

The Early Church Fathers Writings

Volume 59

THE EARLY CHURCH FATHERS WRITINGS

Volume 59

Augustine: Tractates 55 to 124 and the Harmony of the
Gospels

c. AD 400 – 420

S E R M O N I N D E X

The Early Church Fathers Writings

Volume 59: Augustine: Tractates 55 to 124 and the Harmony of the Gospels

The translations in this book are in the public domain, as described in the Sources and Credits at the back. The section divisions and the introductions to the works were prepared for SermonIndex and are released under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International licence (CC BY-SA 4.0): you may copy, adapt and share them, including commercially, if you give credit and share the result under the same licence.

The introductions to the works were prepared with the help of artificial intelligence.

Published by SermonIndex, sermonindex.net

This book is also free to read online at sermonindex.net/books/

First edition, 2026

ISBN to be added

CONTENTS

Introduction to This Volume	vii
PART ONE · TRACTATES ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN	1
Tractates on the Gospel of John 55–124	3
Tractate 55	3
Tractate 56	7
Tractate 57	10
Tractate 58	14
Tractate 59	17
Tractate 60	20
Tractate 61	23
Tractate 62	25
Tractate 63	29
Tractate 64	32
Tractate 65	34
Tractate 66	37
Tractate 67	39
Tractate 68	42
Tractate 69	45
Tractate 70	48
Tractate 71	51
Tractate 72	54
Tractate 73	57
Tractate 74	60
Tractate 75	64
Tractate 76	66
Tractate 77	69
Tractate 78	72
Tractate 79	75
Tractate 80	78
Tractate 81	80
Tractate 82	83
Tractate 83	85
Tractate 84	88
Tractate 85	90
Tractate 86	92
Tractate 87	95
Tractate 88	98
Tractate 89	101
Tractate 90	104
Tractate 91	106

Tractate 92.....	109
Tractate 93.....	112
Tractate 94.....	116
Tractate 95.....	120
Tractate 96.....	124
Tractate 97.....	129
Tractate 98.....	134
Tractate 99.....	141
Tractate 100.....	149
Tractate 101.....	152
Tractate 102.....	156
Tractate 103.....	160
Tractate 104.....	164
Tractate 105.....	167
Tractate 106.....	173
Tractate 107.....	179
Tractate 108.....	183
Tractate 109.....	185
Tractate 110.....	190
Tractate 111.....	197
Tractate 112.....	204
Tractate 113.....	207
Tractate 114.....	212
Tractate 115.....	215
Tractate 116.....	219
Tractate 117.....	224
Tractate 118.....	227
Tractate 119.....	232
Tractate 120.....	235
Tractate 121.....	238
Tractate 122.....	243
Tractate 123.....	252
Tractate 124.....	258
 PART TWO · THE HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS	269
The Harmony of the Gospels	271
 Sources and Credits	579

INTRODUCTION TO THIS VOLUME

How this book is arranged

This is the fifty-ninth volume of a series that gathers the writings of the early Church in order of date, from the generation after the apostles down to the eighth century. This volume holds Augustine, Tractates 55 to 124 and the Harmony of the Gospels, from the period about AD 400 – 420.

Within each work the text is divided into chapters and numbered sections, so that any passage can be found again and cited. The small bold figures in the text are the section numbers.

The translations

The text is in English only. Wherever a modern English version has been prepared for SermonIndex it is used here; otherwise the book prints an older public-domain translation. In both cases the wording is the translator's own: older translations have not been altered beyond dividing them into sections. The sources for every work are listed at the back of the book, together with the licence under which each text is released. All the works in this volume are printed in older public-domain translations.

In this volume

Augustine was born at Thagaste in North Africa in AD 354. He taught rhetoric at Carthage, Rome and Milan, and after years as a Manichaean he was baptised at Milan by Ambrose in AD 387. He returned to Africa, was ordained a presbyter at Hippo about AD 391, and was bishop of Hippo from about AD 395 until his death in AD 430, while the Vandals were besieging the city. He wrote the Confessions, The City of God and On the Trinity, and a great body of sermons, letters and treatises against the Manichaeans, the Donatists and the Pelagians.

The Harmony of the Gospels, written about AD 400, is the first great work on the differences between the four Gospels. Augustine answers critics who said that the evangelists contradict one another, and he goes through the story of Christ passage by passage.

Dates and authorship

Dates are approximate and are debated by scholars. Each work begins with a short introduction that states what is known about its author and its date, and what is uncertain.

P A R T O N E

Tractates on the Gospel of John

Tractates 55 to 124, to the end of the Gospel.

Tractates on the Gospel of John 55–124

AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO

AD 354–430

Augustine preached these one hundred and twenty-four tractates on the Gospel of John at Hippo in the years after AD 406. They were taken down as he spoke, and they were afterwards revised and collected. This volume holds Tractates 55 to 124.

TRACTATE 55

John 13:1-5. 1. The Lord's Supper, as set forth in John, must, with His assistance, be unfolded in a becoming number of Lectures, and explained with all the ability He is pleased to grant us. "Now, before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own who were in the world, He loved them unto the end. Pascha (passover) is not, as some think, a Greek noun, but a Hebrew: and yet there occurs in this noun a very suitable kind of accordance in the two languages. For inasmuch as the Greek word *paschein* means to suffer, therefore pascha has been supposed to mean suffering, as if the noun derived its name from His passion: but in its own language, that is, in Hebrew, pascha means passover; because the pascha was then celebrated for the first time by God's people, when, in their flight from Egypt, they passed over the Red Sea. And now that prophetic emblem is fulfilled in truth, when Christ is led as a sheep to the slaughter, that by His blood sprinkled on our doorposts, that is, by the sign of His cross marked on our foreheads, we may be delivered from the perdition awaiting this world, as Israel from the bondage and destruction of the Egyptians; and a most salutary transit we make when we pass over from the devil to Christ, and from this unstable world to His well-established kingdom.

And therefore surely do we pass over to the ever-abiding God, that we may not pass away with this passing world. The apostle, in extolling God for such grace bestowed upon us, says: "Who hath delivered us from the power of

darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love. This name, then, of pascha, which, as I have said, is in Latin called transitus (pass over), is interpreted, as it were, for us by the blessed evangelist, when he says, "Before the feast of pascha, when Jesus knew that His hour was come that He should pass out of this world to the Father. Here you see we have both pascha and pass-over. Whence, and whither does He pass? Namely, "out of this world to the Father. The hope was thus given to the members in their Head, that they doubtless would yet follow Him who was "passing" before. And what, then, of unbelievers, who stand altogether apart from this Head and His members? Do not they also pass away, seeing that they abide not here always? They also do plainly pass away: but it is one thing to pass from the world, and another to pass away with it; one thing to pass to the Father, another to pass to the enemy. For the Egyptians also passed over [the sea]; but they did not pass through the sea to the kingdom, but in the sea to destruction.

2. "When Jesus knew," then, "that His hour was come that He should pass out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own who were in the world, He loved them unto the end. In order, doubtless, that they also, through that love of His, might pass from this world where they now were, to their Head who had passed hence before them. For what mean these words, "to the end," but just to Christ? "For Christ is the end of the law," says the apostle, "for righteousness to every one that believeth. The end that consummates, not that consumes; he end whereto we attain, not wherein we perish. Exactly thus are we to understand the passage, "Christ our passover is sacrificed. He is our end; into Him do we pass. For I see that these gospel words may also be taken in a kind of human sense, that Christ loved His own even unto death, so. that this may be the meaning of "He loved them unto the end. This meaning is human, not divine: for it was not merely up to this point that we were loved by Him, who loveth us always and endlessly. God forbid that He, whose death could not end, should have ended His love at death. Even after death that proud and ungodly rich man loved his five brethren; and is Christ to be thought of as loving us only till death? God forbid, beloved.

He would have come in vain with a love for us that lasted till death, if that love had ended there. But perhaps the words, "He loved them unto the end," may have to be understood in this way, That He so loved them as to die

for them. For this He testified when He said, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. We have certainly no objection that "He loved them unto the end" should be so understood, that is, it was His very love that carried Him on to death. 3. "And the supper," he says, "having taken place, and the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray Him, [Jesus] knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He has come from God, and is going to God; He riseth from supper, and layeth aside His garments; and took a towel, and girded Himself. After that He poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded." We are not to understand by the supper having taken place, as if it were already finished and over; for it was still going on when the Lord rose and washed His disciples' feet. For He afterwards sat down again, and gave the morsel [sop] to His betrayer, implying certainly that the supper was not yet over, or, in other words, that there was still bread on the table. Therefore, by supper having taken place, is meant that it was now ready, and laid out on the table for the use of the guests.

4. But when he says, "The devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray Him;" if one inquires, what was put into Judas' heart, it was doubtless this, "to betray Him." Such a putting [into the heart] is a spiritual suggestion: and entereth not by the ear, but through the thoughts; and thereby not in a way that is corporal, but spiritual. For what we call spiritual is not always to be understood in a commendatory way. The apostle knew of certain spiritual things [powers], of wickedness in heavenly places, against which he testifies that we have to maintain a struggle; and there would not be spiritual wickednesses, were there not also wicked spirits. For it is from a spiritual being that spiritual things get their name. But how such things are done, as that devilish suggestions should be introduced, and so mingle with human thoughts that a man accounts them his own, how can he know? Nor can we doubt that good suggestions are likewise made by a good spirit in the same unobservable and spiritual way; but it is matter of concern to which of these the human mind yields assent, either as deservedly left without, or graciously aided by, the divine assistance. The determination, therefore, had now been come to in Judas' heart by the instigation of the devil, that the disciple should betray the Master, whom he had not learned to know as his God. In such a state had he now come to their social

meal, a spy on the Shepherd, a plotter against the Redeemer, a seller of the Saviour; as such was he now come, was he now seen and endured, and thought himself undiscovered: for he was deceived about Him whom he wished to deceive. But He, who had already scanned the inward state of that very heart, was knowingly making use of one who knew it not.

5. "[Jesus] knowing that the Father has given all things into His hands." And therefore also the traitor himself: for if He had him not in His hands, He certainly could not use him as He wished. Accordingly, the traitor had been already betrayed to Him whom he sought to betray; and he carried out his evil purpose in betraying Him in such a way, that good he knew not of was the issue in regard to Him who was betrayed. For the Lord knew what He was doing for His friends, and patiently made use of His enemies: and thus had the Father given all things into His hands, both the evil for present use, and the good for the final issue. "Knowing also that He has come from God, and is going to God:" neither quitting God when He came from Him, nor us when He returned. 6. Knowing, then, these things, "He riseth from supper, and layeth aside His garments; and took a towel, and girded Himself. After that He poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded." We ought, dearly beloved, carefully to mark the meaning of the evangelist; because that, when about to speak of the pre-eminent humility of the Lord, it was his desire first to commend His majesty. It is in reference to this that he says, "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He has come from God, and is going to God." It is He, therefore, into whose hands the Father had given all things, who now washes, not the disciples' hands, but their feet: and it was just while knowing that He had come from God, and was proceeding to God, that He discharged the office of a servant, not of God the Lord, but of man. And this also is referred to by the prefatory notice he has been pleased to make of His betrayer, who was now come as such, and was not unknown to Him; that the greatness of His humility should be still further enhanced by the fact that He did not esteem it beneath His dignity to wash also the feet of one whose hands He already foresaw to be steeped in wickedness.

7. But why should we wonder that He rose from supper, and laid aside His garments, who, being in the form of God, made Himself of no reputation? And why should we wonder, if He girded Himself with a towel, who took

upon Him the form of a servant, and was found in the likeness of a man? Why wonder, if He poured water into a basin wherewith to wash His disciples' feet, whopoured His blood upon the earth to wash away the filth of their sins? Why wonder, if with the towel wherewith He was girded He wiped the feet He had washed, who with the very flesh that clothed Him laid a firm path way for the footsteps of His evangelists? In order, indeed, to gird Himself with the towel, He laid aside the garments He wore; but when He emptied Himself [of His divine glory] in order to assume the form of a servant, He laid not down what He had, but assumed that which He had not before. When about to be crucified, He was indeed stripped of His garments, and when dead was wrapped in linen clothes: and all that suffering of His is our purification. When, therefore, about to suffer the last extremities [of humiliation,] He here illustrated beforehand its friendly compliances; not only to those for whom He was about to endure death, but to him also who had resolved on betraying Him to death. Because so great is the beneficence of human humility, that even the Divine Majesty was pleased to commend it by His own example; for proud man would have perished eternally, had he not been found by the lowly God. For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost. And as he was lost by imitating the pride of the deceiver, let him now, when found, imitate the Redeemer's humility.

TRACTATE 56

John XIII. 6-10. 1. When the Lord was washing the disciples' feet, "He cometh to Simon Peter; and Peter saith unto Him, Lord, dost Thou wash my feet?" For who would not be filled with fear at having his feet washed by the Son of God? Although, therefore, it was a piece of the greatest audacity for the servant to contradict his Lord, the creature his God; yet Peter preferred doing this to the suffering of his feet to be washed by his Lord and God. Nor ought we to think that Peter was one amongst others who so expressed their fear and refusal, seeing that others before him had suffered it to be done to themselves with cheerfulness and equanimity. For it is easier so to understand the words of the Gospel, because that, after saying, "He began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded," it is then added, "Then cometh He to Simon Peter," as if He had already washed the feet of some, and after them had now come to the first of them all. For who can fail to know that the most blessed Peter was the first of the apostles? But we are not so to understand it, that it was after some oth-

ers that He came to him; but that He began with him. When, therefore, He began to wash the disciples' feet, He came to him with whom He began, namely, to Peter; and then Peter took fright at what any one of them might have been frightened, and said, "Lord, dost Thou wash my feet?" What is implied in this "Thou"? and what in "my"? These are subjects for thought rather than for speech; lest perchance any adequate conception the soul may have formed of such words may fail of explanation in the utterance.

2. But "Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." And not even yet, terrified as he was by the sublimity of the Lord's action, does he allow it to be done, while ignorant of its purpose; but is unwilling to see, unable to endure, that Christ should thus humble Himself to his very feet. "Thou shalt never," he says, "wash my feet." What is this "never" [in aeternum]? I will never endure, never suffer, never permit it: that is, a thing is not done "in aeternum" which is never done. Then the Saviour, to terrify His reluctant patient with the danger of his own salvation, says, "If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part with me." He speaks in this way, "If I wash thee not," when He was referring only to his feet; just as it is customary to say, You are trampling on me, when it is only the foot that is trampled on. And now the other, in a perturbation of love and fear, and more frightened at the thought that Christ should be withheld from him, than even to see Him humbled at his feet, exclaims, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." Since this, indeed, is Thy threat, that my bodily members must be washed by Thee, not only do I no longer withhold the lowest, but I lay the foremost also at Thy disposal. Deny me not having a part with Thee, and I deny Thee not any part of my body to be washed.

3. "Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." Some one perhaps may be aroused at this, and say: Nay, but if he is every whit clean, what need has He even to wash his feet? But the Lord knew what He was saying, even though our weakness reach not into His secret purposes. Nevertheless, so far as He is pleased to instruct and teach us out of His law, up to the little measure of my apprehension, I would also, with His help, make some answer bearing on the depths of this question: and, first of all, I shall have no difficulty in showing that there is no self-contradiction in the manner of expression. For who may not say, as here, with the greatest propriety, He is all clean, except his feet?-although he

would speak with greater elegance were he to say, He is all clean, save his feet; which is equivalent in meaning. Thus, then, doth the Lord say, "He needeth not save to wash his feet, but is all clean." All, that is, except, or save his feet, which he still needs to wash.

4. But what is this? what does it mean? and what is there in it we need to examine? The Lord says, The Truth declares that even he who has been washed has need still to wash his feet. What, my brethren, what think you of it, save that in holy baptism a man has all of him washed, not all save his feet, but every whit; and yet, while thereafter living in this human state, he cannot fail to tread on the ground with his feet. And thus our human feelings themselves, which are inseparable from our mortal life on earth, are like feet wherewith we are brought into sensible contact with human affairs; and are so in such a way, that if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. And every day, therefore, is He who intercedeth for us, washing our feet: and that we, too have daily need to be washing our feet, that is ordering aright the path of our spiritual foot. steps, we acknowledge even in the Lord's prayer, when we say, "Forgive us our debts as we also forgive our debtors." For "if," as it is written, "we confess our sins," then verily is He, who washed His disciples' feet, "faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness," that is, even to our feet wherewith we walk on the earth.

5. Accordingly the Church, which Christ cleanseth with the washing of water in the word, is without spot and wrinkle, not only in the case of those who are taken away immediately after the washing of regeneration from the contagious influence of this life, and tread not the earth so as to make necessary the washing of their feet, but in those also who have experienced such mercy from the Lord as to be enabled to quit this present life even with feet that have been washed. But although the Church be also clean in respect of those who tarry on earth, because they live righteously; yet have they need to be washing their feet, because they assuredly are not without sin. For this cause is it said in the Song of Songs, "I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them? For one so speaks when he is constrained to come to Christ, and in coming has to bring his feet into contact with the ground. But again, there is another question that arises. Is not Christ above? hath He not ascended into heaven, and sitteth He not at the Father's right hand? Does not the apostle expressly declare, "If ye, then, be risen with Christ, set your thoughts

on those things which are above, where Christ is sitting on the right hand of God. Seek the things which are above, not things which are on earth?

How is it, then, that to get to Christ we are compelled to tread the earth, since rather our hearts ought to be turned upwards toward the Lord, that we may be enabled to dwell in His presence? You see, brethren, the shortness of the time to-day curtails our consideration of this question. And if you perhaps fail in some measure to do so, yet I for my part see how much clearing up it requires. And therefore I beg of you to suffer it rather to be adjourned, than to be treated now in too negligent and restricted a manner; and your expectations will not be defrauded, but only deferred. For the Lord who thus makes us your debtors, will be present to enable us also to pay our debts.

TRACTATE 57

John XIII. 6-10 (continued), and Song of Sol. V. 2, 3. In what way the church should fear to defile her feet, while proceeding on her way to Christ. 1. I Have not been unmindful of my debt, and acknowledge that the time of payment has now come. May He give me wherewith to pay, as He gave me cause to incur the debt. For He has given me the love, of which it is said, "Owe no man anything, but to love one another. May He give also the word, which I feel myself owing to those I love. I put off your expectations till now for this reason, that I might explain as I could how it is we come to Christ along the ground, When we are commanded rather to seek the things which are above, not the things which are upon the earth. For Christ is sitting above, at the right hand of the Father: but He is assuredly here also; and for that reason said also to Saul, as he was raging on the earth, "Why persecutest thou me? But the topic on which we were speaking, and which led to our entering on this inquiry, was our Lord's washing His disciples' feet, after the disciples themselves had already been washed, and needed not, save to wash their feet. And we there saw it to be understood that a man is indeed wholly washed in baptism; but while thereafter he liveth in this present world, and with the feet of his human passions treadeth on this earth, that is, in his life-intercourse with others, he contracts enough to call forth the prayer, "Forgive us our debts.

And thus from these also is he cleansed by Him who washed His disciples' feet, and ceaseth not to make intercession for us. And here occurred the words of the Church in the Song of Songs, when she saith, "I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them? when she wished to go and open to that Be-

ing, fairer in form than the sons of men, who had come to her and knocked, and asked her to open to Him. This gave rise to a question, which we were unwilling to compress into the narrow limits of the time, and therefore deferred till now, in what sense the Church, when on her way to Christ, may be afraid of defiling her feet, which she had washed in the baptism of Christ. 2. For thus she speaks: "I sleep, but my heart waketh: it is the voice of my Beloved that knocketh at the gate. And then He also says: "Open to me, my sister, my nearest, my dove, my perfect one; for my head is filled with dew, and my hair with the drops of the night. And she replies: "I have put off my dress; how shall I put it on? I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them? O wonderful sacramental symbol! O lofty mystery! Does she, then, fear to defile her feet in coming to Him who washed the feet of His disciples? Her fear is genuine; for it is along the earth she has to come to Him, who is still on earth, because refusing to leave His own who are stationed here. Is it not He that saith, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world"? Is it not He that saith, "Ye shall see the heavens opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man"? If they ascend to Him because He is above, how do they descend to Him, but because He is also here? Therefore saith the Church: "I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them? She says so even in the case of those who, purified from all dross. can say: "I desire to depart, and to be with Christ; nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you.

She says it in those who preach Christ, and open to Him the door, that He may dwell by faith in the hearts of men. In such she says it, when they deliberate whether to undertake such a ministry, for which they do not consider themselves qualified, so as to discharge it blamelessly, and so as not, after preaching to others, themselves to become castaways. For it is safer to hear than to preach the truth: for in the hearing, humility is preserved; but when it is preached, it is scarcely possible for any man to hinder the entrance of some small measure of boasting, whereby the feet at least are defiled. 3. Therefore, as the Apostle James saith, "Let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak." As it is also said by another man of God, "Thou wilt make me to hear joy and gladness; and the bones Thou hast humbled will rejoice." This is what I said: When the truth is heard, humility is preserved. And another says: "But the friend of the bridegroom standeth and heareth him, and rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice." Let us rejoice in the hearing that

comes from the noiseless speaking of the truth within us. For although, when the sound is outwardly uttered, as by one that readeth; or proclaimeth, or preacheth, or disputeth, or commandeth, or comforteth, or exhorteth, or even by one that sings or accompanies his voice on an instrument, those who do so may fear to defile their feet, when they aim at pleasing men with the secretly active desire of human applause. Yet the one who hears such with a willing and pious mind, has no room for self-gratulation in the labors of others; and with no self-inflation, but with the joy of humility, rejoices because of the Master's words of truth. Accordingly, in those who hear with willingness and humility, and spend a tranquil life in sweet and wholesome studies, the holy Church will take delight, and may say, "I sleep, and my heart waketh." And what is this, "I sleep, and my heart waketh," but just I sit down quietly to listen? My leisure is not laid out in nourishing slothfulness, but in acquiring wisdom. "I sleep, and my heart waketh." I am still, and see that Thou art the Lord: for "the wisdom of the scribe cometh by opportunity of leisure; and he that hath little business shall become wise." "I sleep, and my heart waketh." I rest from troublesome business, and my mind turns its attention to divine concerns (or communications).

4. But while the Church finds delightful repose in those who thus sweetly and humbly sit at her feet, here is one who knocks, and says: "What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house-tops." It is His voice, then, that knocks at the gate, and says: "Open to me, my sister, my neighbor, my dove, my perfect one; for my head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night." As if He had said, Thou art at leisure, and the door is closed against me: thou art caring for the leisure of the few, and through abounding iniquity the love of many is waxing cold. The night He speaks of is iniquity: but His dew and drops are those who wax cold and fall away, and make the head of Christ to wax cold, that is, the love of God to fail. For the head of Christ is God. But they are borne on His locks, that is, their presence is tolerated in the visible sacraments; while their senses never take hold of the internal realities. He knocks, therefore, to shake off this quiet from His inactive saints, and cries, "Open to me," thou who, through my blood, art become "my sister;" through my drawing nigh, "my neighbor;" through my Spirit, "my dove;" through my word which thou hast fully learned in thy leisure, "my perfect one:" open to me, go and preach me to others. For how shall I get in to those who have

shut their door against me, without some one to open? and how shall they hear without a preacher?

5. Hence it happens that those who love to devote their leisure to good studies, and shrink from encountering the troubles of toilsome labors, as feeling themselves unsuited to undertake and discharge such services with credit, would prefer, were it possible, to have the holy apostles and ancient preachers of the truth again raised up against that abounding of iniquity which hath so reduced the warmth of Christian love. But in regard to those who have already left the body, and put off the garment of the flesh (for they are not utterly parted), the Church replies, "I have put off my dress; how shall I put it on?" That dress shall, indeed, yet be recovered; and in the persons of those who have meanwhile laid it aside, shall the Church again put on the garment of flesh: only not now, when the cold are needing to be warmed; but then, when the dead shall rise again. Realizing, then, her present difficulty through the scarcity of preachers, and remembering those members of her own who were so sound in word and holy in character, but are now dis-united from their bodies, the Church says in her sorrow, "I have put off my dress; how shall I put it on?" How can those members of mine, who had such surpassing power, through their preaching, to open the door to Christ, now return to the bodies which they have laid aside?

6. And then, turning again to those who preach, and gather in and govern the congregations of His people, and so open as they can to Christ, but are afraid, amid the difficulties of such work, of falling into sin, she says, "I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?" For whosoever offendeth not in word, the same is a perfect man. And who, then, is perfect? Who is there that offendeth not amid such an abounding of iniquity, and such a freezing of charity? "I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?" At times I read and hear: "My brethren, be not many masters, seeing that ye shall receive the greater condemnation: for in many things we offend all." "I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?" But see, I rise and open. Christ, wash them. "Forgive us our debts," because our love is not altogether extinguished: for "we also forgive our debtors." When we listen to Thee, the bones which have been humbled rejoice with Thee in the heavenly places. But when we preach Thee, we have to tread the ground in order to open to Thee: and then, if we are blameworthy, we are troubled; if we are commended, we become inflated. Wash our feet, that were formerly cleansed, but have again been de-

filed in our walking through the earth to open unto Thee. Let this be enough today, beloved. But in whatever we have happened to offend, by saying otherwise than we ought, or have been unduly elated by your commendations, entreat that our feet may be washed, and may your prayers find acceptance with God.

TRACTATE 58

John XIII. 10-15. 1. We have already, beloved, as the Lord was pleased to enable us, expounded to you those words of the Gospel, where the Lord, in washing His disciples' feet, says, "He that is once washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." Let us now look at what follows. "And ye," He says, "are clean, but not all." And to remove the need of inquiry on our part, the evangelist has himself explained its meaning, by adding: "For He knew who it was that should betray Him; therefore said He, Ye are not all clean." Can anything be clearer? Let us therefore pass to what follows. 2. "So, after He had washed their feet, and had taken His garments, and was set down again, He said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you?" Now it is that the blessed Peter gets that promise fulfilled: for he had been put off when, in the midst of his trembling and asserting, "Thou shalt never wash my feet," he received the answer, "What I do, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter" (vers. 7, 8). Here, then, is that very hereafter; it is now time to tell what was a little ago deferred. Accordingly, the Lord, mindful of His foregoing promise to make him understand an act of His so unexpected, so wonderful, so frightening, and, but for His own still more terrifying rejoinder, impossible to be permitted, that the Master not only of themselves, but of angels, and the Lord not only of them, but of all things, should wash the feet of His own disciples and servants: having then promised to let him know the meaning of so important an act, when He said, "Thou shalt know afterwards," begins now to show them what it was that He did.

3. "Ye call me," He says, "Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. Ye say well," for ye only say the truth; I am indeed what ye say. There is a precept laid on man: "Let not thine own mouth praise thee, but the mouth of thy neighbor. For self-pleasing is a perilous thing for one who has to be on his guard against falling into pride. But He who is over all things, however much He commend Himself, cannot exalt Himself above His actual dignity: nor can God be rightly termed arrogant. For it is to our advantage to know Him, not to His; nor can any one know Him, unless that self-knowing One make

Himself known. If He, then, by abstaining from self-commendation, wish, as it were, to avoid arrogance, He will deny us the power of knowing Him. And no one surely would blame Him for calling Himself Master, even though believing Him to be nothing more than a man; seeing He only makes profession of what even men themselves in the various arts profess to such an extent, without any charge of arrogance, that they are termed professors. But to call Himself also the Lord of His disciples,—of men who, in an earthly sense, were themselves also free-born,—who would tolerate it in a man? But it is God that speaks. Here no elation is possible to loftiness so great, no lie to the truth: the profit is ours to be the subjects of such loftiness, the servants of the truth.

That He calls Himself Lord is no imperfection on His side, but a benefit on ours. The words of a certain profane author are commended, when he says, "All arrogance is hateful, and specially disagreeable is that of talent and eloquence; and yet, when the same person was speaking of his own eloquence, he said, "I would call it perfect, were I to pronounce judgment; nor, in truth, would I greatly fear the charge of arrogance. If, then, that most eloquent man had in truth no fear of being charged with arrogance, how can the truth itself have such a fear? Let Him call Himself Lord who is the Lord, let Him say what is true who is the Truth; so that I may not fail to learn that which is profitable, by His being silent about that which is. The most blessed Paul—certainly not himself the only-begotten Son of God, but the servant and apostle of that Son; not the Truth, but a partaker of the truth—declares with freedom and consistency, "And though I would desire to glory, I shall not be a fool; for I say the truth. For it would not be in himself, but in the truth, which is superior to himself, that he was glorying both humbly and truly: for it is he also who has given the charge, that he that glorieth should glory in the Lord.

Could thus the lover of wisdom have no fear of being chargeable with foolishness, though he desired to glory, and would wisdom itself, in its glorying, have any fear of such a charge? He had no fear of arrogance who said, "My soul shall make her boast in the Lord; and could the power of the Lord have any such fear in commending itself, in which His servant's soul is making her boast? "Ye call me," He says, "Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. Therefore ye say well, that I am so: for if I were not what ye say, ye would be wrong to say so, even with the purpose of praising me. How,

then, could the Truth deny what the disciples of the Truth affirm? How could that which was said by the learners be denied by the very Truth that gave them their learning? How can the fountain deny what the drinker asserts? how can the light hide what the beholder declares?

4. "If I, then," He says, "your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." This, blessed Peter, is what thou didst not know when thou wert not allowing it to be done. This is what He promised to let thee know afterwards, when thy Master and thy Lord terrified thee into submission, and washed thy feet. We have learned, brethren, humility from the Highest; let us, as humble, do to one another what He, the Highest, did in His humility. Great is the commendation we have here of humility: and brethren do this to one another in turn, even in the visible act itself, when they treat one another with hospitality; for the practice of such humility is generally prevalent, and finds expression in the very deed that makes it discernible. And hence the apostle, when he would commend the well-deserving widow, says, "If she is hospitable, if she has washed the saints' feet." And wherever Such is not the practice among the saints, what they do not with the hand they do in heart, if they are of the number of those who are addressed in the hymn of the three blessed men, "O ye holy and humble of heart, bless ye the Lord." But it is far better, and beyond all dispute more accordant with the truth, that it should also be done with the hands; nor should the Christian think it beneath him to do what was done by Christ. For when the body is bent at a brother's feet, the feeling of such humility is either awakened in the heart itself, or is strengthened if already present.

