

Mark 16:19-20
20 And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by the signs that followed. Amen.

Luke 24:50-53
the temple, blessing God.

¹ Some ancient authorities omit *and was carried up into heaven*. ² Some ancient authorities omit *worshipped him, and*.

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON POINTS OF SPECIAL DIFFICULTY IN THE HARMONY

A. About Harmonies of the Gospels

We do not know how soon an effort was made to combine in one book the several portrayals of the life of Jesus. Luke in his Gospel (1:1-4) makes a selection of the material and incorporates data from different sources, but with the stamp of his own arrangement and style. He followed, in the main, the order of Mark's Gospel, as is easily seen. But this method is not what is meant by a harmony of the Gospels, for the result is a selection from all sorts of material (oral and written), monographs and longer treatises.

The first known harmony is Tatian's Diatessaron (*dia tessaron*, by four) in the second century (about 160 A.D.) in the Syriac tongue. It was long lost, but an Arabic translation has been found and an English rendering appeared in 1894 by J. Hamlyn Hill. It is plain that Tatian has blended into one narrative our Four Gospels with a certain amount of freedom as is shown by Hobson's *The Diatessaron of Tatian and the Synoptic Problem* (1904). There have been modern attempts also to combine into one story the records of the Four Gospels. There is a superficial advantage in such an effort in the freedom from variations in the accounts, but the loss is too great for such an arbitrary gain. The word harmony calls for such an arrangement, but it is not the method of the best modern harmonies which preserve the differences in material and style just as they are in the Four Gospels.

In the third century Ammonius arranged the Gospels in four parallel columns (the *Sections* of Ammonius). This was an attempt to give a conspectus of the material in the Gospels side by side. In the fourth century Eusebius with his Canons and Sections enabled the reader to see at a glance the parallel passages in the Gospels. The ancients took a keen interest in this form of study of the Gospels, as Augustine shows.

Of modern harmonies that by Edward Robinson has had the most influence. The edition in English appeared in 1845, that in Greek in 1846. Riddle revised Robinson's Harmony in 1889. There were many others that employed the Authorized Version, like Clark's, and that divided the life of Christ according to the feasts.

Broadus (June, 1893) followed Waddy (1887) in the use of the Canterbury Revision, but was the first to break away from the division by feasts and to

show the historical development in the life of Jesus. Stevens and Burton followed (December, 1893) Broadus within six months and, like him, used the Canterbury Revision and had an independent division of the life of Christ to show the historical unfolding of the events. These two harmonies have held the field for nearly thirty years for students of the English Gospels. In 1903 Kerr issued one in the American Standard Version and James one in the Canterbury Revision (1901).

Harmonies of the Gospels in the Greek continued to appear, like Tischendorf's (1851, new edition 1891), Wright's *A Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek* (1903), Huck's *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien* (1892, English translation in 1907), Campbell's *First Three Gospels in Greek* (1899), *A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels in Greek* by Burton and Goodspeed (1920).

The progress in synoptic criticism emphasized the difference in subject matter and style between the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel as appears in the works of Huck, Campbell, and Burton and Goodspeed that give only the Synoptic Gospels. Burton and Goodspeed have also an English work, *A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels for Historical and Critical Study* (1917). In 1917 Sharman (*Records of the Life of Jesus*) gives first a harmony of the Synoptic Gospels with references to the Fourth Gospel and then an outline of the Fourth Gospel with references to the Synoptic Gospels.

Once more in 1919 Van Kirk produced *The Source Book of the Life of Christ* which is only a partial harmony, for the parables and speeches of Jesus are only referred to, not quoted. But he endeavored to show the results of Gospel criticism in the text of the book. There is much useful material here for a harmony, but it is not a real harmony that can be used for the full story of the life of Jesus. Van Kirk, however, is the first writer to place Mark in the first column instead of Matthew. I had already done it in my outline before I saw Van Kirk's book, but his was published first. It is an immense improvement to put Mark first. The student thus sees that the arrangement of the material is not arbitrary and whimsical, but orderly and natural. Both Matthew and Luke follow Mark's order except in the first part of Matthew where he is topical in the main. John supplements the Synoptic Gospels, particularly in the Judean (Jerusalem) Ministry.

Slowly, therefore, progress has been made in the harmonies of the Gospels. But the modern student is able to reproduce the life and words of Jesus as has not been possible since the first century. It is a fourfold portrait of Christ that we get, but the whole is infinitely richer than the picture given by any one of the Four Gospels. The present Harmony aims to put the student in touch with the results of modern scholarly research and to focus attention on the actual story in the Gospels themselves. One may have his own opinion of the Fourth Gospel, but it is needed in a harmony for completeness.

2. Synoptic Criticism

The criticism of the synoptic gospels has been able to reach a broad general conclusion that is likely to stand the test of time. The reason for this happy solution lies in the fact that the processes and results can be tested. It is not mere subjective speculation. Any one who knows how to weigh evidence can compare Mark, Matthew, and Luke in the English, and still better in the Greek. The pages of the present harmony offer proof enough. It is plain as a pikestaff that both our Matthew and Luke used practically all of Mark and followed his general order of events. For this reason Mark has been placed first on the pages where this Gospel appears at all. But another thing is equally clear and that is that both Matthew and Luke had another source in common because they each give practically identical matter for much that is not in Mark at all. This second common source for Matthew and Luke has been called Logia because it is chiefly discourses. It is sometimes referred to as "Q", the first letter of the German word *Quelle* (source). Unfortunately we do not have the whole of the Logia (Q) before us as in the case of Mark, though we probably do not possess the original ending of Mark in 16:9-20. But we can at least reproduce what is preserved. Still, just as sometimes either Matthew or Luke made use of Mark, so in the case of the Logia that is probably true. Hence we cannot tell the precise limits of the Logia. Besides, a small part of Mark is not employed by either Matthew or Luke and that may be true of the Logia. But the fact of these two sources for Matthew and Luke seems to be proven.

But there are various other points to be observed. One is that both Matthew and Luke may have had various other sources. Luke tells us (Luke 1:1-4) that he made use of "many" such sources, both oral and written. And a large part of Luke does not appear in the other gospels or at least similar events and sayings occur in different environments and times. Hence our solid conclusion must allow freedom and flexibility to the writers in various ways. We can see for ourselves how Matthew and Luke handled both Mark and the Logia, each in his own way and with individual touches of style and purpose.

One other matter calls for attention. Papias is quoted by Eusebius as saying that Matthew wrote in Hebrew (or Aramaic) whereas our present Matthew is in Greek. It is now commonly held that the real Matthew (Levi) wrote the Logia first in Aramaic and that either he or some one else used that with Mark and other sources for our present Gospel of Matthew.

It should be added also that there is a considerable body of evidence for the view that Mark wrote under the influence of Simon Peter and preserves the vividness and freshness of Peter's own style as an eyewitness.

One other result has come. It is increasingly admitted that the Logia was

very early, before 50 A.D., and Mark likewise if Luke wrote the Acts while Paul was still alive. Luke's Gospel comes (Acts 1:1) before the Acts. The date of Acts is still in dispute, but the early date (about A.D. 63) is gaining support constantly. The upshot of these centuries of synoptic criticism has brought into sharp outline the facts that now stand out with reasonable clearness. There are many points in dispute still, but we at least know how the synoptic gospels were written, and are reasonably certain of the dates and the authors.

There are many good books on the subject, like Hawkin's *Horae Synopticae* (second edition), Sanday's *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, Harnack's *Sayings of Jesus* and his *Date of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. My own views appear in my *Commentary on Matthew* (Bible for Home and School), *Studies in Mark's Gospel*, and *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research*.

3. The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel

It has come to pass that one has to defend the use of the Fourth Gospel on a par with the Synoptic Gospels. The Johannine problem is an old one and a difficult one. It cannot be said that modern scholarship has come to a clear result here, as is true of the Synoptic Gospels. As a matter of fact, the battle still rages vigorously. There are powerful arguments on both sides. A mere sketch of the real situation is all that can be attempted here.

The Gospel and the Epistles are in the same style and can be confidently affirmed to be by the same author. The Apocalypse has some striking peculiarities of its own. There are likenesses in vocabulary and idiom beyond a doubt of a subtle nature, but the grammatical irregularities in the Book of Revelation have long been a puzzle to those who hold to the Johannine authorship. A full discussion of these grammatical details can be found in the leading commentaries on the Apocalypse. A brief survey is given in my *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. The facts are undisputed and have a most interesting parallel in the papyri fragments of some of the less educated writers of the *Koiné* as one can see for himself in Milligan's *Greek Papyri* or in any other collection.

There are two solutions of the problem with two alternatives in each instance. There are those who roundly assert that the same man could not have written both the Gospel and the Apocalypse. Some of these affirm that the Apostle John wrote the Apocalypse but not the Gospel. Certainly a "John" wrote the Revelation or claimed it at any rate. Others of this group hold that an inferential Presbyter John (not "the elder" in 2 and 3 John) supposed to be meant by Papias wrote the Apocalypse while some one else wrote the Gospel whether the Apostle John or not.

But a considerable body of scholars still hold that the same man wrote both the Gospel and the Apocalypse, but a different explanation is offered by two

groups. One class of writers affirm that John wrote the Apocalypse first before he had come to be at home in the Greek idiom as we see it in the Gospel and the Epistles. We know that John and Peter were fishermen and were not considered men of literary training by the Sanhedrin (Acts 4:14). This explanation is sufficient but for the further fact that the early date of the Apocalypse (about 70 A.D.) is not now so generally held to be true. The later or Domitianic date as given by Irenæus seems pretty clearly to be correct. So the other group suggest that the books may belong substantially to the same period (the Domitianic date) and that the explanation of the grammatical infelicities in the Apocalypse may be due to the fact that John being on the Isle of Patmos when he wrote did not have the benefit of friends in Ephesus who apparently read the Gospel (John 21:24-25). Besides, the excited state of John's mind because of the visions may have added to the number of the solecisms in the Apocalypse. This view I personally hold as probable. The unity of both Gospel and Apocalypse is denied by some.

So the matter stands as between the Gospel and the Apocalypse. But the Fourth Gospel has difficulties of its own. These relate in part to the book in itself. It is true there is a great similarity in language and style between the narrative parts of the book and the discourses of Jesus. It is affirmed that the writer has colored the speeches of Jesus with his own style or even made up the dialogues so that they are without historical value or at least on a much lower plane than the Synoptic Gospels as objective history. There is something in this point, but one must remember that the Synoptic Gospels vary in their manner of reporting the speeches of Jesus and aim to give the substance rather than the precise words of the Master in all instances. It is at most a matter of degree. There is a Johannine type of thought and phrase beyond a doubt, but curiously enough we have a paragraph in Matthew 11:24-31 and Luke 10:21-23 that is precisely like the Johannine specimens, written long before the Fourth Gospel. One must remember the versatility of Jesus, who could not be retained in any one style or mold. But there are those who admit the Johannine authorship of the Gospel and yet who refuse to put it on the same plane as the Synoptic Gospels. Every one must decide for himself on this point. For myself I see too much of Christ in the Fourth Gospel in the most realistic and dramatic form to be mere invention. We can enlarge our conception of Christ to make room for the Fourth Gospel.

