a scarcely natural way. Although Harnack and Ramsay have lent their support to this idea (*Journal of Theological Literature*, 1909, col. 49 *f.*), writers of the most opposite schools combine in treating it as a Passover. Such it was at any rate in the sense of the Mosaic ordinance. Our Lord, however, seems not to have partaken of any cup, as an accretion (see Stuart, p. 254 *ff.*)

536 The "Kingdom of God," the Father's Kingdom, Matt. 26: 29, or "Kingdom of Heaven," yet future. *Cf.* Rev. 19: 9.

537 Luke 22: 17 — "A cup," *viz.*, the first of four used in the historical ceremony (Khodadad, p. 27). Some suppose that for the second of such cups was substituted that used in the institution of the Supper (Carr). Whilst the Lord is said by Luke to have "received" (δεξάμενος) the Passover cup (*cf.* note 535), Matthew speaks of His spontaneously having "taken" (λαβών) — used in institution of His Supper.

538 Luke 22: 19 *f.* — The LORD'S SUPPER, κυριακὸν δεῖπνον (1 Cor. 11: 20). Until the discoveries of Papyri, within the last twenty years, it was supposed that the word κυριακόν (*cf.* κυριακή of the Lord's Day, in Rev. 1: 10) was coined for the purpose; but it is now known that the word belonged to the Greek language of everyday life in that period, being used in the sense of "imperial," or "royal."

Besides this designation of the ordinance, Scripture sanctions "the breaking of bread" (Acts 2: 42, Acts 20: 7), "the Communion" (1 Cor. 10: 16) and "the Eucharist" or "Thanksgiving" (1 Cor. 11: 24, 1 Cor. 14: 16).

539 "This is My body given for you." The unleavened cake declared His *sacrificial* death. *Cf.* 1 Cor. 11: 29, the Lord's "body," which cannot mean the Church, described in Scripture as the "body of *Christ*." Tertullian uses the words against Marcion (book iv., chapter xl.) by saying, "That is, *the figure of My body*. . . . It would not contribute very well to the support of Marcion's theory of a phantom body, that the bread should have been crucified." This was before the days of Transubstantiation!

The form of words used by a father in family celebration of the Passover has been strangely

neglected by Catholic writers. The "is" could only so mean *represents*.

"Given," διδόμενον. Catholic commentators avail themselves of the present participle for their theory that "the sacrifice was in the Eucharist itself, not on the Cross only" (Darby-Smith). Cf. the "Explanatory Catechism," Nos. 278-280. But all that is really meant is that the Lord's body was on the point of being given for them, just as He was on the point of going to the Father: see the present tense of John 17: 11.

Since the Reformation the great Anglican divine Hooker has written that the virtue resides in the recipient: his wise language is borne out by Mark 14: 23 *f.*, for it was when the disciples had already drunk of the cup, that our Lord addressed to them the words of verse 24 there.

The present High Anglican view may be seen in Sadler, "Commentary on Luke," pp. 555-563. Canon (since Bishop) Gore, in revolt from the idea of worship of *dead* elements, has had recourse to a theory that the communion is with the *glorified* body of the Lord ("The Body of Christ," p. 66). But where would be the "remembrance" of words spoken by the historical JESUS before He suffered? If it is His death which governs the ordinance, all must be in keeping with that; whilst the Bishop, on that page of his book, directs the mind of the reader to Christ in His heavenly condition, and not as the earthly Speaker. It is impossible to think of the Saviour as dead and alive at the same time (Rev. 1: 18). Eucharistic doctrine developed from the "Mysteries" is accountable for such dilemmas.

That the mediaeval idea of eating a Divine being ("Theophagy"), to which official Catholicism still adheres, was a survival of pagan thought (Reinach, p. 26) seems to be undeniable. The attempt made, even by some Protestant "critics," to saddle it on the Gospels, must ever be resisted. Bousset, indeed, has to own (on 1 Cor. 10: 22) that, however it may have been in the hands of Paul, in the Gospels there is not the least tendency to sacramentalism discernible. It behoves every Christian to view the rite as it came from the Lord's own lips. The Apostle cites, and does not enlarge upon, His words when 1 Cor. 11: 27-29 is rightly understood.

540 "This do in remembrance of Me." As to the omission of these words, with the rest of verse 19 after "body" and the whole of verse 20 in the "Western" text, see, besides references in critical footnote, Zahn, "Introduction," ii. 357-359 (German edition).

For memorial before God, see Lev. 24: 7, etc., with which compare 1 Cor. 11: 26, as to the voice of this ordinance to men in general.

Luke's words, "this cup . . . shed," it will be found, combine those of Matthew, Mark, and Paul. It is because of their special relation to the Apostle's statement in 1 Cor. 11: 24 that some suppose there is an interpolation in Luke's text. Yet it is Codex D in particular, elsewhere prone to harmonize, which omits them. The effect of supposing interference with the Evangelist's primitive text is, of course, questioning, so far as the Gospel records are concerned, that the Lord Himself instituted the ecclesiastical "Breaking of Bread" (Acts 2: 42, 46) as a permanent rite; for it is in the Third Gospel alone that the words "Do this, etc.," appear. As confirming their rejection of the ordinance, "Friends" naturally hail this view (see *British Friend*, 1908), represented by writers such as Jülicher (Essay, 1892) in Germany, Gardner ("The Origin of the Lord's Supper," 1893) in England, and McGiffert in America. The last-named scholar remarks: "Expecting to return at an early day (Mark 14: 25), Jesus can hardly have been solicitous to provide for the preservation of His memory" ("Apostolic Age," p. 69). The assumption here expressed has already been dealt with in note 524. Reference might further be made to Sanday, art. "Jesus Christ," in Hastings' "Dict. of the Bible," vol. ii., p. 638).

Paul says that he "received of the Lord" the account which he gives, covering the injunction.

Although Sir W. M. Ramsay does not seem right in treating the Apostle's statement as meaning that the record contained in 1 Corinthians had been handed down to Paul by tradition (*Expository Times*, April, 1908, p. 296 *f.*), the Church must have had a true instinct in continued observance of the Supper, which forms part of the historical evidence of the Faith; but the way in which the "Holy Communion" has been used as an instrument of oppression has doubtless counteracted its function in this respect, so great has been the corruption or defacement by which it is marred. Happily, the day is fast running out when men, because of doctrinal differences, hesitate to partake in common of these symbols of love and unity, so much needed for the realization of our Lord's High-priestly Prayer. *Cf.* note on John 17: 21.

541 For *wine* as a figure of *blood*, Tertullian (*loc. cit.*) refers to Isa. 63: 1 and Gen. 49: 11.

In Heb. 10: 19 we have the "blood of Jesus": in 1 Peter 1: 19, "the blood of Christ" in 1 John 1: 7, the "blood of Jesus Christ." What "higher criticism" is sufficient for these things?

Albert Ritschl, by whom many living German theologians have been influenced, in his work on "Justification and Reconciliation" (vol. iii., p. 568, of E. T.), has expressed repugnance to such hymns, dear to every spiritual mind, as the notable one by Bernard of Clairvaux (Trench, "Sacred Latin Poetry," p. 139 *ff.*; *cf.* "Hymns Ancient and Modern," No. 111); and, in his "History of Pietism," of the like compositions of Paul Gerhardt (see "Lyra Germanica," Newnes' ed., pp. 60-63), which visualized the bleeding Saviour on the Cross for the comfort of the dying, but are often discredited as voicing unpopular "blood theology." Nevertheless, in his own last hours, the Göttingen professor requested his son to recite to him Gerhardt's soul-stirring lines (Gerok's edition, p. 63), not excepting certain verses which, in his writings, he had singled out for animadversion.

As to redemptive significance of the Death of Christ, see recent works of the Scottish professors Stalker and Denney; also articles in Hastings' one vol. Bible Dictionary on Atonement, Mediation, Redemption, and Salvation, all by Prof. Orr. The late Dr. N. M. Adler, British Chief Rabbi, stated that "For the modern Jew there is no Atonement. . . . He believes that he obtains forgiveness simply by repentance"; and he went on to quote Ex. 32: 30, maintaining that Jehovah's answer there shows that He did not accept the idea of Atonement.

542 Stalker has happily remarked: "The essence of this ordinance is . . . God giving Himself to man, and man giving Himself to God" (p. 193). *Cf.* Jer. 31: 33.

As to remission of sins (Matt. 26: 28), see note below on Luke 24: 47, and as to the word "covenant," note 149 on Mark, besides papers of Carr in the *Expositor*.

Luke 22: 23 shows that Judas partook of the Supper.

543 Luke 22: 24. — "Should be held": American Revv., "Was accounted." The order here is peculiar to Luke. According to his Gospel, the disciples must have had this contention twice over: see 9: 46. In the shibboleth of critics, it is a "doublet."

544 Luke 22: 25. — Such were Philip of Macedon and Alexander "the Great," Ptolemy III. and Antigonus.

545 Luke 22: 28. — "Temptations," *e.g.*, such as described in John 6: 15. Our blessed Lord was ever sinless: 1 John 3: 5.