5. But apart from this moral understanding of the passage, we remember that the way in which we commended to your attention the grandeur of this act of the Lord's, was that, in washing the feet of disciples who were already washed and clean, the Lord instituted a sign, to the end that, on account of the human feelings that occupy us on earth, however far we may have advanced in our apprehension of righteousness, we might know that we are not exempt from sin; which He thereafter washes away by interceding for us, when we pray the Father, who is in heaven, to forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors. What connection, then, can such an understanding of the passage have with that which He afterwards gave Himself, when He explained the reason of His act in the words, "If I then, your Lord and Master,

have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you"? Can we say that even a brother may cleanse a brother from the contracted stain of wrongdoing? Yea, verily, we know that of this also we were admonished in the profound significance of this work of the Lord's, that we should confess our faults one to another, and pray for one another, even as Christ also maketh intercession for us.

Let us listen to the Apostle James, who states this precept with the greatest clearness when he says, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another. For of this also the Lord gave us the example. For if He who neither has, nor had, nor will have any sin, prays for our sins, how much more ought we to pray for one another's in turn! And if He forgives us, whom we have nothing to forgive; how much more ought we, who are unable to live here without sin, to forgive one another! For what else does the Lord apparently intimate in the profound significance of this sacramental sign, when He says, "For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you; but what the apostle declares in the plainest terms, "Forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye"? Let us therefore forgive one another his faults, and pray for one another's faults, and thus in a manner be washing one another's feet. It is our part, by His grace, to be supplying the service of love and humility: it is His to hear us, and to cleanse us from all the pollution of our sins through Christ, and in Christ; so that what we forgive even to others, that is, loose on earth, may be loosed in heaven.

TRACTATE 59

John XIII. 16-20. 1. We have just heard in the holy Gospel the Lord speaking, and saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord, nor the apostle [he that is sent] greater than he that sent him: if ye know these things, blessed shall ye be if ye do them. He said this, therefore, because He had washed the disciples' feet, as the Master of humility both by word and example. But we shall be able, with His help, to handle what is in need of more elaborate handling, if we linger not at what is perfectly clear. Accordingly, after uttering these words, the Lord added, "I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but, that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me, shall lift up his heel upon me. And what is this, but that he shall trample upon me? We know of whom He speaks: it is Judas,

that betrayer of His, who is referred to. He had not therefore chosen the person whom, by these words, He setteth utterly apart from His chosen ones. When I say then, He continues "Blessed shall ye be if ye do them, I speak not of you all: there is one among you who will not be blessed, and who will not do these things. "I know whom I have chosen. Whom, but those who shall be blessed in the doing of what has been commanded and shown as needful to be done, by Him who alone can make them blessed?

The traitor Judas, He says, is not one of those that have been chosen. What, then, is meant by what He says in another place, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? Was it that he also was chosen for some purpose, for which he was really necessary; although not for the blessedness of which He has just been saying, "Blessed shall ye be if ye do these things"? He speaketh not so of them all; for He knows whom He has chosen to be associated with Himself in blessedness. Of such he is not one, who ate His bread in order that he might lift up his heel upon Him. The bread they ate was the Lord Himself; he ate the Lord's bread in enmity to the Lord: they ate life, and he punishment. "For he that eateth unworthily," says the apostle, "eateth judgment unto himself. "From this time," Christ adds, "I tell you before it come; that when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am He: that is, I am He of whom the Scripture that preceded has just said, "He that eateth bread with me, shall lift up his heel upon me."

2. He then proceeds to say: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me. Did He mean us to understand that there is as little distance between one sent by Him, and Himself, as there is between Himself and God the Father? If we take it in this way, I know not what measurements of distance (which may God forbid! we shall be adopting, in the Arian fashion. For they, when they hear or read these words of the Gospel, have immediate recourse to their dogmatic measurements, whereby they ascend not to life, but fall headlong into death. For they straightway say: The Son's messenger stands at the same relative distance from the Son, as expressed in the words, "He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me," as that in which the Son Himself stands from the Father, when He said, "He that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me. But if thou sayest so, thou forgettest, heretic, thy measurements. For if, because of these words of the Lord, thou puttest the Son at as great a distance from the Father as the messenger [apostle] from the

Son, where dost thou purpose to place the Holy Spirit? Has it escaped thee, that ye are wont to place Him after the Son? He will therefore come in between the messenger and the Son; and much greater, then, will be the distance between the Son and His messenger, than between the Father and His Son.

Or perhaps, to preserve that distinction between the Son and His messenger, and between the Father and His Son, at their equality of distance, will the Holy Spirit be equal to the Son? But as little will ye allow this. And where, then, do ye think of placing Him, if ye place the Son as far beneath the Father, as ye place the messenger beneath the Son? Restrain, therefore, your foolhardy presumption; and do not be seeking to find in these words the same distance between the Son and His messenger as between the Father and His Son. But listen rather to the Son Himself, when He says, "I and my Father are one. For there the Truth hath left you no shadow of distance between the Beggetter and the Only-begotten; there Christ Himself hath erased your measurements, and the rock hath broken your staircase to pieces. 3. But now that the heretical slander has been disposed of, in what sense are we to understand these words of the Lord: "He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me"? For if we were inclined to understand the words, "He that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me," as expressing the oneness in nature of the Father and the Son; the sequence from the similar arrangement of words in the other clause, "He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me," would be the unity in nature of the Son and His messenger. And there might, indeed, be no impropriety in so understanding it, seeing that a twofold substance belongeth to the strong man, who hath rejoiced to run the race; for the Word was made flesh, that is, God became man. And accordingly He might be supposed to have said, "He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me," with reference to His human nature; "and he that receiveth me" as God, "receiveth Him that sent me." But in so speaking, He was not commending the unity of nature, but the authority of the Sender in Him who is sent. Let every one, therefore, so receive Him that is sent, that in His person lie may give heed to Him who sent Him. If, then, thou lookest for Christ in Peter, thou wilt find the disciple's instructor; and if thou lookest for the Father in the Son, thou wilt find the Beggetter of the Only-begotten: and so in Him who is sent, thou art not mistaken in receiving the Sender. What follows in the

Gospel cannot be compressed within the shortness of the time remaining. And therefore, dearly beloved, let what has been said, if thought sufficient, be received in a healthful way, as pasture for the holy sheep; and if it is somewhat scanty, let it be ruminated over with ardent desire for more.

TRACTATE 60

John XIII. 21. 1. It is no light question, brethren, that meets us in the Gospel of the blessed John, when he says: "When Jesus had thus said, He was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. Was it for this reason that Jesus was troubled, not in flesh, but in spirit, that He was now about to say, "One of you shall betray me"? Did this occur then for the first time to His mind, or was it at that moment suddenly revealed to Him for the first time, and so troubled Him by the startling novelty of so great a calamity? Was it not a little before that He was using these words, "He that eateth bread with me will lift up his heel against me"? And had He not also, previously to that, said, "And ye are clean, but not all"? where the evangelist added, "For He knew who should betray Him: to whom also on a still earlier occasion He had pointed in the words, "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? Why is it, then, that He "was now troubled in spirit," when "He testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me"? Was it because now He had so to mark him out, that he should no longer remain concealed among the rest, but be separated from the others, that therefore "He was troubled in spirit"?

Or was it because now the traitor himself was on the eve of departing to bring those Jews to whom he was to betray the Lord, that He was troubled by the imminency of His passion, the closeness of the danger, and the swooping hand of the traitor, whose resolution was foreknown? For some such cause it certainly was that Jesus "was troubled in spirit," as when He said, "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour; but for this cause came I unto this hour. And accordingly, just as then His soul was troubled as the hour of His passion approached; so now also, as Judas was on the point of going and coming, and the atrocious villainy of the traitor neared its accomplishment, "He was troubled in spirit." 2. He was troubled, then, who had power to lay down His life, and had power to take it again. That mighty power is troubled, the firmness of the rock is disturbed: or is it rather our infirmity that is troubled in Him? Assuredly so: let servants believe

nothing unworthy of their Lord, but recognize their own membership in their Head. He who died for us, was also Himself troubled in our place. He, therefore, who died in power, was troubled in the midst of His power: He who shall yet transform the body of our humility into similarity of form with the body of His glory, hath also transferred into Himself the feeling of our infirmity, and sympathizeth with us in the feelings of His own soul. Accordingly, when it is the great, the brave, the sure, the invincible One that is troubled, let us have no fear for Him, as if He were capable of failing: He is not perishing, but in search of us [who are]. Us, I say; it is us exclusively whom He is thus seeking, that in His trouble we may behold ourselves, and so, when trouble reaches us, may not fall into despair and perish. By His trouble, who could not be troubled save with His own consent, He comforts such as are troubled unwillingly.

3. Away with the reasons of philosophers, who assert that a wise man is not affected by mental perturbations. God hath made foolish the wisdom of this world; and the Lord knoweth the thoughts of men, that they are vain. It is plain that the mind of the Christian may be troubled, not by misery, but by pity: he may fear lest men should be lost to Christ; he may sorrow when one is being lost; he may have ardent desire to gain men to Christ; he may be filled with joy when such is being done; he may have fear of falling away himself from Christ; he may sorrow over his own estrangement from Christ; he may be earnestly desirous of reigning with Christ, and he may be rejoicing in the hope that such fellowship with Christ will yet be his lot. These are certainly four of what they call perturbations—fear and sorrow, love and gladness. And Christian minds may have sufficient cause to feel them, and evidence their dissent from the error of Stoic philosophers, and all resembling them: who indeed, just as they esteem truth to be vanity, regard also insensibility as soundness; not knowing that a man's mind, like the limbs of his body, is only the more hopelessly diseased when it has lost even the feeling of pain.

4. But says some one: Ought the mind of the Christian to be troubled even at the prospect of death? For what comes of those words of the apostle, that he had a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, if the object of his desire can thus trouble him when it comes? Our answer to this would be easy, indeed, in the case of those who also term gladness itself a perturbation [of the mind]. For what if the trouble he thus feels arises entirely from his re-

joicing at the prospect of death? But such a feeling, they say, ought to be termed gladness, and not rejoicing. And what is that, but just to alter the name, while the feeling experienced is the same? But let us for our part confine our attention to the Sacred Scriptures, and with the Lord's help seek rather such a solution of this question as will be in harmony with them; and then, seeing it is written, "When He had thus said, He was troubled in spirit," we will not say that it was joy that disturbed Him; lest His own words should convince us of the contrary when He says, "My soul is sorrowful, even unto death." It is some such feeling that is here also to be understood, when, as His betrayer was now on the very point of departing alone, and straightway returning along with his associates, "Jesus was troubled in spirit."

5. Strong-minded, indeed, are those Christians, if such there are, who experience no trouble at all in the prospect of death; but for all that, are they stronger-minded than Christ? Who would have the madness to say so? And what else, then, does His being troubled signify, but that, by voluntarily assuming the likeness of their weakness, He comforted the weak members in His own body, that is, in His Church; to the end that, if any of His own are still troubled at the approach of death, they may fix their gaze upon Him, and so be kept from thinking themselves castaways on this account, and being swallowed up in the more grievous death of despair? And how great, then, must be that good which we ought to expect and hope for in the participation of His divine nature, whose very perturbation tranquillizes us, and whose infirmity confirms us? Whether, therefore, on this occasion it was by His pity for Judas himself thus rushing into ruin, or by the near approach of His own death, that He was troubled, yet there is no possibility of doubting that it was not through any infirmity of mind, but in the fullness of power, that He was troubled, and so no despair of salvation need arise in our minds, when we are troubled, not in the possession of power, but in the midst of our weakness. He certainly bore the infirmity of the flesh,-an infirmity which was swallowed up in His resurrection.

But He who was not only man, but God also, surpassed by an ineffable distance the whole human race in fortitude of mind. He was not, then, troubled by any outward plesure of man, but troubled Himself; which was very plainly declared of Him when He raised Lazarus from the dead: for it is there written that He troubled Himself, that it may be so understood even where the text does not so express it, and yet declares that He was troubled.

For having by His power assumed our full humanity, by that very power He awoke in Himself our human feelings whenever He judged it becoming.

TRACTATE 61

John XIII. 21-26. 1. This short section of the Gospel, brethren, we have in this lesson brought forward for exposition, as thinking that we ought also to say something of the Lord's betrayer, as now plainly enough disclosed by the dipping and holding out to him of the piece of bread. Of that indeed which precedes, (namely), that Jesus, when about to point him out, was troubled in spirit, we have treated in our last discourse; but what I perhaps omitted to mention there, the Lord, by His own perturbation of spirit, thought proper to indicate this also, that it is necessary to bear with false brethren, and those tares that are among the wheat in the Lord's field until harvest-time, because that when we are compelled by urgent reasons to separate some of them even before the harvest, it cannot be done without disturbance to the Church. Such disturbance to His saints in the future, through schismatics and heretics, the Lord in a way foretold and prefigured in Himself, when, at the moment of that wicked man Judas' departure, and of his thereby bringing to an end, in a very open and decided way, his past intermingling with the wheat, in which he had long been tolerated, He was troubled, not in body, but in spirit. For it is not spitefulness, but charity, that troubles His spiritual members in scandals of this kind; test perchance. in separating some of the tares, any of the wheat should also be uprooted therewith.

2. "Jesus," therefore, "was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said: Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me." "One of you," in number, not in merit; in appearance, not in reality; in bodily commingling, not by any spiritual tie; a companion by fleshly juxtaposition, not in any unity of the heart; and therefore not one who is of you, but one who is to go forth from you. For how else can this "one of you" be true, of which the Lord so testified, and said, if that is true which the writer of this very Gospel says in his Epistle, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us"? Judas, therefore was not of them; for, had he been of them, he would have continued with them. What, then, do the words "One of you shall betray me" mean, but that one is going out from you who shall betray me? Just as he also, who said, "If they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us," had said before, "They went out from us." And thus it is true in both senses,

"of us," and "not of us;" in one respect "of us," and in another "not of us;" "of us" in respect to sacramental communion, but "not of us" in respect to the criminal conduct that belongs exclusively to themselves.

3. "Then the disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom He spake." For while they were imbued with a reverential love to their Master, they were none the less affected by human infirmity in their feelings towards each other. Each one's own conscience was known to himself; but as he was ignorant of his neighbor's, each one's self-assurance was such that each was uncertain of all the others, and all the others were uncertain of that one. 4. "Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom, one of His disciples, whom Jesus loved. What he meant by saying "in His bosom," he tells us a little further on, where he says, "on the breast of Jesus. It was that very John whose Gospel is before us, as he afterwards expressly declares. For it was a custom with those who have supplied us with the sacred writings, that when any of them was relating the divine history, and came to something affecting himself, he spoke as if it were about another; and gave himself a place in the line of his narrative becoming one who was the recorder of public events, and not as one who made himself the subject of his preaching. Saint Matthew acted also in this way, when, in coming in the course of his narrative to himself, he says, "He saw a publican named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom, and saith unto him, Follow me. He does not say, He saw me, and said to me. So also acted the blessed Moses, writing all the history about himself as if it concerned another, and saying, "The Lord said unto Moses. Less habitually was this done by the Apostle Paul, not however in any history which undertakes to explain the course of public events, but in his own epistles. At all events, he speaks thus of himself: "I knew a man in Christ fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;

such an one caught up into the third heaven. And so, when the blessed evangelist also says here, not, I was leaning on Jesus' bosom, but, "There was leaning one of the disciples," let us recognize a custom of our author's, rather than fall into any wonder on the subject. For what loss is there to the truth, when the facts themselves are told us, and all boastfulness of language is in a measure avoided? For thus at least did he relate that which most signally pertained to his praise. 5. But what mean the words, "whom Jesus loved"? As if He did not love the others, of whom this same John has said above, "He loved them to the end" (ver. 1); and as the Lord Himself, "Greater love hath

no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." And who could enumerate all the testimonies of the sacred pages, in which the Lord Jesus is exhibited as the lover, not only of this one, or of those who were then around Him, but of such also as were to be His members in the distant future, and of His universal Church? But there is some truth, doubtless, underlying these words, and having reference to the bosom on which the narrator was leaning. For what else can be indicated by the bosom but some hidden truth? But there is another more suitable passage, where the Lord may enable us to say something about this secret that may prove sufficient.

6. "Simon Peter therefore beckons, and says to him." The expression is noteworthy, as indicating that something was said not by any sound of words, but by merely beckoning with the head. "He beckons, and says;" that is, his beckoning is his speech. For if one is said to speak in his thoughts, as Scripture saith, "They said [reasoned] with themselves;" how much more may he do so by beckoning, which expresses outwardly by some sort of signs what had previously been conceived within! What, then, did his beckoning mean? What else but that which follows? "Who is it of whom He speaks?" Such was the language of Peter's beckoning; for it was by no vocal sounds, but by bodily gestures, that he spake. "He then, having leaned back on Jesus' breast," - surely the very bosom of His breast this, the secret place of wisdom! - "saith unto Him, Lord, who is it? Jesus answered, He it is to whom I shall give a piece of bread, when I have dipped it. And when He had dipped the bread, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. And after the bread, Satan entered into him." The traitor was disclosed, the coverts of darkness were revealed. What he got was good, but to his own hurt he received it, because, evil himself, in an evil spirit he received what was good. But we have much to say about that dipped bread which was presented to the false-hearted disciple, and about that which follows; and for these we shall require more time than remains to us now at the close of this discourse.

TRACTATE 62

John XIII. 26-31. 1. I Know, dearly beloved, that some may be moved, as the godly to inquire into the meaning of, and the ungodly to find fault with, the statement, that it was after the Lord had given the bread, that had been dipped, to His betrayer that Satan entered into him. For so it is written: "And when He had dipped the bread, He gave it to Judas Iscariot, the Son of Simon. And after the bread, then entered Satan into him. For they say, Was

this the worth of Christ's bread, given from Christ's own table, that after it Satan should enter into His disciple? And the answer we give them is, that thereby we are taught rather how much we need to beware of receiving. what is good in a sinful spirit. For the point of special importance is, not the thing that is received, but the person that receives it; and not the character of the thing that is given, but of him to whom it is given. For even good things are hurtful, and evil things are beneficial, according to the character of the recipients. "Sin," says the apostle, "that it might appear sin, wrought death to me by that which is good. Thus, you see, evil is brought about by the good, so long as that which is good is wrongly received. It is he also that says:

"Lest I should be exalted unduly through the greatness of my revelations, there was given to me a thorn in my flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me. For which thing I besought the Lord thrice, that He would take it away from me; and He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for strength is made perfect in weakness. And here, you see, good was brought about by that which was evil, when the evil was received in a good spirit. Why, then, do we wonder if Christ's bread was given to Judas, that thereby he should be made over to the devil; when we see, on the other hand, that Paul was visited by a messenger of the devil, that by such an instrumentality he might be perfected in Christ? In this way, both the good was injurious to the evil man, and the evil was beneficial to the good. Bear in mind the meaning of the Scripture, "Whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. And when the apostle said this, he was dealing with those who were taking the body of the Lord, like any other food, in an undiscerning and careless spirit.

If, then, he is thus taken to task who does not discern, that is, does not distinguish from the other kinds of food, the body of the Lord, what condemnation must be his, who in the guise of a friend comes as an enemy to His table! If negligence in the guest is thus visited with blame, what must be the punishment that will fall on the man that sells the very person who has invited him to his table! And why was the bread given to the traitor, but as an evidence of the grace he had treated with ingratitude? 2. It was after this bread, then, that Satan entered into the Lord's betrayer, that, as now given over to his power, he might take full possession of one into whom before this he had only entered in order to lead him into error. For we are not to suppose that he was not in him when he went to the Jews and bargained about

the price of betraying the Lord; for the evangelist Luke very plainly attests this when he says: "Then entered Satan into Judas, who was surnamed Iscariot, being one of the twelve; and he went his way, and communed with the chief priests." Here, you see, it is shown that Satan had already entered into Judas. His first entrance, therefore, was when he implanted in his heart the thought of betraying Christ; for in such a spirit had he already come to the supper. But now, after the bread, he entered into him, no longer to tempt one who belonged to another, but to take possession of him as his own.

3. But it was not then, as some thoughtless readers suppose, that Judas received the body of Christ. For we are to understand that the Lord had already dispensed to all of them the sacrament of His body and blood, when Judas also was present, as very clearly related by Saint Luke; and it was after this that we come to the moment when, in accordance with John's account, the Lord made a full disclosure of His betrayer by dipping and holding out to him the morsel of bread, and intimating perhaps by the dipping of the bread the false pretensions of the other. For the dipping of a thing does not always imply its washing; but some things are dipped in order to be dyed. But if a good meaning is to be here attached to the dipping, his ingratitude for that good was deservedly followed by damnation. 4. But still, possessed as Judas now was, not by the Lord, but by the devil, and now that the bread had entered the belly, and an enemy the soul of this man of ingratitude: still, I say, there was this enormous wickedness, already conceived in his heart, waiting to be wrought out to its full issue, for which the damnable desire had always preceded. Accordingly, when the Lord, the living Bread, had given this bread to the dead, and in giving it had revealed the betrayer of the Bread, He said, "What thou doest, do quickly. He did not command the crime, but foretold evil to Judas, and good to us. For what could be worse for Judas, or what could be better for us, than the delivering up of Christ, - a deed done by him to his own destruction, but done, apart from him, in our behalf? "What thou doest, do quickly. Oh that word of One whose wish was to be ready rather than to be angry! That word! expressing not so much the punishment of the traitor as the reward awaiting the Redeemer! For He said, "What thou doest, do quickly," not as wrathfully looking to the destruction of the trust-betrayer, but in His own haste to accomplish the salvation of the faithful; for He was delivered for our offences, and He loved the Church, and

gave Himself for it. And as the apostle also says of himself: "Who loved me, and gave Himself for me.

Had not, then, Christ given Himself, no one could have given Him up. What is there in Judas' conduct but sin? For in delivering up Christ he had no thought of our salvation, for which Christ was really delivered, but thought only of his money gain, and found the loss of his soul. He got the wages he wished, but had also given him, against his wish, the wages he merited. Judas delivered up Christ, Christ delivered Himself up: the former transacted the business of his own selling of his Master, the latter the business of our redemption. "What thou doest, do quickly," not because thou hast the power in thyself, but because He wills it who has all the power. 5. "Now no one of those at the table knew for what intent He spake this unto him. For some of them thought, because Judas had the money-bag, that Jesus said unto him, Buy those things which we have need of against the feast; or, that he should give something to the poor." The Lord, therefore, had also a money-box, where He kept the offerings of believers, and distributed to the necessities of His own, and to others who were in need. It was then that the custom of having church-money was first introduced, so that thereby we might understand that His precept about taking no thought for the morrow was not a command that no money should be kept by His saints, but that God should not be served for any such end, and that the doing of what is right should not be held in abeyance through the fear of want. For the apostle also has this foresight for the future, when he says: "If any believer hath widows, let him give them enough, that the church may not be burdened, that it may have enough for them that are widows indeed."

6. "He then, having received the morsel of bread, went immediately out: and it was night." And he that went out was himself the night. "Therefore when" the night "was gone out, Jesus said, Now is the Son of man glorified." The day therefore uttered speech unto the day, that is, Christ did so to His faithful disciples, that they might hear and love Him as His followers; and the night showed knowledge unto the night, that is, Judas did so to the unbelieving Jews, that they might come as His persecutors, and make Him their prisoner. But now, in considering these words of the Lord, which were addressed to the godly, before His arrest by the ungodly, special attention on the part of the hearer is required; and therefore it will be more becoming in

the preacher, instead of hurriedly considering them now, to defer them till a future occasion.

TRACTATE 63

John XIII. 31, 32 1. Let us give our mind's best attention, and, with the Lord's help, seek after God. The language of the divine hymn is: "Seek God and your soul shall live. Let us search for that which needs to be discovered, and into that which has been discovered. He whom we need to discover is concealed, in order to be sought after; and when found, is infinite, in order still to be the object of our search. Hence it is elsewhere said, "Seek His face evermore. For He satisfies the seeker to the utmost of his capacity; and makes the finder still more capable, that he may seek to be filled anew, according to the growth of his ability to receive. Therefore it was not said, "Seek His face evermore," in the same sense as of certain others, who are "always learning, and never coming to a knowledge of the truth; but rather as the preacher saith, "When a man hath finished, then he beginneth; till we reach that life where we shall be so filled, that our natures shall attain their utmost capacity, because we shall have arrived at perfection, and no longer be aiming at more. For then all that can satisfy us will be revealed to our eyes. But here let us always be seeking, and let our reward in finding put no end to our searching. For we do not say that it will not be so always, because it is only so here;

but that here we must always be seeking, lest at any time we should imagine that here we can ever cease from seeking. For those of whom it is said that they are "always learning, and never coming to a knowledge of the truth. are here indeed always learning; but when they depart this life they will no longer be learning, but receiving the reward of their error. For the words, "always learning, and never coming to a knowledge of the truth," mean, as it were, always walking, and never getting into the road. Let us, on the other hand, be walking always in the way, till we reach the end to which it leads; let us nowhere tarry in it till we reach the proper place of abode: and so we shall both persevere in our seeking, and be making some attainments in our finding, and, thus seeking and finding, be passing on to that which remains, till the very end of all seeking shall be reached in that world where perfection shall admit of no further effort at advancement. Let these prefatory remarks, dearly beloved, make your Charity attentive to this discourse of our Lord's, which He addressed to the disciples before His passion: for it is

profound in itself; and where, in particular, the preacher purposes to expend much labor, the hearer ought not to be remiss in attention.

2. What is it, then, that the Lord says, after that Judas went out, to do quickly what he purposed doing, namely, betraying the Lord? What says the day when the night had gone out? What says the Redeemer when the seller had departed? "Now," He says, "is the Son of man glorified. Why "now"? It was not, was it, merely that His betrayer was gone out, and that those were at hand who were to seize and slay Him? Is it thus that He "is now glorified," to wit, that His deeper humiliation is approaching; that over Him are impending both bonds, and judgment, and condemnation, and mocking, and crucifixion, and death? Is this glorification, or rather humiliation? Even when He was working miracles, does not this very John say of Him, "The Spirit was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified"? Even then, therefore, when He was raising the dead, He was not yet glorified; and is He glorified now, when drawing near in His own person unto death? He was not yet glorified when acting as God, and is He glorified in going to suffer as man? It would be strange if it were this that God, the great Master, signified and taught in such words.

We must ascend higher to unveil the words of the Highest, who reveals Himself somewhat that we may find Him, and anon hides Himself that we may seek Him, and so press on step by step, as it were, from discoveries already made to those that still await us. I get here a sight of something that prefigures a great reality. Judas went out, and Jesus is glorified; the son of perdition went out, and the Son of man is glorified. He it was that had gone out, on whose account it had been said to them all, "And ye are clean, but not all" (ver. 10). When, therefore, the unclean one departed, all that remained were clean, and continued with their Cleanser. Something like this will it be when this world shall have been conquered by Christ, and shall have passed away, and there shall be no one that is unclean remaining among His people; when, the tares having been separated from the wheat, the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. The Lord, foreseeing such a future as this, and in testimony that such was signified now in the separation of the tares, as it were, by the departure of Judas, and the remaining behind of the wheat in the persons of the holy apostles, said, "Now is the Son of man glorified:

as if He had said, See, so will it be in that day of my glorification yet to come, when none of the wicked shall be present, and none of the good shall be wanting. His words, however, are not expressed in this way: Now is pre-figured the glorification of the Son of man; but expressly, "Now is the Son of man glorified: just as it was not said, The Rock signified Christ; but, "That Rock was Christ. Nor is it said, The good seed signified the children of the kingdom, or, The tares signified the children of the wicked one; but what is said is, "The good seed, these are the children of the kingdom; and the tares, the children of the wicked one. According, then, to the usage of Scripture language, which speaks of the signs as if they were the things signified, the Lord makes use of the words, "Now is the Son of man glorified; indicating that in the completed separation of that arch sinner from their company, and in the remaining around Him of His saints, we have the foreshadowing of His glorification, when the wicked shall be finally separated, and He shall dwell with His saints through eternity.

3. But after saying, "Now is the Son of man glorified," He added, "and God is glorified in Him." For this is itself the glorifying of the Son of man, that God should be glorified in Him. For if He is not glorified in Himself, but God in Him, then it is He whom God glorifies in Himself. And just as if to give them this explanation, He furthers adds: "If God is glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself." That is, "If God is glorified in Him," because He came not to do His own will, but the will of Him that sent Him; "and God shall glorify Him in Himself," in such wise that the human nature, in which He is the Son of man, and which was so assumed by the eternal Word, should also be endowed with an eternal immortality. "And," He says, "He shall straightway glorify Him;" predicting, to wit, by such an asseveration, His own resurrection in the immediate future, and not, as it were, ours in the end of the world. For it is this very glorification of which the evangelist had previously said, as I mentioned a little ago, that on this account the Spirit was not yet in their case given in that new way, in which He was yet to be given after the resurrection to those who believed, because that Jesus was not yet glorified: that is, mortality was not yet clothed with immortality, and temporal weakness transformed into eternal strength. This glorification may also be indicated in the words, "Now is the Son of man glorified;" so that the word "now" may be supposed to refer, not to His impending passion, but to His closely succeeding resurrection, as if what was now so near at hand

had actually been accomplished. Let this suffice your affection to-day; we shall take up, when the Lord permits us, the words that follow.