But even so it is urged that the Beloved Disciple cannot be the Apostle John. If not, then the Fourth Gospel ignores the Apostle John,—a very curious situation. It is a long story for which one must go to the able books in defense of the Johannine authorship by Ezra Abbott, James Drummond, W. Sanday, Luthardt, Watkins and many others. The ablest modern attacks are made by Bacon and Wendt and Schmiedel. My own view is given in my *The Divinity of Christ in the Gospel of John*.

4. *The Jesus of History*

It is not long since the cry of "Back to Christ" was raised and away from Paul and John. Soon this cry was changed to an appeal to the Jesus of History in opposition to the Christ of Theology. So we had the "Jesus or Christ" controversy (see the Hibbert Journal Supplement for 1909). It was gravely affirmed by some that Paul had created the Christ of Christianity and had permanently altered the simple program of Jesus for a social Kingdom and had turned it into a great ecclesiastical system with speculative Christological interpretations quite beyond the range of the vision of the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels. It was admitted that the Fourth Gospel, the Apocalypse, and the Epistles all gave the Pauline view.

To the Synoptic Gospels, therefore, we all went. But the Christ of Paul and of John is in the Synoptic Gospels. In all essentials the picture is the same in Luke as in John and Paul. The shading is different, but Jesus in Luke is the Son of God as well as the Son of Man (see my *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research*). It was admitted that Matthew gives the picture of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah. Mark reflects Peter's conception of Jesus and gives Jesus as Lord and Christ (see my *Studies in Mark's Gospel*). And Q (the Logia), the earliest document that we have for the life of Christ and almost contemporary with the time of Christ, gives the same essential features of Jesus as the Son of Man and Son of God (see my article *The Christ of the Logia* in the Contemporary Review for August, 1919). The sober results of modern critical research show the same figure in the very earliest documents that we possess (Q and Mark's Gospel). The Christ of Paul and of John walks as the Jesus of History in the Synoptic Gospels. We do know the earthly life of Jesus much more distinctly and the research of centuries has had a blessed outcome in the enrichment of our knowledge. Matthew and Luke are the first critics of the sources for the life of Jesus. We see how they made use of Mark, the Logia, and other documents. The Fourth Gospel comes last with knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels.

There are, to be sure, a few men who even deny that Jesus ever lived at all. That was the next step; but this absurdity has met complete refutation. The Christ of faith is the Christ of fact. There is no getting away from the fact of Christ, the chief fact of all the ages, the centre of all history, the hope of the ages. Jesus Christ we can still call him, our Lord and Saviour, and he never made such an appeal to men as he does today in the full blaze of modern historical research. Men are just beginning to take his words to heart in all the spheres of human life. The one hope of a new world of righteousness lies precisely in the program of Jesus Christ for the life of the individual in his private affairs, in his family relations, in his business and social dealings, in his political ideals and conduct. And nations must also follow the leadership of Jesus the supreme Teacher of the race.

The purpose of a harmony is not to teach theology, but to make available for men of any faith the facts in the Gospels concerning Jesus of Nazareth. Each interprets these facts and teachings as he sees the light. We can all acknowledge our debt to modern scholarship for the tremendous contributions made to a richer understanding of the environment into which Jesus came and to a juster appreciation of the real significance of his person and his message. The Gospels are still the most fascinating books in the world for sheer simplicity and beauty. One can first trace the picture of Jesus in the Logia, then in Mark, in Matthew, in Luke, in John. To these he can add the pictures of Christ in the Acts, the Epistles, the Apocalypse.

5. *The Two Genealogies of Christ*

Sceptics of all ages, from Porphyry and Celsus to Strauss, have urged the impossibility of reconciling the difficulties in the two accounts of the descent of Jesus. Even Alford says it is impossible to reconcile them. But certainly several possible explanations have been suggested. The chief difficulties will be discussed.

1. In Matthew's list several discrepancies are pointed out.

(a) It is objected that Matthew is mistaken in making three sets of fourteen each. There are only forty-one names, and this would leave one set with only thirteen. But does Matthew say he has mentioned forty-two names? He does say (1:17) that there are three sets of fourteen and divides them for us himself: "So all the generations from Abraham unto David are fourteen generations; and from David unto the carrying away to Babylon fourteen generations; and from the carrying away to Babylon unto the Christ fourteen generations." The points of division are David and the captivity; in the one case a man, in the other an event. He counts David in each of the first two sets, although Jechoniah is counted only once. David was the connecting link between the patriarchal line and the royal line. But he does not say "from David to Jechoniah," but "from David to the carrying away unto Babylon," and Josiah is the last name he counts before that event. And so the first name after this same event is Jechoniah. Thus Matthew deliberately counts David in two places to give symmetry to the division, which made an easy help to the memory.

(b) The omissions in Matthew's list have occasioned some trouble. These omissions are after Joram, the names of Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah, and after Josiah, these of Jehoiakim and Eliakim (2 Kings 8:24; 1 Chron. 3:11; 2 Chron. 22:1, 11; 24:27; 2 Kings 23:34; 24:6). But such omissions were very common in the Old Testament genealogies. See 2 Chron. 22:9. Here "son of Jehoshaphat" means "grandson of Jehoshaphat." So in Matt. 1:1 Jesus is called the son of David, the son of Abraham. A direct line of descent is all that it is designed to express. This is all that the term "begat" necessarily

means here. It is a real descent. Whatever omissions were made for various reasons, would not invalidate the line. The fact that Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah were the sons of Ahab and Jezebel would be sufficient ground for omitting them.

(c) Matthew mentions four women in his list, which is contrary to Jewish custom, viz. Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and the wife of Uriah. But neither one is counted in the lists of fourteen, and each one has something remarkable in her case (Broadus, Comm. on Matt. *in loco*). Three were guilty of gross sin, and one, Ruth, was of Gentile origin and deserved mention for that reason. This circumstance would seem to indicate that Matthew did not simply copy the genealogical history of Joseph. He did this, omitting what suited his purpose and adding likewise remarks of his own. His record is thus reliable and yet made a part of his own story.

2. A comparison of the lists of Matthew and Luke.

If no list had been given by Luke, no further explanations would be necessary. But Luke not only gives a list, but one radically different from Matthew's, and in inverse order. Matthew begins with Abraham and comes to Jesus; Luke begins with Jesus and concludes with Adam [the son of God]. Several explanations are offered to remove the apparent contradiction.

(a) As early as Julius Africanus it was suggested that the two lines had united in accordance with the law of Levirate marriage. By this theory, Heli and Jacob being stepbrothers, Jacob married Heli's widow and was the real father of Joseph. Thus both genealogies would be the descent of Joseph, one the real, the other the legal. This theory is ably advocated by McClellan, pp. 416 ff., and Waddy, p. xvii. It is argued that Jechoniah's children were born in captivity and so, being slaves, lost both his royal dignity and his legal status. Stress is laid upon the word "begat" to show that Matthew's descent must be the natural pedigree of Joseph, and upon the use of the expression "son (as was supposed) of Joseph." Hence both Joseph's real and legal standing are shown, for by Luke's account he had an undisputed legal title to descend from David. This is certainly possible, although it rests on the hypothesis of the Levirate marriage.

(b) Lord Arthur Hervey, in his volume on the Genealogies of Our Lord, and in Smith's Dictionary, argues that Matthew gives Joseph's legal descent as successor to the throne of David. According to this theory Solomon's line failed in Jechoniah (Jer. 22:30) and Shealtiel of Matthew's line took his place. Luke's account, on the other hand, gives Joseph's real parentage. Matthew's Matthan and Luke's Mattathias are identified as one, and the law of Levirate marriage comes into service with Jacob and Heli. This explanation has received favor with such writers as Mill, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott, Westcott, Fairbairn. McNeile (on Matthew) considers this the "only possible" view. The chief objection seems to be the most

natural meaning of "begat," implying direct descent, and the necessity for two suppositions, one about Shealtiel and another about Jacob and Heli. It is even fairly probable that the Shealtiel and Zerubbabel of Matthew and Luke are different persons.

(c) The third and most plausible solution yet suggested makes Matthew give the real descent of Joseph, and Luke the real descent of Mary. Several arguments of more or less weight can be adduced for this hypothesis.

(1) The most natural meaning of "begat" in Matthew is preserved. Jesus goes through David's royal line and so fulfils prophecy. It is not elsewhere stated that Mary was of Davidic descent, although presumptive evidence exists in the language of the angel (Luke 1:32) and the enrollment of Mary (Luke 2:5). So Robinson (Revised edition).

(2) The use of Joseph without the article, while it is used with every other name in the list. "The absence of the article puts the name outside of the genealogical series properly so-called."—Godet. This would seem to indicate that Joseph belonged to the parenthesis, "as was supposed." It would read thus, "being son (as was supposed of Joseph) of Heli." Luke had already clearly stated the manner of Christ's birth, so that no one would think he was the son of Joseph. Jesus would thus be Heli's grandson, an allowable meaning of "son." See Andrews' (new edition) *Life of Our Lord*, p. 63.

(3) It would seem proper that Matthew should give the legal descent of Jesus, since he wrote chiefly for Jews. This, of course, could only be through Joseph.

(4) And it would seem equally fitting that Luke should give the real genealogy of Jesus, since he was writing for all. And this could come only through Mary. If it is objected that a woman's genealogy is never given, it may be replied that women are mentioned for special reasons in Matthew's list, though not counted, and that Mary's name is not mentioned in this list. The genealogy goes back to her father either by skipping her as suggested above and making son mean the grandson of Heli, or by allowing Joseph to stand in her place in the list, as he would have to do anyhow. On the whole, then, this theory seems the most plausible and pleasing. So practically Luther, Bengel, Olshausen, Lightfoot, Wieseler, Robinson, Alexander, Godet, Weiss, Andrews (new edition, p. 65), Broadus, and many recent writers.

But Bacon (Genealogy of Jesus Christ, Hastings D. B. and Am. J. of Theol. Jan., 1911) says that nearly all writers of authority abandon any effort to reconcile the two pedigrees of Jesus save as the effort of Christians to give "His Davidic sonship rather than His actual descent." See Machen's survey of negative criticism, on the subject in Princeton Theol. Review (Jan., 1906). Barnard (Hastings D.C.G.) admits two independent accounts, but sees no solution, but Sweet (Int. St. Bible Encycl.) accepts the view that Matthew gives the real genealogy of Joseph and Luke that of Mary. Plummer

(Comm. on Luke) thinks it incredible that Mary's genealogy should be given by Luke.

6. *The Probable Time of the Saviour's Birth*

Every one now understands that the accepted date of our Lord's birth is wrong by several years. The estimates of the true date vary all the way from one to seven years B.C. There are various data that fix the year with more or less certainty, but none of them with absolute precision. They do, however, agree in marking pretty clearly a narrow limit for this notable occurrence, B.C. 6 or 5.