546 Luke 22: 29 *f.* — "I appoint," διατίθεμαι. Not "I bequeath": *cf.* Jer. 31: 31 in the LXX. Wills are believed to have been unknown to the Jews at the time the Gospel of Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 9: 15 *f.*) were first circulated. *Cf.* paper of Carr in *Expositor*, April, 1909.

We have here a New Testament version of the "Messianic banquet" in Isa. 45: 6, Isa. 49: 12. Cf. Luke 13: 28 *f.*; in connection, not merely with the Passover celebration, but with the institution of "Breaking of Bread." It sets before us "the time of Regeneration," spoken of in Matt. 19: 28 (the "restoration" of Acts 3: 21). To it refer the words, "Many are called, but few chosen" (Matt. 22: 14, *cf.* 20: 16), with which contrast the statement of Rev. 7: 9.

Wellhausen's comment on βασιλεία, first without and then accompanied by the article, is that the one expresses "sovereignty," the other the "Kingdom." But what about Rev. 1: 6?

A leading idea of all Millenarians may be expressed in the words of one amongst the Germans: "The whole congregation of the faithful rule and judge mankind for 1,000 years" (Hofmann, "Prophecy and Fulfilment," ii. 373).

The *future* aspect of the Kingdom comes out conspicuously in this last reference to it in our Gospel. It is this dominating aspect to which recent German literature (surveyed by Schweitzer) has been addressed. Thus Wernle speaks of "the centre of gravity of the Christian faith transferred to its Eschatology" ("Beginnings," i. 140). Schweitzer's own position is preposterous: the Lord died, he says, for the Apocalyptic idea, but by His death sounded its death-knell! Facts, however, are still more stubborn than theories: and the fact here is that, "not only in later Jewish and early Christian history, but right down through the Middle Ages, Apocalyptic Eschatology has been a constantly recurring phenomenon" (B. H. Streeter, in *Interpreter*, Oct., 1911, p. 38). The topic, nevertheless, has been until recently much more cultivated in this country than in Germany, where the influence of Bengel was largely ephemeral, and scarcely revived by such as Auberlen in the nineteenth century. Cf. note 282.

As for the relation of the Second Coming of Christ to the Kingdom, with the exception of Origen and the few who rejected the "Apocalypse" as apostolic, all primitive expositors — Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus, etc. — were premillenarians; that is, held that the Lord's Second Advent will precede the Millennium: see Gibbon, "Decline and Fall, etc.," chapter 15, comparing Elliott, "Horae Apocalypticae," iv p. 310. "The expectation," remarks Wernle, "of the Kingdom of God upon earth and of the resurrection of the dead, the two thoughts least Greek in character, stand at the centre of the *Christian Hope*." To this the same writer devotes his chapter 13. "Even so educated a Christian as Justin," he says, "was a convinced Millenarian. The process of Hellenization set in about the end of the second century" (ii., p. 133), that is, in Origen's youth. Augustine did the disservice of following in the wake of the allegorizing of that erratic theologian: see the celebrated Latin Father's "City of God," in particular book x., §7. Gibbon observes that "*Agreement of the Fathers* went by the board;" that the Apocalyptic Kingdom "came to be treated as the invention of heresy and fanaticism." J. H. Newman, naturally, in his Oxford sermons, through his, incipient Catholicism — that farrago of ideas — discredited the Patristic Millennium indiscriminately. And so Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, in his "Lectures on the Apocalypse" (1848), as to whose views see criticism by B. W. Newton in "Aids to Prophetic Inquiry," pp. 310-386 (3rd ed., 1881). The darkening of counsel seems complete when an esteemed writer like the Protestant Bishop Martensen is found attaching a symbolic meaning, derived from 2 Peter 3: 8, to the "thousand years" of Rev. 20: 4.

On the other hand, leading expositors of such different schools as Godet, Alford, Sadler, and W. H. Simcox have resolutely maintained that there can be no honest escape from the conclusion that the classical passage of the Apocalypse shows a thousand years' reign of Christ upon earth (*pace* Kennett, in *Interpreter*: see note 509). "The plain meaning of the words," says Simcox, "is that after the overthrow of Antichrist the martyrs and other most excellent saints will rise from the dead; the rest of the dead, even those finally saved, will not rise till later. But at last, after the Millennium, and after the

last short-lived assault of Satan, all the dead, good and wicked, will arise" ("Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges: The Revelation of St. John the Divine," Appendix, p. 237). The belief of W. Kelly — founded upon a now much-received interpretation of 1 Thess. 4: 13 *ff.* — diverged from this statement so far as to view *all* "saints" as rising *before* the ἐπιφάνεια of the παρουσία (see note 524), and so, before the revelation of Antichrist (2 Thess. 2: 8); and, further, to see *only the wicked* dead in those standing before the "Great White Throne" of Rev. 20: 11-15. *Cf.* his last "Exposition of the Revelation" (3rd ed., 1904). Simcox continues: "Any view but the literal seems exposed to insuperable exegetical difficulties. If the true sense be not the literal one, it is safest to regard it as being as yet undiscovered." To realise the force of these words one has only to study the later expositions of the Apocalypse by Bousset and J. Weiss, partly on the lines laid down by Gunkel, who plumes himself on having "discovered" by critical acumen the clue to that book in Babylonian mythology! A humiliating circumstance here is, that this grotesque theory has been acclaimed by some in England.

The Kingdom in its *present* aspect has been discussed from various points of view, in England by Whately, Maurice, Seeley, Bruce, Horton, etc.; in America by Stevens and others; and in Germany by writers of the Ritschlian school, so ably represented by Harnack. Its *eschatological* character has been taken up also by, amongst others, the last-named scholar in the "Encyclopaedia Biblica," and during recent years in this country by Charles.

547 Luke 22: 31 *f.* — "Has begged," etc. The ἐκ of ἐξητήσατο denotes vehemence, importunity. See, however, Field's note, and Burton, § 35.

548 "When once turned back," ἐπιστρέψας. *Cf.* the LXX. at Ps. 51: 13, ἐπιστρέψουσι, for Hebrew *yashubu*, "shall return," and P. B. version of Ps. 23: 3, "He shall convert my soul." See also Field *ad loc.* on the present passage, as to "convert" (act.) and "conversion" on man's part, which answers to God's grace in quickening — to regeneration as used conventionally in the sense of being "born again." The learned writer of "*Otium Norvicense*" would, of course, not have questioned the Psalmist's "Turn us again," which has doubtless given rise, since the days of Wesley, to the now current use of the word "conversion."

Dr. Arnold has preached from this passage, on Conversion ("Sermons," iii., 173).

549 With verse 32 *cf.* 1 Peter 1: 17, 1 John 2: 1, each time "the Father," before whom the Advocate pleads.

Reference should here be made to the Catholic Catechism, No. 91.

550 Luke 22: 34. — "Peter." *Cf.* verse 31, "Simon." Wellhausen "cannot see" any reason for the change. Was it not now to say, Strong as he was (Matt. 18: 18) he needed reminding of his weakness? (Farrar, apparently after Godet).

As to the σήμερον here, see notes 142, 151 on Mark (14: 30). Matthew and Mark give the prediction as if said on the way to Gethsemane; Luke and John as though pronounced in the upper room; so that it is probably referable to both connections divisibly, to which the account of Matthew and Mark itself lends support. The added assurance of the other disciples, uttered with raised voice, could scarcely have been given in *public*.

551 Luke 22: 35. — "Without purse," etc., words used to the Seventy (Luke 10: 4).

552 Luke 22: 37. — "Have an end." Field: "are being fulfilled." The quotation is from the Hebrew.

553 Luke 22: 38. — For the idea of "saying no more about it," *cf.* Deut. 3: 26.

Upon the words of this verse was founded the Bull of Pope Boniface VIII. ("Unam Sanctam") — the two swords, spiritual and civil.

554 Luke 22: 39-46. — This section definitely introduces the last day (Friday) of the Lord's life on earth.

The AGONY. *Cf.* John 12: 27, as of course the parallels in Matthew and Mark. Pfeiderer speaks of "The preceding predictions of passion, death, and resurrection of Jesus" being "not historical; otherwise the struggle in Gethsemane could not have taken place" (i., p. 389). But Fairbairn: "Few incidents have been more utterly misunderstood than this. . . . The antecedent of the agony was not the idea of death, but the feeling as to its means and agents" (*op. cit.*, pp. 426-431). *Cf.* note 152 on Mark.

A difficulty has been manufactured out of no man hearing the utterances of the Lord on this occasion. As to such objections, see note on the Temptation.

555 Luke 22: 42. — Observe that our Lord says, "Father"; on the Cross, "My God" (Matt. 27: 46: *cf.* Ps. 40: 8).

556 Luke 22: 43 *f.* — The Gospel of Peter (Docetic) says that JESUS on the Cross "held His peace, as in nowise having pain"! (Orr, "New Testament Apocryphal Writings," p. 73). On Divine suffering, Caird has said: "Separation of Divine from human acts and experiences is really the dissolving or rending in twain of the unity of Christ's person and life. It virtually asserts that He was not always, throughout His whole life, the God-Man, but only now the God, and now the man," etc. Again: "Incapacity to suffer is not a sign of largeness, but of littleness" (Gifford "Lectures," vol. ii., pp. 108, 142).