TRACTATE 64

John XIII. 33. 1. It becomes us, dearly beloved, to keep in view the orderly connection of our Lord's words. For after having previously said, but subsequently to Judas' departure, and his separation from even the outward communion of the saints, "Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him;"-whether He said so as pointing to His future kingdom, when the wicked shall be separated from the good, or that His resurrection was then to take place, that is, was not to be delayed, like ours, till the end of the world;-and having then added, "If God is glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him," whereby without any ambiguity He testified to the immediate fulfillment of His own resurrection; He proceeded to say, "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. To keep them, therefore, from thinking that God was to glorify Him in such a way that He would never again be joined with them in earthly intercourse, He said, "Yet a little while I am with you: as if He had said, Straightway indeed I shall be glorified in my resurrection; and yet I am not straightway to ascend into heaven, but "yet a little while I am with you. For, as we find it written in the Acts of the Apostles, He spent forty days with them after His resurrection, going in and out, and eating and drinking:

not indeed that He had any experience of hunger and thirst, but even by such evidences confirmed the reality of His flesh, which no longer needed, but still possessed the power, to eat and to drink. Was it, then, these forty days He had in view when He said, "Yet a little while I am with you," or something else? For it may also be understood in this way: "Yet a little while I am with you; still, like you, I also am in this state of fleshly infirmity, that is, till He should die and rise again: for after He rose again He was with them, as has been said, for forty days in the full manifestation of His bodily presence; but He was no longer with them in the fellowship of human infirmity. 2. There is also another form of His divine presence unknown to mortal senses, of which He likewise says, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." This, at least, is not the same as "yet a little while I am with you;" for it is not a little while until the end of the world. Or if even this is so (for time flies, and a thousand years are in God's sight as one day, or as a watch in the night,) yet we cannot believe that He intended any such meaning on this oc-

casion, especially as He went on to say, "Ye shall seek me, and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come." That is to say, after this little while that I am with you, "ye shall seek me, and whither I go, ye cannot come." Is it after the end of the world that, whither He goes, they will not be able to come? And where, then, is the place of which He is going to say a little after in this same discourse, "Father, I will that they also be with me where I am"? It was not then of that presence of His with His own which He is maintaining with them till the end of the world that He now spake, when He said, "Yet a little while I am with you;" but either of that state of mortal infirmity in which He dwelt with them till His passion, or of that bodily presence which He was to maintain with them up till His ascension. Whichever of these any one prefers, he can do so without being at variance with the faith.

3. That no one, however, may deem that sense inconsistent with the true one, in which we say that the Lord may have meant the communion of mortal flesh which He held with the disciples till His passion, when He said, "Yet a little while I am with you;" let those words also of His after His resurrection, as found in another evangelist, be taken into consideration, when He said, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you:" as if then He was no longer with them, even at the very time that they were standing by, seeing, touching, and talking with Him. What does He mean, then, by saying, "while I was yet with you," but, while I was yet in that state of mortal flesh wherein ye still remain? For then, indeed, He had been raised again in the same flesh; but He was no longer associated with them in the same mortality. And accordingly, as on that occasion, when now clothed in fleshly immortality, He said with truth, "while I was yet with you," to which we can attach no other meaning than, while I was yet with you in fleshly mortality; so here also, without any absurdity, we may understand His words, "Yet a little while I am with you," as if He had said, Yet a little while I am mortal like yourselves. Let us look, then, at the words that follow.

4. "Ye shall seek me: and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so say I to you now. That is, ye cannot come now. But when He said so to the Jews, He did not add the "now. The former, therefore, were not able at that time to come where He was going, but they were so afterwards; because He says so a little afterwards in the plainest terms to the Apostle Peter. For, on the latter inquiring, "Lord, whither goest Thou? He replied to him, "Whither I go thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me after-

wards" (ver. 36). But what it means is not to be carelessly passed over. For whither was it that the disciples could not then follow the Lord, but were able afterwards? If we say, to death, what time can be discovered when any one of the sons of men will find it impossible to die; since such, in this perishable body, is the lot of man, that therein life is not a whit easier than death? They were not, therefore, at that time less able to follow the Lord to death, but they were less able to follow Him to the life which is deathless. For thither it was the Lord was going, that, rising from the dead, He should die no more, and death should no more have dominion over Him.

For as the Lord was about to die for righteousness' sake, how could they have followed Him now, who were as yet unripe for the ordeal of martyrdom? Or, with the Lord about to enter the fleshly immortality, how could they have followed Him now, when, even though ready to die, they would have no resurrection till the end of the world? Or, on the point of going, as the Lord was, to the bosom of the Father, and that without any forsaking of them, just as He had never quitted that bosom in coming to them, how could they have followed Him now, since no one can enter on that state of felicity but he that is made perfect in love? And to show them, therefore, how it is that they may attain the fitness to proceed, where He was going before them, He says, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another" (ver. 34). These are the steps whereby Christ must be followed; but any fuller discourse thereon must be put off till another opportunity.

TRACTATE 65

John XIII. 34, 35. 1. The Lord Jesus declares that He is giving His disciples a new commandment, that they should love one another. "A new commandment," He says, "I give unto you, that ye love one another. But was not this already commanded in the ancient law of God, where it is written, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"? Why, then, is it called a new one by the Lord, when it is proved to be so old? Is it on this account a new commandment, because He hath divested us of the old, and clothed us with the new man? For it is not indeed every kind of love that renews him that listens to it, or rather yields it obedience, but that love regarding which the Lord, in order to distinguish it from all carnal affection, added, "as I have loved you. For husbands and wives love one another, and parents and children, and all other human relationships that bind men together: to say nothing of the blame-worthy and damnable love which is mutually felt by adulterers and

adulteresses, by fornicators and prostitutes, and all others who are knit together by no human relationship, but by the mischievous depravity of human life. Christ, therefore, hath given us a new commandment, that we should love one another, as He also hath loved us. This is the love that renews us, making us new men, heirs of the New Testament, singers of the new song.

It was this love, brethren beloved, that renewed also those of olden time, who were then the righteous, the patriarchs and prophets, as it did afterwards the blessed apostles: it is it, too, that is now renewing the nations, and from among the universal race of man, which overspreads the whole world, is making and gathering together a new people, the body of the newly-married spouse of the only-begotten Son of God, of whom it is said in the Song of Songs, "Who is she that ascendeth, made white? Made white indeed, because renewed; and how, but by the new commandment? Because of this, the members thereof have a mutual interest in one another; and if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; and one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it. For this they hear and observe, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another: not as those love one another who are corrupters, nor as men love one another in a human way; but they love one another as those who are God's, and all of them sons of the Highest, and brethren, therefore, of His only Son, with that mutual love wherewith He loved them, when about to lead them on to the goal were all sufficiency should be theirs, and where their every desire should be satisfied with good things. For then there will be nothing wanting they can desire, when God will be all in all. An end like that has no end.

No one dieth there, where no one arriveth save he that dieth to this world, not that universal kind of death whereby the body is bereft of the soul; but the death of the elect, through which, even while still remaining in this mortal flesh, the heart is set on the things which are above. Of such a death it is that the apostle said, "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. And perhaps to this, also, do the words refer, "Love is strong as death. For by this love it is brought about, that, While still held in the present corruptible body, we die to this world, and our life is hid with Christ in God; yea, that love itself is our death to the world, and our life with God. For if that is death when the soul quits the body, how can it be other than

death when our love quits the world? Such love, therefore, is strong as death. And what is stronger than that which bindeth the world?

2. Think not then, my brethren, that when the Lord says, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another," there is any overlooking of that greater commandment, which requires us to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our mind; for along with this seeming oversight, the words "that ye love one another" appear also as if they had no reference to that second commandment, which says, "Thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself. For "on these two commandments," He says, "hang all the law and the prophets. But both commandments may be found in each of these by those who have good understanding. For, on the one hand, he that loveth God cannot despise His commandment to love his neighbor; and on the other, he who in a holy and spiritual way loveth his neighbor, what doth he love in him but God? That is the love, distinguished from all mundane love, which the Lord specially characterized, when He added, "as I have loved you. For what was it but God that He loved in us? Not because we had Him, but in order that we might have Him; and that He may lead us on, as I said a little ago, where God is all in all. It is in this way, also, that the physician is properly said to love the sick; and what is it he loves in them but their health, which at all events he desires to recall;

not their sickness, which he comes to remove? Let us, then, also so love one another, that, as far as possible, we may by the solicitude of our love be winning one another to have God within us. And this love is bestowed on us by Him who said, "As I have loved you, that ye also love one another. For this very end, therefore, did He love us, that we also should love one another; bestowing this on us by His own love to us, that we should be bound to one another in mutual love, and, united together as members by so pleasant a bond, should be the body of so mighty a Head. 3. "By this," He adds, "Shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another:" as if He said, Other gifts of mine are possessed in common with you by those who are not mine,-not only nature, life, perception, reason, and that safety which is equally the privilege of men and beasts; but also languages, sacraments, prophecy, knowledge, faith, the bestowing of their goods upon the poor, and the giving of their body to the flames: but because destitute of charity, they only tinkle like cymbals; they are nothing, and by nothing are they profited. It is not, then, by such gifts of mine, however good, which may be alike pos-

sessed by those who are not my disciples, but "by this it is that all men shall know that ye are my disciples, that ye have love one to another." O thou spouse of Christ, fair amongst women! O thou who ascendest in whiteness, leaning upon thy Beloved! for by His light thou art made dazzling to whiteness, by His assistance thou art preserved from falling. How well becoming thee are the words in that Song of Songs, which is, as it were, thy bridal chant, "That there is love in thy delights"! This it is that suffers not thy soul to perish with the ungodly; it is this that judges thy cause, and is strong as death, and is present in thy delights. How wonderful is the character of that death, which was all but swallowed up in penal sufferings, had it not been over and above absorbed in delights! But here this discourse must now be closed; for we must make a new commencement in dealing with the words that follow.

TRACTATE 66

John XIII. 36-38. 1. While the Lord Jesus was commending to the disciples that holy love wherewith they should love one another, "Simon Peter saith unto Him, Lord, whither goest Thou? So, at all events, said the disciple to his Master, the servant to his Lord, as one who was prepared to follow. Just as for the same reason the Lord, who read in his mind the purpose of such a question, made him this reply: "Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; as if He said, In reference to the object of thy asking, thou canst not now. He does not say, Thou canst not; but "Thou canst not now. He intimated delay, with out depriving of hope; and that same hope, which He took not away, but rather bestowed, in His next words He confirmed, by proceeding to say, "Thou shall follow me afterwards. Why such haste, Peter? The Rock (*petra*) has not yet solidified thee by His Spirit. Be not lifted up with presumption, "Thou canst not now; be not cast now into despair, "Thou shalt follow afterwards. But what does he say to this? "Why cannot I follow Thee now? I will lay down my life for Thy sake. He saw what was the kind of desire in his mind; but what the measure of his strength, he saw not. The weak man boasted of his willingness, but the Physician had an eye on the state of his health; the one promised, the Other foreknew: the ignorant was bold; He that foreknew all, condescended to teach.

How much had Peter taken upon himself, by looking only at what he wished, and having no knowledge of what he was able! How much had he taken upon himself, that, when the Lord had come to lay down His life for

His friends, and so for him also, he should have the assurance to offer to do the same for the Lord; and while as yet Christ's life was not laid down for himself, he should promise to lay down his own life for Christ! "Jesus" therefore "answered him, Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake? Wilt thou do for me what I have not yet done for thee? "Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake? Canst thou go before, who art unable to follow? Why dost thou presume so far? what dost thou think of thyself? what dost thou imagine thyself to be? Hear what thou art: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice. See, that is how thou wilt speedily become manifest to thyself, who art now talking so loftily, and knowest not that thou art but a child. Thou promisest me thy death, and thou wilt deny me thy life. Thou, who now thinkest thyself able to die for me, learn to live first for thyself; for in fearing the death of thy flesh, thou wilt occasion the death of thy soul. Just as much as it is life to confess Christ, it is death to deny Him.

2. Or was it that the Apostle Peter, as some with a perverse kind of favor strive to excuse him, did not deny Christ, because, when questioned by the maid, he replied that he did not know the man, as the other evangelists more expressly affirm? As if, indeed, he that denies the man Christ does not deny Christ; and so denies Him in respect of what He became on our account, that the nature He had given us might not be lost. Whoever, therefore, acknowledges Christ as God, and disowns Him as man, Christ died not for him; for as man it was that Christ died. He who disowns Christ as man, finds no reconciliation to God by the Mediator. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. He that denies Christ as man is not justified: for as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners; so also by the obedience of one man shall many be made righteous. He that denies Christ as man, shall not rise again into the resurrection of life; for by man is death, and by man is also the resurrection of the dead: for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. And by what means is He the Head of the Church, but by His manhood, because the Word was made flesh, that is, God, the Only-begotten of God the Father, became man.

And how then can one be in the body of Christ who denies the man Christ? Or how can one be a member who disowns the Head? But why linger over a multitude of reasons when the Lord Himself undoes all the windings

of human argumentation? For He says not, The cock shall not crow till thou hast denied the man; or, as He was wont to speak in His more familiar condescension with men, The cock shall not crow till thou hast thrice denied the Son of man; but He says, "till thou hast denied me thrice. What is that "me," but just what He was, and what was He but Christ? Whatever of Him, therefore, he denied, he denied Himself, he denied the Christ, he denied the Lord his God. For Thomas also, his fellow-disciple, when he exclaimed, "My Lord and my God," did not handle the Word, but only His flesh; and laid not his inquisitive hands on the incorporeal nature of God, but on His human body. And so he touched the man, and yet recognized his God. If, then, what the latter touched, Peter denied; what the latter invoked, Peter offended. "The cock shall not crow till thou hast denied me thrice. Although thou say, "I know not the man; although thou say, "Man, I know not what thou sayest; although thou say, "I am not one of His disciples; thou wilt be denying me. If, which it were sinful to doubt, Christ so spake, and foretold the truth, then doubtless Peter denied Christ.

Let us not accuse Christ in defending Peter. Let infirmity acknowledge its sin; for there is no falsehood in the Truth. When Peter's infirmity acknowledged its sin, his acknowledgment was full; and the greatness of the evil he had committed in denying Christ, he showed by his tears. He himself reproves his defenders, and for their conviction, brings his tears forward as witnesses. Nor have we, on our part, in so speaking, any delight in accusing the first of the apostles; but in looking on him, we ought to take home the lesson to ourselves, that no man should place his confidence in human strength. For what else had our Teacher and Saviour in view, but to show us, by making the first of the apostles himself an example, that no one ought in any way to presume of himself? And that, therefore, really took place in Peter's soul, for which he gave cause in his body. And yet he did not go before in the Lord's behalf, as he rashly presumed, but did so otherwise than he reckoned. For before the death and resurrection of the Lord, he both died when he denied, and returned to life when he wept; but he died, because he himself had been proud in his presumption, and he lived again, because that Other had looked on him with kindness.

TRACTATE 67

John XIV. 1-3. 1. Our special attention, brethren, must be earnestly turned to God, in order that we may be able to obtain some intelligent apprehension

of the words of the holy Gospel, which have just been ringing in our ears. For the Lord Jesus saith: "Let not your heart be troubled. Believe in God, and believe [or, believe also] in me." That they might not as men be afraid of death, and so be troubled, He comforts them by affirming Himself also to be God. "Believe," He says, "in God, believe also in me." For it follows as a consequence, that if ye believe in God, ye ought to believe also in me: which were no consequence if Christ were not God. "Believe in God, and believe in" Him, who, by nature and not by robbery, is equal with God; for He emptied Himself; not, however, by losing the form of God, but by taking the form of a servant. You are afraid of death as regards this servant form, "let not your heart be troubled," the form of God will raise it again.

2. But why have we this that follows, "In my Father's house are many mansions," but that they were also in fear about themselves? And therein they might have heard the words, "Let not your heart be troubled. For, was there any of them that could be free from fear, when Peter, the most confident and forward of them all, was told, "The cock shall not crow till thou hast denied me thrice"? Considering themselves, therefore, beginning with Peter, as destined to perish, they had cause to be troubled: but when they now hear, "In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you," they are revived from their trouble, made certain and confident that after all the perils of temptations they shall dwell with Christ in the presence of God. For, albeit one is stronger than another, one wiser than another, one more righteous than another, "in the Father's house there are many mansions; none of them shall remain outside that house, where every one, according to his deserts, is to receive a mansion. All alike have that penny, which the householder orders to be given to all that have wrought in the vineyard, making no distinction therein between those who have labored less and those who have labored more: by which penny, of course, is signified eternal life, whereto no one any longer lives to a different length than others, since in eternity life has no diversity in its measure.

But the many mansions point to the different grades of merit in that one eternal life. For there is one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory; and so also the resurrection of the dead. The saints, like the stars in the sky, obtain in the kingdom different mansions of diverse degrees of brightness;

but on account of that one penny no one is cut off from the kingdom; and God will be all in all in such a way, that, as God is love, love will bring it about that what is possessed by each will be common to all. For in this way every one really possesses it, when he loves to see in another what he has not himself. There will not, therefore, be any envying amid this diversity of brightness, since in all of them will be reigning the unity of love.

3. Every Christian heart, therefore, must utterly reject the idea of those who imagine that there are many mansions spoken of, because there will be some place outside the kingdom of heaven, which shall be the abode of those blessed innocents who have departed this life without baptism, because without it they cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. Faith like this is not faith, inasmuch as it is not the true and catholic faith. Are you not so foolish and blinded with carnal imaginations as to be worthy of reprobation, if you should thus separate the mansion, I say not of Peter and Paul, or any of the apostles, but even of any baptized infant from the kingdom of heaven; do you not think yourselves deserving of reprobation in thus putting a separation between these and the house of God the Father? For the Lord's words are not, In the whole world, or, In all creation, or, In everlasting life and blessedness, there are many mansions; but He says, "In my Father's house are many mansions. Is not that the house where we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens? Is not that the house whereof we sing to the Lord, "Blessed are they that dwell in Thy house; they shall praise Thee for ever and ever"?

Will you then venture to separate from the kingdom of heaven the house, not of every baptized brother, but of God the Father Himself, to whom all we who are brethren say, "Our Father, who art in heaven," or divide it in such a way as to make some of its mansions inside, and some outside, the kingdom of heaven? Far, far be it from those who desire to dwell in the kingdom of heaven, to be willing to dwell in such folly with you: far be it, I say, that since every house of sons that are reigning can be nowhere else but in the kingdom, any part of the royal house itself should be outside the kingdom. 4. "And if I go," He says "and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also. And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know." O Lord Jesus, how goest Thou to prepare a place, if there are already many mansions in Thy Father's house, where Thy people shall dwell with Thyself? Or if Thou receivest them unto Thyself,

how wilt Thou come again, who never withdrawest Thy presence? Such subjects as these, beloved, were we to attempt to explain them with such brevity as seems within the proper bounds of our discourse to-day, would certainly suffer in clearness from compression, and the very brevity would become itself a second obscurity; we shall therefore defer this debt, which the bounty of our Family head will enable us to repay at a more suitable opportunity.

TRACTATE 68

On the same passage. 1. We acknowledge, beloved brethren, that we are owing you, and ought now to repay, what was left over for consideration, how we can understand that there is no real mutual contrariety between these two statements, namely, that after saying, "In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you, that I go to prepare a place for you;"—where He makes it clear enough that He said so to them for the very reason that there are many mansions there already, and there is no need of preparing any;—the Lord again says: "And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also. How is it that He goes and prepares a place, if there are many mansions already? If there were not such, He would have said, "I go to prepare. Or if the place has still to be prepared, would He not then also properly have said, "I go to prepare"? Are these mansions in existence already, and yet needing still to be prepared? For if they were not in existence, He would have said, "I go to prepare. And yet, because their present state of existence is such as still to stand in need of preparation, He does not go to prepare them in the same sense as they already exist;

but if He go and prepare them as they shall be hereafter, He will come again and receive His own to Himself: that where He is, there they may be also. How then are there mansions in the Father's house, and these not different ones but the same, which already exist in a sense in which they can admit of no preparation, and yet do not exist, inasmuch as they are still to be prepared? How are we to think of this, but in the same way as the prophet, who also declares of God, that He has [already] made that which is yet to be. For he says not, Who will make what is yet to be, but, "Who has made what is yet to be. Therefore He has both made such things and is yet to make them. For they have not been made at all if He has not made them; nor will they ever be if He make them not Himself. He has made them therefore in the way of fore-ordaining them; He has yet to make them in the way of ac-

tual elaboration. Just as the Gospel plainly intimates when He chose His disciples, that is to say, at the time of His calling them; and yet the apostle says, "He chose us before the foundation of the world," to wit, by predestination, not by actual calling. "And whom He did predestinate, them He also called; He hath chosen by predestination before the foundation of the world, He chooses by calling before its close.

And so also has He prepared those mansions, and is still preparing them and He who has already made the things which are yet to be, is now preparing, not different ones, but the very mansions He has already prepared: what He has prepared in predestination, He is preparing by actual working. Already, therefore; they are, as respects predestination; if it were not so, He would have said, I will go and prepare, that is, I will predestinate. But because they are not yet in a state of practical preparedness He says, "And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself." 2. But He is in a certain sense preparing the dwellings by preparing for them the dwellers. As, for instance, when He said, "In my Father's house are many dwellings," what else can we suppose the house of God to mean but the temple of God? And what that is, ask the apostle, and he will reply, "For the temple of God is holy, which [temple] ye are" This is also the kingdom of God, which the Son is yet to deliver up to the Father; and hence the same apostle says, "Christ, the beginning, and then they that are Christ's in His presence; then [cometh] the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; that is, those whom He has redeemed by His blood, He shall then have delivered up to stand before His Father's face. This is that kingdom of heaven whereof it is said, "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man who sowed good seed in his field. But the good seed are the children of the kingdom; and although now they are mingled with tares, at the end the King Himself shall send forth His angels, "and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. The kingdom will shine forth in the kingdom when [those that are] the kingdom shall have reached the kingdom; just as we now pray when we say, "Thy kingdom come.

Even now, therefore, already is the kingdom called, but only as yet being called together. For if it were not now called, it could not be then said, "They shall gather out of His kingdom everything that offends. But the realm is not yet reigning. Accordingly it is already so far the kingdom, that when all

offences shall have been gathered out of it, it shall then attain to sovereignty, so as to possess not merely the name of a kingdom, but also the power of government. For it is to this kingdom, standing then at the right hand, that it shall be said in the end, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, receive the kingdom; that is, ye who were the kingdom, but without the power to rule, come and reign; that what you formerly were only in hope, you may now have the power to be in reality. This house of God, therefore, this temple of God, this kingdom of God and kingdom of heaven, is as yet in the process of building, of construction, of preparation, of assembling. In it there will be mansions, even as the Lord is now preparing them; in it there are such already, even as the Lord has already ordained them.

3. But why is it that He went away to make such preparation, when, as it is certainly we ourselves that are the subjects in need of preparation, His doing so will be hindered by leaving us behind? I explain it, Lord, as I can: it was surely this Thou didst signify by the preparation of those mansions, that the just ought to live by faith. For he who is sojourning at a distance from the Lord has need to be living by faith, because by this we are prepared for beholding His countenance. For "blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God; and "He purifieth their hearts by faith. The former we find in the Gospel, the latter in the Acts of the Apostles. But the faith by which those who are yet to see God have their hearts purified, while sojourning at a distance here, believeth what it cloth not see; for if there is sight, there is no longer faith. Merit is accumulating now to the believer, and then the reward is paid into the hand of the beholder. Let the Lord then go and prepare us a place; let Him go, that He may not be seen; and let Him remain concealed, that faith may be exercised. For then is the place preparing, if it is by faith we are living. Let the believing in that place be desired, that the place desired may itself be possessed; the longing of love is the preparation of the mansion.

Prepare thus, Lord, what Thou art preparing; for Thou art preparing us for Thyself, and Thyself for us, inasmuch as Thou art preparing a place both for Thyself in us, and for us in Thee. For Thou hast said, "Abide in me, and I in you. As far as each one has been a partaker of Thee, some less, some more, such will be the diversity of rewards in proportion to the diversity of merits; such will be the multitude of mansions to suit the inequalities among their inmates; but all of them, none the less, eternally living, and endlessly blessed. Why is it that Thou goest away? Why is it Thou comest again? If I

understand Thee aright, Thou withdrawest not Thyself either from the place Thou goest from, or from the place Thou comest from: Thou goest away by becoming invisible, Thou comest by again becoming manifest to our eyes. But unless Thou remainest to direct us how we may still be advancing in goodness of life, how will the place be prepared where we shall be able to dwell in the fullness of joy? Let what we have said suffice on the words which have been read from the Gospel as far as "I will come again, and receive you to myself. But the meaning of what follows, "That where I am, there ye may be also;

and whither I go ye know, and the way ye know," we shall be in a better condition-after the question put by the disciple, that follows, and which we also may be putting, as it were, through him-for hearing, and more suitably situated for making the subject of our discourse.

TRACTATE 69

John XIV. 4-6. 1. We have now the opportunity, dearly, beloved, as far as we can, of understanding the earlier words of the Lord from the later, and His previous statements by those that follow, in what you have heard was His answer to the question of the Apostle Thomas. For when the Lord was speaking above of the mansions, of which He both said that they already were in His Father's house, and that He was going to prepare them; where we understood that those mansions already existed in predestination, and are also being prepared through the purifying by faith of the hearts of those who are hereafter to inhabit them, seeing that they themselves are the very house of God; and what else is it to dwell in God's house than to be in the number of His people, since His people are at the same time in God, and God in them? To make this preparation the Lord departed, that by believing in Him, though no longer visible, the mansion, whose outward form is always hid in the future, may now by faith be prepared: for this reason, therefore, He had said, "And if I go away and prepare a place for you, I will come i again, and receive you to myself; that whereI am, there ye may be also. And whither I goye know, and the way ye know. In replyto this "Thomas saith unto Him Lord, we know not whither Thou goest: and how can we know the way?

Both of these the Lord had said that they knew; both of them this other declares that he does not know, to wit, the place to which, and the way whereby, He is going. But he does not know that he is speaking falsely; they knew, therefore, and did not know that they knew. He will convince them

that they already know what they imagine themselves still to be ignorant of. "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life. What, brethren, does He mean? See, we have just heard the disciple asking, and the Master instructing, and we do not yet, even after His voice has sounded in our ears, apprehend the thought that lies hid in His words. But what is it we cannot apprehend? Could His apostles, with whom He was talking, have said to Him, We do not know Thee? Accordingly, if they knew Him, and He Himself is the way, they knew the way; if they knew Him who is Himself the truth, they knew the truth; if they knew Him who is also the life, they knew the life. Thus, you see, they were convinced that they knew what they knew not that they knew.

2. What is it, then, that we also have not apprehended in this discourse? What else, think you, brethren, but just that He said, "And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know"? And here we have discovered that they knew the way, because they knew Him who is the way: the way is that by which we go; but is the way the place also to which we go? And yet each of these He said that they knew, both whither He was going, and the way. There was need, therefore, for His saying, "I am the way," in order to show those who knew Him that they knew the way, which they thought themselves ignorant of; but what need was there for His saying, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life," when, after knowing the way by which He went, they had still to learn whither He was going, but just because it was to the truth and to the life He was going? By Himself, therefore, He was going to Himself. And whither go we, but to Him, and by what way go we, but by Him? He, therefore, went to Himself by Himself, and we by Him to Him; yea, likewise both He and we go thus to the Father. For He says also in another place of Himself, "I go to the Father; and here on our account He says, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me.

And in this way, He goeth by Himself both to Himself and to the Father, and we by Him both to Him and to the Father. Who can apprehend such things save he who has spiritual discernment? and how much is it that even he can apprehend, although thus spiritually discerning? Brethren, how can you desire me to explain such things to you? Only reflect how lofty they are. You see what I am, I see what you are; in all of us the body, which is corrupted, burdens the soul, and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things. Do we think we can say, "To Thee have I lif-

ted up my soul, O Thou that dwellest in the heavens"? But burdened as we are with so great a weight, under which we groan, how shall I lift up my soul unless He lift it with me who laid His own down for me? I shall speak then as I can, and let each of you who is able receive it. As He gives, I speak; as He gives, the receiver receiveth; and as He giveth, there is faith for him who cannot yet receive with understanding. For, saith the prophet, "If ye will not believe, ye shall not understand."

3. Tell me, O my Lord, what to say to Thy servants, my fellow-servants. The Apostle Thomas had Thee before him in order to ask Thee questions, and yet could not understand Thee unless he had Thee within him; I ask Thee because I know that Thou art over me; and I ask, seeking, as far as I can, to let my soul diffuse itself in that same region over me where I may listen to Thee, who usest no external sound to convey Thy teaching. Tell me, I pray, how it is that Thou goest to Thyself. Didst Thou formerly leave Thyself to come to us, especially as Thou camest not of Thyself, but the Father sent Thee? I know, indeed, that Thou didst empty Thyself; but in taking the form of a servant, it was neither that Thou didst lay down the form of God as something to return to, or that Thou lost it as something to be recovered; and yet Thou didst come, and didst place Thyself not only before the carnal eyes, but even in the very hands of men. And how otherwise save in Thy flesh? By means of this Thou didst come, yet abiding where Thou wast; by this means Thou didst return, without leaving the place to which Thou hadst come. If, then, by such means Thou didst come and return, by such means doubtless Thou art not only the way for us to come unto Thee, but wast the way also for Thyself to come and to return.

For when Thou didst return to the life, which Thou art Thyself, then of a truth that same flesh of Thine Thou didst bring from death unto life. The Word of God, indeed, is one thing, and man another; but the Word was made flesh, or became man. And so the person of the Word is not different from that of the man, seeing that Christ is both in one person; and in this way, just as when His flesh died. Christ died, and when His flesh was buried, Christ was buried (for thus with the heart we believe unto righteousness, and thus with the mouth do we make confession unto salvation); so when the flesh came from death unto life, Christ came to life. And because Christ is the Word of God, He is also the life. And thus in a wonderful and ineffable manner He, who never laid down or lost Himself, came to Himself. But God,

as was said, had come through the flesh to men, the truth to liars; for God is true, and every man a liar. When, therefore, He withdrew His flesh from amongst men, and carried it up there where no liar is found, He also Himself-for the Word was made flesh-returned by Himself, that is, by His flesh, to the truth, which is none other but Himself. And this truth, we cannot doubt, although found amongst liars, He preserved even in death; for Christ was once dead, but never false.

4. Take an example, very different in character and wholly inadequate, yet in some little measure helpful to the understanding of God, from things that are in peculiarly intimate subjection to God. See here in my own case, while as far as pertains to my mind I am just the same as yourselves, if I keep silence I am so to myself; but if I speak to you something suited to your understanding, in a certain sense I go forth to you without leaving myself, but at the same time approach you and yet quit not the place from which I proceed. But when I cease speaking, I return in a kind of way to myself, and in a kind of way I remain with you, if you retain what you have heard in the discourse I am delivering. And if the mere image that God made is capable of this, what may not God, the very image of God, not made by, but born of God; whose body, wherein He came forth to us and returned from us, has not ceased to be, like the sound of my voice, but abides there, where it shall die no more, and death shall have no more dominion over it? Much more, perhaps, might and ought to have been said on these words of the Gospel; but your souls ought not to be burdened with spiritual food, however pleasant, especially as the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.