1. The death of Herod the Great is relied on with most certainty to fix the year of Christ's birth. The rule of Archelaus and Antipas demands B.C. 4. Josephus mentions an eclipse of the moon which occurred shortly before he died. Ant. XVII, 6, 4. This eclipse is the only one alluded to by Josephus, and fixes with absolute certainty the time after which the birth of Jesus could not have occurred, since, according to Matt. 2:1-6, Jesus was born while Herod was still living. The question to be determined would be the year of this eclipse. Astronomical calculations name an eclipse of the moon March 12 and 13, in the year of Rome 750, and no eclipse occurred the following year that was visible in Palestine. Josephus (Ant. XVII, 8, 1), says that Herod died thirty-seven years after he was declared king by the Romans. In 714 he was proclaimed king, and this would bring his death counting from Nisan to Nisan, as Josephus usually does, "in the year from 1st Nisan 750 to 1st Nisan 751, according to Jewish computation, at the age of seventy" (Andrews). Herod died shortly before the Passover of 750, then, according to the eclipse and the length of his reign. Caspari contends for January 24, 753, as the date of Herod's death, because there was a total eclipse of the moon January 10. So he puts his death fourteen days later. Mr. Page (*New Light from Old Eclipses*) argues for the eclipse that occurred July 17, 752, as the one preceding Herod's death. He thinks that this makes unnecessary the subtraction of two years from the reign of Tiberius on the theory that Tiberius was contemporary ruler with Augustus for two years. But he finds difficulty in lengthening Herod's reign so long, and his theory has gained no great acceptance as yet. Our present era makes the birth of Christ in the year of Rome 754, and is due to the Abbot Dionysius Exiguus in the Sixth Century. Hence it is clear that if Herod died in the early spring of 750, Jesus must have been born at least four years before 754, the common era, and likely in the year 749.

2. It has been inferred by some that Jesus was at least two or three years old when Herod slaughtered the infants in Bethlehem, Matt. 2:16. Thus the year would be put two years further back to the end of 747 or beginning of 747. But this is not demanded by the "two years" of Matthew, for Herod

would naturally extend the limit so as to be sure to include the child in the number slain, and a child just entering the second year would be called "two years" old by Jewish custom. No more definite note of time comes from this circumstance, save that the massacre probably took place some months before Herod's death, which fact would bring the Saviour's birth back some time into the year 749.

3. The appearance of the "star in the east" (Matt. 2:2). This, of course, was before Herod's death, and would agree in time with the slaughter of the children, if the star be looked upon as a supernatural phenomenon, and not the wise men's interpretation of a natural conjunction of planets. Kepler first suggested that, as there was a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in 747, to which Mars was added in 748, this conjunction might have been the bright star that led on the wise men. See Wieseler, *Synopsis*, p. 57. Kepler had also suggested that a periodical star or a comet might have joined the constellation. The Chinese records preserve the account of the appearance of a comet in the spring of 749. Either of these theories is fascinating in itself, especially to those minds that prefer a natural explanation of anything that looks miraculous. Both phenomena are possible in themselves, but they hardly meet the requirements of the record in Matthew. (1) The word used is *aster*, star, and not *astron*, a group of stars. (2) Rev. C. Pritchard, whose calculations have been verified at Greenwich (Smith's Dic.), has shown that those "planets could never have appeared as one star, for they never approached each other within double the apparent diameter of the moon." So Ideler's hypothesis that the wise men all had weak eyes seems rather feeble. (3) The year 747 would conflict slightly with other evidence for Christ's birth that favors 749, although Wieseler, p. 53, note 4, contends that the star first appeared to the wise men two years before their visit, and a second time on their visit to Bethlehem. (4) Besides, the star is said to have stood over "where the young child was," v. 9. If it were a natural star it would have kept going as they went, and would not have stopped till they stopped. Even then it would appear as far away as ever from Bethlehem. It seems best, therefore, to admit the existence of a miracle here, and hence gain nothing from the visit of the Magi to establish the date of the Saviour's birth, save that it was not long before the slaughter of the infants, and would at least agree with the date 749. See Broadus, Comm. *in loco*.

4. The language of the heavenly host in Luke 2:14 is urged by some as fixing the birth at a time when there was universal peace throughout the world. The closing of the temple of Janus in the time of Augustus is also adduced, but it is not certainly known when it was closed apart from 725 and 729. It was intended to be closed at the end of 744, but was delayed on account of trouble among the Daci and Dalmatae. See Greswell i. 469. Nothing specific can be obtained from this fact, save that there was a time

of comparative quiet in the Roman world from 746 to 752. There was a hush in the clangor of war when Jesus was born.

5. The entrance of John the Baptist upon his ministry gives us another note of time. See Luke 3:1 f. John emerged from the wilderness seclusion in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. Augustus died August 29, 767. Adding fifteen years to this, the fifteenth year of Tiberius would begin August 29, 781. John was of a priestly family and so could naturally enter upon his work when thirty years of age. Thirty years subtracted from this gives 751, as the date of John's birth. But that is too late by two years to agree with the other date. Here, however, the Roman histories come to our help. Tacitus, Ann. 1, 3: "Tiberius is adopted by Augustus as his son, and *colleague in empire*." Vell. Pat. 2, 121; "At the request of Augustus, Tiberius was invested with equal authority in all the provinces." So Suetonius Aug. 97 and Tib. 21. It is clear, then, that Tiberius reigned jointly with Augustus about two years before he assumed full control of the empire at the death of Augustus. Luke could have used either date, but Tiberius' power was already equal to that of Augustus in the provinces two years before his death. Luke would naturally use the provincial point of view. Taking off the two years from the joint reign of Augustus, we again come to the year 749, as John was born six months before Jesus. So if John was born in the early part of the spring, Jesus would have been born in the summer or fall of 749.

6. The age of Jesus at his entrance upon his ministry, Luke 3:23. "And Jesus himself, when he began to teach, was about thirty years of age." So most modern scholars, taking the language in the obvious sense. Origen refers it to the beginning of a new life, by the second birth of baptism, after his spiritualizing fashion. The Authorized Version has it: "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age," applying the "beginning" to the period of thirty years. McClellan argues that it means "about thirty years, beginning"; that is, a little the rise of thirty years. The Revised Version seems to be preferable and the only doubt would be as to what is included in the phrase "about thirty years." It has been variously argued that Jesus was from one to three years younger or older than thirty. It seems more reasonable to give the words the meaning that he was just about thirty, a few months under or over. Apparently this fact explains the idiom. The argument that Jesus had to be exactly thirty years old because the priest had to be so, when he entered upon his work, has no great force. For Jesus was not a priest save in a spiritual sense. John had been preaching no great while when Jesus was baptized by him and so entered upon his public ministry. If John began his ministry when he was thirty years old in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, then Jesus's ministry would begin about six months later. His birth would then come in the latter part of 749,

unless John was born in the latter part of 748, when it would be earlier in the year.

7. The building of the temple of Herod gives a further clue to the date of Christ's birth. In John 2:20, the Jews say, "Forty and six years was this temple in building." Josephus tells us in one place that Herod began rebuilding the temple in the fifteenth year of his reign, War. I, 21, 1, and in another that he did so in the eighteenth year of his reign, Ant. XV, 11, 1. In the account of Herod's death, Ant. XVII, 8, 1, he used two dates for his reign, according as he counted from his declaration as king by the Romans 714, or the death of Antigonus 717. Eighteen and fifteen would both be correct, according as he reckoned from the one date or the other. Eighteen added to forty-six and both to 714 would make 778. It was at the first Passover in his ministry that this expression is used. It has been probably six months since his baptism. If thirty and a half years be taken from 778, his birth would be thrown back to the year 747, unless the forty-six years be taken as completed, when it would be 748. So Robinson. But this does not quite agree with the other notes of time we have. Many modern harmonists count the eighteen years from 717, and so bring the whole number, adding forty-six, down to 780, or, if the years are complete, 781. Thirty and a half from this would give the autumn of 749 or 750. This is done because Josephus usually reckons Herod's reign from the death of Antigonus, 717. On the whole it seems clear that Josephus is wrong in the War. It is common enough to find Josephus in one passage contradicting what he has said elsewhere. The temple was begun the year that the Emperor came to Syria, as is plain from Josephus. According to Dio Cassius, LIV, 7, this visit was made in B.C. 20 or 19. Correcting Josephus by himself and by Dio Cassius we thus again get B.C. 5 as the probable year of the birth of Christ. See Schuerer, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. I., Vol. I., p. 410.

8. The census of Augustus Cæsar mentioned in Luke 2:1 f., furnishes the last note of time for this event. This subject is involved in a great many difficulties, and for a full discussion, the reader is referred to Ramsay's *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem*, and his *Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* (Chap. XX) and to my *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research*. Every statement made by Luke in 2:1-7 was once challenged. Every one is now shown to be correct.

(1) It used to be said that no census was ever taken by Augustus, but heathen writers mention three, in 726, 746, 767. One of these, 746, may be the one here mentioned, which was delayed for various reasons, or which was executed slowly in the distant provinces. But it is not necessary that the phrase "all the world" should be pressed to its literal meaning, though this is more natural. Nor does the argument from silence prove that no

other general census was taken by Augustus. But Ramsay has triumphantly vindicated Luke and the general census under Augustus by proof from the papyri that Augustus inaugurated a periodical census every fourteen years from B.C. 8 on. The second occurred A.D. 6 (Acts 5:37). See Ramsay's *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem*, and *Bearing of Recent Discovery on Trustworthiness of the New Testament* (Chap. XX) and my *Luke the Historian* (Chap. XX). We have only to think that there was delay in the carrying out of the census in Palestine to bring this date down to B.C. 6 (or even 5).

(2) It is not a "taxing," but an "enrollment" (Rev. Ver.) that was taken. There was a taxing later (Acts 5:37). And if it were done while Herod was king, Augustus could not have taxed Judea without Herod's consent. But Herod was not now in good form with Augustus.

(3) This helps to explain another objection that the enrollment would not have included Judea anyhow, because it was not yet a province, but a kingdom. But it is not likely that Herod would have displeased Augustus by refusing such information if it was desired. Tacitus asserts that the *regna*, the dependent kingdoms, were included in the census taken by Augustus.

(4) Hence, also, it is natural that the enrollment should have taken place according to the Jewish and not according to the usual Roman method, because Herod would wish it to be in accordance with the customs of his kingdom. So every one went to his own city. We now know from numerous papyri that in Egypt the family went to the home city. The Jews were used to enrollment by tribes and that was allowed. See Deissmann's *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 268, and Ramsay's *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem*, p. 108.

(5) We now have to meet the objection that Quirinius was not governor till ten years later, A.D. 6, when a taxing did occur. (See Acts 5:37.)

It is now possible to give a real solution of this problem. Luke is now shown to be wholly correct in his statement that Quirinius was twice governor, and that the first census took place during the first period. A series of inscriptions in Asia Minor show that Quirinius was governor of Syria B.C. 10-7 and so twice governor of Syria (second time A.D. 6; Josephus, Ant. XVIII, 1:1). See Ramsay, *Bearing of Recent Discovery*, pp. 273-300, and my *Luke the Historian*, pp. 127-9. Tertullian (*adv. marc.* iv, 19) says that Sentius Saturninus was governor of Syria B.C. 9-6. But we now know that Varus was controlling the internal affairs of Syria while Quirinius was leader of the army. Luke is therefore quite accurate in his statement about Quirinius being twice governor of Syria. The *Lapis Tiburtinus* has *iterum Syriam* about Quirinius. Ramsay has cleared up this famous historical puzzle and has completely vindicated Luke.