We meet here with an experience of the "reasonable soul" of our Lord. *Cf.* Matt. 26: 38; John 12: 27.

Conflict, ἀγωνία, an "agony of fear" (Field). Burgon has referred to Ps. 55: 4-6.

"Appeared," ὤφθη: *cf.* 1 Tim. 3: 16.

557 As to doctrinal repugnance to the admission of such records into Scripture, Plummer writes, "There is not any tangible evidence for the excision of a considerable portion of narrative for doctrinal reasons at any period of textual history." It is, however, just such evidence which resists detection and is difficult to obtain: repugnance works silently as well as ostensibly.

558 Luke 22: 45. — There are two distinct words for "sleep" used in this verse, κοιμᾶσθαι (as in 1 Thess. 4: 13 *f.*) and καθεύδειν (as in 1 Thess. 5: 6, 7, 10). Two distinct classes of mankind are concerned in these chapters of 1 Thessalonians.

558a Luke 22: 47 *f.* — Tholuck has preached on these verses.

558b Luke 22: 50. — *Cf.* John 18: 10. "Suffer thus far" would be said to the soldiers.

559 Luke 22: 52. — "Chief priests," it will be observed, is peculiar to Luke's account.

"Power." The Greek is ἐξουσία, "authority."

For hands not being laid on the Lord until His voluntary submission, *cf.* John 8: 20.

560 Luke 22: 54-60. — *Cf.* John 18: 12-18, the informal investigation before Annas. For "laid hold on Him," *cf.* Acts 2: 23.

561 Luke 22: 58. — Luke: a man, the second time; Matthew, "another maid." See note 156 on Mark, in which Gospel the two other accounts coalesce. There is a helpful analysis of Peter's denials in Stuart, pp. 269, 271.

562 Luke 22: 61-65. — The Lord is here before Caiaphas and a committee of the Sanhedrin (John 18: 24; Mark 14: 55-65; Matt. 26: 59-68).

"The Lord turned," peculiar to this Gospel.

"Looked," *i.e.*, fixedly, is a form of ἐμβλέπω, used in John 1: 42 of the Lord's gaze then at Peter, as already of the Baptist's at Himself (verse 36).

563 Luke 22: 62. — "Wept," or "sobbed," ἔκλαυσεν.

564 Luke 22: 65-71. — This is the third trial, before the *whole* Sanhedrin (Matt. 27: 1; Mark 15: 1), merging in appearance before Pilate, 23: 1.

*Cf.* John 18: 13, which is accounted for by Luke's record — an interval between the arrest and the Council's meeting.

Fairbairn: "The *elders* are Israel as a State; the *chief priests*, Israel as a Church; the *scribes*, Israel as possessed of the oracles of God" (*op. cit.*, p. 398).

"Ye say that I am." American Revv., "Ye say (it) because I am."

565 Luke 22: 67-70. — See note 154 on Mark. In each of the Synoptics is brought out the contrast between "the Christ" of the high priest and "the Son of Man" in the Lord's answer. *Cf.* note 127.

With verse 69 *cf.* Ps. 80: 17.

For the now ordinary Jewish idea of Messiah, see Montefiore, vol. i. pp. 50, 100 *f.*

## NOTES ON THE TWENTY-THIRD CHAPTER.

566 Luke 23: 3. — See 1 Tim. 6: 13.

567 Luke 23: 4. — "Find." For this forensic use, still preserved, *cf.* 2 Cor. 5: 3, Phil. 3: 9, 2 Peter 3: 14. For the examination before Pilate *in extenso*, see John 18: 33 *ff.* For the travesty of justice by which it was throughout marked, see Rosadi, "The Trial of Jesus" (E. T. from third Italian edition).

568 Luke 23: 5. — "All Judea, etc." See note on Luke 4: 44.

569 Luke 23: 6 *ff.* — Against the impeachment of this section by critics (*e.g.* O. Holtzmann, p. 482, Schmiedel, § 108, col. 1840), Burkitt's defence, "attested by Gospel of Peter," may well qualify by *quantum valeat* (p. 138).

A difficulty has been raised as to the Crucifixion being as early as 9 A.M. (Mark 15: 25), in the light of Luke's statement here. But *cf.* John 18: 28: "it was early," when the Lord was led into the Praetorium (palace), which may quite well have been by 6 A.M. The distance traversed and retraversed between the residences of Pilate and Herod would be short. The historicity of this section needs for its support no such assumptions as those of Verrall (*The Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1909, pp. 321-353).

As to Luke's source of information, *cf.* note 4F. He is as familiar with the doings of Agrippa in Acts 12: 20, Acts 13: 1, as here with those of Antipas.

For the technical term rendered here and in verse 17, "remitted," *cf.* Acts 25: 21, where it is used again.

570 Luke 23: 11. — The word λαμπρός is strictly "white"; and to this incident is attributed the use of the vestment called "alb."

571 Luke 23: 12. — With regard to the treatment by textual critics of verses 10-12, it may be said that, what with Tischendorf's fondness for , Hort's partiality to "B," and Wellhausen's being wedded to Syrsin, something further is needed as determinative beyond "diplomatic" evidence, reinforced as that may be by "historical" or "critical acumen" enlisted in the service of irreconcilable views.

572 *Cf.* Acts 4: 27.

573 Luke 23: 22.- *Cf.* veres 4 and 15. By Roman Law the Procurator ought not to have entertained the second, to say nothing of the third, trial.

574 Luke 23: 23. — "Urgent": so American Revv. *Cf.* Ps. 12: 4.

575 Luke 23: 25. — Wellhausen can but speak of "indiscoverable reasons." J. Weiss, however, notes Luke's also forbearing to record the soldier's completion of the crucifixion: the Evangelist clearly meant to attach the blame to the Jews.

"Pilate" is included in Whyte's "Bible Characters," LXXXIV.

576 Luke 23: 26. — "Cyrene," the modern Tripoli. *Cf.* Acts 6: 9. Observe how Luke's account brings together John's statement and that of Matthew and Mark. The Lord must alone have borne the cross until relieved of some portion of it by Simon.

577 Luke 23: 28-30. — *Cf.* Rev. 6: 12, 15 *f.* Stier calls this the first part of the Lord's Passion Sermon; the remainder is, of course, the seven words from the Cross, beginning with that in verse 34, where see note.

578 Luke 23: 31. — *Cf.* Ps. 1: 4. The explanation of "green" and "dry" is that long ago given by Theophylact (*cf.* Farrar).

See Tholuck's Sermon on verses 26-31 ("Light from the Cross," p. 100), and Dr. Arnold's from verse 30.

579 Luke 23: 32. — Some copies alter the order, but the punctuation of A.V. is right from every point of view.

580 "Skull," *i.e.*, *Golgotha* a name avoided, as Gethsemane, etc., in view of Gentile readers. "Calvary" of A.V. is from the Latin Vulgate.

581 Luke 23: 34. — This saying of course fulfils the last clause of Isa. 53: 12. *Cf.* 1 Tim. 1: 13. The other utterances from the Cross are: (2) in verse 43 here; (3) in John 19: 26; (4) in Mark 15: 34; (5) in John 19: 28; (6) in John 19: 30; and (7) in verse 46 here.

On the reading, see Blass, "Philology of the Gospels," p. 71.

582 The suggestion of O. Holtzmann and others that the words in Matt. 27: 46, as in Mark 15: 34, had by the time Luke wrote come to be regarded as derogatory to the Son of God, is in the usual strain of "critical" nescience.

One has but to compare Luke 20: 17 with the scope of quotation from Ps. 118 in Matthew and Mark, to see, as often elsewhere in this Gospel, how Luke condenses his record. That which is of chief

importance is that it was to God as such, and not from the standpoint of John 3: 14 *ff.*, that the cry "with a loud voice" (verse 46) went up. *Cf.* note 587.

Tholuck has preached on verses 33-35 (p. 203).

583 Luke 23: 38. — "The King of the Jews, this!" For the tone of contempt, which finds suited expression in Luke, *cf.* Isa. 53: 3.

As to the various forms of inscription recorded by the Evangelists, see Stuart, pp. 283-285, comparing note 349 on John. The Lord here acts as King; before as Prophet (verse 28), and then as Priest (verse 34). *Cf.* Maclaren, ii., p. 307.

584 Luke 23: 42 *f.* — As to this robber's probable acquaintance with the Lord's predictions, see Meyer *in loc.* "The Penitent Thief" is one of Whyte's "Bible Characters," No. LXXXVII.

Wellhausen treats the εἰς in "B" (R.V. margin, "into") as "a very bad correction."