TRACTATE 70

John XIV. 7-10. 1. The words of the holy Gospel, brethren, are rightly understood only if they are found to be in harmony with those that precede; for the premises ought to agree with the conclusion, when it is the Truth that speaks. The Lord had said before, "And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also: and then had added, "And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know; and showed that all He said was that they knew himself. What, therefore, the meaning was of His going to Himself by Himself,-for He also lets the disciples see that it is by Him that they are to come to Him,-we have already told you, as we could, in our last discourse. When He says, therefore, "That where I am, there ye may be also," where else were they to be but in

Himself? In this way is He also in Himself, and they, therefore, are just where He is, that is, in Himself. Accordingly, He Himself is that eternal life which is yet to be ours, when He has received us unto Himself; and as He is that life eternal, so is it in Him, that where He is there shall we be also, that is to say, in Himself.

"For as the Father hath life in Himself," and certainly that life which He has is in no wise different from what He is Himself as its possessor, "so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself," inasmuch as He is the very life which He hath in Himself. But shall we then actually be what He is, (namely), the life, when we shall have begun our existence in that life, that is, in Himself? Certainly not, for He, by His very existence as the life, hath life, and is Himself what He hath; and as the life, is in Him, so is He in Himself: but we are not that life, but partakers of His life, and shall be there in such wise as to be wholly incapable of being in ourselves what He is, but so as, while ourselves not the life, to have Him as our life, who has Himself the life on this very account that He Himself is the life. In short, He both exists unchangeably in Himself and inseparably in the Father. But we, when wishing to exist in ourselves, were thrown into inward trouble regarding ourselves, as is expressed in the words, "My soul is cast down within me: and changing from bad to worse, cannot even remain as we were.

But when by Him we come unto the Father, according to His own words, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me," and abide in Him, no one shall be able to separate us either from the Father or from Him. 2. Connecting, therefore, His previous words with those that follow, He proceeded to say, "If ye had known me, ye should certainly have known my Father also. This conforms to His previous words, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me. And then He adds: "And from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him. But Philip, one of the apostles, not understanding what he had just heard, said, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. And the Lord replied to him, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet have ye not known me, Philip? he that seeth me, seeth also the Father. Here you see He complains that He had been so long time with them, and yet He was not known. But had He not Himself said, "And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know; and on their saying that they knew it not, had convinced them that they did know, by adding the words: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life"? How, then, says He now, "Have I been so long time with you, and

have ye not known me? when, in fact, they knew both whither He went and the way, on no other grounds save that they really knew Himself? But this difficulty is easily solved by saying that some of them knew Him, and others did not, and that Philip was one of those who did not know Him;

so that, when He said, "And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know," He is understood as having spoken to those that knew, and not to Philip, who has it said to him, "Have I been so long time with you, and have ye not known me, Philip? To such, then, as already knew the Son, was it now also said of the Father, "And from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him: for such words were used because of the all-sided likeness subsisting between the Father and the Son; so that, because they knew the Son, they might henceforth be said to know the Father. Already, therefore, they knew the Son, if not all of them, those at least to whom it is said, "And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know; for He is Himself the way. But they knew not the Father, and so have also to hear, "If ye have known me, ye have known my Father also; that is, through me ye have known Him also. For I am one, and He another. But that they might not think Him unlike, He adds, "And from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him. For they saw His perfectly resembling Son, but needed to have the truth impressed on them, that exactly such as was the Son whom they saw, was the Father also whom they did not see. And to this points what is afterwards said to Philip, "He that seeth me, seeth also the Father.

Not that He Himself was Father and Son, which is a notion of the Sabelians, who are also called Patripassians, condemned by the Catholic faith; but that Father and Son are so alike, that he who knoweth one knoweth both. For we are accustomed to speak in this way of two who closely resemble each other, to those who are in the habit of seeing one of them, and wish to know what like the other is, so that we say, In seeing the one, you have seen the other. In this way, then, is it said "He that seeth me, seeth also the Father. Not, certainly, that He who is the Son is also the Father, but that the Son in no respect disagrees with the likeness of the Father. For had not the Father and Son been two persons, it would not have been said, "If ye have known me, ye have known my Father also" Such is certainly the case for "no one," He says, "cometh unto the Father but by me: if ye have known me, ye have known my Father also; because it is I, who am the only way to the Father, that will lead you to Him, that He also may Himself become known to you.

But as I am in all respects His perfect image, "from henceforth ye know Him" in knowing me; "and have seen Him," if you have seen me with the spiritual eyesight of the soul.

3. Why, then, Philip, dost thou say, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us? Have I been so long time with you, and yet have ye not known me, Philip? He that seeth me, seeth the Father also. If it interests thee much to see this, believe at least what thou seest not. For "how," He says, "sayest thou, Show us the Father? If thou hast seen me, who am His perfect likeness, thou hast seen Him to whom I am like. And if thou canst not directly see this, "believest thou not," at least, "that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? But Philip might say here, "I see Thee indeed, and believe Thy full likeness to the Father; but is one to be reprov'd and rebuked because, when he sees one who bears a likeness to another, he wishes to see that other to whom he is like? I know, indeed, the image, but as yet I know only the one without the other; it is not enough for me, unless I know that other whose likeness he bears. Show us, therefore, the Father, and it sufficeth us. But the Master really reprov'd the disciple because He saw into the heart of his questioner. For it was with the idea, as if the Father were somehow better than the Son, that Philip had the desire to know the Father: and so he did not even know the Son, because believing that He was inferior to another.

It was to correct such a notion that it was said, "He that seeth me, seeth the Father also. How sayest thou, Show us the Father? I see the meaning of thy words: it is not the original likeness thou seekest to see, but it is that other thou thinkest the superior. "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? Why desirest thou to discover some distance between those who are thus alike? why cravest thou the separate knowledge of those who cannot be separated? What, after this, He says not only to Philip, but to all of them together, must not now be thrust into a corner, in order that, by His help, it may be the more carefully expounded.

TRACTATE 71

John XIV. 10-14. 1. Give close attention, and try to understand, beloved; for while it is we who speak it is He Himself who never withdraweth His presence from us who is our Teacher. The Lord saith, what you have just heard read "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself: but the Father, that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works." Even His words, then, are works? Clearly so. For surely he that edifies a neighbor by what he says, works a good

work. But what mean the words, "I speak not of myself," but, I who speak am not of myself? Hence He attributes what He does to Him, of whom He, that doeth them, is. For the Father is not God [as born, etc.] of any one else, while the Son is God, as equal, indeed, to the Father, but [as born] of God the Father. Therefore the former is God, but not of God; and the Light, but not of light: whereas the latter is God of God, Light of Light.

2. For in connection with these two clauses,-the one where it is said, "I speak not of myself; and the other, which runs, "but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works,"-we are opposed by two different classes of heretics, who, by each of them holding only to one clause, run off, not in one, but opposite directions, and wander far from the pathway of truth. For instance, the Arians say, See here, the Son is not equal to the Father, He speaketh not of Himself. The Sabellians, or Patripassians, on the other hand, say, See, He who is the Father is also the Son; for what else is this, "The Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works," but I that do them dwell in myself? You make contrary assertions, and that not only in the sense that any one thing is false, that is, contrary to truth, but in this also, when two things that are both false contradict one another. In your wanderings you have taken opposite directions; midway between the two is the path you have left. You are a far longer distance apart from each other than from the very way you have both forsaken. Come hither, you from the one side, and you from the other: pass not across, the one to the other, but come from both sides to us, and make this the place of your mutual meeting. Ye Sabellians, acknowledge the Being you overlook;

Arians, set Him whom you subordinate in His place of equality, and you will both be walking with us in the pathway of truth. For you have grounds on both sides that make mutual admonition a duty. Listen, Sabellian: so far is the Son from being the same as the Father, and so truly is He another, that the Arian maintains His inferiority to the Father. Listen, Arian: so truly is the Son equal to the Father, that the Sabellian declares Him to be identical with the Father. Do thou restore the personality thou hast abstracted, and thou, the full dignity thou hast lowered, and both of you stand together on the same ground as ourselves: because the one of you [who has been an Arian], for the conviction of the Sabellian, never lets out of sight the personality of Him who is distinct from the Father, and the other [who has been a Sabellian] takes care, for the conviction of the Arian, of not impairing the

dignity of Him who is equal with the Father. For to both of you He cries, "I and my Father are one. When He says "one," let the Arians listen; when He says, "we are," let the Sabellians give heed, and no longer continue in the folly of denying, the one, His equality [with the Father], the other, His distinct personality.

If, then, in saying, "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself," He is thereby accounted of a power so inferior, that what He doeth is not what He Himself willeth; listen to what He also said, "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will. And so likewise, if in saying, "The Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works," He is on that account not to be regarded as distinct in person from the Father, let us listen to His other words, "What things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise; and He will be understood as speaking not of one person twice over, but of two who are one. But just because their mutual equality is such as not to interfere with their distinct personality, therefore He speaketh not of Himself, because He is not of Himself and the Father also, that dwelleth in Him, Himself doeth the works, because He, by whom and with whom He doeth them, is not, save of [the Father] Himself. And then He goes on to say, "Believe ye not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? Or else believe me for the very works' sake. Formerly it was Philip only who was reproofed, but now, it is shown that he was not the only one there that needed reproof. "For the very works' sake," He says, "believe ye that I am in the Father, and the Father in me:

for had we been separated, we should have been unable to do any kind of work inseparably. 3. But what is this that follows? "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it. And so He promised that He Himself would also do those greater works. Let not the servant exalt himself above his Lord, or the disciple above his Master. He says that they will do greater works than He doeth Himself; but it is all by His doing such in or by them, and not as if they did them of themselves. Hence the song that is addressed to Him, "I will love Thee, O Lord, my strength. But what, then, are those greater works? Was it that their very shadow, as they themselves passed by, healed the sick? For it is a mightier thing for a

shadow, than for the hem of a garment, to possess the power of healing. The one work was done by Christ Himself, the other by them; and yet it was He that did both. Nevertheless, when He so spake, He was commending the efficacious power of His own words: for it was in this sense He had said, "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself;

but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works. What works was He then referring to, but the words He was speaking? They were hearing and believing, and their faith was the fruit of those very words: howbeit, when the disciples preached the gospel, it was not small numbers like themselves, but nations also that believed; and such, doubtless, are greater works. And yet He said not, Greater works than these shall ye do, to lead us to suppose that it was only the apostles who would do so; for He added, "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do. Is the case then so, that he that believeth on Christ doeth the same works as Christ, or even greater than He did? Points like these are not to be treated in a cursory way, nor ought they to be hurriedly disposed of; and, therefore, as our present discourse must be brought to a close, we are obliged to defer their further consideration.

TRACTATE 72

On the same passage. 1. It is no easy matter to comprehend what is meant by, or in what sense we are to receive, these words of the Lord, "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also: and then, to this great difficulty in the way of our understanding, He has added another still more difficult, "And greater things than these shall he do. What are we to make of it? We have not found one who did such works as Christ did; and are we likely to find one who will do even greater? But we remarked in our last discourse, that it was a greater deed to heal the sick by the passing of their shadow, as was done by the disciples, than as the Lord Himself did by the touch of the hem of His garment; and that more believed on the apostles than on the Lord Himself, when preaching with His own lips; so that we might suppose works like these to be understood as greater: not that the disciple was to be greater than his Master, or the servant than his Lord, or the adopted son than the Only-begotten, or man than God, but that by them He Himself would condescend to do these greater works, while telling them in another passage, "Without me ye can do nothing. While He Himself, on the other

hand, to say nothing of His other works, which are numberless, made them without any aid from themselves, and without them made this world;

and because He Himself thought meet to become man, without them He made also Himself. But what have they [made or done] without Him, save sin? And last of all, He straightway also withdrew from the subject all that could cause us agitation; for after saying, "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; He immediately went on to add, "Because I go unto the Father; and whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do. He who had said, "He will do," afterwards said, "I will do; as if He had said, Let not this appear to you impossible; for he that believeth on me can never become greater than I am, but it is I who shall then be doing greater things than now; greater things by him that believeth on me, than by myself apart from him; yet it is I myself apart from him, and I myself by him [that will do the works]: and as it is apart from him, it is not he that will do them; and as, on the other hand, it is by him, although not by his own self, it is he also that will do them. And besides, to do greater things by one than apart from one, is not a sign of deficiency, but of condescension. For what can servants render unto the Lord for all His benefits towards them?

And sometimes He hath condescended to number this also amongst His other benefits towards them, namely, to do greater works by them than apart from them Did not that rich man go away sad from His presence, when seeking counsel about eternal life? He heard, and cast it away: and yet in after days the counsel that fell on his ears was followed, not by one, but by many, when the good Master was speaking by the disciples; He was an object of contempt to the rich man, when warned by Himself directly, and of love to those whom by means of poor men He transformed from rich into poor. Here, then, you see, He did greater works when preached by believers, than when speaking Himself to hearers. 2. But there is still something to excite thought in His doing such greater works by the apostles; for He said not, as if merely with reference to them, The works that I do shall ye do also; and greater works than these shall ye do: but wishing to be understood as speaking of all that belonged to His family, said, "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do. If, then, he that believeth shall do such works, he that shall do them not is certainly no believer: just as "He that loveth me, keepeth my commandments,"

implies, of course, that he who keepeth them not, loveth not. In another place, also, He says, "He that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who buildeth his house upon a rock; and he, therefore, who is unlike this wise man, without doubt either heareth these sayings and doeth them not, or faileth even to hear them." "He that believeth in me," He says, "though he die, yet shall he live; and he, therefore, that shall not live, is certainly no believer now. In a similar way, also, it is said here, "He that believeth in me shall do [such works]: he is, therefore, no believer who shall not do so. What have we here, then, brethren? Is it that one is not to be reckoned among believers in Christ, who shall not do greater works than Christ?

It were hard, unreasonable, intolerable, to suppose so; that is, unless it be rightly understood. Let us listen, then, to the apostle, when he says, "To him that believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. This is the work in which we may be doing the works of Christ, for even our very believing in Christ is the work of Christ. It is this He worketh in us, not certainly without us. Hear now, then, and understand, "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also: I do them first, and he shall do them afterwards; for I do such works that he may do them also. And what are the works, but the making of a righteous man out of an ungodly one? 3. "And greater works than these shall he do. Than what, pray? Shall we say that one is doing greater works than all that Christ did who is working out his own salvation with fear and trembling? A work which Christ is certainly working in him, but not without him; and one which I might, without hesitation, call greater than the heavens and the earth, and all in both within the compass of our vision. For both heaven and earth shall pass away, but the salvation and justification of those predestinated thereto, that is, of those whom He foreknoweth, shall continue forever. In the former there is only the working of God, but in the latter there is also His image. But there are also in the heavens, thrones, governments, principalities, powers, archangels, and angels, which are all of them the work of Christ; and is it, then, greater works also than these that he doeth, who, with Christ working in him, is a co-worker in his own eternal salvation and justification? I dare not call for any hurried decision on such a point: let him who can, understand, and let him who can, judge whether it is a greater work to create righteous beings than to make righteous the ungodly.

For at least, if there is equal power employed in both, there is greater mercy in the latter, For "this is the great mystery of godliness which was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. But when He said, "Greater works than these shall he do," there is no necessity requiring us to suppose that all of Christ's works are to be understood. For He spake, perhaps, only of these He was now doing; and the work He was doing at that time was uttering the words of faith, and of such works specially had He spoken just before when He said, "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself: but the Father, that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works. His words, accordingly, were His works. And it is assuredly something less to preach the words of righteousness, which He did apart from us, than to justify the ungodly, which He does in such a way in us that we also are doing it ourselves. It remains for us to inquire how the words are to be understood, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do it. Because of the many things His believing ones ask, and receive not, there is no small question claiming our attention; but as this discourse must now be concluded, we must allow at least a little delay for its consideration and discussion.

TRACTATE 73

Again on the same passage. 1. The Lord, by His promise, gave those whose hopes were resting on Himself a special ground of confidence, when He said, "For I go to the Father; and whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do it. His proceeding, therefore, to the Father, was not with any view of abandoning the needy, but of hearing and answering their petitions. But what is to be made of the words, "Whatsoever ye shall ask," when we behold His faithful ones so often asking and not receiving? Is it, shall we say, for no other reason but that they ask amiss? For the Apostle James made this a ground of reproach when he said, "Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts. What one, therefore, wishes to receive, in order to turn to an improper use, God in His mercy rather refuses to bestow. Nay, more, if a man asks what would, if answered, only tend to his injury, there is surely greater cause to fear, lest what God could not withhold with kindness, He should give in His anger. Do we not see how the Israelites got to their own hurt what their guilty lusting craved? For while it was raining manna on them from heaven, they desired to have flesh to eat. They disdained what they had, and shamelessly sought what they had not:

as if it were not better for them to have asked not to have their unbecoming desires gratified with the food that was wanting, but to have their own dislike removed, and be made themselves to receive aright the food that was provided. For when evil becomes our delight, and what is good the reverse, we ought to be entreating God rather to win us back to the love of the good, than to grant us the evil. Not that it is wrong to eat flesh, for the apostle, speaking of this very thing, says, "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused which is received with thanksgiving; but because, as he also says, "It is evil for that man who eateth with offense; and if so, with offense to man, how much more so if to God, to whom it was no light offense, on the part of the Israelites, to reject what wisdom was supplying, and ask for that which lust was craving: although they would not actually make the request, but murmured because it was wanting. But to let us know that the wrong lies not with any creature of God, but with obstinate disobedience and inordinate desire, it was not in swine's flesh that the first man found death, but in an apple; and it was not for a fowl, but for a dish of pottage, that Esau lost his birthright.

2. How, then, are we to understand "Whatsoever ye shall ask, I will do it," if there are some things which the faithful ask, and which God, even purposely on their behalf, leaves undone? Or ought we to suppose that the words were addressed only to the apostles? Surely not. For what He has got the length of now saying is in the very line of what He had said before: "He that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do;" which was the subject of our previous discourse. And that no one might attribute such power to himself, but rather to make it manifest that even these greater works were done by Himself, He proceeded to say, "For I go to the Father; and whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do it." Was it the apostles only that believed on Him? When, therefore, He said, "He that believeth on me," He spake to those, among whom we also by His grace are included, who by no means receive everything that we ask. And if we turn our thoughts even to the most blessed apostles, we find that he who labored more than they all, yet not he, but the grace of God that was with him, besought the Lord thrice that the messenger of Satan might depart from him, and received not what he had asked. What shall we say, beloved? Are we to suppose that the promise here made, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do it," was not fulfilled by Him even to the apostles? And to

whom, then, will ever His promise be fulfilled, if therein He has deceived His own apostles?

3. Wake up, then, believer, and give careful heed to what is stated here, "in my name: for in these words He does not say, "whatsoever ye shall ask" in any way; but, "in my name. How, then, is He called, who promised so great a blessing? Christ Jesus, of course: Christ means King, and Jesus means Saviour! for certainly it is not any one who is a king that will save us, but only the Saviour-King; and therefore, whatsoever we ask that is adverse to the interests of salvation, we do not ask in the name of the Saviour. And yet He is the Saviour, not only when He does what we ask, but also when He refuses to do so; since by not doing what He sees to be contrary to our salvation, He manifests Himself the more fully as our Saviour. For the physician knows which of his patient's requests will be favorable, and which will be adverse, to his safety; and therefore yields not to his wishes when asking what is prejudicial, that he may effect his recovery. Accordingly, when we wish Him to do whatsoever we ask, let it not be in any way, but in His name, that is, in the name of the Saviour, that we present our petition. Let us not, then, ask aught that is contrary to our own salvation; for if He do that, He does it not as the Saviour, which is the name He bears to His faithful disciples.

For He who condescends to be the Saviour of the faithful, is also a Judge to condemn the ungodly. Whatsoever, therefore, any one that believeth on Him shall ask in that name which He bears to those who believe on Him, He will do it; for He will do it as the Saviour. But if one that believeth on Him asketh something through ignorance that is injurious to his salvation, he asketh it not in the name of the Saviour; for His Saviour He will no longer be if He do aught to impede his salvation. And hence, in such a case, in not doing what He is entreated to do, His way is kept the clearer for doing what His name imports. And on that account, not only as the Saviour, but also as the good Master, He taught us, in the very prayer He gave us, what we should ask, in order that, whatsoever we shall ask, He may do it; and that we, too, might thereby understand that we cannot be asking in the Master's name anything that is inconsistent with the rule of His own instructions.

4. There are some things, indeed, which, although really asked in His name, that is, in harmony with His character as both Saviour and Master, He doeth not at the time we ask them, and yet He faileth not to do them. For when we pray that the kingdom of God may come, it does not imply that He

is not doing what we ask, because we do not begin at once to reign with Him in the everlasting kingdom: for what we ask is delayed, but not denied. Nevertheless, let us not fail in praying, for in so doing we are as those that sow the seed; and in due season we shall reap. And even when we are asking aright, let us ask Him at the same time not to do what we ask amiss; for there is reference to this also in the Lord's Prayer, when we say, "Lead us not into temptation." For surely the temptation is no slight one if thine own request be hostile to thy cause. But we must not listen with indifference to the statement that the Lord (to prevent any from thinking that what He promised to do to those that asked, He would do without the Father, after saying, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do it") immediately added, "That the Father may be glorified in the Son: if ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it." In no respect, therefore, does the Son act without the Father, since He so acts for the very purpose that in Him the Father may be glorified. The Father, therefore, acts in the Son, that the Son may be glorified in the Father: and the Son acts in the Father, that the Father may be glorified in the Son; for the Father and the Son are one.

TRACTATE 74

John XIV. 15-17. 1. We have heard, brethren, while the Gospel was read, the Lord saying: "If ye love me, keep my commandments: and I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter [Paraclete], that He may abide with you for ever; [even] the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye shall know Him; for He shall dwell with you, and shall be in you. There are many points which might form the subject of inquiry in these few words of the Lord; but it were too much for us either to search into all that is here for the searching, or to find out all that we here search for. Nevertheless, as far as the Lord is pleased to grant us the power, and in proportion to our capacity and yours, attend to what we ought to say and you to hear, and receive, beloved, what we on our part are able to give, and apply to Him for that wherein we fail. It is the Spirit, the Comforter, that Christ has promised to His apostles; but let us notice the way inwhich He gave the promise. "If ye love me," He says, "keep my commandments: and I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever: [even] the Spirit of truth. We have here, at all events, the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, whom the

catholic faith acknowledges to be consubstantial and co-eternal with Father and Son:

He it is of whom the apostle says, "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, who is given unto us. How, then, doth the Lord say, "If ye love me, keep my commandments: and I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter; when He saith so of the Holy Spirit, without [having] whom we can neither love God nor keep His commandments? How can we love so as to receive Him, without whom we cannot love at all? or how shall we keep the commandments so as to receive Him, without whom we have no power to keep them? Or can it be that the love wherewith we love Christ has a prior place within us, so that, by thus loving Christ and keeping His commandments, we become worthy of receiving the Holy Spirit, in order that the love, not of Christ, which had already preceded, but of God the Father, may be shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, who is given unto us? Such a thought is altogether wrong. For he who believes that he loveth the Son, and loveth not the Father, certainly loveth not the Son, but some figment of his own imagination. And besides, this is the apostolic declaration, "No one saith, Lord Jesus, but in the Holy Spirit: and who is it that calleth Him Lord Jesus but he that loveth Him, if he so call Him in the way the apostle intended to be understood?

For many call Him so with their lips, but deny Him in their hearts and works; just as He saith of such, "For they profess that they know God, but works they deny Him. If it is by works He is denied, it is doubtless also by works that His name is truly invoked. "No one," therefore, "saith, Lord Jesus," in mind, in word, in deed, with the heart, the lips, the labor of the bands,-no one saith, Lord Jesus, but in the Holy Spirit; and no one calls Him so but he that loveth, And accordingly the apostles were already calling Him Lord Jesus: and if they called Him so, in no way that implied a feigned utterance, with the mouth confessing, in heart and works denying Him; if they called Him so in all truthfulness of soul, there can be no doubt they loved. And how, then, did they love, but in the Holy Spirit? And yet they are commanded to love Him and keep His commandments, previous and in order to their receiving the Holy Spirit: and yet, without having that Spirit, they certainly could not love Him and keep His commandments.

2. We are therefore to understand that he who loves has already the Holy Spirit, and by what he has becomes worthy of a fuller possession, that by hav-

ing the more he may love the more. Already, therefore, had the disciples that Holy Spirit whom the Lord promised, for without Him they could not call Him Lord; but they had Him not as yet in the way promised by the Lord. Accordingly they both had, and had Him not, inasmuch as they had Him not as yet to the same extent as He was afterwards to be possessed. They had Him, therefore, in a more limited sense: He was yet to be given them in an ampler measure. They had Him in a hidden way, they were yet to receive Him in a way that was manifest; for this present possession had also a bearing on that fuller gift of the Holy Spirit, that they might come to a conscious knowledge of what they had. It is in speaking of this gift that the apostle says: "Now we have received, not the spirit of this world, but the spirit which is of God, that we may know the things that are freely given to us of God. For that same manifest bestowal of the Holy Spirit the Lord made, not once, but on two separate occasions. For close on the back of His resurrection from the dead He breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit.

And because He then gave [the Spirit], did He on that account fail in afterwards sending Him according to His promise? Or was it not the very same Spirit who was both then breathed upon them by Himself, and afterwards sent by Him from heaven? And so, why that same giving on His part which took place publicly, also took place twice, is another question: for it may be that this twofold bestowal of His in a public way took place because of the two Commandments of love, that is, to our neighbor and to God, in order that love might be impressively intimated as pertaining to the Holy Spirit, And if any other reason is to be sought for, we cannot at present allow our discourse to be improperly prolonged by such an inquiry: provided, however, it be admitted that, without the Holy Spirit, we can neither love Christ nor keep His commandments; while the less experience we have of His presence, the less also can we do so; and the fuller our experience, so much the greater our ability. Accordingly, the promise is no vain one, either to him who has not [the Holy Spirit], or to him who has. For it is made to him who has not, in order that he may have; and to him who has, that he may have more abundantly. For were it not that He was possessed by some in smaller measure than by others, St. Elisha would not have said to St.

Elijah, "Let the spirit that is in thee be in a twofold measure in me. 3. But when John the Baptist said, "For God giveth not the Spirit by measure," he was speaking exclusively of the Son of God, who received not the Spirit by

measure; for in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead. And no more is it independently of the grace of the Holy Spirit that the Mediator between God and men is the man Christ Jesus: for with His own lips He tells us that the prophetic utterance had been fulfilled in Himself: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because He hath anointed me, and hath sent me to preach the gospel to the poor." For His being the Only-begotten, the equal of the Father, is not of grace, but of nature; but the assumption of human nature into the personal unity of the Only-begotten is not of nature, but of grace, as the Gospel acknowledges itself when it says, "And the child grew, and waxed strong, being filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was in Him." But to others He is given by measure, - a measure ever enlarging until each has received his full complement up to the limits of his own perfection. As we are also reminded by the apostle, "Not to think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think, but to think soberly; according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." Nor is it the Spirit Himself that is divided, but the gifts bestowed by the Spirit: for there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.

4. But when He says, "I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete," He intimates that He Himself is also a paraclete. For paraclete is in Latin called *advocatus* (advocate); and it is said of Christ, "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." But He said that the world could not receive the Holy Spirit, in much the same sense as it is also said, "The minding of the flesh is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God; neither indeed can be;" just as if we were to say, Unrighteousness cannot be righteous. For in speaking in this passage of the world, He refers to those who love the world; and such a love is not of the Father. And thus the love of this world, which gives us enough to do to weaken and destroy its power within us, is in direct opposition to the love of God, which is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who is given unto us. "The world," therefore, "cannot receive Him, cause it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him." For worldly love possesseth not those invisible eyes, whereby, save in an invisible way, the Holy Spirit cannot be seen.

5. But ye," He adds, "shall know Him; for He shall dwell with you, and be in you." He will be in them, that He may dwell with them; He will not dwell with them to the end that He may be in them: for the being anywhere is prior to the dwelling there. But to prevent us from imagining that His words,

"He shall dwell with you," were spoken in the same sense as that in which a guest usually dwells with a man in a visible way, He explained what "He shall dwell with you" meant, when He added the words, "He shall be in you." He is seen, therefore, in an invisible way: nor can we have any knowledge of Him unless He be in us. For it is in a similar way that we come to see our conscience within us: for we see the face of another, but we cannot see our own; but it is our own conscience we see, not another's. And yet conscience is never anywhere but within us: but the Holy Spirit can be also apart from us, since He is given that He may also be in us. But we cannot see and know Him in the only way in which He may be seen and known, unless He be in us.

TRACTATE 75

John XIV. 18-21. 1. After the promise of the Holy Spirit, lest any should suppose that the Lord was to give Him, as it were, in place of Himself, in any such way as that He Himself would not likewise be with them, He added the words: "I will not leave you orphans; I will come to you." Orphani [Greek] are pupilli [parent-less children] in Latin. The one is the Greek, the other the Latin name of the same thing: for in the psalm where we read, "Thou art the helper of the fatherless" [in the Latin version, pupillo], the Greek has orphano. Accordingly, although it was not the Son of God that adopted sons to His Father, or willed that we should have by grace that same Father, who is His Father by nature, yet in a sense it is paternal feelings toward us that He Himself displays, when He declares, "I will not leave you orphans; I will come to you." In the same way He calls us also the children of the bridegroom, when He says, "The time will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall the children of the bridegroom fast." And who is the bridegroom, but Christ the Lord?

2. He then goes on to say, "Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more." How so the world saw Him then; for under the name of the world are to be understood those of whom He spake above, when saying of the Holy Spirit, "Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him." He was plainly visible to the carnal eyes of the world, while manifest in the flesh; but it saw not the Word that lay hid in the flesh: it saw the man, but it saw not God: it saw the covering, but not the Being within. But as, after the resurrection, even His very flesh, which He exhibited both to the sight and to the handling of His own, He refused to exhibit to others, we may in this way perhaps understand the meaning of the words,

"Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye shall see me: because I live, ye shall live also."