Few subjects have excited as much interest, even needless curiosity, as the date of the birth of the Saviour. But it is noticeable that by the masses of Christians more interest is taken in the day of Christ's birth than in the

year. The Christmas festivities and the natural desire to make that the birthday of Jesus cause this widespread interest in December 25. Not only is it impossible to determine with any degree of certainty the day of the month, but the time of the year also is equally uncertain. The chief thing that appears proved is that December 25 is not the time, since the shepherds would hardly be in the fields at night with the flocks, which were usually taken into the folds in November and kept in till March. The nights of December would scarcely allow watching in the mountain fields even as far south as Bethlehem. And besides, the long journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem would hardly be made by Joseph and Mary in winter, the rainy season. McClellan argues for December 25, but his arguments are not convincing. The ancients had various days for Christ's birth: May 20 (Clement of Alexandria), April 20, December 25, January 5. Tertullian and others even say that the day of his birth (December 25) was kept in the register at Rome. But chronologists attach little weight to this testimony, since the same tradition puts the birth of John, June 24; the annunciation of Mary, March 25, and Elizabeth's conception, September 25—the four cardinal points of the year. If one might hazard an opinion, it would be that the birth of Jesus occurred in the summer or early in the fall of 749 or of 748, that is B.C. 6 or 5. Turner (*Chronology*, Hastings D B) reaches B.C. 6 as the probable year of the birth of Jesus though he did not have the new light on the census and on Quirinius which confirms it. Hitchcock (*Hastings D C G*) saw the bearing of the periodical census that called for B.C. 7-5, but did not yet know the discovery about Quirinius. Armstrong (*Chronology New Testament*, Int. St. Bible Encycl.) is less certain about the precise year.

7. The Feast of John 5:1, and the Duration of Our Lord's Ministry

It seems almost impossible to decide with certainty what feast is alluded to in John 5:1. One can only speak with moderation where everything is so doubtful. Various feasts have been suggested as solving the problem.

1. The Feast of Dedication has been proposed by Kepler and Petavius. But this view has met with no great amount of favor, for there is too short an interval between the first Passover and December, when it occurred. It might be a later Feast of Dedication, but this feast was not one of the great feasts and would hardly have drawn Jesus all the way from Galilee to attend it. He did attend this feast once (John 10:22), but he was already in Judea at this time, having come up to attend the Feast of Tabernacles (John 7:2, 14). So Robinson, Clark, etc. So this feast seems to be ruled out of the question.

2. The Feast of Tabernacles is advocated by Ebrard, Ewald, Patritius.

It is very unlikely that the Feast of Tabernacles after the first Passover could be meant, as the Saviour did not return to Galilee for some time afterwards. He could hardly have come back so soon to Jerusalem. But the Feast of Tabernacles after the Passover of John 6:4 is mentioned later, John 7:2 f., which Jesus attended, it seems, because he was hindered from going up to the previous Passover by the murderous designs of the Jews. It is possible that the feast of John 5:1 may have been the Feast of Tabernacles after a Passover not mentioned, and so would come after the second Passover of his public ministry. But we do not know that Jesus attended any other Feast of Tabernacles save the one in John 7:2, which he may have done because he missed the preceding Passover.

3. The Feast of Purim, first suggested by Kepler, has had great favor with modern harmonists, but apparently more on sentimental than on scholarly grounds. Meyer says, "Without doubt it was Purim." But it is by no means so certain as Meyer would have us believe. (a) Meyer relies on John 4:35 and 6:4 to show that this was the Feast of Purim just before John 6:4. But the expression, "Say not ye, There are yet four months and then cometh the harvest?" may be, and probably is a proverbial saying indicating the usual length of time between sowing and reaping, which, as a matter of fact, was about four months. Hence nothing can be determined by this note of time. And, besides, the four months could precede the Passover just as well as Purim, because the sowing lasted a month or so. (b) The Feast of Purim occurred a month before the Passover. Is it at all likely that two circuits of all Galilee were made in the meantime, besides much work of other kinds? See Luke 8:1 and Matt. 9:25-38. The three general circuits throughout Galilee, besides the mission of the twelve and a large part of their training, the general statements about the Master's work of preaching and healing, require an expansion rather than a contraction of the time for this period of his ministry. It seems then quite unreasonable, when once the mind takes in this enlarged conception of the missionary work of Jesus, as recorded by the Synoptic Gospels, to limit it to the amount of work mentioned by John, since he omits much of the early ministry, because, it would seem, the others are so full just here. (c) The Feast of Purim, moreover, was observed at home in the synagogues, and not by going to Jerusalem. See Esther 9:22 and Jos. Ant. xi. 6, 13. But "the multitude" (John 5:13) seems to imply (Robinson) a concourse of strangers at one of the great festivals. (d) It seems hardly probable, besides, that Jesus would go to any feast just a month before the Passover and come back to Galilee and not go to the Passover itself (John 6:4). Least of all would he do this in the case of Purim. (e) The man who was healed at this feast was healed on the Sabbath (John 5:9), and this occasioned the outburst among the people. But the Feast of Purim was never celebrated on the

Sabbath, and when it came on a Sabbath it was postponed. See Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* 4, 9.

4. Pentecost is held to be the feast here alluded to by many early and some later writers, such as Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Erasmus, Calvin, Bengel, etc. Norris makes it the Pentecost after the first Passover, but to do this, has to crowd into this short interval Christ's first Judean ministry, the journey through Samaria together with the first part of his Galilean ministry. So this idea has little weight. McClellan argues that the allusions of Jesus in John 5:17-47, "infallibly point to Pentecost," meaning the Pentecost after a second Passover that is not mentioned. He further contends that this best suits the chronological arrangement and the term "a feast of the Jews." This view is certainly possible and cannot be positively disproved, although it is not so "infallibly" clear as McClellan imagines.

5. The Passover has always met with many adherents, being the second Passover in the Saviour's ministry and making four in all (John 2:13; 5:1; 6:4; 12:1). An unnamed Passover may exist in the ministry even if not referred to here. The arguments in favor of this interpretation are the most satisfactory. We cannot consider them as absolutely conclusive, yet the Passover meets all sides of the case better than any of the other feasts. (a) The plucking of ears from standing grain by the disciples (Luke 6:1) would indicate a time after the Passover and before Pentecost. This incident appears to have happened after the feast mentioned in John 5:1. (b) It is fairly implied (John 5:1) that the feast took Jesus to Jerusalem. The Passover would more likely be the one to lead him there. It is expressly stated that he attended two Passovers and a special reason is given for his not attending a third. If there was another Passover in his ministry, this would naturally be the one. (c) This suits best the hostility manifested at this feast, which would have time to become acute (Broadus' *Comm. on Matt.*) and break out with increased vigor in Galilee and prevent his attending the next Passover (John 6:4; 7:1). (d) If this Passover be a second Passover of the ministry, sufficient time is afforded for the great Galilean ministry without artificial crowding. His ministry would be long enough to allow the great work recorded as done by him. Only two serious objections can be urged to this idea. (1) It is objected that the article would be used with "feast," if the Passover were thus mentioned as *the* feast. But to this we can reply: (a) The article is sometimes omitted when the Passover is meant (Matt. 27:15; Mark 15:6). (b) The absence of the article proves nothing whatever one way or the other. No conclusion can be drawn for or against the idea of the Passover. (c) The article does occur in many manuscripts, including the Sinaitic, and is put in the margin of the Revised Version. So nothing can be gained against this theory here. (2) The chief

objection is that Jesus would not have remained so long away from Jerusalem, a year and six months, from the Second Passover till the Feast of Tabernacles after the Third Passover. But (a) we do not know that he did not attend any other feast in that time, for silence proves nothing; and (b) a good reason is given for his failure to attend the Third Passover, which may have applied to the others, if he did not go, *viz.*, the desire of the Jews to kill him (John 7:1).

Hence it is natural that there should be a variety of opinions as to the length of the Saviour's ministry, varying all the way from one to four years, leaving out mere guesses based on five and more Passovers. McKnight argues that the ministry may have lasted five or more full years, since all the Passovers of Christ's ministry may not be mentioned.

(1) The *Bi-paschal* theory makes the time of the public life of Jesus one year, allowing only two Passovers to the Gospel of John. Browne in his *Ordo Saeculorum* advocates this view. But the words, "the Passover," in John 6:4 must be omitted, and for this there is not enough documentary evidence. If this could be done, Westcott thinks Browne would make out a good case. But with the present text, his view cannot be entertained.

(2) The *Tri-paschal* theory finds only three Passovers in the life of Christ. Hence the public work of Jesus would be from two to two and a half years in length. This view is quite possible, as is shown in the Harmony. These writers usually make the feast of John 5:1 Purim before the Passover of John 6:4, or Pentecost after it.

(3) The *Quadri-paschal* theory contends for four Passovers and a ministry of from three to three and a half years. This theory follows from making John 5:1 a Passover or Purim before or Pentecost or Tabernacles after an unnamed Passover. This seems to be the more probable length of the Saviour's public work on earth. How short a space was even this to compass such a marvellous work. The ministry of Jesus seems crowded beyond our comprehension. It would be certain that the Saviour's public life lasted about three years and a half, if it was admitted that John 5:1 referred to a Passover. Various writers seek to find an allusion to the three years of the Saviour's ministry in the Parable of the Barren Fig Tree (Luke 13:6), but this application of the parable is by no means certain, since three might naturally be used as a round number. But there can very well have been a passover not mentioned. All we can say is that we know that the ministry of Jesus was two and a half years in length with the probability of three and a half.

8. The Four Lists of the Twelve Apostles

It is interesting to compare the four lists of Jesus' chosen apostles as given by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Acts.

Mark 3:16 f.	Matthew 10:2 f.	Luke 6:14 f.	Acts 1:13 f.	
1. Simon Peter	Simon Peter	Simon Peter	Simon Peter	<i>Explains</i>
2. James	Andrew	Andrew	James	
3. John	James	James	John	
4. Andrew	John	John	Andrew	
5. Philip	Philip	Philip	Philip	
6. Bartholomew	Bartholomew	Bartholomew	Thomas	<i>Didymus</i>
7. Matthew	Thomas	Matthew	Bartholomew	<i>Nathanael</i>
8. Thomas	Matthew	Thomas	Matthew	<i>Levi</i>
9. James the son of Alphaeus	James the son of Alphaeus	James the son of Alphaeus	James the son of Alphaeus	
10. Thaddeus	Thaddeus	Simon the Zealot	Simon the Zealot	
11. Simon the Cananaean	Simon the Cananaean	Judas the brother of James	Judas the brother of James	<i>Lebbeus</i>
12. Judas Iscariot	Judas Iscariot	Judas Iscariot	Judas Iscariot	

Let us examine the names here given.

(1) The lists are given some time after the selection was made, and hence represent a later grouping according to later developments in this inner circle. The primacy of Peter in these lists does not mean necessarily that he was the acknowledged leader at first. See discussion under (4) below. The point to note here is that we are not to think of Peter as the formal leader of the Twelve before the death of Christ. Jesus was himself that leader.

(2) One mark of an apostle was that he should have been with the Lord from the baptism of John until the day that he was received up (Acts 1:21 f.). Perhaps no great stress is to be laid on any exact time here, provided it began in the time of John. An apostle must know the Lord. Hence Paul received the vision of Christ. We have some knowledge of seven of these apostles before this time. If we infer from John 1:41 that John followed the example of Andrew in finding his own brother, it was not long till James was a disciple as well as John, Andrew, and Peter. Philip and Nathanael are soon added to the list (John 1:43 f.). Later Matthew hears the call of the Saviour, too (Matt. 9:9; Mark 2:13 f.). Of the other five we have no knowledge previous to this occasion. Jesus had "found" them by the same insight that led to his other selections. He chose Judas, though knowing that he was a devil.