585 Luke 23: 43. — "Verily." For this form of emphatic announcement, *cf.* Luke 2: 24, Luke 12: 37, Luke 18: 17, 29, Luke 21: 32.

"Today shalt thou be, etc." Or, "I say to thee today, thou shalt be, etc." (Whately and others). This alternative is rejected by Alford, but favoured, it would seem, by B. W. Newton, in his note on the Locality of Hades ("Remarks on Mosaic Cosmogony," p. 85), who points out the advantage such punctuation affords in meeting the difficulty which some feel in respect of the present passage, and refers to the bearing of John 3: 13 on the Paradise question (*infra*).

Syrstin has an interesting addition: the impenitent robber had here said, "Save thyself alive *today* and us."

"With Me": Plummer, "Not merely in My company (σὺν ἐμοί), but sharing with Me (μετ' ἐμοῦ). The promise implies continuance of consciousness after death."

"PARADISE" (*cf.* note on Luke 16: 22). Or, as Continental versions, "the Paradise."

The Expositor's view, that by this is meant the heavenly Paradise, is taken also by B. W. Newton, B. Weiss, and others. It will be observed that W. Kelly (as Delitzsch, "Biblical Psychology," p. 497, and Beck of Tübingen, "The Logic of Christian Doctrine," p. 526) held that our Lord's human spirit did not pass, as say the Apostles' and Athanasian Creeds, into *Hades* ("Hell"); and this notwithstanding Acts 2: 27, where the Revv. have preserved "in." His conviction was that εἰς there should have been rendered "to," as the corresponding Hebrew preposition in Ps. 16: 10, the Apostle's citation. It is fair, however, to note that the same Hebrew occurs in Job 39: 14, and is there rendered "on," in parallelism with "in." Others regard "to" in the Psalm as equivalent to "in."

The usual belief is founded on such passages as Matt. 12: 40 (the Lord's *soul*), Rom. 10: 7 and Eph. 4: 9.

The Expositor, as B. W. Newton, has taken sides against the early "Fathers," according to whose view, the separate state of all the blessed dead is referable to *Hades*; and has thus agreed with the Westminster Divines (note 417).

At the Reformation there was a recoil, emphasized by the Puritans of the next century, from mediaeval ideas in general; and so, not only from such conceptions as Gregory's purgatorial suffering, but from the interpretation of passages like Phil. 1: 6, considered by many still to indicate continued sanctification after death for the perfect state of Heaven (*cf.* Heb. 12: 23), right on "to the day of Christ!" This does not, however, seem to be the Apostle's real meaning.

Such words as Paul's in Eph. 2: 6 dispose some to the view taken in the Exposition; whilst others emphasize the difference between the "*Sheol*" of the Old Testament, regarded as a "prison," a scene of "gloom," and the condition of *comfort* presented in Luke 16: 25, — the "unseen" world as brightened by the enjoyment, in rest, of Christ's presence as Divine Redeemer (Ps. 139: 8, Eph. 4: 10, 2 Cor. 5: 8, Phil. 1: 23). They likewise experience difficulty in conceiving that *any* could be set before the βῆμα of Christ (2 Cor. 5: 10) — yet *all* are to be "manifested" there — if the "Catholic" interpretation be really correct of the opening verses of the chapter concerned (see Explanatory Catechism, No. 102), as of Rev. 2: 7, according to which a select company of believers go straight to heaven on death; or the view of Weymouth, that those do so "who resemble in character and watchfulness the Wise Virgins."

That the "Beatific Vision" ("Explan. Catech." 132) will be finally realized by *all* the redeemed, is common ground (Rev. 22: 4). Holy Scripture, however, nowhere speaks, as do the Roman Catechism (No. 104) and some Protestant hymns, of any disembodied spirits as already "glorified." For that, resumption of the body will be needed (Phil. 3: 21).

By "dead in Christ" (1 Thess. 4: 16) must be meant the whole person of each (1 Thess. 5: 23). Resurrection, not death, is the hope of the Christian (2 Cor. 5: 4: *cf.* Matt. 16: 18 and 1 Cor. 15: 55, which are future).

Tholuck and Newman Hall have preached on verses 39-43.

586 Luke 23: 44 *ff.* — Under normal conditions there could be no eclipse of the sun at the season of full moon: hence the solemnity of the darkness. *Cf.* Jer. 23: 20 *ff.*, Ps. 89: 36 *ff.*

Montefiore (after others, see note 582) observes that "the cry of forsakenness was inconceivable to" Luke (verse 46). But — as he himself says elsewhere of a remark of J. Weiss — how does he know that? No one pretends that the quotation from Ps. 31 is a "substitute" for the earlier quotation from Ps. 22. Luke's is *added* detail: recovery of sense of Divine Sonship when, according to the last of the records, from the remembrance of an eye-witness, JESUS could exclaim, "It is finished" (John 19: 30).

587 The Lord's death, according to the view of Wieseler, Schürer, and Salmon, was on the 7th April, A.D. 30. "Christ our Passover was sacrificed" (1 Cor. 5: 7), at the hour of the evening sacrifice, "between the two evenings" (Ex. 12: 6), which may mean between the beginning of Friday (our Thursday) evening and the beginning of Saturday (our Friday) evening. See next note.

See Tholuck's Sermon on verses 46-48.

588 Luke 23: 54. — The "Preparation" (παρασκευή) is synonymous with the "eve" of the Passover, "by which the time from the evening of the 14th to that of the 15th Nisan is always described in Jewish writings" (Edersheim, "The Temple," etc.: p. 220 *f.*). It came to designate the Christian's Friday.

The word ἐπέφωσκε. Montefiore connects with the kindling of the "Sabbath lights" at the Jewish opening of that day.

*Cf.* note 531, and see Mark 15: 42, John 19: 31, 42, with notes thereon.

## NOTES ON THE TWENTY-FOURTH CHAPTER.

589 The RESURRECTION (*cf.* notes 167 on Mark, 356 on John). Besides the parallels set out in margin of the Exposition, see 1 Cor. 15: 4. Before entering on details in Luke *seriatim*, it may be well

to prefix some general remarks on the attitude of criticism towards this cardinal article of the Christian Faith.

The Evangelists' joint record is impeached in five particulars: in respect of (1) time, (2) the number of women, (3) the appearance of angels, (4) their instructions to the women, and (5) the scene of the Lord's appearances (Selbie, p. 148).

A. The so-called "discrepancies" are primarily of a *forensic* nature, calling for skill in their investigation such as is possessed by lawyers, habitually concerned with weighing evidence, in which shine few merely literary critics, the trained intelligence of whom is of another order (see note 15 on Mark). Here these are really in no better position than readers of ordinary culture, belonging to the class from which a "petty" jury is empanelled, who in marshalling the whole of the evidence, may be aided by the professional experience of the court, but have to decide upon it for themselves, and are generally right. Many Biblical critics affect to do the work of a "grand" jury, which, after all, is only preliminary to the *thorough* investigation of the case falling to the less pretentious functionaries, to whose judgment the τεκμήρια (Acts 1: 3) are submitted.

(1) See note 167 on Mark, third paragraph. (2) *Ibid.*, fifth paragraph. (3) See note below on verse 4. (4) See note 167 on Mark, as for No. 2. (5) See note 167*a* on Mark.

B. The *historical* critic comes on the scene to have his say about the alleged "legendary" matter in the record. The most imposing figure here in critical literature for several years was D. F. Strauss. He propounded an idea, inconvenient for those who were to follow him in the same line of attack, that "no one of the narrators knew and presupposed what another records" ("Life of Jesus," iii. p. 344). The French writer Loisy applies his ability to this department of criticism: and Lake, an English clergyman, now holding a congenial chair at Leiden, has issued a volume grounded on the fact, which no one has ever disputed, that there was no human witness of the *act* of bodily resurrection: *history* takes no cognizance of that which is solely a Christian belief founded on dogmatic reasoning. *Cf.* his letter to the *Guardian* of 29th Sept., 1911. His position is: "The actual resurrection of the Lord was not from Joseph of Arimathea's sepulchre, but from the body which He left hanging on the Cross." But, from the historical point of view, such a belief can only be subjective: there was no human witness of any such resurrection as that either. Those who believe in Christ's *physical* resurrection are, from the same point of view, in no weaker position.

Harnack has provided his Berlin hearers and his readers everywhere with a conundrum: "We must hold the Easter faith even without the Easter message" ("The Essence of Christianity," p. 163). But Rom. 10: 17 stands in the way of this (*cf.* note 614 below).

Allies of these writers are those who engage in "psychical research": see, *e.g.*, the work of Dr. James H. Hyslop bearing on the Resurrection. *Cf.* further, art. in *Interpreter*, April, 1910, "Psychology and the Resurrection," for the bearing of sub-consciousness on the disciples' experience (*cf.* note 614 below).

C. Finally, the *textual* critic presents himself, whose business is to investigate the "growth" of the text in each case, and determine "accretions," if any. This part of the case finds notable illustration in the disputed verses at the end of Mark's Gospel (note 168 there) — the supposed earliest record, subsequent, as generally admitted, to the circulation of Paul's greater epistles (*e.g.*, 1 Corinthians and Romans).