3. What is meant by the words, "Because I live, ye shall live also"? Why did He speak in the present tense of His own living, and in the future of theirs, but just by way of promise that the life also of the resurrection-body, as it preceded in His own case, would certainly follow in theirs? And as His own resurrection was in the immediate future, He put the word in the present tense to signify its speedy approach: but of theirs, as delayed till the end of the world, He said not, ye live; but, "ye shall live." With elegance and brevity, therefore, by means of two words, one of them in the present tense and the other in the future, He gave the promise of two resurrections, to wit, His own in the immediate future, and ours as yet to come in the end of the world. "Because I live," He says, "ye shall live also:" because He liveth, therefore shall we live also. For as by man is death, by man also is the resurrection of the dead, For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. As it is only through the former that every one is liable to death, it is only through Christ that any one can attain unto life. Because we did not live, we are dead; because He lived, we shall live also. We were dead to Him, when we lived to ourselves; but, because He died in our behalf, He liveth both for Himself and for us. For, because He liveth, we shall live also. For while we were able of ourselves to attain unto death, it is not of ourselves also that life can come into our possession.

4. "In that day," He says, "ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." In what day, but in that whereof He said, "Ye shall live also"? For then will it be that we can see what we believe. For even now is He in us, and we in Him: this we believe now, but then shall we also know it; although what we know even now by faith, we shall know then by actual vision. For as long as we are in the body, as it now is, to wit, corruptible, and encumbering to the soul, we live at a distance from the Lord; for we walk by faith, not by sight. Then accordingly it will be by sight, for we shall see Him as He is. For if Christ were not even now in us, the apostle would not say, "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead indeed because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness." But that we are also in Him even then, He makes sufficiently clear, when He says, "I am the vine, ye are the branches." Accordingly in that day, when we shall be living the life, whereby death shall be swallowed up, we shall know that He is in the Father, and we in

Him, and He in us; for then shall be completed that very state which is already in the present begun by Him, that He should be in us, and we in Him.

5. "He that hath my commmandments," He adds, "and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." He that hath [them] in his memory, and keepeth them in his life; who hath them orally, and keepeth them morally; who hath them in the ear, and keepeth them in deed; or who hath them in deed, and keepeth them by perseverance;—"he it is," He says, "that loveth me." By works is love made manifest as no fruitless application of a name. "And he that loveth me," He says, "shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." But what is this, "I will love"? Is it as if He were then only to love, and loveth not at present? Surely not. For how could the Father love us apart from the Son, or the Son apart from the Father? Working as They do inseparably, how can They love apart? But He said, "I will love him," in reference to that which follows, "and I will manifest myself to him." "I will love, and will manifest;" that is, I will love to the very extent of manifesting. For this has been the present aim of His love, that we may believe, and keep hold of the commandment of faith; but then His love will have this for its object, that we may see, and get that very sight as the reward of our faith: for we also love now, by believing in that which we shall see hereafter; but then shall we love in the sight of that which now we believe.

TRACTATE 76

John XIV. 22-24. 1. While the disciples thus question, and Jesus their Master replies to them, we also, as it were, are learning along with them, when we either read or listen to the holy Gospel. Accordingly, because the Lord had said, "Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye shall see me," Judas—not indeed His betrayer, who was surnamed Iscariot, but he whose epistle is read among the canonical Scriptures—asked Him of this very matter: "Lord, how is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" Let us, too, be as it were questioning disciples with them, and listen to our common Master. For Judas the holy, not the impure, the follower, but not the persecutor of the Lord, has inquired the reason why Jesus was to manifest Himself to His own, and not to the world; why it was that yet a little while, and the world should not see Him, but they should see Him.

2. "Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make

our abode with him. He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings. Here we have set forth the reason why He is to manifest Himself to His own, and not to that other class whom He distinguishes by the name of the world; and such is the reason also why the one loveth Him, and the other loveth Him not. It is the very reason, whereof it is declared in the sacred psalm, "Judge me, O God, and plead my cause against an unholy nation. For such as love are chosen, because they love: but those who have not love, though they speak with the tongues of men and angels, are become a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal; and though they had the gift of prophecy, and knew all mysteries and all knowledge, and had all faith so that they could remove mountains, they are nothing; and though they distributed all their substance, and gave their body to be burnt, it profiteth them nothing. The saints are distinguished from the world by that love which maketh the one-minded to dwell [together] in a house In this house Father and Son make their abode, and impart that very love to those whom They shall also honor at last with this promised self manifestation;

of which the disciple questioned his Master, that not only those who then listened might learn it from His own lips, but we also from his Gospel. For he had made inquiry about the manifestation of Christ, and heard [in reply] about His loving and abiding. There is therefore a kind of inward manifestation of God, which is entirely unknown to the ungodly, who receive no manifestation of God the Father and the Holy Spirit: of the Son, indeed, there might have been such, but only in the flesh; and that, too, neither of the same kind as the other, nor able under any form to remain with them, save only for a little while; and even that, for judgment, not for rejoicing; for punishment, not for reward. 3. We have now, therefore, to understand, so far as He is pleased to unfold it, the meaning of the words, "Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye shall see me." It is true, indeed, that after a little while He was to withdraw even His body, in which the ungodly also were able to see Him, from their sight; for none of them saw Him after His resurrection. But since it was declared on the testimony of angels, "He shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven;" and our faith stands to this, that He will come in the same body to judge the living and the dead; there can be no doubt that He will then be seen by the world, meaning by the name, those who are aliens from His kingdom. And, on this account, it is far better to understand Him as having intended to refer at

once to that epoch, when He said, "Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more," when in the end of the world He shall be taken away from the sight of the damned, that for the future He may be seen only of those with whom, as those that love Him, the Father and Himself are making their abode. But He said, "a little while," because that which appears tedious to men is very brief in the sight of God: for of this same "little while" our evangelist, John, himself says, "Little children, it is the last time."

4. But further, lest any should imagine that the Father and Son only, without the Holy Spirit, make their abode with those that love Them, let him recall what was said above of the Holy Spirit, "Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye shall know Him; for He shall dwell with you, and shall be in you" (ver. 17). Here you see that, along with the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit also taketh up His abode in the saints; that is to say, within them, as God in His temple. The triune God, Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, come to us while we are coming to Them: They come with help, we come with obedience; They come to enlighten, we to behold; They come to fill, we to contain: that our vision of Them may not be external, but inward; and Their abiding in us may not be transitory, but eternal. The Son cloth not manifest Himself in such a way as this to the world: for the world is spoken of in the passage before us as those, of whom He immediately adds, "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings." These are such as never see the Father and the Holy Spirit: and see the Son for a little while, not to their attainment of bliss, but to their condemnation; and even Him, not in the form of God, wherein He is equally invisible with the Father and the Holy Spirit, but in human form, in which it was His will to be an object of contempt in suffering, but of terror in judging the world.

5. But when He added, "And the saying which ye have heard is not mine, but the Father's who sent me," let us not be filled with wonder or fear: He is not inferior to the Father, and yet He is not, save of the Father: He is not unequal in Himself, but He is not of Himself. For it was no false word He uttered when He said, "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings." He called them, you see, His own sayings; does He, then, contradict Himself when He said again, "And the saying which ye have heard is not mine"? And, perhaps, it was on account of some intended distinction that, when He said His own, He used "sayings" in the plural; but when He said that "the saying,"

that is, the Word, was not His own, but the Father's, He wished it to be understood of Himself. For in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. For as the Word, He is certainly not His own, but the Father's: just as He is not His own image, but the Father's; and is not Himself His own Son, but the Father's. Rightly, therefore, does He attribute whatever He does, as equal, to the Author of all, of whom He has this very prerogative, that He is in all respects His equal.

TRACTATE 77

John XIV. 25-27. 1. In the preceding lesson of the holy Gospel, which is followed by the one that has just been read, the Lord Jesus had said that He and the Father would come to those who loved Them, and make Their abode with them. But He had also already said above of the Holy Spirit, "But ye shall know Him; for He shall dwell with you, and shall be in you" (ver. 17): by which we understood that the divine Trinity dwelleth together in the saints as in His own temple. But now He saith, "These things have I spoken unto you while [still] dwelling with you." That dwelling, therefore, which He promised in the future, is of one kind; and this, which He declares to be present, is of another. The one is spiritual, and is realized inwardly by the mind; the other is corporal, and is exhibited outwardly to the eye and the ear. The one brings eternal blessedness to those who have been delivered, the other pays its visits in time to those who await deliverance. As regards the one, the Lord never withdraws from those who love Him; as regards the other, He comes and goes. "These things, He says, "have I spoken unto you, while [still] dwelling with you;" that is, in His bodily presence, wherein He was visibly conversing with them.

2. "But the Comfort," He adds, "[which is] the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. Is it, then, that the Son speaks, and the Holy Spirit teaches, so that we merely get hold of the words that are uttered by the Son, and then understand them by the teaching of the Spirit as if the Son could speak without the Holy Spirit, or the Holy Spirit teach without the Son: or is it not rather that the Son also teacheth and the Spirit speaketh, and, when it is God that speaketh and teacheth anything, that the Trinity itself is speaking and teaching? And just because it is a Trinity, its persons required to be introduced individually, so that we might hear it in its distinct personality, and understand its insepar-

able nature. Listen to the Father speaking in the passage where thou readest, "The Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son: listen to Him also teaching, in that where thou readest, "Ever man that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. The Son, on the other hand, thou hast just heard speaking; for He saith of Himself, "Whatsoever I have said unto you: and if thou wouldst also know Him as a Teacher, bethink thyself of the Master, when He saith, "One is your Master, even Christ.

Furthermore, of the Holy Spirit, whom thou hast just been told of as a Teacher in the words, "He shall teach you all things," listen to Him also speaking, where thou readest in the Acts of the Apostles, that the Holy Spirit said to the blessed Peter, "Go with them, for I have sent them. The whole Trinity, therefore, both speaketh and teacheth: but were it not also brought before us in its individual personality, it would certainly altogether surpass the power of human weakness to comprehend it. For as it is altogether inseparable in itself, it could never be known as the Trinity, were it always spoken of inseparably; for when we speak of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, we certainly do not pronounce them simultaneously, and yet in themselves they cannot be else than simultaneous. But when He added, "He will bring to your remembrance," we ought also to understand that we are commanded not to forget that these pre-eminently salutary admonitions are part of that grace which the Holy Spirit brings to our remembrance.

3. "Peace," He said, "I leave with you, my peace I give unto you." It is here we read in the prophet, "Peace upon peace:" peace He leaves with us when going away, His own peace He will give us when He cometh in the end. Peace He leaveth with us in this world, His own peace He will give us in the world to come. His own peace He leaveth with us, and abiding therein we conquer the enemy. His own peace He will give us when, with no more enemies to fight, we shall reign as kings. Peace He leaveth with us, that here also we may love one another: His own peace will He give us, where we shall be beyond the possibility of dissension. Peace He leaveth with us, that we may not judge one another of what is secret to each, while here on earth: His own peace will He give us, when He "will make manifest the counsels of the heart; and then shall every man have praise of God." And yet in Him and from Him it is that we have peace, whether that which He leaveth with us when going to the Father, or that which He will give us when we ourselves are brought by Him to the Father. And what is it He leaveth with us, when ascending from us,

save His own presence, which He never withdraweth? For He Himself is our peace who hath made both one. It is He, therefore, that becomes our peace, both when we believe that He is, and when we see Him as He is. For if, so long as we are in this corruptible body that burdens the soul, and are walking by faith, not by sight, He forsaketh not those who are sojourning at a distance from Himself; how much more, when we have attained to that sight, shall He fill us with Himself?

4. But why is it that, when He said, "Peace I leave with you," He did not add, "my; but when He said, "I give unto you," He there made use of it? Is "my" to be understood even where it is not expressed, on the ground that what is expressed once may have a reference to both? Or may it not be that here also we have some underlying truth that has to be asked and sought for, and opened up to those who knock thereat? For what, if by His own peace He meant such to be understood as that which He possesses Himself? whereas the peace, which He leaves us in this world, may more properly be termed our peace than His. For He, who is altogether without sin, has no elements of discord in Himself; while the peace we possess, meanwhile, is such that in the midst of it we have still to be saying, "Forgive us our debts. A certain kind of peace, accordingly, we do possess, inasmuch as we delight in the law of God after the inward man: but it is not a full peace, for we see another law in our members warring against the law of our mind. In the same way we have peace in our relations with one another, just because, in mutually loving, we have a mutual confidence in one another: but no more is such a peace as that complete, for we see not the thoughts of one another's hearts;

and we have severally better or worse opinions in certain respects of one another than is warranted by the reality. And so that peace, although left us by Him, is our peace: for were it not from Him, we should not be possessing it, such as it is; but such is not the peace He has Himself. And if we keep what we received to the end, then such as He has shall we have, when we shall have no elements of discord of our own, and we shall have no secrets hid from one another in our hearts. But I am not ignorant that these words of the Lord may be taken so as to seem only a repetition of the same idea, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: so that after saying "peace," He only repeated it in saying "my peace; and what He had meant in saying "I leave with you," He simply repeated in saying "I give unto you. Let each one understand it as he pleases; but it is my delight, as I believe it is yours also, my beloved

brethren, to keep such hold of that peace here, where our hearts are making common cause against the adversary, that we may be ever longing for the peace which there will be no adversary to disturb.

5. But when the Lord proceeded to say, "Not as the world giveth, give I unto you," what else does He mean but, Not as those give who love the world, give I unto you? For their aim in giving themselves peace is that, exempt from the annoyance of lawsuits and wars, they may find enjoyment, not in God, but in the friendship of the world; and although they give the righteous peace, in ceasing to persecute them, there can be no true peace where there is no real harmony, because their hearts are at variance. For as one is called a consort who unites his lot (sortem) with another, so may he be termed concordant whose heart has entered into a similar union. Let us, therefore, beloved, with whom Christ leaveth peace, and to whom He giveth His own peace, not after the world's way, but in a way worthy of Him by whom the world was made, that we should be of one heart with Himself. having our hearts run into one, that this one heart, set on that which is above, may escape the corruption of the earth.

TRACTATE 78

John XIV. 27, 28. 1. We have just heard, brethren, these words of the Lord, which He addressed to His disciples: "Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid. Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come unto you: if ye loved me, ye would surely rejoice, because I go unto the Father; for the Father is greater than I. Their hearts might have become filled with trouble and fear, simply because of His going away from them, even though intending to return; lest, possibly, in the very interval of the shepherd's absence, the wolf should make an onset on the flock. But as God, He abandoned not those from whom He departed as man: and Christ Himself is at once both man and God. And so He both went away in respect of His visible humanity, and remained as regards His Godhead: He went away as regards the nature which is subject to local limitations, and remained in respect of that which is ubiquitous. Why, then, should their heart be troubled and afraid, when His quitting their eyesight was of such a kind as to leave unaltered His presence in their heart? Although even God, who has no local bounds to His presence, may depart from the hearts of those who turn away from Him, not with their feet, but their moral character; just as He comes to

such as turn to Him, not with their faces, but in faith, and approach Him in the spirit, and not in the flesh.

But that they might understand that it was only in respect of His human nature that He said, "I go and come to you," He went on to say, "If ye loved me, ye would surely rejoice, because I go unto the Father; for the Father is greater than I. And so, then, in that very respect wherein the Son is not equal to the Father, in that was He to go to the Father, just as from Him is He hereafter to come to judge the quick and the dead: while in so far as the Only-begotten is equal to Him that begat, He never withdraws from the Father; but with Him is everywhere perfectly equal in that Godhead which knows of no local limitations. For "being as He was in the form of God," as the apostle says, "He thought it not robbery to be equal with God. For how could that nature be robbery, which was His, not by usurpation, but by birth? "But He emptied Himself, taking upon Him the form of a servant; and so, not losing the former, but assuming the latter, and emptying Himself in that very respect wherein He stood forth before us here in a humbler state than that wherein He still remained with the Father. For there was the accession of a servant-form, with no recession of the divine: in the assumption of the one there was no consumption of the other. In reference to the one He says, "The Father is greater than I;

but because of the other, "I and my Father are one." 2. Let the Arian attend to this, and find healing in his attention; that wrangling may not lead to vanity, or, what is worse, to insanity. For it is the servant-form which is that wherein the Son of God is less, not only than the Father, but also than the Holy Spirit; and more than that, less also than Himself, for He Himself, in the form of God, is greater than Himself. For the man Christ does not cease to be called the Son of God, a name which was thought worthy of being applied even to His flesh alone as it lay in the tomb. And what else than this do we confess, when we declare that we believe in the only-begotten Son of God, who, under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, and buried? And what of Him was buried, save the flesh without the spirit? And so in believing in the Son of God, who was buried, we surely affix the name, Son of God, even to His flesh, which alone was laid in the grave. Christ Himself, therefore, the Son of God, equal with the Father because in the form of God, inasmuch as He emptied Himself, without losing the form of God, but assuming that of a

servant, is greater even than Himself; because the unlost form of God is greater than the assumed form of a servant.

And what, then, is there to wonder at, or what is there out of place, if, in reference to this servant-form, the Son of God says, "The Father is greater than I; and in speaking of the form of God, the self-same Son of God declares, "I and my Father are one"? For one they are, inasmuch as "The Word was God; and greater is the Father, inasmuch as "the Word was made flesh. Let me add what cannot be gainsaid by Arians and Eunomians: in respect of this servant-form, Christ as a child was inferior also to His own parents, when, according to Scripture, "He was subject" as an infant to His seniors. Why, then, heretic, seeing that Christ is both God and man, when He speaketh as man, dost thou calumniate God? He in His own person commends our human nature; dost thou dare in Him to asperse the divine? Unbelieving and ungrateful as thou art, wilt thou degrade Him who made thee, just for the very reason that He is declaring what He became because of thee? For equal as He is with the Father, the Son, by whom man was made, became man, in order to be less than the Father: and had He not done so, what would have become of man?

3. May our Lord and Master bring home clearly to our minds the words, "If ye loved me, ye would surely rejoice, because I go unto the Father; for the Father is greater than I. Let us, along with the disciples, listen to the Teacher's words, and not, with strangers, give heed to the wiles of the deceiver. Let us acknowledge the twofold substance of Christ; to wit, the divine, in which he is equal with the Father, and the human, in respect to which the Father is greater. And yet at the same time both are not two, for Christ is one; and God is not a quaternity, but a Trinity. For as the rational soul and the body form but one man, so Christ, while both God and man, is one; and thus Christ is God, a rational soul, and a body. In all of these we confess Him to be Christ, we confess Him in each. Who, then, is He that made the world? Christ Jesus, but in the form of God. Who is it that was crucified under Pontius Pilate? Christ Jesus, but in the form of a servant. And so of the several parts whereof He consists as man. Who is He who was not left in hell? Christ Jesus, but only in respect of His soul. Who was to rise on the third day, after being laid in the tomb? Christ Jesus, but solely in reference to His flesh.

In reference, then, to each of these, He is likewise called Christ. And yet all of them are not two, or three, but one Christ. On this account, therefore,

did He say, "If ye loved me, ye would surely rejoice, because I go unto the Father; for human nature is worthy of congratulation, in being so assumed by the only-begotten Word as to be constituted immortal in heaven, and, earthy in its nature, to be so sublimated and exalted, that, as incorruptible dust, it might take its seat at the right hand of the Father. In such a sense it is that He said He would go to the Father. For in very truth He went unto Him, who was always with Him. But His going unto Him and departing from us were neither more nor less than His transforming and immortalizing that which He had taken upon Him from us in its mortal condition, and exalting that to heaven, by means of which He lived on earth in man's behalf. And who would not draw rejoicing from such a source, who has such love to Christ that he can at once congratulate his own nature as already immortal in Christ, and cherish the hope that he himself will yet become so through Christ?

TRACTATE 79

John XIV. 29-31. 1. Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, had said unto His disciples, "If ye loved me, ye would surely rejoice, because I go unto the Father; for the Father is greater than I. And that He so spake in His servant-form, and not in that of God, wherein He is equal with the Father, is well known to faith as it resides in the minds of the pious, not as it is reigned by the scornful and senseless. And then He added, "And now I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe. What can He mean by this, when the fact rather is, that a man ought, before it comes to pass, to believe that which demands his belief? For it forms the very encomium of faith when that which is believed is not seen. For what greatness is there in believing what is seen, as in those words of the same Lord, when, in reproving a disciple, He said, "Because thou hast seen, thou hast believed; blessed are they that see not, and yet believe. And I hardly know whether any one can be said to believe what he sees; for this same faith is thus defined in the epistle addressed to the Hebrews: "Now faith is the substance of those that hope, the assurance of things not seen.

Accordingly, if faith is in things that are believed, and that, too, in things which are not seen, what mean these words of the Lord, "And now I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe"? Ought He not rather to have said, And now I have told you before it come to pass, that ye may believe what, when it is come to pass, ye shall see?

For even he who was told, "Because thou hast seen, thou hast believed," did not believe only what he saw; but he saw one thing, and believed another: for he saw Him as man, and believed Him to be God. He perceived and touched the living flesh, which he had seen in the act of dying, and he believed in the Deity infolded in that flesh. And so he believed with the mind what he did not see, by the help of that which was apparent to his bodily senses. But though we may be said to believe what we see, just as every one says that he believes his own eyes, yet that is not to be mistaken for the faith which is built up by God in our souls; but from things that are seen, we are brought to believe in those which are invisible. Wherefore, beloved, in the passage before us, when our Lord says, "And now I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe;

by the words, "when it is come to pass," He certainly means, that they would yet see Him after His death, alive, and ascending to His I Father; at the sight of which they should then be compelled to believe that He was indeed the Christ, the Son of the living God, seeing He could do such a thing, even after predicting it, and also could predict it before He did it: and this they should then believe, not with a new, but with an augmented faith; or at least [with a faith] that had been impaired by His death, and was now repaired by His resurrection. For it was not that they had not previously also believed Him to be the Son of God, but when His own predictions were actually fulfilled in Him, that faith, which was still weak at the time of His here speaking to them, and at the time of His death almost ceased to exist, sprang up again into new life and increased vigor.

2. But what says He next? "Hereafter I will not talk much with you; for the prince of this world cometh; and who is that, but the devil?" And hath nothing in me; that is to say, no sin at all. For by such words He points to the devil, as the prince, not of His creatures, but of sinners, whom He here designates by the name of this world. And as often as the name of the world is used in a bad sense, He is pointing only to the lovers of such a world; of whom it is elsewhere recorded, "Whosoever will be a friend of this world, becomes the enemy of God. Far be it from us, then, so to understand the devil as prince of the world, as if he wielded the government of the whole world, that is, of heaven and earth, and all that is in them; of which sort of world it was said, when we were lecturing on Christ the Word, "And the world was made by Him. The whole world therefore, from the highest heavens to the

lowest earth, is subject to the Creator, not to the deserter; to the Redeemer, not to the destroyer; to the Deliverer, not to the enslaver; to the Teacher, not to the deceiver.

And in what sense the devil is to be understood as the prince of the world, is still more clearly unfolded by the Apostle Paul, who, after saying, "We wrestle not against flesh and blood," that is, against men, went on to say, "but against principalities and powers, and the world-rulers of this darkness. For in the very next word he has explained what he meant by "world," when he added, "of this darkness; so that no one, by the name of the world, should understand the whole creation, of which in no sense are fallen angels the rulers. "Of this darkness," he says, that is, of the lovers of this world: of whom, nevertheless, there were some elected, not from any deserving of their own, but by the grace of God, to whom he says, "Ye were sometimes darkness; but now are ye light in the Lord. For all have been under the rulers of this darkness, that is, [under the rulers] of wicked men, or darkness, as it were, in subjection to darkness: but "thanks be to God, who hath delivered us," says the same apostle, "from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love. And in Him the prince of this world, that is, of this darkness, had nothing; for neither did He come with sin as God, nor had His flesh any hereditary taint of sin in its procreation by the Virgin.

And, as if it were said to Him, Why, then, dost Thou die, if Thou hast no sin to merit the punishment of death? He immediately added, "But that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do: arise, let us go hence. For He was sitting at table with those who were similarly occupied. But "let us go," He said, and whither, but to the place where He, who had nothing in Him deserving of death, was to be delivered up to death? But He had the Father's commandment to die, as the very One of whom it had been foretold, "Then I paid for that which I took not away; and so appointed to pay death to the full, while owing it nothing, and to redeem us from the death that was our due. For Adam had seized on sin as a prey, when, deceived, he presumptuously stretched forth his hand to the tree, and attempted to invade the incommunicable name of that Godhead I which was disallowed him, and with which the Son of God was endowed by nature, and not by robbery.

TRACTATE 80

John XV. 1-3. 1. This passage of the Gospel, brethren, where the Lord calls Himself the vine, and His disciples the branches, declares in so many words that the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, is the head of the Church, and that we are His members. For as the vine and its branches are of one nature, therefore, His own nature as God being different from ours, He became man, that in Him human nature might be the vine, and we who also are men might become branches thereof. What mean, then, the words, "I am the true vine"? Was it to the literal vine, from which that metaphor was drawn, that He intended to point them by the addition of "true"? For it is by similitude, and not by any personal propriety, that He is thus called a vine; just as He is also termed a sheep, a lamb, a lion, a rock, a corner-stone, and other names of a like kind, which are themselves rather the true ones, from which these are drawn as similitudes, not as realities. But when He says, "I am the true vine," it is to distinguish Himself, doubtless, from that [vine] to which the words are addressed: "How art thou turned into sourness, as a strange vine?" For how could that be a true vine which was expected to bring forth grapes and brought forth thorns?

2. "I am," He says, "the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, He taketh away; and every one that beareth fruit, He purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Are, then, the husbandman and the vine one? Christ is the vine in the same sense as when He said, "The Father is greater than I; but in that sense wherein He said, "I and my Father are one," He is also the husbandman. And yet not such a one as those, whose whole service is confined to external labor; but such, that He also supplies the increase from within. "For neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase. But Christ is certainly God, for the Word was God; and so He and the Father are one: and if the Word was made flesh,-that which He was not before,-He nevertheless still remains what He was. And still more, after saying of the Father, as of the husbandman, that He taketh away the fruitless branches, and pruneth the fruitful, that they may bring forth more fruit, He straightway points to Himself as also the purger of the branches, when He says, "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Here, you see, He is also the pruner of the branches-a work which belongs to

the husbandman, and not to the vine; and more than that, He maketh the branches His workmen.

For although they give not the increase, they afford some help; but not of themselves: "For without me," He says, "ye can do nothing." And listen, also, to their own confession: "What, then, is Apollos, and what is Paul but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man. I have planted, Apollos watered. And this, too, "as the Lord gave to every man; and so not of themselves. In that, however, which follows, "but God gave the increase," He works not by them, but by Himself; for work like that exceeds the lowly capacity of man, transcends the lofty powers of angels, and rests solely and entirely in the hands of the Triune Husbandman. "Now ye are clean," that is, clean, and yet still further to be cleansed. For, had they not been clean, they could not have borne fruit; and yet every one that beareth fruit is purged by the husbandman, that he may bring forth more fruit. He bears fruit because he is clean; and to bear more, he is cleansed still further. For who in this life is so clean as not to be in need of still further and further cleansing? seeing that, "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; but if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness;

to cleanse in very deed the clean, that is, the fruitful, that they may be so much the more fruitful, as they have been made the cleaner. 3. "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Why does He not say, Ye are clean through the baptism wherewith ye have been washed, but "through the word which I have spoken unto you," save only that in the water also it is the word that cleanseth? Take away the word, and the water is neither more nor less than water. The word is added to the element, and there results the Sacrament, as if itself also a kind of visible word. For He had said also to the same effect, when washing the disciples' feet, "He that is washed needeth not, save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit. And whence has water so great an efficacy, as in touching the body to cleanse the soul, save by the operation of the word; and that not because it is uttered, but because it is believed? For even in the word itself the passing sound is one thing, the abiding efficacy another. "This is the word of faith which we preach," says the apostle, "that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth that Jesus is the Lord, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto right-

eousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. Accordingly, we read in the Acts of the Apostles, "Purifying their hearts by faith;

and, says the blessed Peter in his epistle, "Even as baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience. "This is the word of faith which we preach," whereby baptism, doubtless, is also consecrated, in order to its possession of the power to cleanse. For Christ, who is the vine with us, and the husbandman with the Father, "loved the Church, and gave Himself for it. And then read the apostle, and see what he adds: "That He might sanctify it, cleansing it with the washing of water by the word. The cleansing, therefore, would on no account be attributed to the fleeting and perishable element, were it not for that which is added, "by the word. This word of faith possesses such virtue in the Church of God, that through the medium of him who in faith presents, and blesses, and sprinkles it, He cleanseth even the tiny infant, although itself unable as yet with the heart to believe unto righteousness, and to make confession with the mouth unto salvation. All this is done by means of the word, whereof the Lord saith, "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you."

TRACTATE 81

John XV. 4-7. 1. Jesus called Himself the vine, and His disciples the branches, and His Father the husbandman; whereon we have already discoursed as we were able. But in the present passage, while still speaking of Himself as the vine, and of His branches, or, in other words, of the disciples, He said, "Abide in me, and I in you." They are not in Him in the same kind of way that He is in them. And yet both ways tend to their advantage, and not to His. For the relation of the branches to the vine is such that they contribute nothing to the vine, but from it derive their own means of life; while that of the vine to the branches is such that it supplies their vital nourishment, and receives nothing from them. And so their having Christ abiding in them, and abiding themselves in Christ, are in both respects advantageous, not to Christ, but to the disciples. For when the branch is cut off, another may spring up from the living root; but that which is cut off cannot live apart from the root.

2. And then He proceeds to say: "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me." A great encomium on grace, my brethren,—one that will instruct the souls of the

humble, and stop the mouths of the proud. Let those now answer it, if they dare, who, ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own, havenot submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. Let the self-complacent answer it, who think they have no need of God for the performance of good works. Fight they not against such a truth, those men of corrupt mind, reprobate concerning the faith, whose reply is only full of impious talk, when they say: It is of God that we have our existence as men, but it is of ourselves that we are righteous? What is it you say, you who deceive yourselves, and, instead of establishing freewill, cast it headlong down from the heights of its self-elevation through the empty regions of presumption into the depths of an ocean grave? Why, your assertion that man of himself worketh righteousness, that is the height of your self-elation. But the Truth contradicts you, and declares, "The branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine." Away with you now over your giddy precipices, and, without a spot whereon to take your stand, vapor away at your windy talk. These are the empty regions of your presumption. Butlook well at what is tracking your steps, and, if you have any sense remaining, let your hair stand on end. For whoever imagines that he is bearing fruit of himself is not in the vine, and he that is not in the vine is not in Christ, and he that is not in Christ is not a Christian. Such are the ocean depths into which you have plunged.