(3) Observe the three groups of four, headed by Simon Peter, Philip, and James the son of Alphaeus, respectively. The great variety in the arrangement of the other names makes this uniformity significant. It seems

clear that there are three recognized groups among the apostles (Bengel, Broadus, Clark). Each group has the same persons in every list, although there is such a variety in the order. In the first group Matthew and Luke have the same order, while Mark and Acts agree. In the second group Mark and Luke have a like order, while Matthew and Acts agree in putting Matthew at the end of this group. In the third group Matthew and Mark agree exactly, while Luke and Acts are identical save the dropping out of Judas Iscariot from the list in Acts because of his apostasy and death. No great importance can be attached to the precise order within the groups since Luke, in the Gospel and Acts, gives a different arrangement in the first and second groups.

(4) Observe also that Simon Peter not only stands at the head of his group, but at the head of all the groups, while Judas Iscariot is always at the bottom till he drops out entirely. Simon finally occupied a position of precedence of some sort. He was one of the inner circle of three that was so close to the Saviour's heart. Perhaps it was this, rather than any notion of primacy in authority or power. He was the spokesman because of his natural impetuosity. The question as to who should be greatest among the apostles illustrates the spirit of rivalry about precedence that existed among them. In the October, 1916, *Journal of Theol. Studies*, Dr. A. Wright argues that the critical text in Mark 14:10 means "Judas Iscariot the first of the Twelve." The *Koiné* did sometimes use *heis* as an ordinal (see Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 96, and my *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, pp. 671 f.). But the disputes among the Twelve show that they themselves considered Jesus only as leader till his death. See my article on "The Primacy of Judas Iscariot," the *Expositor* (London) for April, 1917, and one by Rendel Harris in the June, 1917, issue, and Wright's reply in the November, 1917, number.

(5) There are among the Twelve three pairs of brothers—Simon and Andrew, James and John, James the son of Alphaeus and Judas the brother of James. The first two pairs form the first group of the Twelve. It is, however, uncertain whether Judas is the brother or the son of James. The Greek is ambiguous, James's Judas. The Revised Version translated it "Judas son of James," but the Epistle of Jude begins "Judas a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James." But the Jude of the Epistle and the Judas of the Twelve were hardly the same. Cf. Broadus, *Comm. on Matt.*, p. 216.

(6) There are some apparent discrepancies in the names in the various lists. **Bartholomew** occurs in every list, but is generally understood to be another name for **Nathanael**. **Thaddeus** is also called **Judas the brother of James**. Matthew and Mark give Thaddeus, and Luke in Gospel and Acts gives Judas the brother of James. It was a very common circumstance

for one to have two names. **Lebbeus**, given in some MSS. in Matthew and Mark, is only a marginal explanation of **Thaddeus**. Both are terms of endearment. Matthew and Mark again call **Simon the Cananean**, while Luke in the Gospel and Acts speaks of him as **Simon the Zealot**. But "Zealot" is simply a translation into Greek of the Aramaic "Cananean." Jesus gave the other **Simon** the name "**Cephas**," which was translated into the Greek "**Peter**," meaning rock. He is called by all three names in the New Testament. **Matthew** likewise had another name, **Levi**, and **Thomas** was also called **Didymus**, which was a Greek translation of Thomas, meaning "twin."

9. The Sermon on the Mount

Do Matthew and Luke record the same discourse? Let us consider the several theories on this subject. My own view will be stated last.

1. Some hold that the two discourses are entirely distinct in time, place, circumstances and audience. The arguments for this theory usually presented are these.

(a) The time of delivery of the two sermons appears to be different. Matthew gives the sermon before his call (Matt. 9:9), while Luke precedes his sermon by the call of the twelve. Hence Matthew's discourse comes quite a while before Luke's in the early Galilean ministry. But it may be well replied that, inasmuch as Matthew's arrangement in ch. 8-13 is not chronological, but topical, it is entirely possible, even likely, that the same arrangement should prevail in ch. 5-7. It is perfectly natural that Matthew, writing for Jewish readers and about the Messianic reign, should give at the beginning of his account of that reign the formal principles that rule in this new state of affairs, as proclaimed by Jesus on a later occasion. In the early part of the ministry of Jesus, besides, the hearers would hardly be prepared for so advanced and radical ideas. Besides, Matthew makes no note of time whatever for this discourse.

(b) The place appears to be different. One is on a mountain (Matt. 5:1), while the other is on a plain (Luke 6:17). Hence the one is called by Clark the Sermon on the Mount, and the other the Sermon on the Plain. Miller (*Int. Stand. Bible Encyclopædia*) is uncertain whether Matthew and Luke report the same discourse and so discusses also Luke's "Sermon on the Plain." But his argument is not convincing. If it is necessary that "plain" here shall mean a place away from a mountain, down in a valley, this would seem to refer to a different place. McClellan seeks to show that Luke uses "and" in 6:17-20 by way of anticipation. He presents for effective grouping events that happened after Jesus came down out of the mountain before he gives the sermon delivered to the whole body of disciples up in the mountain. This is possible, but another interpretation is much more likely. The plain

here is really simply "a level place" (Rev. Ver.). So then the two accounts of Matthew and Luke will harmonize quite well. Jesus first went up into the mountain to pray (Luke 6:12) and selected and instructed the Twelve. Afterwards he came down to a level place on the mountain side whither the crowds had gathered, and stood there and wrought miracles (Luke 6:17). He then went up a little higher into the mountain where he could sit down and see and teach the multitudes (Matt. 5:1). Matthew gives the multitudes as the reason for his going up into the mountain. By this arrangement any discrepancy between "sat" in Matthew and "stood" in Luke disappears. Waddy has given an admirable arrangement of the material at this point in Note C, p. xix. Many writers affirm that the tradition mentioned by Jerome, making the Horns of Hattin the place where the Sermon on the Mount was delivered, suits this explanation exactly. There is a level place on it where the crowds could have assembled. It is not necessary to insist that this mountain is the Mount of Beatitudes, nor need we contend, as Robinson does, that the mountain must be very close to Capernaum.

(c) The audience is different. Matthew (4:25) states that his audience was composed of "great multitudes from Galilee and Decapolis and Jerusalem and Judea and from beyond Jordan," while Luke (6:17) says that there was "a great multitude of his disciples, and a great number of the people from all Judea and Jerusalem, and the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon." Matthew says (5:1) also that "his disciples came unto him." Hence both assemblages were composed of great multitudes from many regions besides many of his disciples, but in neither case is Jesus said to address himself to any save his disciples, his followers (Matt. 5:1 and Luke 6:20). So in both accounts the Saviour seems to withdraw a little from the great outside crowd of curiosity seekers. But the multitudes also must have heard something of what he said, for they were astonished at his teaching (Matt. 7:28). Andrews well shows that the audience in Matthew were not mostly Jews (according to Kraft), and the audience in Luke mostly heathen. Matthew omits Tyre and Sidon, but he had already mentioned Syria (4:24), which includes Tyre and Sidon. Neither list may be complete. Hence nothing can be made out of Luke's omission of Galilee, Decapolis, and beyond Jordan. Great multitudes from the same general regions are alluded to as being present.

(d) The contents are radically different. It is objected by Alford, Greswell, etc., that Luke omits large portions of what Matthew has so that Luke has only thirty verses, while Matthew has one hundred and seven. But this leaves out of consideration the several large portions of the same matter which Luke has placed elsewhere, or which Jesus repeated on other occasions (cf. Matt. 6:9-13 and Luke 11:2-4; Matt. 6:25-34 and Luke 12:22-31). Jesus often repeated his sayings on other occasions as all teachers do and

ought to do. Neither evangelist gives a complete report of this wonderful discourse. So Matthew omits some things which Luke records (cf. Matt. 5:12 with Luke 6:23-6; Matt. 7:12 with Luke 6:31-40). Nor need we be surprised that Luke, writing generally for all Christians, omits large portions towards the beginning of the sermon that were designed especially for Jews (see Matt. 5:17-27; 6:1-18). These Matthew would be sure to record. Luke adds four woes to the beatitudes. It is unnecessary to remark upon minor variations of language, since the gospels manifestly aim to give the sense of what the Saviour said and not the *verbatim* words. The variations in the Synoptic reports of the sayings of Jesus add much to the interest of the narratives. Moreover, to offset these variations, which admit of explanation, it ought to be remembered that the two discourses begin alike and end alike, that they have a general similarity in the order of the different parts, and that they show a general likeness and often absolute identity of expression.

So these differences all melt away on careful comparison, and it is not proved that there are two distinct sermons.

2. Another theory holds that the two sermons are distinct, but spoken on the same day, and near together. So Augustine, who is followed by Lange. The further points of this theory are two. (a) The one (Matt.) was spoken before the choice of the Apostles, to the disciples alone, and while Jesus was sitting on the mountain. (b) The other (Luke) was spoken after the choice of the Apostles, to the multitudes, and standing upon the plain. It is not hard to see that these points do not solve the question. In Matt. 7:28 we are told that the multitudes were astonished at his teaching and in Luke 6:20 that "he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said." So this distinction vanishes. The question of the mountain and the plain has been already discussed, and another more probable explanation suggested. It is only a conjecture that the discourse of Matthew was before the appointment of the Twelve. This theory has had no great following.

3. Wieseler holds that Matthew has simply brought together detached sayings of Jesus on different occasions and does not mean to present the whole as one discourse; Luke's account being only one of the discourses used by Matthew. But this violates the evident notes of place and audience and surroundings by which Matthew gives local color and cast to the entire discourse. See Matt. 5:1 and 8:1. The case of the grouping of the miracles in chapters 8 and 9 is not parallel, since there Matthew does not state that they occurred on one occasion. The fact that various portions of this discourse are repeated elsewhere by Matthew is immaterial, because this was a common habit of Jesus in his discourses. Votaw in his exhaustive and able discussion of the Sermon on the Mount in the extra volume in the Hastings D B admits the possibility of this hypothesis, but considers it far less probable

than the historical reality of the Sermon as recorded by both Matthew and Luke. Moffatt (Encycl. Biblica) considers it "a composition rather than an actual address," while Bacon (Sermon on the Mount) admits only what is also in Luke. Adeney (Hastings' D C G) holds to the essential integrity of the address in Matthew.

4. Both Matthew and Luke give substantially similar accounts of the same discourse. In that case we have a good illustration of the use of the Logia in Matthew and Luke. Most of the arguments for this interpretation have been mentioned in rebuttal of the previously mentioned theories. (a) This is the most natural explanation in view of the large volume of similar matter in both, in the beginning, progress, and close of the discourse. It is always best to give the Scripture the most natural and manifest setting, when possible. (b) This theory is the most probable one, since it is hardly likely that Jesus would again make the same sermon to the same audience, and under the same circumstances. (c) There are no objections to this theory that do not admit of a probable explanation. See the discussion above. The omissions and additions in each case suit the specific purpose of the writer. The apparent contradictions, when studied carefully, blend into a harmonious whole. Hence we seem to be justified in maintaining the identity of the discourses recorded by Matthew and Luke. For a careful outline of this matchless discourse see Broadus on Matthew. Stalker, *The Ethics of Jesus*, has a very able exposition of the teaching.

10. The Combination of Luke and John

We now have to deal with the most perplexing question in harmonistic study, the proper disposal of the mass of material furnished by Luke in 9:51-18:14. McClellan discusses ten schemes, pushes them all aside, and then suggests another which is no more convincing and equally complicated. Nothing can be attempted here but a presentation of the chief points in this endless discussion. All the principal plans for arranging this part of Luke proceed on one or the other of the following ideas:

1. Some hold that this portion of Luke is neither orderly nor chronological. Hence many of the incidents, here recorded as apparently belonging to the last six months of the Saviour's ministry, in reality are to be placed earlier. They are put here as a sort of summing up of things not mentioned elsewhere. So Robinson and others. In favor of this theory it is urged that Luke here speaks of some things that Matthew and Mark put before the third Passover, such as the healing of a demoniac (Luke 11:14-36) and the blasphemy following. But it may be well replied.