The foot-notes in the present volume exhibit the textual phenomena of the Gospel with which it is concerned.

In addition to the literature named in note 356 on John, mention should be made here of Bishop Westcott's posthumous "Gospel according to St. John," pp. 334-336, and of Professor Orr's valuable recent work on the Resurrection. Dr. Jas. Drummond treats of the Resurrection from a Unitarian point of view in pp. 30-37 of his pamphlet, already referred to, on "The Miraculous in Christianity."

590 Luke 24: 1. — According to Westcott's arrangement, that which is recorded here was preceded by the events narrated in John 20: 1, Mark 16: 1, 2, 5, etc., Matt. 28: 5.

Loisy goes out of his way to criticize Luke's statement with regard to the spices as if too late to be of use — which is unaccountable save as careless comment. It is a question of *further* embalment, Nicodemus having provided and employed spices already at the time of burial (John 19: 39 *f.*).

591 Luke 24: 2. — "The stone rolled away." Luke, according to a peculiarity of his record, has not previously mentioned this stone. *Cf.* note on Luke 4: 23.

592 Luke 24: 3. — "The Lord Jesus": as Acts 1: 21. See textual footnote. Hort says that "Lord Jesus" is not found in the genuine text of the Gospels, but for this he has to discredit "B" itself. The exegetical insight of Weiss keeps the German critic right in this place.

For "the body of Jesus," see Luke 23: 52.

593 Luke 24: 4. — Observe that the second company of women spoken of here (*cf.* John) see two angels, while an early company have seen only one. *Cf.* note on Mark 16: 1, *ad fin.*

The caustic words quoted by van Oosterzee of the great Lessing, whose memory all Germans delight to honour, might be commended to the younger men of the Theological Faculties at the present day, some of whom represent the class that the editor of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments had in mind. The appeals to "cold discrepancy-mongers" who cannot see that "the Evangelists did not count the angels," that "the neighbourhood of the sepulchre swarmed with them." Such are words of a man all of whose predilections were on the side of DOUBT.

594 Luke 24: 6 *f.* — The angel that Matthew and Mark speak of recalled to the women there concerned the words of the Lord to His disciples as to His appearances in Galilee. This has been passed over by Luke, because his record is designedly limited to the Judean connection and resists all imputation of inconsistency.

595 Luke 24: 7. — Wesley notes how the Lord Himself (see verse 26 of this chapter) did not use the title "Son of Man" after His resurrection.

596 Luke 24: 9. — "Related," etc. See note on Mark 16: 8, as to "said nothing to any one" in that Gospel.

597 Luke 24: 10. — "Mary Magdalene ": see John 20: 2.

"The other women," as Salome (Mark 16: 1).

598 Luke 24: 11. — "An idle tale." Sir O. Lodge adopts the language, now familiar, of others in describing the women's narrative as "legend" ("Man and the Universe," p. 274). It is noticeable that the disciples themselves anticipated the nineteenth century phraseology by calling their report λῆρος, fable; but those honest men had soon to cross the Rubicon, pull down bridges and burn boats.

This seems to be antecedent to John 20: 3.

599 Luke 24: 12. — John 20: 5 speaks of Peter's *first* visit, accompanied by "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Luke is speaking of the *second*, solitary visit, resulting from the report of the angels'

words. On returning from this later visit, Peter met the Lord: to this the Evangelist refers in verse 34.

For the relation of Luke's to the fourth record, *cf.* further John 20: 10.

Here the thread of Luke's, as of Matthew's record diverges from that of Mark, and remains distinct to the end.

600 Luke 24: 13 *ff.* — Those following Westcott's arrangement will regard this as the third appearance (*cf.* Mark 16: 12), the two earlier being: (1) to Mary Magdalene (John 20: 14-18, Mark 16: 9) and (2) to the other women (Matt. 28: 9, etc.). But it may have been preceded by that in verse 34: *cf.* consecutive use of εἶτα and ἔπειτα in 1 Cor. 15: 5 *f.*, and, in reverse order, in verse 23 *f.* there. Critics, one after another, emphasize Paul's as the earliest account, which says nothing about women (1 Cor. 15: 5-8). But he is equally silent on what is recorded in these verses.

In verse 16, "know" might be replaced by "recognize" (ἐπιγινῶναι); and so in verse 31.

601 Luke 24: 17. — Field has criticized the R.V. here ("Ot. Norvic.," iii., p. 60).

602 Luke 24: 18. — "Cleopas": not to be confounded, as by Alford, with Alphaeus. The name here is an abbreviation of Cleopater (Wellhausen). As to the belief that Luke himself was the other, see note 2; also paper of Carr in *Expositor.*, Feb., 1904.

602a "Thou sojournest alone," *i.e.*, "art the only sojourner who does not know."

603 Luke 24: 19. — "Was"; or, "proved," ἐγένετο.

604 Luke 24: 21. — "Hoped . . . redeem." This is opposed to a now current theory that it was only after His death the disciples regarded JESUS as Messiah. Even Wernle rejects that idea. *Cf.* Selbie, p. 97.

"Third day." Gunkel seeks to derive this from Babylonian or Orphic mythology; but see Orr, *Expositor*, October, 1908. As to Eastern method of reckoning time, see Khodadad, p. 15.

605 Luke 24: 24. — See verse 11 *f.*, and notes thereon.

606 Luke 24: 25. — The Apostles, notwithstanding what we are told in Luke 18: 31-33, had no effective expectation of the Resurrection of JESUS. The intended embalming by the women (verse 1: *cf.* Mark 16: 1 *f.*) supposes its impossibility.

"Senseless"; or "foolish" (ἀνόητοι); not "fools" (ἄφρονες, 11: 40), applied to scribes and Pharisees.

607 Luke 24: 26. — "Enter." See note 99 on Mark.

608 Luke 24: 27. — "From Moses and from all the prophets." Lindsay has a good note, working this out from each book of the Old Testament concerned; so also Neil. Richard Cecil said: "If we do not see the golden thread through all the Bible, marking out Christ, we read the Scripture without the King." So already Augustine: "The Old Testament has no true relish if Christ be not understood in it" (Ninth Tractate on John). *Cf.* 2 Cor. 3: 17, "the Lord is the spirit," and Col. 3: 16, "the word of the Christ." As a first aid to such study of the Scripture, book by book, one of the very best works of its kind is that by A. M. Hodgkin, "Christ in all the Scriptures" (2nd ed., 1908).

609 Luke 24: 29. — "Stay," A.V. "abide," which inspired Lyte's well-known hymn, "Abide with me."

See Pusey's Sermon, "How to detain Jesus in the Soul" (vol. i.), and Maclaren, p. 346 *ff.*

610 Luke 24: 30 *ff.* — As to use made of this by Roman writers for "Communion in one kind," see Wordsworth *in loc.*

For verse 32 (*cf.* verse 45), see Ps. 119: 130.

With verse 33, *cf.* John 20: 19 *f.*

611 Luke 24: 34. — (*Cf.* 1 Cor. 15: 5). This would, according to Westcott's arrangement, be regarded as the fourth appearance. But see note on verse 13. How can Bousset, who (on 1 Cor. 14: 5) says that Luke treats the appearance to Peter as before all others, make that square with 10 *f.* here?

Bishop McIlvaine has preached from this verse, and Principal Whyte's discourse, LXXXIX., in "Bible Characters," is on "Cleopas and his Companion."

612 Luke 24: 36. — *Cf.* Ps. 22: 22. The *fifth* appearance (Mark 16: 14, John 20: 19).

Augustine preached from this verse (1., p. 480).

613 Luke 24: 37. — *Cf.* John 20: 20 and note there.

613a Luke 24: 38. — "Reasonings." American Revv., "questionings."

614 Luke 24: 39 *ff.* — A difficulty has been made (see, *e.g.*, Loisy's last work, p. 772: *cf.* D. Smith, xl.) about the risen Lord's *eating*, founded on the assumption that His body was here already in a glorified condition. This does not seem to have come about fully until the Ascension, the body meanwhile undergoing gradual transformation.

With this incident *cf.*, of course, that recorded in Gen. 18: 7 *f.*

Selbie remarks that Paul cannot have held a material resurrection. But if he did not, 1 Cor. 15: 3, "buried," compared with verse 12, "from among [the] dead," becomes very difficult — surely impossible — to interpret. The Lord's *body* rose; His spirit or soul is not spoken of. *Cf.* Blass, "The Holy Scriptures and the Evangelical Church" (against Kalthoff). Again, Paul tells the Corinthians that there was no difference between what he and the other Apostles preached (verse 11).

The Apostle's real position is categorically stated in Col. 2: 9, Phil. 3: 21 and the Lord's *bodily* resurrection is clearly implied in Rom. 8: 11. *Cf.* 2 Tim. 2: 8, where, if JESUS was of the seed of David physically, and His body passed among the dead, to exclude this from the last part of the verse is scarcely "scientific."