3. Ponder again and again what the Truth has still further to say: "I am the vine," He adds, "ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing. For just to keep any from supposing that the branch can bear at least some little fruit of itself, after saying, "the same bringeth forth much fruit," His next words are not, Without me ye can do but little, but "ye can do nothing. Whether then it be little or much, without Him it is impracticable; for without Him nothing can be done. For although, when the branch beareth little fruit, the husbandman purgeth it that it may bring forth more; yet if it abide not in the vine, and draw its life from the root, it can bear no fruit whatever of itself. And although Christ would not have been the vine had He notbeen man, yet He could not have supplied such grace to the branches had He not also been God. And just because such grace is so essential to life, that even death itself ceases to be at the disposal of free-will, He adds, "If any

one abide not in me, he shall be cast forth as a branch, and wither; and they shall gather him, and cast him into the fire, and he is burned.

The wood of the vine, therefore, is in the same proportion the more contemptible if it abide not in the vine, as it is glorious while so abiding; in fine, as the Lord likewise says of them in the prophet Ezekiel, when cut off, they are of no use for any purpose of the husbandman, and can be applied to no labor of the mechanic. The branch is suitable only for one of two things, either the vine or the fire: if it is not in the vine, its place will be in the fire; and that it may escape the latter, may it have its place in the vine. 4. "If ye abide in me," He says, "and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. For abiding thus in Christ, is there aught they can wish but what will be agreeable to Christ? So abiding in the Saviour, can they wish anything that is inconsistent with salvation? Some things, indeed, we wish because we are in Christ, and other things we desire because still in this world. For at times, in connection with this our present abode, we are inwardly prompted to ask what we know not it would be inexpedient for us to receive. But God forbid that such should be given us if we abide in Christ, who, when we ask, only does what will be for our advantage. Abiding, therefore, ourselves in Him, when His words abide in us we shall ask what we will, and it shall be done unto us. For if we ask, and the doing follows not, what we ask is not connected with our abiding in Him, nor with His words which abide in us, but with that craving and infirmity of the flesh which are not in Him, and have not His words abiding in them. For to His words, at all events, belongs that prayer which He taught, and in which we say, "Our Father, who art in heaven. Let us only not fall away from the words and meaning of this prayer in our petitions, and whatever we ask, it shall be done unto us.

For then only may His words be said to abide in us, when we do what He has commanded us, and love what He has promised. But when His words abide only in the memory, and have no place in the life, the branch is not to be accounted as in the vine, because it draws not its life from the root. It is to this distinction that the word of Scripture has respect, "and to those that remember His commandments to do them. For many retain them in their memory only to treat them with contempt, or even to mock at and assail them. It is not in such as have only some kind of contact, but no connection, that the words of Christ abide; and to them, therefore, they will not be a

blessing, but a testimony against them; and because they are present in them without abiding in them, they are held fast by them for the very purpose of being judged according to them at last.

TRACTATE 82

John XV. 8-10. 1. The Saviour, in thus speaking to the disciples, commends still more and more the grace whereby we are saved, when He says, "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear very much fruit, and be made my disciples." Whether we say glorified, or made bright, both are the rendering given us of one Greek verb, namely *doxazein* (*docazein*). For what is *doxa* (*doca*) in Greek, is in Latin glory. I have thought it worth while to mention this, because the apostle says, "If Abraham was justified by works, he hath glory. but not before God." For this is the glory before God, whereby God, and not man, is glorified, when he is justified, not by works, but by faith, so that even his doing well is imparted to him by God; just as the branch, as I have stated above, cannot bear fruit of itself. For if herein God the Father is glorified, that we bear much fruit, and be made the disciples of Christ, let us not credit our own glory therewith, as if we had it of ourselves. For of Him is such a grace, and accordingly therein the glory is not ours, but His. Hence also, in another passage, after saying, "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works;" to keep them from the thought that such good works were of themselves, He immediately added, "and may glorify your Father who is in heaven." For herein is the Father glorified, that we bear much fruit, and be made the disciples of Christ. And by whom are we so made, but by Him whose mercy hath forestalled us? For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works.

2. "As the Father hath loved me," He says, "so have I loved you: continue ye in my love." Here, then, you see, is the source of our good works. For whence should we have them. were it not that faith worketh by love? And how should we love, were it not that we were first loved? With striking clearness is this declared by the same evangelist in his epistle: "We love God because He first loved us." But when He says, "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you," He indicates no such equality between our nature and His as there is between Himself and the Father, but the grace whereby the Mediator between God and men is the man Christ Jesus. For He is pointed out as Mediator when He says, "The Father-me, and I-you." For the Father, indeed,

also loveth us, but in Him; for herein is the Father glorified, that we bear fruit in the vine, that is, in the Son, and so be made His disciples.

3. "Continue ye," He says, "in my love. How shall we continue? Listen to what follows: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love. Love brings about the keeping of His commandments; but does the keeping of His commandments bring about love? Who can doubt that it is love which precedes? For he has no true ground for keeping the commandments who is destitute of love. And so, in saying, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love," He shows not the source from which love springs, but the means whereby it is manifested. As if He said, Think not that ye abide in my love if ye keep not my commandments; for it is only if ye have kept them that ye shall abide. In other words, it will thus be made apparent that ye shall abide in my love if ye keep my commandments. So that no one need deceive himself by saying that he loveth Him, if he keepeth not His commandments. For we love Him just in the same measure as we keep His commandments; and the less we keep them, the less we love. And although, when He saith, "Continue ye in my love," it is not apparent what love He spake of; whether the love we bear to Him, or that which He bears to us: yet it is seen at once in the previous clause. For He had there said, "So have I loved you; and to these words He immediately adds, "Continue ye in my love:

accordingly, it is that love which He bears to us. What, then, do the words mean, "Continue ye in my love," but just, continue ye in my grace? And what do these mean, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love," but, hereby shall ye know that ye shall abide in the love which I bear to you, if ye keep my commandments? It is not, then, for the purpose of awakening His love to us that we first keep His commandments; but this, that unless He loves us, we cannot keep His commandments. This is a grace which lies all disclosed to the humble, but is hid from the proud. 4. But what are we to make of that which follows: "Even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love"? Here also He certainly intended us to understand that fatherly love wherewith He was loved of the Father. For this was what He has just said, "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you; and then to these He added the words, "Continue ye in my love; in that, doubtless, wherewith I have loved you. Accordingly, when He says also of the Father, "I abide in His love," we are to understand it of that love which was borne Him by the Father. But then, in this case also, is that love which the

Father bears to the Son referable to the same grace as that wherewith we are loved of the Son: seeing that we on our part are sons, not by nature, but by grace; while the Only-begotten is so by nature and not by grace? Or is this even in the Son Himself to be referred to His condition as man? Certainly so. For in saying, "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you," He pointed to the grace that was His as Mediator. For Christ Jesus is the Mediator between God and men, not in respect to His Godhead, but in respect to His manhood. And certainly it is in reference to this His human nature that we read, "And Jesus increased in wisdom and age, and in favor [grace] with God and men.

In harmony, therefore, with this, we may rightly say that while human nature belongs not to the nature of God, yet such human nature does by grace belong to the person of the only-begotten Son of God; and that by grace so great, that there is none greater, yea, none that even approaches equality. For there were no merits that preceded that assumption of humanity, but all His merits began with that very assumption. The Son, therefore, abideth in the love wherewith the Father hath loved Him, and so hath kept His commandments. For what are we to think of Him even as man, but that God is His lifter up? for the Word was God, the Only-begotten, co-eternal with Him that begat; but that He might be given to us as Mediator, by grace ineffable, the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.

TRACTATE 83

John XV. 11, 12. 1. You have just heard, beloved, the Lord saying to His disciples, "These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might be in you, and that your joy might be full. And what else is Christ's joy in us, save that He is pleased to rejoice over us? And what is this joy of ours which He says is to be made full, but our having fellowship with Him? On this account He had said to the blessed Peter, "If I wash thee not, thou shall have no part with me. His joy, therefore, in us is the grace He hath bestowed upon us: and that is also our joy. But over it He rejoiced even from eternity, when He chose us before the foundation of the world. Nor can we rightly say that His joy was not full; for God's joy was never at any time imperfect. But that joy of His was not in us: for we, in whom it could be, had as yet no existence; and even when our existence commenced, it began not to be in Him. But in Him it always was, who in the infallible truth of His own foreknowledge rejoiced that we should yet be His own. Accordingly, He had a joy over us that was already

full, when He rejoiced in foreknowing and foreordaining us: and as little could there be any fear intermingling in that joy of His, lest there should be any possible failure in what He foreknew would be done by Himself.

Nor, when He began to do what He foreknew that He would do, was there any increase to His joy as the expression of His blessedness; otherwise His making of us must have added to His blessedness. Be such a supposition, brethren, far from our thoughts; for the blessedness of God was neither less without us, nor became greater because of us. His joy, therefore, over our salvation, which was always in Him, when He foreknew and foreordained us, began to be in us when He called us; and this joy we properly call our own, as by it we, too, shall yet be blessed: but this joy, as it is ours, increases and advances, and presses onward perseveringly to its own completion. Accordingly, it has its beginning in the faith of the regenerate, and its completion in the reward when they rise again. Such is my opinion of the purport of the words, "These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might be in you, and that your joy might be made full: that mine "might be in you; that yours "might be made full. For mine was always full, even before ye were called, when ye were foreknown as those whom I was afterwards to call; but it finds its place in you also, when ye are transformed into that which I have foreknown regarding you. And "that yours may be full: for ye shall be blessed, what ye are not as yet; just as ye are now created, who had no existence before.

2. "This," He says, "is my injunction, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." Whether we call it injunction or commandment. both are the rendering of the same Greek word, *entole* (*entolh*). But He had already made this same announcement on a former occasion, when, as ye ought to remember, I repounded it to you to the best of my ability. For this is what He says there, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." And so the repetition of this commandment is its commendation: only that there He said, "A new commandment I give unto you;" and here, "This is my commandment:" there, as if there had been no such commandment before; and here, as if He had no other commandment to give them. But there it is spoken of as "new," to keep us from persevering in our old courses; here, it is called "mine," to keep us from treating it with contempt.

3. But when He said in this way here, "This is my commandment," as if there were none else, what are we to think, my brethren? Is, then, the commandment about that love wherewith we love one another, His only one? Is there not also another that is still greater,—that we should love God? Or has God in very truth given us such a charge about love alone, that we have no need of searching for others? There are three things at least that the apostle commends when he says, "But now abide faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity. And although in charity, that is, in love, are comprehended the two commandments; yet it is here declared to be the greatest only, and not the sole one. Accordingly, what a host of commandments are given us about faith, what a multitude about hope! who is there that could collect them together, or suffice to number them? But let us ponder the words of the same apostle: "Love is the fullness of the law. And so, where there is love, what can be wanting? and where it is not, what is there that can possibly be profitable? The devil believes, but does not love: no one loveth who doth not believe. One may, indeed, hope for pardon who does not love, but he hopes in vain; but no one can despair who loves. Therefore, where there is love, there of necessity will there be faith and hope;

and where there is the love of our neighbor, there also of necessity will be the love of God. For he that loveth not God, how loveth he his neighbour as himself, seeing that he loveth not even himself? Such an one is both impious and iniquitous; and he that loveth iniquity, manifestly loveth not, but hateth his own soul. Let us, therefore, be holding fast to this precept of the Lord, to love one another; and then all else that is commanded we shall do, for all else we have contained in this. But this love is distinguished from that which men bear to one another as such; for in order to mark the distinction, it is added, "as I have loved you. And wherefore is it that Christ loveth us, but that we may be fitted to reign with Christ? With this aim, therefore, let us also be loving one another, that we may manifest the difference of our love from that of others, who have no such motive in loving one another, because the love itself is wanting. But those whose mutual love has the possession of God Himself for its object, will truly love one another; and, therefore, even for the very purpose of loving one another, they love God. There is no such love as this in all men; for few have this motive for their love one to another, that God may be all in all.

TRACTATE 84

John XV. 13. 1. The Lord, beloved brethren, hath defined that fullness of love which we ought to bear to one another, when He said: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Inasmuch, then, as He had said before, "This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you; and appended to these words what you have just been hearing, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends; there follows from this as a consequence, what this same Evangelist John says in his epistle, "That as Christ laid down His life for us, even so we also ought to lay down our lives for the brethren; loving one another in truth, as He hath loved us, who laid down His life for us. Such also is doubtless the meaning of what we read in the Proverbs of Solomon: "If thou sittest down to supper at the table of a ruler, consider wisely what is set before thee; and so put to thy hand, knowing that thou art bound to make similar preparations. For what is the table of the ruler, but that from which we take the body and blood of Him who laid down His life for us? And what is it to sit thereat, but to approach in humility? And what is it to consider intelligently what is set before thee, but worthily to reflect on the magnitude of the favor?

And what is it, so to put to thy hand, as knowing that thou art bound to make similar preparations, but as I have already said, that, as Christ laid down His life for us, so we also ought to lay down our lives for the brethren? For as the Apostle Peter also says, "Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow His steps. This is to make similar preparations. This it was that the blessed martyrs did in their burning love; and if we celebrate their memories in no mere empty form, and, in the banquet whereat they themselves were filled to the full, approach the table of the Lord, we must, as they did, be also ourselves making similar preparations. For on these very grounds we do not commemorate them at that table in the same way, as we do others who now rest in peace, as that we should also pray for them, but rather that they should do so for us, that we may cleave to their footsteps; because they have actually attained that fullness of love, than which, our Lord hath told us, there cannot be a greater. For such tokens of love they exhibited for their brethren, as they themselves had equally received at the table of the Lord.

2. But let us not be supposed to have so spoken as if on such grounds we might possibly arrive at an equality with Christ the Lord, if for His sake we have undergone witness-bearing even unto blood. He had power to lay down His life, and to take it again; but we have no power to live as long as we wish; and die we must, however unwilling: He, by dying, straightway slew death in Himself; we, by His death, are delivered from death: His flesh saw no corruption; ours, after corruption, shall in the end of the world be clothed by Him with incorruption: He had no need of us, in order to work out our salvation; we, without Him, can do nothing: He gave Himself as the vine, to us the branches; we, apart from Him, can have no life. Lastly, although brethren die for brethren, yet no martyr's blood is ever shed for the remission of the sins of brethren, as was the case in what He did for us; and in this respect He bestowed not on us aught for imitation, but something for congratulation. In as far, then, as the martyrs have shed their blood for the brethren, so far have they exhibited such tokens of love as they themselves perceived at the table of the Lord. (One might imitate Him in dying, but no one could, in redeeming.

In all else, then, that I have said, although it is out of my power to mention everything, the martyr of Christ is far inferior to Christ Himself. But if any one shall set himself in comparison, I say, not with the power. but with the innocence of Christ, and (I would not say) in thinking that he is healing the sins of others, but at least that he has no sins of his own, even so far is his avidity overstepping the requirements of the method of salvation; it is a matter of considerable moment for him, only he attains not his desire. And well it is that he is admonished in that passage of the Proverbs, which immediately goes on to say, "But if thy greed is too great, be not desirous of his dainties; for it is better that thou take nothing thereof, than that thou shouldst take more than is befitting. For such things," it is added, "have a life of deceit," that is, of hypocrisy. For in asserting his own sinlessness, he cannot prove, but only pretend, that he is righteous. And so it is said, "For such have a deceiving life. There is only One who could at once have human flesh and be free from sin. Appropriately are we commanded that which follows; and such a word and proverb is well adapted to human weakness, when it is said, "Lay not thyself out, seeing thou art poor, against him that is rich.

For the rich man is Christ, who was never obnoxious to punishment either through hereditary or personal debt and is righteous Himself, and jus-

tifies others. Lay not thyself out against Him, thou who art so poor, that thou art manifestly to the eyes of all the daily beggar that thou art in thy prayer for the remission of sins. "But keep thyself," he says, "from thine own counsel" ["cease from thine own wisdom"-E. V.]. From what, but from this delusive presumption? For He, indeed, inasmuch as He is not only man but also God, can never be chargeable with evil. "For if thou turn thine eye upon Him, He will nowhere be visible. "Thine eye," that is, the human eye, where-with thou distinguishest that which is human; "if thou turn it upon Him, He will nowhere be visible," because He cannot be seen with such organs of sight as are thine. "For He will provide Himself wings like an eagle's, and will depart to the house of His overseer," from which, at all events, He came to us, and found us not such as He Himself was who came. Let us therefore love one another, even as Christ hath loved us, and given Himself for us. "For greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. And let us be imitating Him in such a spirit of reverential obedience, that we shall never have the boldness to presume on a comparison between Him and ourselves.

TRACTATE 85

John XV. 14, 15. 1. When the Lord Jesus had commended the love which He manifested toward us in dying for us, and had said, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends," He added, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." What great condescension! when one cannot even be a good servant unless he do his lord's commandments; the very means, which only prove men to be good servants, He wished to be those whereby His friends should be known. But the condescension, as I have termed it, is this, that the Lord condescends to call those His friends whom He knows to be His servants. For, to let us know that it is the duty of servants to yield obedience to their master's commands, He actually in another place reproaches those who are servants, by saying, "And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?" Accordingly, when ye say Lord, prove what you say by doing my commandments. Is it not to the obedient servant that He is yet one day to say, "Well done, thou good servant; because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord"? One, therefore, who is a good servant, can be both servant and friend.

2. But let us mark what follows. "Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth." How, then are we to understand the good servant to be both servant and friend, when He says, "Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth"? He introduces the name of friend in such a way as to withdraw that of servant; not as if to include both in the one term, but in order that the one should succeed to the place vacated by the other. What does it mean? Is it this, that even in doing the Lord's commandments we shall not be servants? Or this, that then we shall cease to be servants, when we have been good servants? And yet who can contradict the Truth, when He says, "Henceforth I call you not servants?" and shows why He said so: "For the servant," He adds, "knoweth not what his lord doeth." Is it that a good and tried servant is not likewise entrusted by his master with his secrets? What does He mean, then, by saying, "The servant knoweth not what his lord doeth"? Be it that "he knoweth not what he doeth," is he ignorant also of what he commands? For if he were so, how can he serve? Or how is he a servant who does no service? And yet the Lord speaks thus: "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants." Truly a marvellous statement! Seeing we cannot serve the Lord but by doing His commandments, how is it that in doing so we shall cease to be servants? If I be not a servant in doing His commandments, and yet cannot be in His service unless I so do, then, in my very service, I am no longer a servant.

3. Let us, brethren, let us understand, and may the Lord enable us to understand, and enable us also to do what we understand. And if we know this, we know of a truth what the Lord doeth; for it is only the Lord that so enables us, and by such means only do we attain to His friendship. For just as there are two kinds of fear, which produce two classes of fearers; so there are two kinds of service, which produce two classes of servants. There is a fear, which perfect love casteth out; and there is another fear, which is clean, and endureth for ever. The fear that lies not in love, the apostle pointed to when he said, "For ye have not received the spirit of service again to fear. But he referred to the clean fear when he said, "Be not high-minded, but fear. In that fear which love casteth out, there has also to be cast out the service along with it: for both were joined together by the apostle, that is, the service and the fear, when he said, "For ye have not received the spirit of service again to fear. And it was the servant connected with this kind of service that the Lord

also had in His eye when He said, "Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth. Certainly not the servant characterized by the clean fear, to whom it is said, "Well done, thou good servant:

enter thou into the joy of thy lord; but the servant who is characterized by the fear which love casteth out, of whom He elsewhere saith, "The servant abideth not in the house for ever, but the Son abideth ever. Since, therefore, He hath given us power to become the sons of God, let us not be servants, but sons: that, in some wonderful and indescribable but real way, we may as servants have the power not to be servants; servants, indeed, with that clean fear which distinguishes the servant that enters into the joy of his lord, but not servants with the fear that i has to be cast out, and which marketh him that abideth not in the house for ever. But let us bear in mind that it is the Lord that enableth us to serve so as not to be servants. And this it is that is unknown to the servant, who knoweth not what his Lord doeth; and who, when he doeth any good thing, is lifted up as if he did it himself, and not his Lord; and so, glories not in the Lord, but in himself, thereby deceiving himself, because glorying, as if he had not received. But let us, beloved, in order that we may be the friends of the Lord, know what our Lord doeth. For it is He who makes us not only men, but also righteous, and not we ourselves. And who but He is the doer, in leading us to such a knowledge?

For "we have received not the spirit of this world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Whatever good there is, is freely given by Him. And so because this also is good, by Him who graciously imparteth all good is this gift of knowing likewise bestowed; that, in respect of all good things whatever, he that glorieth may glory in the Lord. But the words that follow, "But I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you," are so profound, that we must by no means compress them within the limits of the present discourse, but leave them over till another.

TRACTATE 86

John XV. 15, 16. 1. It is a worthy subject of inquiry how these words of the Lord are to be understood, "But I have called you friends: for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you. For who is there that dare affirm or believe that any man knoweth all things that the only-begotten Son hath heard of the Father; when there is no one that can comprehend even how He heareth any word of the Father, being as He is Himself the only

Word of the Father? Nay more, is it not the case that a little afterwards, in this same discourse, which He delivered to the disciples between the Supper and His passion, He said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now"? How, then, are we to understand that He made known unto the disciples all that He had heard of the Father, when there are many things that He saith not, just because He knows that they cannot bear them now? Doubtless what He is yet to do He says that He has done as the same Being who hath made those things which are yet to be. For as He says by the prophet, "They pierced my hands and my feet," and not, They will yet pierce; but speaking as it were of the past, and yet predicting what Was still in the future:

so also in the passage before us He declares that He has made known to the disciples all, that He knows He will yet make known in that fullness of knowledge, whereof the apostle says, "But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. For in the same place he adds: "Now I know in part, but then shall I know, even as also I am known; and now through a glass in a riddle, but then face to face. For the same apostle also says that we have been saved by the washing of regeneration, and yet declares in another place, "We are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is no hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it. To a similar purpose it is also said by his fellow-apostle Peter, "In whom, though now seeing Him not, ye believe; and in whom, when ye see Him, ye shall rejoice with a joy unspeakable and glorious: receiving the reward of faith, even the salvation of your souls. If, then, it is now the season of faith, and faith's reward is the salvation of our souls; who, in that faith which worketh by love, can doubt that the day must come to an end, and at its close the reward be received;

not only the redemption of our body, whereof the Apostle Paul speaketh, but also the salvation of our souls, as we are told by the Apostle Peter? For the felicity springing from both is at this present time, and in the existing state of mortality, a matter rather of hope than of actual possession. But this it concerns us to remember, that our outward man, to wit the body, is still decaying; but the inward, that is, the soul, is being renewed day by day. Accordingly, while we are waiting for the immortality of the flesh and salvation of our souls in the future, yet with the pledge we have received, it may be said that we are saved already; so that knowledge of all things which the

Only-begotten hath heard of the Father we are to regard as a matter of hope still lying in the future, although declared by Christ as something He had already imparted.

2. "Ye have not chosen me," He says, "but I have chosen you. Grace such as that is ineffable. For what were we so long as Christ had not yet chosen us, and we were therefore still destitute of love? For he who hath chosen Him, how can he love Him? Were we, think you, in that condition which is sung of in the psalm: "I had rather be an abject in the house of the Lord, than dwell in the tents of wickedness"? Certainly not. What were we then, but sinful and lost? We had not yet come to believe on Him, in order to lead to His choosing us; for if it were those who already believed that He chose, then was He chosen Himself, prior to His choosing. But how could He say, "Ye have not chosen me," save only because His mercy anticipated us? Here surely is at fault the vain reasoning of those who defend the foreknowledge of God in opposition to His grace, and with this view declare that we were chosen before the foundation of the world, because God foreknew that we should be good, but not that He Himself would make us good. So says not He, who declares, "Ye have not chosen me. For had He chosen us on the ground that He foreknew that we should be good, then would He also have foreknown that we would not be the first to make choice of Him. For in no other way could we possibly be good:

unless, forsooth, one could be called good who has never made good his choice. What was it then that He chose in those who were not good? For they were not chosen because of their goodness, inasmuch as they could not be good without being chosen. Otherwise grace is no more grace, if we maintain the priority of merit. Such, certainly, is the election of grace, whereof the apostle says: "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant saved according to the election of grace. To which he adds: "And if by grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. Listen, thou ungrateful one, listen: "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you. Not that thou mayest say, I am chosen because I already believed. For if thou wert believing in Him, then hadst thou already chosen Him. But listen: "Ye have not chosen me. Not that thou mayest say, Before I believed I was already doing good works, and therefore was I chosen. For what good work can be prior to faith, when the apostle says, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin"? What, then, are we to say on hearing such words, "Ye have not chosen me," but that

we were evil, and were chosen in order that we might be good through the grace of Him who chose us? For it is not by grace, if merit preceded: but it is of grace: and therefore that grace did not find, but effected the merit.

3. See then, beloved, how it is that He chooseth not the good, but maketh those whom He has chosen good. "I have chosen you," He saith, "and appointed you that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and [that] your fruit should remain." And is not that the fruit, whereof He had already said, "Without me ye can do nothing"? He hath chosen therefore, and appointed that we should go and bring forth fruit; and no fruit, accordingly, had we to induce His choice of us. "That ye should go," He said, "and bring forth fruit." We go to bring forth, and He Himself is the way wherein we go, and wherein He hath appointed us to go. And so His mercy hath anticipated us in all. "And that your fruit," He saith, "should remain; that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, He may give it you." Accordingly let love remain; for He Himself is our fruit. And this love lies at present in longing desire, not yet in fullness of enjoyment; and whatsoever with that longing desire we shall ask in the name of the only-begotten Son, the Father giveth us. But what is not expedient for our salvation to receive, let us not imagine that we ask that in the Saviour's name: but we ask in the name of the Saviour only that which really belongs to the way of salvation.

TRACTATE 87

John XV. 17-19. 1. In the Gospel lesson which precedes this one, the Lord had said: "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and appointed you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and [that] your fruit should remain; that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, He may give it you. On these word you remember that we have already discoursed, as the Lord enabled us. But here, that is, in the succeeding lesson which you have heard read, He says: "These things I command you, that ye love one another. And thereby we are to understand that this is our fruit, of which He had said, "I have chosen you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and [that] your fruit should remain. And what He subjoined, "That whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, He may give it you," He will certainly give us if we love one another; seeing that this very thing He has also given us, in choosing us when we had no fruit, because we had chosen Him not; and appointing us that we should bring forth fruit,-that is, that we should love one another,-a fruit that we cannot have apart from Him, just as the branches can

do nothing apart from the vine. Our fruit, therefore, is charity, which the apostle explains to be, "Out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned. So love we one another, and so love we God.

For it would be with no true love that we loved one another, if we loved not God. For every one loves his neighbor as himself if he loves God; and if he loves not God, he loves not himself. For on these two commandments of love hang all the law and the prophets: this is our fruit. And it is in reference, therefore, to such fruit that He gives us commandment when He says, "These things I command you, that ye love one another. In the same way also the Apostle Paul, when wishing to commend the fruit of the Spirit in opposition to the deeds of the flesh, posited this as his principle, saying, "The fruit of the Spirit is love; and then, as if springing from and bound up in this principle, he wove the others together, which are "joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. For who can truly rejoice who loves not good as the source of his joy? Who can have true peace, if he have it not with one whom he truly loves? Who can be long-enduring through persevering continuance in good, save through fervent love? Who can be kind, if he love not the person he is aiding? Who can be good, if he is not made so by loving? Who can be sound in the faith, without that faith which worketh by love? Whose meekness can be beneficial in character, if not regulated by love?

And who will abstain from that which is debasing, if he love not that which dignifies? Appropriately, therefore, does the good Master so frequently commend love, as the only thing needing to be commended, without which all other good things can be of no avail, and which cannot be possessed without bringing with it those other good things that make a man truly good. 2. But alongside of this love we ought also patiently to endure the hatred of the world. For it must of necessity hate those whom it perceives recoiling from that which is loved by itself. But the Lord supplies us with special consolation from His own case, when, after saying, "These things I command you, that ye love one another," He added, "If the world hate you, know that it hated me before [it hated] you." Why then should the member exalt itself above the head? Thou refuseth to be in the body if thou art unwilling to endure the hatred of the world along with the Head. "If ye were of the world," He says, "the world would love its own." He says this, of course, of the whole Church, which, by itself, He frequently also calls by the name of the

world: as when it is said, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." And this also: "The Son of man came not to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." And John says in his epistle: "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also [for those] of the whole world." The whole world then is the Church, and yet the whole world hateth the Church. The world therefore hateth the world, the hostile that which is reconciled, the condemned that which is saved, the polluted that which is cleansed.

3. But that world which God is in Christ reconciling unto Himself, which is saved by Christ, and has all its sins freely pardoned by Christ, has been chosen out of the world that is hostile, condemned, and defiled. For out of that mass, which has all perished in Adam, are formed the vessels of mercy, whereof that world of reconciliation is composed, that is hated by the world which belongeth to the vessels of wrath that are formed out of the same mass and fitted to destruction. Finally, after saying, "If ye were of the world, the world would love its own," He immediately added, "But because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." And so these men were themselves also of that world, and, that they might no longer be of it, were chosen out of it, through no merit of their own, for no good works of theirs had preceded; and not by nature, which through free-will had become totally corrupted at its source: but gratuitously, that is, of actual grace. For He who chose the world out of the world, effected for Himself, instead of finding, what He should choose: for "there is a remnant saved according to the election of grace. And if by grace," he adds, "then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace."

4. But if we are asked about the love which is borne to itself by that world of perdition which hateth the world of redemption; we reply, it loveth itself, of course, with a false love, and not with a true. And hence, it loves itself falsely, and hates itself truly. For he that loveth wickedness, hateth his own soul. And yet it is said to love itself, inasmuch as it loves the wickedness that makes it wicked; and, on the other hand, it is said to hate itself, inasmuch as it loves that which causes it injury. It hates, therefore, the true nature that is in it, and loves the vice: it hates what it is, as made by the goodness of God, and loves what has been wrought in it by free-will. And hence also, if we rightly understand it, we are at once forbidden and commanded to love it:

thus, we are forbidden, when it is said to us, "Love not the world;" and we are commanded, when it is said to us, "Love your enemies." These constitute the world that hateth us. And therefore we are forbidden to love in it that which it loves in itself; and we are enjoined to love in it what it hates in itself, namely, the workmanship of God, and the various consolations of His goodness. For we are forbidden to love the vice that is in it, and enjoined to love the nature, while it loves the vice in itself, and hates the nature: so that we may both love and hate it in a right manner, whereas it loves and hates itself perversely.