(a) It is not at all clear that we have here the same events that are recorded in Matthew and Mark. Similar miracles were often wrought in the Master's work and similar sayings were frequently repeated on similar or

different occasions. This was a common habit with him, as we have heretofore seen.

(b) This portion of Luke is his distinctive contribution to the ministry of Christ in addition to his account of the nativity. He has condensed his account of the withdrawals from Galilee, apparently to make room for the description of another part of Christ's work. Matthew and Mark almost confine themselves to the ministry in Galilee, while Luke thus devotes the bulk of his narrative to what seems to be a later ministry, after Jesus has left Galilee. It is hardly likely that this account should be a mere jumble of scattered details.

(c) Especially is this unlikely in view of Luke's express statement (1:3) that he was going to write an orderly narrative. In no real sense could this be true, if this large section is dislocated in time and order of events.

2. Others refer the entire narrative (Luke 9:51-18:14) to the last journey of the Saviour to Jerusalem to the Passover and see a triple reference to the same journey arguing for triplications in Luke. Others prefer to understand it as meaning the journey to the Feast of the Tabernacles or Dedication. Some would combine this idea with the unchronological plan noticed above. In favor of this journey being continuous and the last one to Jerusalem, the following arguments are adduced:

(a) The language of Luke 9:51, "when the days were being completed that he should be received up," implies that the end was drawing near, and that he was setting his face towards Jerusalem to meet it. This is true without doubt, for Wieseler's interpretation of "received up" as meaning Christ's reception by man is entirely too forced. The expression points to the end of Christ's earthly career. But what does the vague expression, "the days were being completed," mean? Does it have to mean only a few weeks? May it not include as much as six months? For we know that Jesus had been instructing his disciples on this very subject expressly and pointedly, and at the Transfiguration he had spoken of his "decease." Henceforward this was the uppermost subject in his mind. So the interpretation is correct, but the inference is not necessary. This journey in Luke 9:51 need not be either just before the Passover or the Dedication. It could be as early as Tabernacles and be thus described.

(b) It is insisted that this is Jesus' final departure from Galilee, the one described by Matthew and Mark. No place is allowed for a return to Galilee after the departure in Luke 9:51. Robinson urges that Luke 9:51 naturally means a final departure from Galilee. But it may simply mean that he left it as a sphere of activity, not that he never entered Galilee again. And then Luke 17:11 expressly says that Jesus went "through the midst of Samaria and Galilee." This means more than going on the border between the two countries, as McClellan argues. He went through some portions of

Samaria and Galilee. In order for McClellan to carry out his scheme he has to resort to the artificial device of referring part of John 10:40 to the departure from Galilee, and the other half to the Perea ministry after a diversion of considerable length into Samaria and back into Galilee. So the effort is not convincing to place all the material in this large section of Luke in one last journey to Jerusalem.

3. The combination of Luke's narrative with that of John. Wieseler was the first to point out a possible parallel between Luke and John. John gives us three journeys,—the Feast of Tabernacles (John 7:2 ff.), the journey to Bethany at the raising of Lazarus (John 11:17 ff.), the final Passover (John 12:1). Luke likewise three times in this section speaks of Jesus going to Jerusalem, 9:51; 13:22; 17:11. Hence it would seem possible, even probable, that their journeys corresponded. If so, John 7:2–11:54 is to be taken as parallel to Luke 9:51–18:14. This plan is followed by various modern scholars.

According to John's chronology, Jesus was in Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles (7:2), at the Feast of Dedication (10:22), and at the Passover (12:1). Just after the Feast of the Dedication we find him abiding beyond Jordan, where John had baptized (John 10:40). From this point he comes to Bethany near Jerusalem at the raising of Lazarus (John 11:17), whence he withdraws to a little town called Ephraim in the hills north of Jerusalem (John 11:54). Here he abides awhile with his disciples away from his enemies till he goes to the Passover. Such is John's outline of these last six months of the Saviour's life.

(a) But how is all this to be reconciled with the statement of Luke (17:11) that Jesus went through Samaria and Galilee? If Jesus went back to Galilee, John would have mentioned it, we are told. Not necessarily, not unless it fell in with his plan to do so. Hence no conflict need exist between Luke and John. Luke says he went through Galilee and John permits it by the break in his narrative at 11:54. Various points in the six months have been suggested as the point when the return to Galilee was made. The most natural point is from Ephraim, whither he had withdrawn (John 11:54). It was not far to go up through Samaria and join in Galilee (Luke 17:11) the pilgrims from his own country who were in the habit of going to the Passover through Perea, to avoid passing through Samaria. This supposition is not improbable, as Robinson and McClellan urge, but very natural; it makes Luke and John both agree, and allows Luke 9:51 to mean that Jesus then left Galilee as a field of operations. Various other theories are suggested for this return to Galilee, but none of them appear as fitting as this one. It was just before the Passover, when such a journey from Galilee to Jerusalem would be made.

(b) One other point needs to be considered. The theory we hold makes the journey in Luke 9:51 identical with the one in John 7:2–10, viz., to Taber-

nacles. Many hold such identity to be impossible because of apparent contradictions in the narratives. Andrews makes three objections against this identity: (1) That the Lord refused to go with his brethren (John 7:6). But it was his brothers who were not favorable to him that he refused to go with. He simply wished to avoid publicity. His face was set (Luke 9:51) all the time, but he was not going with them. (2) That the manner of the going is unlike; the one in John is secret, while the one in Luke is public. But the secrecy in John may merely mean the avoidance of the caravan routes and so through Samaria (Luke). The messengers sent before were not to herald his coming to gather crowds simply, but to make ready for him. It was needed, since the Samaritans saw that his face was as if he were going to Jerusalem. (3) That he went rapidly according to John and slowly according to Luke. He does, according to John, appear in Jerusalem before the feast is over, but Luke does not make him move slowly. Nor is it necessary to connect the sending of the seventy (Luke 10:1 ff.) with this journey. It belongs rather to the interval between Tabernacles and Dedication. So the secret going of John and the going through Samaria of Luke agree. John explains, 7:10, that Jesus rejected the advice of his brothers. This theory is held irrespective of this being the final departure from Galilee. It is not necessary to fill out every detail in this programme and show where Jesus was between Tabernacles and Dedication. The main outlines remain clear and harmonious and are fairly satisfactory. This combination of Luke and John preserves the integrity of both narratives and fills up a large blank that would otherwise exist in these closing months of the Saviour's life. Upon the whole, therefore, this view seems decidedly preferable, though nothing like absolute certainty can be claimed in regard to the question.

We do not know what special source Luke had for 9:51–18:14. Some of it may have come from the Logia (Q). Hawkins (*Oxford Studies*, pp. 55 ff.) calls it "the Travel Document." Burton (*Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem*) suggests "The Perea Document" and thinks that Luke may have drafted it early out of oral material. But at any rate it is a great and characteristic portion of his Gospel and adds greatly to our knowledge of Christ.

11. Did Christ Eat the Passover?

To put this question in another form, it would be, On what day of the month was Jesus crucified? For the crucifixion occurred on the same Jewish day as the eating of the meal recorded by all four Evangelists. Nearly all agree that the crucifixion occurred on Friday and the meal was eaten the evening before, our Thursday, but the beginning of the Jewish day, counting from sunset to sunset. But what day of the month was it? The Passover

feast began on the 15th Nisan, the lamb being slain in the afternoon of the 14th. But the day of the week would vary with the new moon. If Jesus ate the regular Passover supper, he was crucified on the 15th Nisan. If he ate an anticipatory meal a day in advance and was himself slain at the hour of killing the paschal lamb, he was crucified on the 14th Nisan. In that case he did not really eat the Passover supper at all. So then we must seek to determine the truth about this matter, because express statements are made about it in the Gospels.

1. Some sentimental views of the question need to be disposed of first. A great controversy once raged in the early churches about the Passover.

(a) In the latter part of the second century some of the churches of Asia Minor, largely composed of Jewish Christians, kept up the Passover on the ground that Jesus had eaten it the night before his crucifixion. Polycarp, the disciple of John, expresses the persuasion that Jesus ate the Passover.

(b) But some of the churches were afraid of this example and its application to the discussion about the relation of the Mosaic laws to Christianity. So they took the position that Jesus did not eat the Passover himself, but as the Paschal Lamb, was crucified at the time the lamb was slain. He was our Passover. The Greek churches now hold this position, while the Latin churches hold that Jesus ate the Passover. But those arguments are purely subjective and do not affect the question of fact. Hence we waive this old-time controversy and come to the testimony of the Gospels themselves.

2. The testimony of the Synoptists, Mark, Matthew, and Luke. The evidence they give is abundant and explicit to the effect that Jesus ate the regular Paschal Supper on the evening after the 14th Nisan.

(a) Jesus predicted that his death would occur during the Feast of the Passover. See Matthew 26:2, "Ye know that after two days the Passover cometh, and the Son of Man is delivered up to be crucified." See also Mark 14:1 and Luke 22:1, where the fact is alluded to. Passover is used in the general sense of the feast of unleavened bread, as Luke explains. The feast of unleavened bread followed the Passover meal, beginning the next morning and lasting a week. But the one term was used to include the other. The Passover was expanded to mean the entire feast that followed, and *vice versa*.

(b) It is true that the Jewish authorities decided not to put Jesus to death during the feast (Matthew 26:5; Mark 14:2). But this decision was reached not because of any compunctions of conscience in the matter, but because they were afraid of a tumult among the people, owing to the great crowds, many of whom were friendly to Christ. But so soon as Judas offered his services, their fears vanished and they proceeded with their murderous designs (Matthew 26:14; Mark 14:11). The rulers did expedite matters at the crucifixion that the bodies might not be exposed on the Sabbath.

But they had often tried to slay Jesus on the Sabbath heretofore. Public executions did take place during the feasts (Deut. 17:12 f.).

(c) The Synoptists flatly say (Matthew 26:17, 20; Mark 14:12, 17; Luke 22:7, 14) that on the first day of unleavened bread Jesus sent Peter and John from Bethany into the city to make preparations for eating the Passover, and that on the evening of the same day he ate it with his disciples. Luke calls it "the hour." Now, the first day of unleavened bread was the 14th Nisan. There is no question about this. Josephus speaks of the feast lasting eight days. The lamb of the supper being slain on the afternoon of this day, it was regarded as the beginning of the feast. Besides, Mark and Luke end the whole matter by saying that on this day they sacrificed the Passover. Jesus himself calls it the Passover (Luke 22:15). It is useless to say that Jesus ate the Passover a day in advance. This could not be done, especially by one to whom the temple authorities were hostile. Equally useless is it to say that the Jews ate the Passover a day too late. If a mistake was made about the new moon, they would hardly keep the Passover on two different days, nor would Jesus be apt to make a point about the matter.