615 Luke 24: 44-50. — The statement is often made that our Evangelist supposed the Lord ascended to heaven on the same day that He rose (verse 50). The one thing against that idea is that it is from Luke himself we learn that forty days intervened (Acts 1: 3); so of course some way out of the collapse of the supposed "discrepancy" has to be found, and this is the fancy that the Evangelist *later on* discovered more. Such triviality abounds in current literature.

*Cf.* Essay of Bishop Chase on the break between verse 45 and that immediately following. Verses 49 and 50 show a like break.

"Law of Moses . . . Psalms." *Cf.* Prologue to Ecclesiasticus. In Matt. 23: 35, the Lord refers to the first and the last books (Genesis, Chronicles) of the Hebrew Canon, by which we may gather that its limits were already fixed.

Luke 24: 45 *f.* — See John 20: 9, where Ps. 16: 10 (*cf.* Acts 2: 25 *ff.*) is probably the Scripture meant; see, however, also Hosea 6: 2 (Bousset on 1 Cor. 15: 4) and note 365.

Maclaren: "He led them to believe all that the prophets have spoken. That faith being effected, sight followed. The world says, Seeing is believing, but the converse is truer, believing is seeing" ("B. C. E.," p. 319).

616 "His obedience showed Him to be equal with God" (Chapman, "Choice Sayings," p. 23 f.).

Isaac Barrow has a sermon on verse 46 ("Works," v., 462).

617 Luke 24: 47. — See verse 33, "and those with them gathered together," and *cf.* John 20: 21-23, with Westcott's remarks on the commission being "to the entire society, and not confined to any particular group."

In assigning cause of the modern deficiency of candidates for "orders," it is usual to disguise the most potent of all, viz., the fact that men of spiritual zeal in every class of English society now "addict themselves" (1 Cor. 16: 15) to ministry of the Gospel and spare bishops their ordination: *cf.* 1 Cor. 9: 16. It is not such men who dally with higher criticism and the like, and if others refrain from ordination under its influence, that may be for the public good. The future of English Christianity is now very much in the hands of the "laity," so-called.

SIN, and its forgiveness. — This all-vital subject has only been touched on in note 147A (*cf.* note 284). For the Biblical definition of Sin as developed in the New Testament, see 1 John 3: 4 (R.V.). In v. 8 of this Gospel it appears as disease; in Luke 19:14 as rebellion. It is essentially *godlessness* (Dr. Chalmers, Bishop Gore, Prof. Orr). Rom. 1: 28 shows that it severs a link between the Creator and creature, who has a natural sense of guilt, illustrated by Luke's account of the Gentile Felix (Acts 24: 25).

Prof. Reinhold Seeberg of Berlin has recently described it as "the opposite of Faith and Love: Sin is faith in the world and love of the world" ("Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion," p. 179, E. T.). Thus in Luke 15: 12 we have in the "far country," the world and its service.

The present Bishop of Oxford has struck a true note when in his "Creed of the Christian" and some Oxford sermons he affirmed the great need in our day of reviving a just sense of the gravity, the solemnity of SIN. The eminent Unitarian, Dr. James Martineau, emphasized this already fifty years ago, in his "Studies of Christianity": "The nature of sin," he said, "is a matter on which we cannot be mistaken. . . . The conscious, free choice of the worse in presence of a better" (pp. 468-470).

The effect of Darwinian conceptions on modern views of Sin has been ably dealt with by Dr. E. Dennert, in a German pamphlet on *Darwinian Christianity* (p. 25 ff.).

Before the days of the Gospel, the earliest use made in still extant religious literature of what Gen. 3. sets before us, that is, the idea of the Fall, appears in Wisdom xi.: Inherited tendencies to evil, which Tennant, following in the wake of Ritschl, has challenged under the theological description — derived from Augustine — of "Original Sin" (Griffiths' "Essays for the Times," No. XII.). The most pronounced *Protestant* statement of it is that in the Westminster Confession (Shorter Catechism, Ans. to Q. 18), the antithesis of the idea of Rousseau, in the eighteenth century, and of Meng-tsé two thousand years earlier, that Man is naturally good: the Presbyterian Divines asserted his "total" depravity. This, rightly understood, means, as Orr ("Sidelights on Christian Doctrine," 1909) has pointed out, that every part of his being is impaired, not that he presents no fair exterior or exhibits no praiseworthy qualities (Mark 10: 21). These indeed exist, to obscure the presence of the evil principle within, which is, moreover, checked by force of conventionality or custom. Such qualities Calvin compares to "wine spoiled with the flavour of the cask." Nevertheless, Sir R. Anderson has remarked in his book, "The Bible or the Church?" "The truest test of a man is, not what he is, but what he would

wish to be" (p. 14). It remains sadly true, however, that "if a corruption of nature means anything at all, it means *the loss of free-will*" (Mozley).

Opposition to the Biblical concept of the moral ruin of man appears in interpretation of the Lord's teaching in this Gospel, from use made of the Parable of the Prodigal Son: see already note 389a *ff.* Now the apostle of Modern Culture was the "world-poet," *facile princeps* in German Literature. Wernle writes: "The aim of Jesus stands out in the sharpest contrast to the modern idea of culture, the free and full development of the individual personality we associate with the name of *Goethe*. We today count sin as a part of our development" ("Beginnings, etc.," p. 78). Here is one of the roots of the so-called "New Theology," popularized in England on the Holborn Viaduct, with "mistaken pursuit of good"; and in Russia, etc., by the writings of Leo Tolstoi. It is voiced by the poetry of Whittier:

"That to be saved is only this —  
Salvation from our selfishness."

On its highest plane, it is the programme of the "Ethical Societies," which seize the Christian idea of human solidarity for a use nowhere sanctioned by any words of the Lord. Nevertheless, the promoters of this movement are not to be ranked with the unhappy Nietzsche, who, not satisfied with calling SIN "a Jewish invention," could speak of "the salvation of the soul" as "the world revolving round me" — only confirming the prediction of the Apostle Jude in verses 14-16 of his Epistle. These heterogeneous elements working together must issue in manifestation of the "Man of Sin."

Any reader able to use a book in German should see the pamphlet on "Atonement," confuting the current academical view, by Dr. L. von Gerdell, who has the advantage of being neither a professor nor a pastor.

Universal experience attests the existence of what the Bible calls SIN, which Orr, with confirmation of Science, has called "racial," as recognizing the doctrine of heredity: this emphasizes the organic unity of the sons of men. With Bishop Gore it may be said that Sin is "not outgrown experience of history" (*op. cit.*, p. 19). "What we need today is some John the Baptist" (p. 44).

"It is only," writes Garvie, "in the contemplation of Sin's remedy that the sense of Sin's disease has been fully developed" ("The Gospel for Today," p. 94). On the subjective effect of the Cross, see *ibid.*, p. 123 *ff.*

As to Synoptic teaching on Sin, see Stalker, "Ethic of Jesus," chapter xi.; on Repentance, *ibid.*, chapter vii.

If the Gospel of LUKE evince the Lord's judgment of Man, as being what at different periods such as Augustine, Calvin, and Spurgeon or Moody have proclaimed, its testimony is unmistakable and clear as to the possibility of Forgiveness. With the present passage *cf.*, in particular, 11: 4. Martineau ("Hours of Thought," p. 110 *f.*) from the religions, Greg ("Creeds of Christendom"), Leslie Stephen ("Essays") and Miss Edith Simcox ("Essays") from the ethical, point of view have modernized the Stoic idea (as to which see Hatch, Hibbert Lectures, p. 159), that forgiveness of sins past is out of question. Thus the first-named distinguishes between "God's interior nature and His external government," and makes all hinge ultimately on government. "A mediator may renew my future, but he cannot change my past" ("Studies of Christianity," p. 476). Nobody, however, denies the principle stated in Gal. 6: 7; because Christians, Catholic and Evangelical alike, all in varying degrees, confess both Grace and Government, and maintain that each is *eternally* true. Government men can understand; but Grace, as revealed in the Bible, is beyond their thoughts (Rom. 11: 33, Eph. 3: 19): the

two principles find their reconciliation in the Deity of the Redeemer. For those who confess Christ not only as Lord but as GOD, it is impossible to occupy common ground with such as reject that belief.

Martineau further says: "Can the punishment precede the sin? You cannot fall, you cannot recover, by deputy" (*ibid.*, p. 475). The one difficulty is analogous to the principle of Rom. 3: 25, where forgiveness, in the inchoate form of "forbearance," anticipates Atonement, and that by virtue of the transcendency of the coming One, who should make propitiation for the world ("the same, yesterday, today and for ever"); whilst the other raises the question, "What is the true view of Substitution?" This latter process, as sometimes stated, is detached from the element of identification with Christ's death in Pauline teaching, thereby exposing the doctrine to reasonable objection. That "no merely external thing is done for" the believer (Dean of Westminster, at Church Congress, 1908), is assuredly true. All that is needed is for Christians to give practical expression to the truth of Rom. 6: 6, Gal. 2: 20, by their conduct, so silencing all cavil.