TRACTATE 88

John XV. 20, 21. 1. The Lord, in exhorting His servants to endure with patience the hatred of the world, proposes to them no greater and better example than His own; seeing that, as the Apostle Peter says, "Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow His steps." And if we really do so, we do it by His assistance, who said, "Without me ye can do nothing." But further, to those to whom He had already said, "If the world hate you, know that it hated me before it hated] you," He now also says in the word you have just been hearing, when the Gospel was read, "Remember my word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord: if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also." Now in saying, "The servant is not greater than his lord," does He not clearly indicate how He would have us understand what He had said above, "Henceforth I call you not servants"? For, you see, He calleth them servants. For what else can the words imply, "The servant is not greater than his lord: if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you"? It is clear, therefore, that when it is said, "Henceforth I call you not servants," He is to be understood as speaking of that servant who abideth not in the house for ever, but is characterized by the fear which love casteth out; whereas, when it is here said, "The servant is not greater than his lord: if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you," that servant is meant who is distinguished by the clean fear which endureth for ever. For this is the servant who is yet to hear, "Well done, thou good servant: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

2. "But all these things," He says, "will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not Him that sent me." And what are "all these things" that "they will do," but what He has just said, namely, that they will

hate and persecute you, and despise your word? For if they kept not their word, and yet neither hated nor persecuted them; or if they even hated, but did not persecute them: it would not be all these things that they did. But "all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake," -what else is that but to say, they will hate me in you, they will persecute me in you; and your word, just because it is mine, they will not keep? For "all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake:" not for yours, but mine. So much the more miserable, therefore, are those who do such things on account of that name, as those are blessed who suffer such things in its behalf: as He Himself elsewhere saith, "Blessed are they that suffer persecution for righteousness' sake." For that is on my account, or "for my name's sake:" because, as we are taught by the apostle, "He is made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." For the wicked do such things to the wicked, but not for righteousness' sake; and therefore both are alike miserable, those who do, and those who suffer them. The good also do such things to the wicked: where, although the former do so for righteousness' sake, yet the latter suffer them not on the same behalf.

3. But some one says, If, when the wicked persecute the good for the name of Christ, the good suffer for righteousness' sake, then surely it is for righteousness' sake that the wicked do so to them; and if such is the case, then also, when the good persecute the wicked for righteousness' sake, it is for righteousness' sake likewise that the wicked suffer. For if the wicked can assail the good with persecution for the name of Christ, why cannot the wicked suffer persecution at the hands of the good on the same account; and what is that, hut for righteousness' sake? For if the good act not so on the same account as that on which the wicked suffer, because the good do so for righteousness' sake, while the wicked suffer for unrighteousness, so then neither can the wicked act so on the same account as that for which the good suffer, because the wicked do so by unrighteousness, while the good suffer for righteousness' sake. And how then will that be true, "All these things will they do unto you for my name's sake," when the former do it not for the name of Christ, that is, for righteousness' sake, but because of their own iniquity? Such a question is solved in this way, if only we understand the words,

All these things will they do unto you for my name's sake," as referring entirely to the righteous, as if it had been said, All these things will ye suffer at their hands for my name's sake, so that the words, "they will do unto you," are equivalent to these, Ye will suffer at their hands. But if "for my name's sake" is to be taken as if He had said, For my name's sake which they hate in you, so also may the other be taken for that righteousness' sake which they hate in you; and in this way the good, when they institute persecution against the wicked, may be rightly said to do so both for righteousness' sake, in their love for which they persecute the wicked, and for that wickedness' sake which they hate in the wicked themselves; and so also the wicked may be said to suffer both for the iniquity that is punished in their persons, and for the righteousness which is exercised in their punishment.

4. It may also be inquired, if the wicked also persecute the wicked, just as ungodly princes and judges, while they were the persecutors of the godly, certainly also punished murderers and adulterers, and all classes of evil-doers whom they ascertained to be acting contrary to the public laws, how are we to understand the words of the Lord, "If ye were of the world, the world would love its own"? (ver. 19.) For those whom it punisheth cannot be loved by the world, which, we see, generally punisheth the classes of crimes mentioned above, save only that the world is both in those who punish such crimes, and in those that love them. Therefore that world, which is to be understood as existing in the wicked and ungodly, both hateth its own in respect of that section of men in whose case it inflicts injury on the criminal, and loveth its own in respect of that other section in whose case it shows favor to its own partners in criminality. Hence, "All these things will they do unto you for my name's sake," is said either reference to that for the sake of which ye suffer, or to that on account of which they themselves so deal with you, because that which is in you they both hate and persecute. And He added, "Because they know not Him that sent me." This is to be understood as spoken of that knowledge of which it is also elsewhere recorded, "But to know Thee is perfect intelligence." For those who with such a knowledge know the Father, by whom Christ was sent, can in no wise persecute those whom Christ is gathering; for they also themselves are being gathered by Christ along with the others.

TRACTATE 89

John XV. 22, 23. 1. The Lord had said above to His disciples, "If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also. But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not Him that sent me. And if we inquire of whom He so spake, we find that He was led on to these words from what He had said before, "If the world hate you, know ye that it hated me before [it hated] you; and now in adding, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin," He more expressly pointed to the Jews. Of them, therefore, He also uttered the words that precede, for so does the context itself imply. For it is of the same parties that He said, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; of whom He also said, "If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also; but all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not Him that sent me; for it is to these words that He also subjoins the following: "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin. The Jews, therefore, persecuted Christ, as the Gospel very clearly indicates, and Christ spake to the Jews, not to other nations;

and it is they, therefore, that He meant to be understood by the world, that hateth Christ and His disciples; and, indeed, not those alone, but even these latter were shown by Him to belong to the same world. What, then, does He mean by the words, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin"? Was it that the Jews were without sin before Christ came to them in the flesh? Who, though he were the greatest fool, would say so? But it is some great sin, and not every sin, that He would have to be understood, as it were, under the general designation. For this is the sin wherein all sins are included; and whosoever is free from it, has all his sins forgiven him: and this it is, that they believed not on Christ, who came for the very purpose of enlisting their faith. From this sin, had He not come, they would certainly have been free. His advent has become as much fraught with destruction to unbelievers, as it is with salvation to those that believe; for He, the Head and Prince of the apostles, has Himself, as it were, become what they declared of themselves, "to some, indeed, the savour of life unto life; and to some the savor of death unto death."

2. But when He went on to say, "But now they have no excuse for their sin," some may be moved to inquire whether those to whom Christ neither

came nor spake, have an excuse for their sin. For if they have not, why is it said here that these had none, on the very ground that He did come and speak to them? And if they have, have they it to the extent of thereby being barred from punishment, or of receiving it in a milder degree? To these inquiries, with the Lord's help and to the best of my capacity, I reply, that such have an excuse, not for every one of their sins, but for this sin of not believing on Christ, inasmuch as He came not and spake not to them. But it is not in the number of such that those are to be included, to whom He came in the persons of His disciples, and to whom He spake by them, as He also does at present; for by His Church He has come, and by His Church He speaks to the Gentiles. For to this are to be referred the words that He spake, "He that receiveth you, receiveth me;" and, "He that despiseth you, despiseth me." "Or would ye," says the Apostle Paul, "have a proof of Him that speaketh in me, namely Christ."

3. It remains for us to inquire, whether those who, prior to the coming of Christ in His Church to the Gentiles and to their hearing of His Gospel, have been, or are now being, overtaken by the close of this life, can have such an excuse? Evidently they can, but not on that account can they escape damnation. "For as many as have sinned without the law, shall also perish without the law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law." And these words of the apostle, inasmuch as his saying, "they shall perish," has a more terrible sound than when he says, "they shall be judged," seem to show that such an excuse can not only avail them nothing, but even becomes an additional aggravation. For those that excuse themselves because they did not hear, "shall perish without the law." 4. But it is also a worthy subject of inquiry, whether those who met the words they heard with contempt, and even with opposition, and that not merely by contradicting them, but also by persecuting in their hatred those from whom they heard them, are to be reckoned among those in regard to whom the words, "they shall be judged by the law," convey somewhat of a milder sound. But if it is one thing to perish without the law, and another to be judged by the law; and the former is the heavier, the latter the lighter punishment: such, without a doubt, are not to have their place assigned in that lighter measure of punishment; for, so far from sinning in the law, they utterly refused to accept the law of Christ, and, as far as in them lay, would have had it altogether annihilated. But those that sin in the law, are such as are in the law, that

is, who accept it, and confess that it is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good; but fail through infirmity in fulfilling what they cannot doubt is most righteously enjoined therein. These are they in regard to whose fate there may perhaps be some distinction made from the perdition of those who are without the law:

and yet if the apostle's words, "they shall be judged by the law," are to be understood as meaning, they shall not perish, what a wonder if it were so For his discourse was not about infidels and believers to lead him to say so, but about Gentiles and Jews, both of whom, certainly, if they find not salvation in that Saviour who came to seek that which was lost, shall doubtless become the prey of perdition; although it may be said that some shall perish in a more terrible, others in a more mitigated sense; in other words, that some shall suffer a heavier, and others a lighter penalty in their perdition. For he is rightly said to perish as regards God, whoever is separated by punishment from that blessedness which He bestows on His saints, and the diversity of punishments is as great as the diversity of sins; but the mode thereof is accounted too deep by divine wisdom for human guessing to scrutinize or express. At all events, those to whom Christ came, and to whom He spake, have not, for their great sin of unbelief, any such excuse as may enable them to say, We saw not, we heard not: whether it be that such an excuse would not be sustained by Him whose judgments are unsearchable, or whether it would, and that, if not for their entire deliverance from damnation, at least for its partial alleviation.

5. "He that hateth me," He says, "hateth my Father also." Here it may be said to us, Who can hate one whom he knows not? And certainly before saying, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin," He had said to His disciples, "These things will they do unto you, because they know not Him that sent me." How, then, do they both know not, and hate? For if the notion they have formed of Him is not that which He is in Himself, but some unknown conjecture of their own, then certainly it is not Himself they are found to hate, but that figment which they devise or rather suspect in their error. And yet, were it not that men could hate that which they know not, the Truth would not have asserted both, namely, that they both know not, and hate His Father. But such a possibility, if by the Lord's help we are able to show it, cannot be demonstrated at present, as this discourse must now be brought to a close.

TRACTATE 90

John XV. 23. 1. The Lord says, as you have just been hearing, "He that hateth me, hateth my Father also: and yet He had said a little before, "These things will they do unto you, because they know not Him that sent me. A question therefore arises that cannot be overlooked, how they can hate one whom they know not? For if it is not God as He really is, but something else, I know not what, that they suspect or believe Him to be, and hate this; then assuredly it is not God Himself that they hate, but the thing they conceive in their own erroneous suspicion or baseless credulity; and if they think of Him as He really is, how can they be said to know Him not? It may be the case, indeed, with regard to men, that we frequently love those whom we have never seen; and in this way it can, on the other hand, be none the less impossible that we should hate those whom we have never seen. The report, for instance, whether good or bad, about some preacher, leads us not improperly to love or to hate the unknown. But if the report is truthful, how can one, of whom we have got such true accounts, be spoken of as unknown? Is it because we have not seen his face? And yet, though he himself does not see it, he can be known to no one better than to himself.

The knowledge of any one, therefore, is not conveyed to us in his bodily countenance, but only lies open to our apprehension when his life and character are revealed. Otherwise no one would be able to know himself, because unable to see his own face. But surely he knows himself more certainly than he is known to others, inasmuch as by inward inspection he can the more certainly see what he is conscious of, what he desires, what he is living for; and it is when these are likewise laid open to us, that he becomes truly known to ourselves. And as these, accordingly, are commonly brought to us regarding the absent, or even the dead, either by hearsay or correspondence, it thus comes about that people whom we have never seen by face (and yet of whom we are not entirely ignorant), we frequently either hate or love. 2. But in such cases our credulity is frequently at fault; for sometimes even history, and still more ordinary report, turns out to be false. Yet, it ought to be our concern, in order not to be misled by an injurious opinion, seeing we cannot search into the consciences of men, to have a true and certain sentiment about things themselves. I mean, that in regard to this or that man, if we know not whether he is immodest or modest, we should at all events hate immodesty and love modesty: and if in regard to some one or other we know

not whether he is unjust or just, we should at any rate love justice and abhor injustice; not such things as we erroneously fancy to ourselves, but such as we believingly perceive according to God's truth, the one to be desired, the other to be shunned; so that, when in regard to things themselves we do desire what ought to be desired, and utterly avoid what ought to be avoided, we may find pardon for the mistaken feelings which we at times, yea, at all times, entertain regarding the actual state of others which is hidden from our eyes. For this, I think, has to do with human temptation, without which we cannot pass through this life, so that the apostle said, "No temptation should befall you but such as is common to man. For what is so common to man as inability to inspect the heart of man;

and therefore, instead of scrutinizing its inmost recesses, to suspect for the most, part something very different from what is going on therein? And although in these dark regions of human realities, that is, of other people's inward thoughts, we cannot clear up our suspicions, because we are only men, yet we ought to restrain our judgments, that is, all definite and fixed opinions, and not judge anything before the time, until the Lord come, and bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall every man have praise of God. When, therefore, we are falling into no error in regard to the thing itself, so that there is an accordance with right in our reprobation of vice and approbation of virtue; surely, if a mistake is committed in connection with individuals, a temptation so characteristic of man is within the scope of forgiveness.

3. But amid all these darknesses of human hearts, it happens as a thing much to be wondered at and mourned over, that one, whom we account unjust, and who nevertheless is just, and in whom, without knowing it, we love justice, we sometimes avoid, and turn away from, and hinder from approaching us, and refuse to have life and living in common with him; and, if necessity compel the infliction of discipline, whether to save others from harm or bring the person himself back to rectitude, we even pursue him with a salutary harshness; and so afflict a good man as if he were wicked, and one whom unknowingly we love. This takes place if one, for example's sake, who is modest is believed by us to be the opposite. For, beyond doubt, if I love a modest person, he is himself the very object that I love; and therefore I love the man himself, and know it not. And if I hate an immodest person, it is on that account, not him that I hate: for he is not the thing that I hate; and yet

to that object of my love, with whom my heart makes continual abode in the love of modesty, I am ignorantly doing an injury, erring as I do, not in the distinction I make between virtue and vice, but in the thick darkness of the human heart.

Accordingly, as it may so happen that a good man may unknowingly hate a good man, or rather loves him without knowing it (for the man himself he loves in loving that which is good; for what the other is, is the very thing that he loves); and without knowing it, hates not the man himself, but that which he supposes him to be: so may it also be the case that an unjust man hates a just man, and, while he opines that he loves one who is unjust like himself, unknowingly loves the just man; and yet so long as he believes him to be unjust, he loves not the man himself, but that which he imagines him to be. And as it is with another man, so is it also with God. For, to conclude, had the Jews been asked if they loved God, what other answer would they have given but that they did love Him, and that not with any intentional falsehood, but because erroneously fancying that they did so? For how could they love the Father of the truth, who were filled with hatred to the truth itself? For they do not wish their own conduct to be condemned, and it is the truth's task to condemn such conduct; and thus they hated the truth as much as they hated their own punishment, which the truth awards to such. But they know not that to be the truth which lays its condemnation on such as they: therefore they hate that which they know not;

and hating it, they certainly cannot but also hate Him of whom it is born. And in this way, because they know not the truth, by whose judgment they are condemned, as that which is born of God the Father; of a surety also they both know not, and hate [the Father] Himself. Miserable men! who, because wishing to be wicked, deny that to be the truth whereby the wicked are condemned. For they refuse to own that to be what it is, when they ought themselves to refuse to be what they are; in order that, while it remains the same, they may be changed, lest by its judgment they fall into condemnation.

TRACTATE 91

John XV. 24, 25. 1. The Lord had said, "He that hateth me, hateth my Father also." For of a certainty he that hateth the truth must also hate Him of whom the truth is born; on which subject we have already spoken, as we were granted ability. And then He added the words on which we have now to dis-

course: "If I had not done among [in] them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin." To wit, that great sin whereof He also says before, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin." Their sin was that of not believing on Him who thus spake and wrought. For they were not without sin before He so spake to them and did such works among them; but this sin of theirs, in not believing on Him, is thus specially mentioned because really inclusive in itself of all sins besides. For had they been clear of this one, and believed on Him, all else would also have been forgiven.

2. But what is meant when, after saying, "If I had not done among them works," He immediately added, "which none other man did"? Of a certainty, among all the works of Christ, none seem to be greater than the raising of the dead; and yet we know that the same was done by the prophets of olden time. For Elias did so; and Elisha also, both when alive in the flesh, and when he lay buried in his sepulchre. For when certain men, who were carrying a dead person, had fled thither for refuge from an onset of their enemies, and had laid him down therein, he instantly came again. to life. And yet there were some works that Christ did which none other man did: as, when He fed the five thousand men with five loaves, and the four thousand with seven; when He walked on the waters, and gave Peter power to do the same; when He changed the water into wine; when He opened the eyes of a man that was born blind, and many besides, which it would take long to mention. But we are answered, that others also have done works which even He did not, and which no other man has done. For who else save Moses smote the Egyptians with so many and mighty plagues, as when He led the people through the parted waters of the sea, when he obtained manna for them from heaven in their hunger, and water from the rock in their thirst?

Who else save Joshua the son of Nun divided the stream of the Jordan for the people to pass over, and by the utterance of a prayer to God bridled and stopped the revolving sun? Who save Samson ever quenched his thirst with water flowing forth from the jawbone of a dead ass? Who save Elias was carried aloft in a chariot of fire? Who save Elisha, as I have just mentioned, after his own body was buried, restored the dead body of another to life? Who else besides Daniel lived unhurt amid the jaws of famishing lions, that were shut up with him? And who else save the three men Ananias, Azariah, and Mis-hael, ever walked about unharmed in flames that blazed and did not burn? 3.

I pass by other examples, as these I consider to be sufficient to show that some of the saints have done wonderful works, which none other man did. But we read of no one whatever of the ancients who cured with such power so many bodily defects, and bad states of the health, and troubles of mortals. For, to say nothing of those individual cases which He healed, as they occurred, by the word of command, the Evangelist Mark says in a certain place: "And at even, when the sun had set, they brought unto Him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And He healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils. And Matthew, in giving us the same account, has also added the prophetic testimony, when he says: "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sickness. In another passage also it is said by Mark: "And whithersoever He entered, into villages, or cities, or country, they laid the sick in the streets, and besought Him that they might touch if it were but the border of His garment: and as many as touched Him were made whole. None other man did such things in them. For so are we to understand the words in them, not among them, or in their presence; but directly in them, because He healed them.

For He wished them to understand the works as those which not only occasioned admiration, but conferred also manifest healing, and were benefits which they ought surely to have requited with love, and not with hatred. He transcends, indeed, the miracles of all besides, in being born of a virgin, and in possessing alone the power, both in His conception and birth, to preserve inviolate the integrity of His mother: but that was done neither before their eyes nor in them. For the knowledge of the truth of such a miracle was reached by the apostles, not through any onlooking that they had in common with others, but in the course of their separate discipleship. Moreover, the fact that on the third day He restored Himself to life from the very tomb, in the flesh wherein He had been slain, and, never thereafter to die, with it ascended into heaven, even surpasses all else that He did: but just as little was this done either in the Jews or before their eyes; nor had it yet been done, when He said, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did."

4. The works, then, are doubtless those miracles of healing in connection with their bodily complaints which He exhibited to such an extent as no one

before had furnished amongst them: for these they saw, and it is in reproaching them therewith that He proceeds to say, "But now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father: but [this cometh to pass] that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause [gratuitously]. He calls it, their law, not as invented by them, but given to them: just as we say, "Our daily bread; which, nevertheless, we ask of God in conjoining the words "Give us. But one hates gratuitously who neither seeks advantage from the hatred nor avoids inconvenience: so do the wicked hate the Lord; and so also is He loved by the righteous, that is to say, gratuitously [gratis, freely,] inasmuch as they expect no other gifts beyond Himself, for He Himself will be all in all. But whoever would be disposed to look for something more profound in the words of Christ, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did" (for although such were done by the Father, or the Holy Spirit, yet no one else did them, for the whole Trinity is one and the same in substance), he will find that it was He who did it even when some man of God did something similar. For in Himself He can do everything by Himself;

but without Him no one can do anything. For Christ with the Father and the Holy Spirit are not three Gods, but one God, of whom it is written, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things. No one else, therefore, really himself did the works which He did amongst them; for any one else who did any such works, did them only through His doing. But He Himself did them without any doing on their part.

TRACTATE 92

John XV. 26, 27. 1. The Lord Jesus, in the discourse which He addressed to His disciples after the supper, when Himself in immediate proximity to His passion, and, as it were, on the eve of departure, and of depriving them of His bodily presence while continuing His spiritual presence to all His disciples till the very end of the world, exhorted them to endure the persecutions of the wicked, whom He distinguished by the name of the world: and from which He also told them that He had chosen, the disciples themselves, that they might know it was by the grace of God they were what they were, and by their own vices they had been what they had been. And then His own persecutors and theirs He clearly signified to be the Jews, that it might be perfectly apparent that they also were included in the appellation of that damnable world that persecuteth the saints. And when He had said of them that

they knew not Him that sent Him, and yet hated both the Son and the Father, that is, both Him who was sent and Him who sent Him,-of all which we have already treated in previous discourses,-He reached the place where it is said, "This cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause. And then He added, as if by way of consequence, the words whereon we have undertaken at present to discourse:

"But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, He shall bear witness of me: and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning. But what connection has this with what He had just said, "But now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father: but that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause"? Was it that the Comforter, when He came, even the Spirit of truth, convicted those, who thus saw and hated, by a still clearer testimony? Yea, verily, some even of those who saw, and still hated, He did convert, by this manifestation of Himself, to the faith that worketh by love. To make this view of the passage intelligible, we recall to your mind that so it actually befell. For when on the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit fell upon an assembly of one hundred and twenty men, among whom were all the apostles; and when they, filled therewith were speaking in the language of every nation;

a goodly number of those who had hated, amazed at the magnitude of the miracle (especially when they perceived in Peter's address so great and divine a testimony borne in behalf of Christ, as that He, who was slain by them and accounted amongst the dead, was proved to have risen again, and to be now alive), were pricked in their hearts and converted; and so became aware of the beneficent character of that precious blood which had been so impiously and cruelly shed, because themselves redeemed by the very blood which they had shed. For the blood of Christ was shed so efficaciously for the remission of all sins, that it could wipe out even the very sin of shedding it. With this therefore in His eye, the Lord said, "They hated me without a cause: but when the Comforter is come, He shall bear witness of me; saying, as it were, They hated me, and slew me when I stood visibly before their eyes; but such shall be the testimony borne in my behalf by the Comforter, that He will bring them to believe in me when I am no longer visible to their sight.

2. "And ye also," He says, "shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning. The Holy Spirit shall bear witness, and so also shall ye. For, just because ye have been with me from the beginning, they can preach what ye know; which ye cannot do at present, because the fullness of that Spirit is not yet present within you." He therefore shall testify of me, and ye also shall bear witness: for the love of God shed abroad in your hearts by the Holy Spirit, who shall be given unto you, will give you the confidence needful for such witness-bearing. And that certainly was still wanting to Peter, when, terrified by the question of a lady's maid, he could give no true testimony; but, contrary to his own promise, was driven by the greatness of his fear thrice to deny Him. But there is no such fear in love, for perfect love casteth out fear. In fine, before the Lord's passion, his slavish fear was questioned by a bond-woman; but after the Lord's resurrection, his free love by the very Lord of freedom: and so on the one occasion he was troubled, on the other tranquillized; there he denied the One he had loved, here he loved the One he had denied. But still even then that very love was weak and straitened, till strengthened and expanded by the Holy Spirit.

And then that Spirit, pervading him thus with the fullness of richer grace, kindled his hitherto frigid heart to such a witness-bearing for Christ, and unlocked those lips that in their previous tremor had suppressed the truth, that, when all on whom the Holy Spirit had descended were speaking in the tongues of all nations to the crowds of Jews collected around, he alone broke forth before the others in the promptitude of his testimony in behalf of the Christ, and con-rounded His murderers with the account of His resurrection. And if any one would enjoy the pleasure of gazing on a sight so charming in its holiness, let him read the Acts of the Apostles: and there let him be filled with amazement at the preaching of the blessed Peter, over whose denial of his Master he had just been mourning; there let him behold that tongue, itself translated from diffidence to confidence, from bondage to liberty, converting to the confession of Christ the tongues of so many of His enemies, riot one of which he could bear when lapsing himself into denial. And what shall I say more?

In him there shone forth such an effulgence of grace, and such a fullness of the Holy Spirit, and such a weight of most precious truth poured from the lips of the preacher, that he transformed that vast multitude of Jews who were the adversaries and murderers of Christ into men that were ready to die

for His name, at whose hands he himself was formerly afraid to die with his Master. All this did that Holy Spirit when sent, who had previously only been promised. And it was these great and marvellous gifts of His own that the Lord foresaw, when He said, "They have both seen and hated both me and my Father: that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause. But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness. For He, in bearing witness Himself, and inspiring such witnesses with invincible courage, divested Christ's friends of their fear, and transformed into love the hatred of His enemies.

TRACTATE 93

John XVI. 1-4. 1. In the words preceding this chapter of the Gospel, the Lord strengthened His disciples to endure the hatred of their enemies, and prepared them also by His own example to become the more courageous in imitating Him: adding the promise, that the Holy Spirit should come to bear witness of Him, and also that they themselves could become His witnesses, through the effectual working of His Spirit in their hearts. For such is His meaning when He saith, "He shall bear witness of me, and ye also shall bear witness. That is to say, because He shall bear witness, ye also shall bear witness: He in your hearts, you in your voices; He by inspiration, you by utterance: that the words might be fulfilled, "Their sound hath gone forth into all the earth. For it would have been to little purpose to have exhorted them by His example, had He not also filled them with His Spirit. Just as we see that the Apostle Peter, after having heard His words, when He said, "The servant is not greater than his lord: if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; and seen that already fulfilled in Him, wherein, had example been sufficient, he ought to have imitated the patient endurance of his Lord, yet succumbed and fell into denial, as utterly unable to bear what He saw his Master enduring. But when he really received the gift of the Holy Spirit, he preached Him whom he had denied;

and whom he had been afraid to confess, he had no fear now in openly proclaiming. Already, indeed, had he been sufficiently taught by example to know what was proper to be done; but not yet was he inspired with the power to do what he knew: he had got instruction to stand, but not the strength to keep him from falling. But after this was supplied by the Holy Spirit, he

preached Christ even to the death, whom, in his fear of death, he had previously denied. And so the Lord in this succeeding chapter, on which we have now to address you, saith, "These things have I spoken unto you, that ye should not be offended. As it is sung in the psalm, "Great peace have they who love Thy law, and nothing shall offend them. Properly enough, therefore, with the promise of the Holy Spirit, by whose operation in their hearts they should be made His witnesses, He added, "These things have I spoken unto you, that ye should not be offended. For when the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit given unto us, they have great peace who love God's law, so that nothing may offend them.

2. And then He expressly declares what they were to suffer: "They shall put you out of the synagogues. But what harm was it for the apostles to be expelled from the Jewish synagogues, as if they were not to separate themselves therefrom, although no one expelled them? Doubtless He meant to announce with reprobation, that the Jews would refuse to receive Christ, from whom they as certainly would refuse to withdraw; and so it would come to pass that the latter, who could not exist without Him, would also be cast out along with Him by those who would not have Him as their place of abode. For certainly, as there was no other people of God than that seed of Abraham, they would, had they only acknowledged and received Christ, have remained as the natural branches in the olive tree; nor would the churches of Christ have been different from the synagogues of the Jews, for they would have been one and the same, had they also desired to abide in Him. But having refused, what remained but that, continuing themselves out of Christ, they put out of the synagogues those who would not abandon Christ? For having received the Holy Spirit, and so become His witnesses, they would certainly not belong to the class of whom it is said: "Many of the chief rulers of the Jews believed on Him; but for fear of the Jews they dared not confess Him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue:

for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God. And so they believed on Him, but not in the way He wished them to believe when He said: "How can ye believe, who expect honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only? It is, therefore, with those disciples who so believe in Him, that, filled with the Holy Spirit, or, in other words, with the gift of divine grace, they no longer belong to those who, "ignorant of the righteousness of God, and going about to establish their own, have not

submitted themselves to the righteousness of God; nor to those of whom it is said, "They loved the praise of men more than the praise of God: that the prophecy harmonizes, which finds its fulfillment in their own case: "They shall walk, O Lord, in the light of Thy countenance: and in Thy name shall they rejoice all the day; and in Thy righteousness shall they be exalted: for Thou art the glory of their strength. Rightly enough is it said to such, "They shall cast you out of the synagogues; that is, they who "have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge; because, "ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own," they expel those who are exalted, not in their own righteousness, but in God's, and have no cause to be ashamed at being expelled by men, since He is the glory of their strength.

3. Finally, to what He had thus told them, He added the words: "But the hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service: and these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the Father, nor me. That is to say, they have not known the Father, nor His Son, to whom they think they will be doing service in slaying you. Words which the Lord added in the way of consolation to His own, who should be driven out of the Jewish synagogues. For it is in thus announcing beforehand what evils they would have to endure for their testimony in His behalf, that He said, "They will put you out of the synagogues. Nor does He say, And the hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service. What then? "But the hour cometh: just in the way He would have spoken, were He foretelling them of something good that would follow such evils. What, then, does He mean by the words, "They will put you out of the synagogues: but the hour cometh"? As if He would have gone on to say this: They, indeed, will scatter you, but I will gather you; or, They shall, indeed, scatter you, but the hour of your joy cometh.