3. The testimony of John. If we had only the evidence of the Synoptists, no serious trouble would ever arise on this question. Strauss has strenuously urged that John is on this point in hopeless conflict with the other Evangelists, since he makes Jesus eat the Passover on the evening after the 13th Nisan (Wednesday), and not the evening after the 14th (Thursday). This idea has gained a foothold among many able modern writers who see a clear contradiction between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. Some of these evidently do so because they hold that the Paschal controversy in Asia Minor arose from this supposed conflict of John with the Synoptists, and that this shows John's Gospel to have been in existence when that controversy began. It is not worth while to maintain that John in chapter 13 alludes to a different meal on a different occasion. The points of contact with the Synoptists are too sharp and clear, such as the sop given to Judas. But five passages in John are produced as being in direct opposition to the statements of the Synoptic Gospels. A careful examination of each of these five passages in the Fourth Gospel will show that John does not say that Jesus ate the Passover meal a day in advance of the regular time, but quite the contrary.

(a) John 13:1 f., "Now before the feast of the Passover, Jesus knowing, etc." Here, it is alleged, a distinct statement is made that this supper was before the Passover, and consequently twenty-four hours before. But several things are taken for granted in this inference. One is that the phrase "feast of the Passover" is to be confined to this particular meal, and is not to include the entire festival of unleavened bread (*cf.* Luke 22:1). Often

by a metonymy of speech the name of a part is given to the whole. Besides, it is not certain that verse 1 is to be connected with verse 2. The best exegeses agree that a complete idea may be presented therein, either a general statement that Jesus loved his own before the Passover and until the end, or that he came into special consciousness of this love just before the Passover. And if the more natural interpretation be taken and the application of this love be made in verse 2, it is not necessary that the "before" be as much as twenty-four hours. Observe also the text adopted in the Revised Version in verse 2, not "supper being ended," but "during supper." With this reading agree the other references in 13:4, "riseth from supper," 13:12, "sat down again," 13:23, "there was at the table reclining in Jesus' bosom." So the natural meaning is that just before the meal began, Jesus purposed to show his love for his own by a practical illustration. So, after they had all reclined at the table according to custom, Jesus arose and passed around the tables, washing their feet; then he reclined again and proceeded with the meal. So nothing at all can be made out of this passage against the view that this was the regular Passover; but, on the other hand, the most natural meaning is that John is here describing what took place at this Passover meal. Else, why should he mention the Passover at all?

(b) John 13:27, "That thou doest, do quickly." The objection is made that the disciples would not have thought that Jesus referred to the feast (13:29), if the Passover meal was already going on or was over. So, it is urged, this remark must have been made a day before the Passover was celebrated. But if that were the case, where would be the necessity for hurry, as there would be plenty of time on the morrow? The word "feast" here need not be confined to the paschal supper, but more naturally refers to the whole of the feast, of which the supper was a part. So this haste was needed to provide for the feast of unleavened bread which began on the next morning. No real force lies in the fact that this day was a holy day, being the first day of the Passover festival. The Mishna expressly allows the procuring, even on a Sabbath, what was needed for the Passover. If this could be done on a Sabbath, much more could it be done on a feast day which was not a Sabbath. Hence not only was it possible for the disciples to have misunderstood the remark of Jesus on the Passover evening, but it was far more natural that such misapprehensions should arise then than a day before. So this passage, like the preceding, when rightly understood, really confirms the Synoptists.

(c) John 18:28, "They themselves entered not into the palace, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover." At first sight this does look like a contradiction. For this was certainly after the feast of John 13:2, and if they had not eaten the Passover meal, why here is a clear case of conflict of authorities. But it is by no means certain that the phrase "eat the Pass-

over" means simply the paschal supper. This phrase occurs five times in the New Testament besides this, but all in Matthew, Mark, and Luke (Matt. 26:17; Mark 14:12, 14; Luke 22:11, 15). In all of these the reference is to the paschal supper. But the word "passover" is used in three senses in the New Testament, the paschal supper, the paschal lamb, or the paschal festival. The word is used eight times in John besides this instance, and in every case the Passover festival is meant. So we may fairly infer that the usage of John must determine his own meaning rather than that of the Synoptists. This becomes more probable when we remember that John wrote much later than they, after the destruction of Jerusalem, when these terms were not used so strictly. He always speaks of "the Jews" as separate from Christians. And this very expression is used in 2 Chronicles 30:22, "And they did eat the festival seven days." The Septuagint translates it, "And they fulfilled (kept) the festival of unleavened bread seven days." See Robinson. So it is entirely possible for the phrase, "eat the Passover," to mean in this instance also the celebration of the Passover festival. Some have urged that the Sanhedrin had not eaten the Passover at the regular hour because of the excitement of the trial. But this is hardly tenable. And, moreover, since this remark was made early in the morning, how could that affect the eating of the supper in the evening? For whatever impurities one had during the day passed away at evening. Hence this uncleanness must belong to the same day on which it was incurred. If the Passover festival had begun, this would be true, for they would wish to participate in the offerings of that day. So this passage likewise becomes an argument in favor of agreement with the Synoptists.

(d) John 19:14, "Now it was the Preparation of the Passover." This is claimed to mean the day preceding the Passover festival. Hence Christ was crucified on the 14th Nisan, in opposition to the Synoptists. The afternoon before the Passover was used as a preparation, but it was not technically so called. This phrase "Preparation" was really the name of a day in the week, the day before the Sabbath, our Friday. We are not left to conjecture about this question. The Evangelists all use it in this sense alone. Matthew uses it for Friday (27:62), Mark expressly says that the Preparation was the day before the Sabbath (15:42), Luke says that it was the day of the Preparation and the Sabbath drew on (23:54), and John himself so uses the word in two other passages (19:31, 42), in both of which haste is exercised on the Preparation, because the Sabbath was at hand. The New Testament usage is conclusive, therefore, on this point. This, then, was the Friday of Passover week. And this agrees with the Synoptists. Besides, the term "Preparation" has long been the regular name for Friday in the Greek language, caused by the New Testament usage. It is so in the Modern Greek to-day. It was the Sabbath eve, just

as the Germans have *Sonnabend* for Sunday eve, i.e., Saturday afternoon. So this passage also becomes a positive argument for the agreement between John and the Synoptists.

(e) John 19:31, "For the day of that Sabbath was a high day." From this passage it has been argued that at this Passover the first day of the Passover festival coincided with the weekly Sabbath. But that is an entirely gratuitous inference. This coincidence would, of course, be a "high day," but so would the first day of the feast, the last day, or the Sabbath of the feast. In John 7:37 the last day is called "the great day of the feast." The Sabbath occurring during the festival would be a high day likewise. Robinson's arguments on this point are quite conclusive. Nothing can be made out of the expression against the position of the Synoptists.

McClellan discusses various other passages in John which show that the crucifixion occurred on Friday, and that this was the first day of the feast (John 18:39, 40; 19:31, 42; 20:1, 19, etc.). We conclude then that a fair interpretation of the passages alleged not only removes all contradiction between John and the Synoptists, but rather decidedly favors the view that they have the same date for the Passover meal, and that Jesus ate the Passover at the regular hour and was crucified on Friday, 15th Nisan.

It is reassuring to note that David Smith (*The Days of His Flesh*, Appendix VIII) reaches the same conclusion as that just stated. He makes it out that Jesus ate the regular Passover meal and was crucified on Friday 15th of Nisan and that the passages in John really agree with the Synoptic account.

12. The Hour of the Crucifixion

In John 19:14 it is stated that the time when Pilate sentenced Jesus to be crucified, or rather when he began the last trial in which he sentenced him, was about the sixth hour. We read, however, in Mark 15:25 that it was the third hour when Christ was crucified. The Synoptists all unite in saying that the darkness began at the sixth hour. The Jewish way of counting the hours was to divide the night and day into twelve divisions each, beginning at sunrise and sunset. The hours would thus vary in length with the time of year. Just after the vernal equinox the third hour of Mark would be about 9 A.M., and the sixth hour of the Synoptists would be about noon. The ninth hour, when Jesus gave his piteous cry to God (Mark 15:34), would be about 3 P.M. But how can the sixth hour of John, the time when Jesus was sentenced by Pilate, be reconciled to this schedule? A real difficulty is here presented, but by no means an insuperable one, as Alford and Meyer hold. Let us discuss some of the more usual explanations. Andrews and McClellan give quite a variety of suggested solutions.

1. Some hold that "sixth" in John is a textual error for "third." This could easily happen, since the gamma and the digamma of the Greek are

very similar. Eusebius said that the accurate copies had it "third" in John. But the textual evidence is overwhelmingly against it, and, besides, the difficulty would not be removed. John is evidently speaking of the time at the last trial and Mark of the time after Jesus has been led out to the crucifixion. So nothing is gained by this hypothesis. We should still be confronted with the same difficulty. The change to *third* in John was a mere stupid scribal correction.

2. Others would change the punctuation in John 19:14 so as to make "of the Passover" belong to "sixth hour," beginning from midnight. But there is no evidence that the Passover began with midnight. So Hofmann. This is very forced and unnatural.

3. Views that hinge on the word "preparation." Some would hold that John simply says that about noon the preparation time of the Passover begins. But Preparation here means Friday, and noon is not the hour needed to harmonize with Mark. Equally arbitrary is it to count six hours backward from noon so as to reach six o'clock.

Augustine suggested that the six hours are to be counted from 3 A.M. This would make 9 A.M., and would concur with the hour of Mark. But this is wholly arbitrary and unsatisfactory, and would not relieve the trouble.

4. Equally arbitrary is the solution that makes Mark refer to the hour of the sentence and John to the crucifixion, just the reverse of the Scripture account. Augustine also proposed that Jesus was crucified at the third hour by the tongues of the Jews, and at the sixth by the hands of the soldiers.

5. Others hold that Mark and John both speak in general terms. Hence the crucifixion may have taken place between 9 and 12 in the morning. Mark looks in one direction and John in the other without aiming at definiteness. The Jews, it is true, were not as exact in the use of expressions of time as we are to-day, but this solution hardly meets the requirements of the case. Mark puts his *third* hour at the beginning of the crucifixion, and John his *sixth* hour at the beginning of the last trial. This reconciliation does not reconcile.

6. The most satisfactory solution of the difficulty is to be found in the idea that John here uses the Roman computation of time, from midnight to noon and noon to midnight, just as we do now. Hence the sixth hour would be our six o'clock in the morning. If this hour was the beginning of the last trial of Jesus, we then have enough, but not too much, time for the completion of the trial, the carrying away of Jesus outside the city walls, together with the procuring of the crosses, etc. All the events, moreover, narrated by the Evangelists, could have occurred between dawn (John 18:27) and six or seven.

For a long time it was doubted whether the Romans ever used this method of computing time for civil days. Farrar vehemently opposes this idea.

But Plutarch, Pliny, Aulus Gellius, and Macrobius expressly say that the Roman civil day was reckoned from midnight to midnight. So the question of fact may be considered as settled. The only remaining question is whether John used this mode of reckoning. Of course, the Romans had also the natural day and the natural night just as we do now. In favor of the idea that John uses the Roman way of counting the hours in the civil day, several things may be said.

(a) He wrote the Gospel late in the century, probably in Asia Minor, long after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Jewish method would not likely be preserved. Roman ideas were prevalent in Asia Minor. John evidently is not writing for the Jews primarily, since he constantly speaks of "the Jews" as outsiders. John is writing to be understood by the people, and this is the way it would be understood in Asia Minor.