Ritschl held, after Luther, that the gift of Forgiveness "the individual appropriates to himself within the community" ("Justification and Reconciliation," p. 577, referring to Jer. 31: 31-34; Mark 14: 24). As some English followers have put it, "Salvation is in the Christian circle." But these would scarcely hear of Ritschl's tendency to subordinate Religion to Morality (see note 147B), as the supposed bond of society with God; and it is the scheme of that "Ethical Religion" (*ibid.*) which nowadays is by so many deemed an adequate expression of the Synoptic "Kingdom of God." His follower Harnack reproaches the Apostles for, as the Berlin luminary alleges, not preaching the "Kingdom" as Christ did, and for making Christ glorified their only theme. Some considerations explanatory of the seemingly diminished prominence of the Kingdom in the hands of the Apostles may be seen in Candlish, "The Kingdom of God," pp. 180-185; but it is hoped that notes on this subject in the present volume bring out the *rationale* of what those men of God taught and have left behind in their writings. He that claimed to be "not a whit behind the very chiefest apostle" distinctly proclaimed the Kingdom (Acts 20: 25-27, Acts 28: 31), as references to his Epistles amply show. The Apostle James's Epistle is saturated with it, and it is not absent, from Peter's writings, nor from the Fourth Gospel (*cf.* note 457a). The "historical church" alone is to blame for the neglect of it.

W. Kelly, in his "Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles," vol. ii., p. 198 *f.*, at Acts 20: 25 has written: "It is a grave blank where the Kingdom is left out as now," speaking of "the large place it occupies in the Apostles' preaching." *Cf.* Knowling, on the same passage, with reference to Paul: "In his first Epistle (1 Thess. 2: 12), as in his last (2 Tim. 4: 18), the Kingdom of God is present to his thoughts"; in 1 Thess. 2: 9, as in 2 Tim. 1: 11, 2 Tim. 4: 17.

That the Apostles' writings (including the Fourth Gospel) have developed the Lord's teaching as given to us in the Synoptic Gospels is what one would expect from His implied authority to do so in the words ascribed to Him in John 16: 12: theirs is the permanent expression of "the mind of Christ" (1 Cor. 2: 16), with regard to the state of things resulting from His death, for which the Synoptic teaching was only preparatory. Unrecorded sayings of His must be embedded in the Epistles. It is largely from the same men who were depositories of Christ's Word on earth that we have derived the developed apostolic teaching (Acts 2: 42). Until the redemptive work was accomplished, the Lord Himself was "straitened" (Luke 12: 50). It was delegated to "a chosen vessel," Paul, to formulate the truth of Reconciliation, Justification, etc.

618 Luke 24: 50 *f.* — The ASCENSION (*cf.* notes 77 and 615). We may observe again Luke's adoption of the Old Testament manner of narration.

Awkwardly for critics, Matthew does not record the Ascension; it would have suited their system

better had he done so, with the necessary implication that it was from Galilee!

Bethany was about two miles from Jerusalem.

619 Luke 24: 51. - "Was separated," or, actively, "stood apart" (διέστη).

One of Bishop Hall's "Contemplations" is on the Ascension.

## **EDITIONS OF AUTHORS USED.**

N.B.-Foreign Works existing in English translations are recorded under the titles of such; all are cited in the notes by English titles. \*Roman "Catholic," †Unitarian, ‡Jewish.

### BRITISH.

ABBOTT, DR. E. A.: Art. "Gospels" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*:

Corrections of Mark adopted by Matthew and Luke (1902).

‡ABRAHAMAS, I.: *Judaism* (1907).

ADENEY, PRINCIPAL. *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (*Century Bible*) (1903).

ANDERSON, SIR R.: *The Lord from Heaven* (1910).

BARNES, A. S.: *Westminster Lectures ; The Witness of the Gospels* (1906).

\*BARRY, DR. W.: *The Tradition of Scripture* (1906).

BEBB, LL. J. M.: Artt. "Luke the Evangelist" and  
"Gospel of Luke" in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*.

BENNETT, PROFESSOR: *The Mishna as Illustrating the Gospels* (1885).

*A Primer of the Bible* (1897).

BRUCE, DR. A. B.: *The Kingdom of God* (1889).

*The Parabolic Teaching of Christ* (1889).

*Apologetics*, 2nd ed. (1893).

*Synoptic Gospels, Expositor's Commentary on Luke* (1897).

BURKITT, PROFESSOR: *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (1906).

*The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus* (1910).

BURGON, DEAN: *Plain Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel* (1877).

CAIRNS, D. S.: *Christianity and the Modern World* (1906).

CAMPBELL, COLIN: *Critical Studies in St. Luke's Gospel* (1891).

†CARPENTER, PRINCIPAL: *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century, Lect. Vf.* (1903).

CARR, A.: *Notes on St. Luke* (1875).

CASSELS, W. R.: *Supernatural Religion*, 7th ed. (1889).

CHARLES, PROFESSOR: *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life* (1899).

Art. "Eschatology" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. ii.

CHASE, BISHOP: *The Gospel in the Light of Historic Criticism* ("Cambridge Essays") (1905).

\*CLARKE, R. F.: *The Pope and the Bible* (Catholic Truth Society) (1889).

COOKE, DR. R. J.: *The Incarnation and Recent Criticism* (1907).

\*DARBY, J. W., and SMITH, S. F.: *Catholic Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel* (cited as DARBY-SMITH) (1897).

DENNEY, PROFESSOR: *Studies in Theology*, 7th ed. (1902).

*The Church and the Kingdom* (1911).

DODS, DR. M.: *Introduction to the New Testament* (1888).

ELLCOTT, BISHOP: *Historical Lectures on the Life of Our Lord* (1876).

\*EXPLANATORY CATECHISM of Christian Doctrine.

FAIRBAIRN, DR. A. M.: *Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (1902).

FARRAR, DEAN: *St. Luke's Gospel in Greek* (Cambridge Series).

FIELD, DR. F.: *Otium Norvicense* (1886).

GARVIE, PRINCIPAL: *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (Westminster N. T.) (1911).

GLOAG, DR. P.: *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels* (1895).

GOODWIN, DEAN, afterwards BISHOP: *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke* (1865).

GORE, BISHOP: *The Creed of the Christian* (1905).

*Dissertations on the Incarnation* (1895).

GWATKIN, PROFESSOR: *Selections from Early Writers Illustrative of Church History* (1902).

HABERSHON, Miss A. R.: *The Study of the Parables* (1905).

HARRIS, DR. J. RENDEL: *Side Lights on New Testament Research* (1908).

HAWKINS, SIR J. C.: *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd ed. (1909).

HERVEY, BISHOP LORD A.: *The Authenticity of the Gospel of St. Luke* (1892).

JONES, BISHOP BASIL: *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke* (Speaker's) (1878).

KENYON, SIR F. G.: *Handbook of Textual Criticism* (1901).

KINNEAR, J. BOYD: *The Foundation of Religion* (1905).

KNOWLING, PROFESSOR: *The Witness of the Epistles* (1892).

*Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (1907).

LAKE, PROFESSOR: *The Text of the New Testament*, 4th ed. (1908).

LINDSAY, PRINCIPAL: *The Gospel according to St. Luke, with Notes* (1886).

MACALPINE, SIR G. W.: *The Days of the Son of Man* (1905).

MACLAREN, DR. A.: Bible Class Expositions: The Gospel of St. Luke (1892).  
 Expositions of Scripture: St. Luke (1908).  
 MARGOLIOUTH, PROFESSOR: Edition of Works of Flavius Josephus, trans. by Whiston (1906).  
 MASON, DR. A. J.: Christ in the New Testament ("Cambridge Essays ") (1905),  
 MAURICE, F. D.: The Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven (1864).  
 MEAD, G. R. S. ("Theosophist"): The Gospels and the Gospel (1902).  
 MOFFATT, DR. JAS.: Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament (1911).  
 ‡MONTEFIORE, C. G. ("Reform" or "Modern") The Synoptic Gospels (1909).  
 MOULTON, PROFESSOR W. J.: Art. "Parables in Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.  
 NEIL, C., AND OTHERS: The Teacher's Classified Lesson Material, vol. iii. The Four Gospels (1894).  
 NEWTON, B. W.: Aids to Prophetic Enquiry, 3rd ed. (1881).  
 NICOLL, SIR W. R.: The Incarnate Saviour (1897).  
 NORRIS, ARCHDEACON: Notes on the New Testament (1880).  
 ORR, PROFESSOR: God's Image in Man and its Defacement, 3rd ed. (1907).  
 Pamphlet on the Virgin Birth of Christ (1907).  
 Paper in "Expositor," on Gospel Narratives and Critical Solvents, reproduced in "The Resurrection," etc. (1908).  
 OXFORD Studies in the Synoptic Problem (ed. by Sanday) (1911).  
 PEAKE, PROFESSOR: Critical Introduction to the New Testament (1909).  
 PLUMMER, DR. A.: The Gospel according to Luke (1896).  
 Art. "Parables" in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.  
 PRAYER BOOK for Congregations of British Jews in Hebrew and English, ed. by Singer, 7th ed. (1904).  
 PULLAN, L.: Art. "Gospel of Luke" in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary (1908).  
 RAMSAY, SIR W. M.: Was Christ born at Bethlehem? (1898).  
 St. Paul the Traveller (ed. of 1905).  
 Artt. in Expositor (1907). "Professor Harnack on Luke," "The Oldest Written Gospels," reproduced in Luke, the Physician, and other Studies (1908).  
 RUSHBROOKE, W. G.: Synopticon (1880).  
 RYLE, BISHOP J. C.: Exposition of the Gospel of St. Luke (1856, etc.).  
 SALMON, DR. G.: Introduction to the New Testament, 5th ed. (1891).  
 The Human Element in the Gospels (1907).  
 SANDAY, PROFESSOR: Outlines of the Life of Christ, 2nd ed. (1906).

The Oracles of God (1891).

The Life of Christ in Recent Research (1907).

SCRIVENER, F. H. A.: Plain Introduction to Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 4th ed. (1894).

SEELEY, SIR J. R.: Ecce Homo (ed. of 1907).

SIMCOX, W. H.: The Language of the New Testament (1887).

SMITH, PROFESSOR D.: The Days of His Flesh (1905).

SOUTER, DR. A.: Art. "Luke" in Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels (1908).

SPENCE, DEAN: Expositor's Bible: Gospel of Luke (1889).

SPURGEON, C. H.: Sermons on the Parables.

STALKER, PROFESSOR: Christology of Jesus (1897).

The Ethic of Jesus (1907).

STANTON, PROFESSOR: The Gospels as Historical Documents, part ii. (1909).

STOCK, DR. E. Talks on St. Luke's Gospel (1907).

STUART, C. E. From Advent to Advent: Outline of the Gospel of Luke (1891).

SWETE, PROFESSOR: Studies in the Teaching of Our Lord, 2nd ed. (1904).

THIRLWALL, BISHOP Introduction to Schleiermacher's Essay on Luke (1875).

TURNER, C. H.: Art. "New Testament Text" in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary.

TURTON, COLONEL: The Truth of Christianity, 6th ed. (1907).

VAUGHAN, DEAN: Authorised or Revised? (1882).

WESTCOTT, BISHOP: Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, 4th ed. (1872) (now in 8th ed.).

Some Lessons of the Revised Version (1897).

The Historic Faith, 1883 (now in cheap reprint).

WEYMOUTH, R. F.: The New Testament in Modern Speech, 3rd ed. (1910).

WHITE, DR. N. J. D.: Art. "Gospels" in Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels (1908).

WHYTE, PRINCIPAL: Bible Characters (1900).

WILSON, CANON J. M.: Studies in the Origins and Aims of the Four Gospels (1910).

WRIGHT, DR. A. The Gospel according to St. Luke in Greek (1900).

Art. "Luke, Gospel according to," in Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels (1908).

AMERICAN.

BACON, PROFESSOR: Introduction to the New Testament (1900).

BIBLE, THE HOLY: Revised Standard Edition (1901).

BRIGGS, PROFESSOR: *New Light on the Life of Jesus* (1904).

BURTON, PROFESSOR: *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (1898).

EMERSON, R. W.: *The Conduct of Life and other Essays* (1886).

FOSTER, PROFESSOR: *The Finality of Christianity* (1906).

GILBERT, PROFESSOR: *The Student's Life of Jesus* (1898).

JAMES, W.: *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902).

KENRICK, ARCHBISHOP: *The Four Gospels, with Notes* (1849).

McGIFFERT, PROFESSOR: *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age* (1891).

McPHEETERS, PROFESSOR: Art. "Authority" in *Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (1908).

NASH, PROFESSOR: *History of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament* (1900).

PRATT, PROFESSOR: *Psychology of Religious Belief* (1907).

RHEES, PROFESSOR RUSH: *The Life of Jesus of Nazareth* (1900).

SCHMIDT, PROFESSOR: *The Prophet of Nazareth* (1905).

STEVENS, G. B.: *The Teaching of Jesus* (1901).

GERMAN.

BLABS, DR. F.: *Philology of the Gospels* (E. T., 1898).

*Grammar of New Testament, Greek* (E. T., 1898).

*Papers in Expository Times*, 1907.

CLEMEN, PROFESSOR: *The Origin of the New Testament* (1906).

DALMAN, PROFESSOR: *The Words of Jesus* (1902).

Artt. on "Gehenna" and "Hades" in *Hauck's Encyclopaedia* vols. vi., vii. respectively.

DEISSMANN, PROFESSOR: *New Light on the New Testament* (E. T., 1907).

DORNER, DR. J. A.: *System of Christian Doctrine* (1880-1882).

EWALD, PROFESSOR P.: Art. "Luke" in *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia*, vol. vii. (1910).

GOEBEL, PROFESSOR: *The Parables of Jesus methodically Expounded* (E. T., 1883).

HAHN, PROFESSOR: *Commentary on Luke's Gospel* (1892).

HARNACK, PROFESSOR: *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity* (E. T., 1904, 1908).

*Luke the Physician* (E. T., 1907).

*The Sayings and Discourses of Jesus* (E. T., 1908).

*The Acts of the Apostles* (1908).

HOLTZMANN, DR. H. J.: *Introduction to the New Testament*, 3rd ed, (1892).

*Manual Commentary on the New Testament* (1889).

HOLTZMANN, PROFESSOR O.: The Life of Jesus (E. T., 1904).

JüLICHER, PROFESSOR: Introduction to the New Testament (E. T., 1904).

The Similitudes of Jesus (1888, 1899).

LOBSTEIN, P.: The Virgin Birth (E. T., 1903).

LÜTGERT, PROFESSOR: The Kingdom of Heaven according to the Synoptic Gospels (1895).

MAYER-BOEHMER: The Gospel of Luke (1909).

MEYER-WEISS: Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospels of Mark and Luke, 6th ed. (1901).

MÜLLER, DR. J.: The Christian Doctrine of Sin (E. T., 1868).

NEUMANN, DR. A.: Jesus (E. T., 1908).

NIETZSCHE, F.: Thus Spake Zarathustra, 2nd ed. (1906).

The Antichrist (E. T. of Works, 1896).

PFLEIDERER, DR. O.: Primitive Christianity (E. T., 1906).

PREUSCHEN, DR. E.: Lexicon to the New Testament Writings, etc. (1910).

RITSCHL, ALB.; The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation and Justification (E. T., 1900).

Instruction in the Christian Religion (E. T., 1901).

\*SCHANZ, PROFESSOR: Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel (1893).

SCHLEIERMACHER, F.: Essay on the Gospel of Luke (1817).

SCHWEITZER, A.: The Quest of the Historical Jesus (trans. by Montgomery, 2nd English ed.) (1911).

SEEBERG, PROFESSOR R.: Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion (E. T., 1908).

SODEN, PROFESSOR BARON H. VON: History of Early Christian Literature (1903).

SOLTAU, DR. W.: The Birth of Jesus Christ (E. T., 1903).

WEISS, PROFESSOR B.: Life of Christ (E. T., 1883, 1884).

Introduction to the New Testament (E. T., 1885).

The Gospels, Greek Text with Short Exposition (cited as "Manual Commentary") (1902): American adaptation (1906).

Sources of Luke's Gospel (1907).

Sources of Synoptic Tradition (in series of "Texts and Investigations," edited by Harnack and Schmidt (1908).

WEISS, PROFESSOR J.: The Writings of the New Testament. The Gospels. (1908).

WELLHAUSEN, PROFESSOR: Introduction to the First Three Gospels (1905).

The Gospel of Luke Translated and Explained (1904).

WENDT, PROFESSOR: The Teaching of Jesus (E. T., 1902).

ZAHN, PROFESSOR: Introduction to the New Testament (E. T., 1909).

FRENCH.

\*LOISY, PROFESSOR A. ("Modernist"): Gospel Studies (1902).

The Synoptic Gospels (1907).

‡REINACH, S.: Orpheus: General History of Religions, 2nd ed. (1909).

SABATIER, L. A.: Outlines of the Philosophy of Religion (1897).

Religions of Authority and Religion of the Spirit (E. T., 1904).

SWISS.

GODET, DR. F.: Commentary on Gospel of Luke (3rd French ed., 1888 ; E. T., of 1st ed., 1865).

Art. "Parables" in Herzog's Encyclopaedia.

SCHMIEDEL, PROFESSOR: Art. "Gospels" in Encyclopaedia Biblica.

Jesus in Modern Criticism (E. T., 1907).

WERNLE, PROFESSOR: The Synoptic Question (1899).

The Beginnings of Christianity (E. T., 1903).

BELGIAN.

\*SCHOUPPE, F. X.: Abridged Course of Religious Instruction (E. T., 1880)

RUSSIAN.

TOLSTOI, COUNT L.: The Teaching of Jesus (E. T., 1909).