(b) All the passages in John, where the hour is mentioned, allow this computation. John 1:39 would be 10 A.M.; 4:6 f. would be 6 P.M., counting from noon also (as we do). This hour suits best the circumstances. In the evening the women would come to get water, Jesus would have time for his journey thither, and would be tired and hungry. In John 4:52 the hour would be 7 P.M. This hour likewise suits the circumstances better. John 11:9, Are there not twelve hours in the day? is not against this idea, since here obviously the natural day, as opposed to night, is meant. The Romans used both methods and so do we.

(c) Moreover, one passage in John (20:19), when compared with Luke 24:29, 36, makes it necessary to understand that John used the Roman method in this instance. It was toward evening, and the day had declined, according to Luke, when Jesus and the disciples drew near to Emmaus. Here he ate supper and, "rising up that very hour," the disciples returned seven miles to Jerusalem and told these things to the eleven who were together. But while they were narrating these things Jesus appeared to them. Now John, in mentioning this very appearance of Jesus (20:19), says that it "was evening on *that day*, the first day of the week," i.e., evening of the day when Mary Magdalene had seen the Lord. But with the Jews the evening began the day. Hence John, here at least, is *bound* to mean the Roman day. It was the evening of the same day in the morning of which Mary had seen Jesus. This appears conclusive. John did use the Roman method here, may have done so always, almost certainly did so in 19:14. Besides, as McClellan shows, the natural meaning of John's phrase is that it was the sixth hour of the Friday (Preparation) of the Passover. But we have just seen that John in 20:19 counts according to the Roman day. Hence the sixth hour of Friday would be six o'clock in the morning.

This is the only solution that really harmonizes John and Mark. The rest make the hours agree, but the hours bring together different events.

This method harmonizes the whole narrative, and seems entirely probable, if we can assume that the Romans or Greeks employed hours in this sense, a point denied by Ramsay.

Sir W. M. Ramsay (*The Expositor* for March, 1893, and Extra Volume, Hastings D B) contends that Mark and John are at variance, but that it is of small moment, since the ancients had little notion about hours. He seeks to show that the martyrdom of Polycarp and Pronius, usually relied on to prove that in Asia Minor the hours were counted from midnight, took place in the afternoon, instead of the morning, the usual time. Hence the eighth and tenth hours respectively would be 2 P.M. and 4 P.M. Ramsay argues that, when hours were counted, they were always counted from sunrise. He holds that John is more accurate about hours than Mark and that hence Mark is in error. He agrees that John "stood on the Roman plane" in the use of time, but denies that the sixth hour can be our 6 A.M. But the evidence is too uncertain for such a dogmatic position.

13. *The Time of the Resurrection of Christ*

1. Mark, Luke, and John say that the resurrection had taken place early on the first day of the week, i.e. early Sunday morning. Mark (16:9) says that Jesus, "having risen early, on the first day of the week, appeared, etc." The position of "early" is ambiguous in the Greek and the passage is disputed. Mark (16:2) states that it was very early on the first day of the week, the sun having risen, when the women came to the sepulchre. Luke (24:1) says that the women came to the tomb at early dawn on the first day of the week. John (20:1) says that Mary Magdalene came to the tomb in the morning on the first day of the week. So then, there is no doubt that these three Evangelists mean to say that Jesus rose very early on Sunday morning, and that shortly after that event came the two Marys and some other women to anoint his body with spices.

Much objection is made to some of the details in the accounts of Mark and John especially as being inconsistent. John (20:1) says that Mary comes while it is yet dark, while Mark says (16:2) that the sun was risen. But Mark also says in the same verse that it was very early, which would agree with John's statement that it was yet dark. Hence Mark's other statement, that the sun was risen, must be interpreted in the light of his own words. Two solutions can be offered.

(a) We may suppose, as McClellan and others, that John's note of time refers to the starting from Bethany, while it was yet dark or very early (Mark). In a few minutes it would be early dawn (Luke), and by the time the women come to the tomb, the sun would be up. All this is entirely possible and looks even probable, for in the twilight of early dawn, the border line is very narrow between darkness and sunrise. A stiff morning walk

would pass through all the stages. It all depends on where you take your stand in this fleeting interim. Mark covers both sides and so includes it all from the first glimmering light till the full light of day.

(b) Or the expression, "the sun was risen" (aorist participle), may simply be a general expression applicable to the phenomena of sunrise. The first gleam of daylight comes from the rising sun, though not yet completely risen. Robinson gives several examples from the Septuagint, where the same phrase is used in the aorist tense in a general way for the dawning light of day (Judges 9:33; 2 Kings 3:22; Ps. 104:22). Either of these explanations is entirely possible and removes the difficulty.

2. But Matthew seems to put the resurrection on the evening after the Sabbath, our Saturday evening. He says (28:1), "But late on the Sabbath day, as it was dawning into the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to view the sepulchre." If this passage means that the visit was made at the end of the Sabbath day (evening) and after the resurrection of Jesus, then Matthew is in plain contradiction to the other Evangelists. Some have taken the position that Jesus rose at sunset on the Sabbath day, forgetting that Mark (16:9) says that he rose early in the morning. There are several ways of reconciling Matthew with the other gospels.

(a) Greswell, Alford and others would translate "late on the Sabbath day" by "late in the week." The Greek word is the same in this verse for Sabbath and week. In both cases, therefore, the translation could be the same. But little sense would result from this translation. "Late in the week" and "dawning into the first day of the week" hardly fit well. By this explanation the latter expression is used for the first part of Sunday and the visit occurred in this dawning part of the day.

(b) Others would translate "late on the Sabbath day" by "after the Sabbath day." Godet, Grimm and others contend that the Greek idiom could mean this, and the *Koine* allows it (Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, pp. 645 f.). This rendering is possible, though the papyri have instances of "late on" for this preposition (*opse*), and it is so translated by several English translators. Thus the Greek idiom allows either "late on" or "after."

(c) Matthew does not clearly say that this visit was made after the resurrection of the Saviour although his words may mean that. Hence the words may have their natural meaning as sustained by the papyri. Late on the Sabbath day, about sundown say, the two Marys go to view the sepulchre (Matt. 28:1), having rested through the day (Luke 23:56). The women who had come with Jesus from Galilee had gone thither on Friday, after his burial, to see where he was laid and had prepared spices. If they went at night-fall at the close of the Sabbath (Matt. 28:1) "to see the sepulchre," they

could have bought spices after sundown (Mark 16:1). Then (Mark 16:2) in the early morning, they rose and took the spices and went to anoint his body. It was then that they saw the angel (Matt. 28:5). Matthew does not say that in the visit of 28:1 the angel appeared to them. He speaks of the earthquake having come, and the resurrection, and then resumes. This view gains some support from the use of the same Greek word in Luke 23:54, "And it was the day of the Preparation (Friday) and the Sabbath drew on (was dawning)." Here the meaning seems to be that the Sabbath *dawned* at the close of the day. So Westcott, McClellan and others. However it may be about the visit of the women in Matt. 28:1, Matthew certainly does not mean to say that Jesus rose at sunset on the Sabbath. The whole course of his narrative in the rest of the chapter shows that it was the morning of Sunday when the angel appeared. While (Matt. 28:11) the women went to the disciples, the soldiers ran to the chief priests (Matt. 28:13) and said that the disciples came by *night* and stole him while they slept, clearly implying that it was now day. Hence Matthew does not teach that Jesus rose at sunset, but the reverse. Besides, Matthew expressly says that Jesus rose on the third day, which would not be true, if he rose on the Sabbath.

(d) Sabbath day may be used of the day followed by the night, according to a possible understanding of the language. The Jews originally counted from evening to evening, but this custom did not prevail universally. Jonah (1:17) and Matthew (12:40) speak of three days and three nights, following the day by the night. Meyer, Morison, Clark and others hold this view, and it is possible, but certainly not so satisfactory as the view given under (c). At any rate, it remains clear that Matthew agrees with the other Evangelists in putting the resurrection of Jesus Sunday morning. The chief point of difficulty is Matthew's visit of the women in 28:1, whether this was in the evening before simply "to view the sepulchre," or in the morning to anoint the body of the Saviour. The condensed account of Matthew leaves this question unsettled, and there we too shall have to leave it. And this last matter does not affect the question as to the time of the Lord's resurrection, but only the number of the visits made by the women.

14. The Length of Our Lord's Stay in the Tomb

Quite an effort is made in some quarters to show that Jesus remained in the tomb seventy-two hours, three full days and nights. The effort seems due to a desire to give full value to the expression "three days" and to vindicate scripture. But a minutely literal interpretation of this phrase makes "on the third day" flatly erroneous. A good deal of labor has been expended in the impossible attempt to make three and four equal to each other. There are three sets of expressions used about the matter, besides the express state-

ments of the Gospels about the days of the crucifixion and resurrection. Let us examine these lines of evidence.

1. Luke settles the matter pointedly by mentioning all the time between the crucifixion and the resurrection (Luke 23:50-24:3). The burial took place Friday afternoon just before the Sabbath drew on (Luke 23:54). The women rested on the Sabbath (Saturday) (Luke 23:56), and went to the sepulchre early Sunday morning, the first day of the week (Luke 24:1). There is no escaping this piece of chronology. This is all the time there was between the two events. Jesus then lay in the tomb from late in the afternoon of Friday till early Sunday morning. The other Gospels agree with this reckoning of the time, as we have already seen.

2. But how about the prediction of Jesus, repeatedly made, and once illustrated by the case of Jonah, that he would rise after three days? Are two nights and a day and two pieces of days three days? Let us see.

(a) The well-known custom of the Jews was to count a part of a day as a whole day of twenty-four hours. Hence a part of a day or night would be counted as a whole day, the term day obviously having two senses, as night and day, or day contrasted with night. So then the part of Friday would count as one day, Saturday another, and the part of Sunday the third day. This method of reckoning gives no trouble to a Jew or to modern men, for that matter. In free vernacular we speak the same way today.

(b) Besides, the phrase "on the third day" is obliged to mean that the resurrection took place on that day, for, if it occurred after the third day, it would be on the fourth day and not on the third. Now it so happens that this term "third day" is applied *seven* times to the resurrection of Christ (Matt. 16:21; Matt. 17:23; Matt. 20:19; Luke 27:7, 21, 46; 1 Cor. 15:4). These numerous passages of Scripture, both prophecy and statement of history, agree with the record of the fact that Jesus did rise on the third day. (Luke 24:7.)

(c) Moreover, the phrase "after three days" is used by the same writers (Matthew and Luke) in connection with the former one, "the third day," as meaning the same thing. Hence the definite and clear expressions must explain the one that is less so. The chief priests and Pharisees remember (Matt. 27:63) that Jesus said, after three days I rise again. Hence they urge Pilate to keep a guard over the tomb until the *third day* (Matt. 27:64). This is their own interpretation of the Saviour's words. Besides, in parallel passages in the different Gospels, one will have one expression and another the other, naturally suggesting that they regarded them as equivalent. (Cf. Mark 8:31 with Matt. 16:21, Luke 9:22 with Mark 10:34.) On the third day cannot mean on the fourth day, while after three days can be used as meaning on the third day.

(d) Matthew 12:40 is urged as conclusive the other way. But the "three

days and three nights" may be nothing more than a longer way of saying three days, using day in its long sense. And we have already seen that the Jews counted any part of this full day (day and night) as a whole day (day and night). Hence this passage may mean nothing more than the common "after three days" above mentioned, and, like that expression, must be interpreted in accordance with the definite term "on the third day" and with the clear chronological data given by Luke and the rest. They seemed to be conscious of no discrepancy in these various expressions. Most likely they understood them as well as we do at any rate.