What, then, has the word which He uses, "but the hour cometh," to do here, as if He were going on to promise them comfort after their tribulation, when apparently He ought rather to have said, in the form of continuous narration, And the hour cometh? But He said not, And it cometh, although predicting the approach of one tribulation after another, instead of comfort after tribulation. Could it have been that such a separation from the synagogues would so discompose them, that they would prefer to die, rather than remain in this life apart from the Jewish assemblies? Far surely would those be from such discomposure, who were seeking, not the praise of men,

but of God. What, then, of the words, "They will put you out of the synagogues: but the hour cometh; when apparently He ought rather to have said, And the hour cometh, "that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service"? For it is not even said, But the hour cometh that they shall kill you, as if implying that their comfort for such a separation would be found in the death that would befall them; but "The hour cometh," He says, "that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.

On the whole, I do not think He wished to convey any further meaning than that they might understand and rejoice that they themselves would gain so many to Christ, by being driven out of the Jewish congregations, that it would be found insufficient to expel them, and they would not suffer them to live for fear of all being converted by their preaching to the name of Christ, and so turned away from the observance of Judaism, as if it were the very truth of God. For so ought we to understand the reference of His words to the Jews, when He said of them, "They will put you out of the synagogues. For the witnesses, in other words, the martyrs of Christ, were likewise slain by the Gentiles: they, however, thought not that it was to the true God, but to their own false deities, that they were doing service when they so acted. But every Jew that slew the preachers of Christ reckoned that he was doing God service; believing as he did that all who were converted to Christ were deserting the God of Israel. For it was also by the same reasoning that they were incited to the murder of Christ Himself: because their own words on this subject have also been put on record. "Ye perceive that the whole world is gone after him: "If we let him live, the Romans will come, and take away both our place and nation. And those of Caiaphas:

"It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and not that the whole nation should perish. And accordingly in this address He sought by His own example to stimulate His disciples, to whom He had just been saying, "If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; that as in slaying Him they thought they had done God a service, so also would it be in reference to them. 4. Such, then, is the meaning of these words: "They will put you out of the synagogues; but have no fear of solitude: inasmuch as, when separated from their assembly, you will assemble so many in my name, that they, in very fear lest the temple, that was with them, and all the sacraments of the old law, should be deserted, will slay you: actually, in thus shedding your blood, full of the notion that they are doing God service. An illus-

tration surely of the apostle's words, "They have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge; when they imagine that they are doing God service in slaying His servants. Appalling mistake! Is it thus thou wouldst please God by striking down the God-pleaser; and is the living temple of God by thy blows laid level with the ground, that God's temple of stone may not be deserted? Accursed blindness! But it is in part that it has happened to Israel, that the fullness of the Gentiles might come in: in part, I say, and not totally, has it happened. For not all, but only some of the branches have been broken off, that the wild olive might be ingrafted.

For just at the time when the disciples of Christ, filled with the Holy Spirit, were speaking in the tongues of all nations, and performing many divine miracles, and scattering divine utterances on every side, Christ, even though slain, was so beloved, that His disciples, when expelled from the congregations of the Jews, gathered into a congregation of their own a vast multitude of those very Jews, and had no fear of being left to solitude. hereupon, accordingly, the others, reprobate and blind, being inflamed with wrath, and having a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge, and believing that they were doing God service, put them to death. But He, who was slain for them, gathered those together; just as He had also, before He was slain, instructed them in what was to happen, lest their minds, left ignorant and unprepared, should be cast into trouble by evils, however transient, that were unexpected and unprovided for; but rather by knowing of them beforehand, and sustaining them with patience, might be led onward to everlasting blessing. For that such was the cause of His making these announcements to them beforehand, is shown also by His words that followed: "But these things have I told you, that, when their time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them. Their hour was an hour of darkness, a midnight hour. But the Lord commanded His loving-kindness in the daytime, and made them sing of it in the night:

when the Jewish night threw no confusion of darkness into the day of the Christians, separated as it was from themselves; and when that which could slay the flesh had no power to darken their faith.

TRACTATE 94

John XVI 4-7 1. When the Lord Jesus had foretold His disciples the persecutions they would have to suffer after His departure, He went on to say: "And these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you; but

now I go my way to Him that sent me. And here the first thing we have to look at is, whether He had not previously foretold them of the sufferings that were to come. And the three other evangelists make it sufficiently clear that He had uttered such predictions prior to the approach of the supper: which was over, according to John, when He spake, and added, "And these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you. Are we, then, to settle such a question in this way, that they, too, tell us that He was near His passion when He said these things? Then it was not when He was with them at the beginning that He so spake, for He was on the very eve of departing, and proceeding to the Father: and so also, even according to these evangelists, it is strictly true what is here said, "And these things I said not unto you at the beginning.

But what are we to do with the credibility of the Gospel according to Matthew, who relates that such announcements were made to them by the Lord, not only when He was on the eve of sitting down with His disciples to the passover supper, but also at the beginning, when the twelve apostles are for the first time expressed by name, and sent forth on the work of God? What, then, is the meaning of what He says here, "And these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you; but that what He says here of the Holy Spirit who was to come to them, and to bear witness, when they should have such ills to endure, this He said not unto them at the beginning, because He was with themselves? 2. The Comforter then, or Advocate (for both form the interpretation of the Greek word, *paraclete*), had become necessary on Christ's departure: and therefore He had not spoken of Him at the beginning, when He was with them, because His own presence was their comfort; but on the eve of His own departure it behoved Him to speak of His coming, by whom it would be brought about that with love shed abroad in their hearts they would preach the word of God with all boldness; and with Him inwardly bearing witness with them of Christ, they also should bear witness, and feel it to be no cause of stumbling when their Jewish enemies put them out of the synagogues, and slew them, with the thought that they were doing God service; because the charity beareth all things, which was to be shed abroad in their hearts by the gift of the Holy Spirit. In this, therefore, is the whole meaning to be found, that He was to make them His martyrs, that is, His witnesses through the Holy Spirit; so that by His effectual working within them, they would endure the hardships

of all kinds of persecution, and, set aglow at that divine fire, lose none of their warmth in the love of preaching. "These things," therefore, He says, "have I told you, that, when their time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them" (ver. 4).

These things, I say, I have told you, not merely because ye shall have to endure such things, but because, when the Comforter is come, He shall bear witness of me, that ye may not keep them back through fear, and by whom ye yourselves shall also be enabled to bear witness. "And these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you," and I myself was your comfort through my bodily presence exhibited to your human senses, and which, as infants, ye were able to comprehend. 3. "But now I go my way to Him that sent me; and none of you," He says, "asketh me, Whither goest Thou?" He means that His departure would be such that none would ask Him of that which they should see taking place in broad daylight before their eyes: for previously to this they had asked Him whither He was going, and had been answered that He was going whither they themselves could not then come. Now, however, He promises that He will go away in such a manner that none of them shall ask Him whither He goes. For a cloud received Him when He ascended up from their side; and of His going into heaven they made no verbal inquiry, but had ocular evidence.

4. "But because I have said these things unto you," He adds, "sorrow hath filled your heart. He saw, indeed, what effect these words of His were producing in their hearts; for having not yet within them the spiritual consolation, which they were afterwards to have by the Holy Spirit, what they still saw objectively in Christ they were afraid of losing; and because they could have no doubt they were about to lose Him whose announcements were always true, their human feelings were saddened, because their carnal view of Him was to be left a blank. But He knew what was most expedient for them, because that inward sight, wherewith the Holy Spirit was yet to comfort them, was undoubtedly superior; not by bringing a human body into the bodies of those who saw, but by infusing Himself into the hearts of those who believed. And then He adds, "Nevertheless I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away. For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you: as if He had said, It is expedient for you that this form of a servant be taken away from you; as the Word made indeed flesh I dwell among you; but I would not that ye

should continue to love me carnally, and, content with such milk, desire to remain infants always. "It is expedient for you that I go away:

for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you. If I withdraw not the tender nutriment wherewith I have nourished you, ye will acquire no keen relish of solid food; if ye adhere in a carnal way to the flesh, ye will not have room for the Spirit. For what is this, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you"? Was it that He could not send Him while located here Himself? Who would venture to say so? Neither was it, that where He was, thence the Other had withdrawn, or that He had so come from the Father as that He did not still abide with the Father. And still further, how could He, even when having His own abode on earth, be unable to send Him, who we know came and remained upon Him at His baptism; yea, more, from whom we know that He was never separable? What does it mean, then, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but that ye cannot receive the Spirit so long as ye continue to know Christ after the flesh? Hence one who had already been made a partaker of the Spirit says, "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we [Him] no more.

For now even the very flesh of Christ he did not know in a carnal way, when brought to a spiritual knowledge of the Word that had been made flesh. And such, doubtless, did the good Master wish to intimate, when He said, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." 5. But with Christ's bodily departure, both the Father and the Son, as well as the Holy Spirit, were spiritually present with them. For had Christ departed from them in such a sense that it would be in His place, and not along with Him, that the Holy Spirit would be present in them, what becomes of His promise when He said, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world;" and, I and the Father "will come unto him, and will make Our abode with him;" seeing that He also promised that He would send the Holy Spirit in such a way that He would be with them for ever? In this way it was, on the other hand, that seeing they were yet out of their present carnal or animal condition to become spiritual, with undoubted certainty also were they yet to have in a more comprehensive way both the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. But in no one are we to believe that the Father is present without the Son and the Holy Spirit, or the Father and the Son without the Holy Spirit, or the Son without the Father

and the Holy Spirit, or the Holy Spirit without the Father and the Son, or the Father and the Holy Spirit without the Son; but wherever any one of Them is, there also is the Trinity, one God. But here the Trinity had to be suggested in such a way that, although there was no diversity of essence, yet the personal distinction of each one separately should be presented to notice; where those who have a right understanding can never imagine a separation of natures.

6. But that which follows, "And when He is come, He will convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, indeed, because they believe not on me; but of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye shall see me no more; and of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged" (vers. 8-11); as if it were sin simply not to believe on Christ; and as if it were very righteousness not to see Christ; and as if that were the very judgment, that the prince of this world, that is, the devil, is judged: all this is very obscure, and cannot be included in the present discourse, lest; brevity only increase the obscurity; but must rather be deferred till another occasion for such explanation as the Lord may enable us to give.

TRACTATE 95

1. The Lord, when promising that He would send the Holy Spirit, said, "When He is come, He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. What does it mean? Is it that the Lord Jesus Christ did not reprove the world of sin, when He said, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin"? And that no one may take it to his head to say that this applied properly to the Jews, and not to the world, did He not say in another place, "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own"? Did He not reprove it of righteousness, when He said, "O righteous Father, the world hath not known Thee"? And did He not reprove it of judgment when He declared that He would say to those on the left hand, "Depart ye into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels"? And many other passages are to be found in the holy evangel, where Christ reproveth the world of these things. Why is it, then, He attributeth this to the Holy Spirit, as if it were His proper prerogative? Is it that, because Christ spake only among the nation of the Jews, He does not appear to have reproved the world, inasmuch as one may be understood to be reproved who actually hears the reprover;

while the Holy Spirit, who was in His disciples when scattered throughout the whole world, is to be understood as having reprov'd not one nation, but the world? For mark what He said to them when about to ascend into heaven: "It is not for you to know the times or the moments, which the Father hath put in His own power. But ye shall receive the power of the Holy Spirit, that cometh upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth. Surely this is to reprove the world. But would any one venture to say that the Holy Spirit reproveth the world through the disciples of Christ, and that Christ Himself doth not, when the apostle exclaims, "Would ye receive a proof of Him that speaketh in me, namely Christ? And so those, surely, whom the Holy Spirit reproveth, Christ. reproveth likewise. But in my opinion, because there was to be shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Spirit that love which casteth out the fear, that might have hindered them from venturing to reprove the world which bristled with persecutions, therefore it was that He said, "He shall reprove the world: as if He would have said, He shall shed abroad love in your hearts, and, having your fear thereby expelled, ye shall have freedom to reprove. We have frequently said, however, that the operations of the Trinity are inseparable;

but the Persons needed to be set forth one by one, that not only without separating Them, but also without confounding Them together, we may have a right understanding both of Their Unity and Trinity. 2. He next explains what He has said" of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. "Of sin indeed," He says, "because they have believed not on me. For this sin, as if it were the only one, He has put before the others; because with the continuance of this one, all others are retained, and in the removal of this, the others are remitted. "But of righteousness," He adds, "because I go to the Father, and ye shall see me no more. And here we have to consider in the first place, if any one is rightly reprov'd of sin, how he may also be rightly reprov'd of righteousness. For if a sinner ought to be reprov'd just because he is a sinner, will any one imagine that a righteous man is also to be reprov'd because he is righteous? Surely not. For if at any time a righteous man also is reprov'd, he is rightly reprov'd on this account, that, according to Scripture, "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not. And accordingly, when a righteous man is reprov'd, he is reprov'd of sin, and not of righteousness. Since in that divine utterance also, where we read, "Be not

made righteous over-much," there is notice taken, not of the righteousness of the wise man, but of the pride of the presumptuous. The man, therefore, that becomes "righteous over-much," by that very excess becomes unrighteous.

For he makes himself righteous over-much who says that he has no sin, or who imagines that he is made righteous, not by the grace of God, but by the sufficiency of his own will: nor is he righteous through living righteously, but is rather self-inflated with the imagination of being what he is not. By what means, then, is the world to be reproved of righteousness, if not by the righteousness of believers? Accordingly, it is convinced of sin, because it believeth not on Christ; and it is convinced of the righteousness of those who do believe. For the very comparison with believers is itself a reproving of unbelievers. And this the exposition itself sufficiently indicates. For in wishing to open up what He has said, He adds, "Of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye shall see me no more. He does not say, And they shall see me no more; that is, those of whom He had said, "because they have believed not on me. Of them He spake, when expounding what He denominated sin, in the words, "because they have believed not on me; but when expounding what He called righteousness, whereof the world is convicted, He turned to those to whom He was speaking, and said, "because I go to the Father, and ye shall see me no more. Wherefore it is of its own sins, but of others' righteousness, that the world is convicted, just as darkness is reproved by the light:

"For all things," says the apostle, "that are reproved, are made manifest by the light. For the magnitude of the evil chargeable on those who do not believe, may be made apparent not only by itself, but also by the goodness of those who do believe. And since the cry of unbelievers usually is, How can we believe what we do not see so the righteousness of unbelievers just required this very definition, "Because I go to the Father, and ye shall see me no more. For blessed are they who see not, and yet do believe. For of those also who saw Christ, the faith in Him that met with commendation was not that they believed what they saw, namely, the Son of man; but that they believed what they did not see, namely, the Son of God. But after His servant-form was itself also withdrawn from their view, then in every respect was the word truly fulfilled, "The just liveth by faith. For "faith," according to the definition in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "is the confidence of those that hope, the conviction of things that are not seen."

3. But how are we to understand, "Ye shall see me no more"? For He saith not, I go to the Father, and ye shall not see me, so as to be understood as referring to the interval of time when He would not be seen, whether short or long, but at all events terminable; but in saying, "Ye shall see me no more," as if a truth announced beforehand that they would never see Christ in all time coming. Is this the righteousness we speak of, never to see Christ, and yet to believe on Him; seeing that the faith whereby the just liveth is commended on the very ground of believing that the Christ whom it seeth not meanwhile, it shall see some day? Once more, in reference to this righteousness, are we to say that the Apostle Paul was not righteous when confessing that He had seen Christ after His ascension into heaven, which was undoubtedly the time of which He had already said, "Ye shall see me no more"? Was Stephen, that hero of surpassing renown, not righteous in the spirit of this righteousness, who, when they were stoning him, exclaimed, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God"? What, then, is meant by "I go to the Father, and ye shall see me no more," but just this, As I am while with you now? For at that time He was still mortal in the likeness of sinful flesh.

He could suffer hunger and thirst, be wearied, and sleep; and this Christ, that is, Christ in such a condition, they were, no more to see after He had passed from this world to the Father; and such, also, is the righteousness of faith, whereof the apostle says, "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him of no more. This, then, He says, will be your righteousness whereof the world shall be reproved, "because I go to the Father, and ye shall see me no more: seeing that ye shall believe in me as in one whom ye shall not see; and when ye shall see me as I shall be then, we shall not see me as I am while with you meanwhile; ye shall not see me in my humility, but in my exaltation; nor in my mortality, but in my eternity; nor at the bar, but on the throne of judgment: and by this faith of yours, in other words, your righteousness, the Holy Spirit will reprove an unbelieving world.

4. He will also reprove it "of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged. Who is this, save he of whom He saith in another place, "Behold, the prince of the world cometh, and shall find nothing in me; that is, nothing within his jurisdiction, nothing belonging to him; in fact, no sin at all? For thereby is the devil the prince of the world. For it is not of the heavens and of

the earth, and of all that is in them, that the devil is prince, in the sense in which the world is to be understood, when it is said, "And the world was made by Him; but the devil is prince of that world, whereof in the same passage He immediately afterwards subjoins the words, "And the world knew Him not; that is, unbelieving men, wherewith the world through its utmost extent is filled: among whom the believing world groaneth, which He, who made the world, chose out of the world; and of whom He saith Himself, "The Son of man came not to judge the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He is the judge by whom the world is condemned, the helper whereby the world is saved: for just as a tree is full of foliage and fruit, or a field of chaff and wheat, so is the world full of believers and unbelievers.

Therefore the prince of this world, that is, the prince of the darkness thereof, or of unbelievers, out of whose hands that world is rescued, to which it is said, "Ye were at one time darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: the prince of this world, of whom He elsewhere saith, "Now is the prince of this world cast out," is assuredly judged, inasmuch as he is irrevocably destined to the judgment of everlasting fire. And so of this judgment, by which the prince of the world is judged, is the world reprov'd by the Holy Spirit; for it is judged along with its prince, whom it imitates in its own pride and impiety. "For if God," in the words of the Apostle Peter, "spared not the angels that sinned, but thrust them into prisons of infernal darkness, and gave them up to be reserved for punishment in the judgment," how is the world otherwise than reprov'd of this judgment by the Holy Spirit, when it is in the Holy Spirit that the apostle so speaketh? Let men, therefore, believe in Christ, that they be not convicted of the sin of their own unbelief, whereby all sins are retained: let them make their way into the number of believers, that they be not convicted of the righteousness of those, whom, as justified, they fail to imitate: let them beware of that future judgment, that they be not judged with the prince of the world, whom, judged as he is, they continue to imitate.

For the unbending pride of mortals can have no thought of being spared itself, as it is thus called to think with terror of the punishment that overtook the pride of angels.

TRACTATE 96

John XVI. 12, 13. 1. In this portion of the holy Gospel, where the Lord says to His disciples, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear

them now," there meets us first this subject of needful inquiry, how it was that He said a little before, "All things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you," and yet says here, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. But how it was that He spake of what He had not yet done as if it were done, just as the prophet testifies that God has made those things which are still to come, when He says, "Who hath made those things which are still to come," we have already explained as well as we could when dealing with those words themselves. Now, however, you are perhaps wishing to know what those things were which the apostles were then unable to bear. But which of us would venture to assert his own present capacity for what they wanted the ability to receive? And on this account you are neither to expect me to tell you things which perhaps I could not comprehend myself were they told me by another; nor would you be able to bear them, even were I talented enough to let you hear of things that are above your comprehension. It may be, indeed, that some among you are fit enough already to comprehend things which are still beyond the grasp of others;

and if not all about which the divine Master said, "I have yet many things to say unto you," yet perhaps some of them: but what they were which He Himself thus omitted to tell them, it would be rash to have even the wish to presume to say. For at that time the apostles were not yet fitted even to die for Christ, when He said to them, "Ye cannot follow me now," and when the very foremost of them, Peter, who had presumptuously declared that he was already able, met with a different experience from what he anticipated: and yet afterwards a countless number both of men and women, boys and girls, youths and maidens, old and young, were crowned with martyrdom; and the sheep were found able for that which, when the Lord spake these words, the shepherds were still unable to bear. Ought, then, those sheep to have been asked, in that extremity of trial, when required to contend for the truth even unto death, and to shed their blood for the name or doctrine of Christ;—ought they, I say, to have been asked, Which of you would venture to account himself ready for martyrdom, for which Peter was still unfitted, even when taught face to face by the Lord Himself?

In the same way, therefore, one may say that Christian people, even when desiring to hear, ought not to be told what those things are of which the Lord then said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear

them now. If the apostles were still unable, much more so are ye: although it may be that many now can bear what Peter then could not, in the same way as many are able to be crowned with martyrdom which at that time was still beyond the power of Peter, more especially that now the Holy Spirit has been sent, as He was not then, of whom He went on immediately to add the words "Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth," thereby showing of a certainty that they could not bear what He had still to say, because the Holy Spirit had not yet come upon them.

2. Well, then, let us grant that it is so, that many can now bear those things when the Holy Spirit has been sent, which could not then, prior to His coming, be borne by the disciples: do we on that account know what it is that He would not say, as we should know it were we reading or hearing it as uttered by Himself? For it is one thing to know whether we or you could bear it; but quite another to know what it is, whether able to be borne or not. But when He Himself was silent about such things, which of us could say, It is this or that? Or if he venture to say it, how will he prove it? For who could manifest such vanity or recklessness as when saying what he pleased to whom he pleased, even though true, to affirm without any divine authority that it was the very thing which the Lord on that occasion refused to utter? Which of us could do such a thing without incurring the severest charge of rashness, - a thing which gets no countenance from prophetic or apostolic authority?

For surely if we had read any such thing in the books confirmed by canonical authority, which were written after our Lord's ascension, it would not have been enough to have read such a statement, had we not also read in the same place that this was actually one of those things which the Lord was then unwilling to tell His disciples, because they were unable to bear them. As if, for example, I were to say that the words which we read at the opening of this Gospel, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; the same was in the beginning with God: and those which follow, because they were written afterwards, and yet without any mention of their being uttered by the Lord Jesus when He was here in the flesh, but were written by one of His apostles, to whom they were revealed by His Spirit, were some of those which the Lord would not then utter, because the disciples were unable to bear them; who would listen to me in making so rash a statement? But if in the same passage where we read the

one we were also to read the other, who would not give due credence to such an apostle?

3. But it seems to me also very absurd to say that the disciples could not then have borne what we find recorded, about things invisible and of profoundest import, in the apostolic epistles, which were written in after days, and of which there is no mention that the Lord uttered them when His visible presence was with them. For why could they not bear then what is now read in their books, land borne by every one, even though not understood? Some things there are, indeed, in the Holy Scriptures which unbelieving men both have no understanding of when they read or hear them, and cannot bear when they are read or heard: as the pagans, that the world was made by Him who was crucified; as the Jews, that He could be the Son of God, who broke up their mode of observing the Sabbath; as the Sabellians, that the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit are a Trinity; as the Arians, that the Son is equal to the Father, and the Holy Spirit to the Father and Son; as the Photinians, that Christ is not only man like ourselves, but God also, equal to God the Father; as the Manicheans, that Christ Jesus, by whom we must be saved, condescended to be born in the flesh and of the flesh of man:

and all others of divers perverse sects, who can by no means bear whatever is found in the Holy Scriptures and in the Catholic faith that stands out in opposition to their errors, just as we cannot bear their sacrilegious vaporings and mendacious insanities. For what else is it not to be able to bear, but not to retain in our minds with calmness and composure? But what of all that has been written since our Lord's ascension with canonical truth and authority, is it not read and heard with equanimity by every believer, and catechumens also, before in his baptism he receive the Holy Spirit, even although it is not yet understood as it ought to be? How then, could not the disciples bear any of those things which were written after the Lord's ascension, even though the Holy Spirit was not yet sent to them, when now they are all borne by catechumens prior to their reception of the Holy Spirit? For although the sacramental privileges of believers are not exhibited to them, it does not therefore happen that they cannot bear them; but in order that they may be all the more ardently desired by them, they are honorably concealed from their view.

4. Wherefore, beloved, you need not expect to hear from us what the Lord then refrained from telling His disciples, because they were still unable

to bear them: but rather seek to grow in the love that is shed abroad in your hearts by the Holy Spirit who is given unto you; that, fervent in spirit, and loving spiritual things, you may be able, not by any sign apparent to your bodily eyes, or any sound striking on your bodily ears, but by the inward eye-sight and hearing, to become acquainted with that spiritual light and that spiritual word which carnal men are unable to bear. For that cannot be loved which is altogether unknown. But when what is known, in however small a measure, is also loved, by the self-same love one is led on to a better and fuller knowledge. If, then, you grow in the love which the Holy Spirit spreads abroad in your hearts, "He will teach you all truth; or, as other codices have it, "He will guide you in all truth: as it is said, "Lead me in Thy way, O Lord, and I will walk in Thy truth. So shall the result be, that not from outward teachers will you learn those things which the Lord at that time declined to utter, but be all taught of God;

so that the very things which you have learned and believed by means of lessons and sermons supplied from without regarding the nature of God, as incorporeal, and unconfined by limits, and yet not rolled out as a mass of matter through infinite space, but everywhere whole and perfect and infinite, without the gleaming of colors, without the tracing of bodily outlines, without any markings of letters or succession of syllables,-your minds themselves may have the power to perceive. Well, now, I have just said something which is perhaps of that same character, and yet you have received it; and you have not only been able to bear it, but have also listened to it with pleasure. But were that inward Teacher, who, while still speaking in an external way to the disciples, said, "I have still many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now," wishing to speak inwardly to us of what I have said of the incorporeal nature of God in the same way as He speaks to the angels, who always behold the face of the Father we should still be unable to bear them.

Accordingly, when He says, "He will teach you all truth," or "will guide you into all truth," I do not think the fulfillment is possible in any one's mind in this present life(for who is there, while living in this corruptible and soul-oppressing body, that can know all truth, when even the apostle says, "We know in part "?), but because it is effected by the Holy Spirit, of whom we have now received the earnest, that we shall attain also to the actual fullness of knowledge: whereof is said by the same apostle, "But then face to face; and, "Now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am

known; not as a thing which he knows fully in this life, but which, as a thing that would still be future on to the attainment of that perfection, the Lord promised us through the love of the Spirit, when He said, "He will teach you all truth," or "will guide you unto all truth."

5. As these things are so, beloved, I warn you in the love of Christ to beware of impure seducers and sects of obscene filthiness, whereof the apostle says, "But it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret: lest, when they begin to teach their horrible impurities, which no human ear whatever can bear, they declare them to be the very things whereof the Lord said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now;" and assert that it is the Holy Spirit's agency that makes such impure and detestable things possible to be borne. The evil things which no human modesty whatever can endure are of one kind, and of quite another are the good things which man's little understanding is unable to bear: the former are wrought in unchaste bodies, the latter are beyond the reach of all bodies; the one is perpetrated in the filthiness of the flesh, the other is scarcely perceivable by the pure mind. "Be ye therefore renewed in the spirit of your mind," and "understand what is the will of God, which is good, and acceptable, and perfect;" that, "rooted and grounded in love, ye may be able to comprehend, with all saints, what is the length, and breadth, and height, and depth, even to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled with all the fullness of God." For in such a way will the Holy Spirit teach you all truth, when He shall shed abroad that love ever more and more largely in your hearts.

TRACTATE 97

John XVI. 12, 13 (continued). 1. The Holy Spirit, whom the Lord promised to send to His disciples, to teach them all the truth which, at the time He was speaking to them, they were unable to bear: of the which Holy Spirit, as the apostle says, we have now received "the earnest," an expression whereby we are to understand that His fullness is reserved for us till another life: that Holy Spirit, therefore, teacheth believers also in the present life, as far as they can severally apprehend what is spiritual; and enkindles a growing desire in their breasts, according as each one makes progress in that love, which will lead him both to love what he knows already, and to long after what still remains to be known: so that those very things which he has some notion of at present, he may know that he is still ignorant of, as they are yet to be known

in that life which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man hath perceived. But were the inner Master wishing at present to say those things in such a way of knowing, that is, to unfold and make them patent to our mind, our human weakness would be unable to bear them. Whereof you remember, beloved, that I have already spoken, when we were occupied with the words of the holy Gospel, where the Lord says, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.

Not that in these words of the Lord we should be suspecting an over-fastidious concealment of no one knows what secrets, which might be uttered by the Teacher, but could not be borne by the learner, but those very things which in connection with religious doctrine we read and write, hear and speak of, as within the knowledge of such and such persons, were Christ willing to utter to us in the self-same way as He speaks of them to the holy angels, in His own Person as the only-begotten Word of the Father, and co-eternal with Him, where are the human beings that could bear them, even were they already spiritual, as the apostles still were not when the Lord so spoke to them, and as they afterwards became when the Holy Spirit descended? For, of course, whatever may be known of the creature, is less than the Creator Himself, who is the supreme and true and unchangeable God. And yet who keeps silence about Him? Where is His name not found in the mouths of readers, disputants, inquirers, respondents, adorers, singers, all sorts of haranguers, and lastly even of blasphemers themselves? And although no one keeps silence about Him, who is there that apprehends Him as He is to be understood, although He is never out of the mouths and the hearing of men? Who is there, whose keenness of mind can even get near Him? Who is there that would have known Him as the Trinity, had not He Himself desired so to become known?

And what man is there that now holds his tongue about that Trinity; and yet what man is there that has any such idea of it as the angels? The very things, therefore, that are incessantly being uttered off-hand and openly about the eternity, the truth, the holiness of God, are understood well by some, and badly by others: nay rather, are understood by some, and not understood at all by others. For he that understands in a bad way, does not understand at all. And in the case even of those by whom they are understood in a right sense, by some they are perceived with less, by others with greater mental vividness, and by none on earth are apprehended as they are by the

angels. In the very mind, therefore, that is to say, in the inner man, there is a kind of growth, not only in order to the transition from milk to solid food, but also to the taking of food itself in still larger and larger measure. But such growth is not in the way of a space-covering mass of matter, but in that of an illuminated understanding; because that food is itself the light of the understanding.

In order, then, to your growth and apprehension of God, and in order that your apprehension may keep full pace with your ever-advancing growth, you ought to be addressing your prayer, and turning your hope, not to the teacher whose voice only reaches your ears, that is, who plants and waters only by outside labor, but to Him who giveth the increase. 2. Accordingly, as I have admonished you in my last sermon, take heed, those of you specially who are still children and have need of a milk diet, of turning a curious ear to men, who have found occasion for self-deception and the deceiving of others in the words of the Lord, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now," in order to the discovery of that which is unknown, while you still have minds that are incompetent to discriminate between the true and the false; and most especially on account of the obscene lewdnesses which Satan has instilled, by God's permission, into unstable and carnal souls, for this end, that His judgments may everywhere be objects of terror, and that pure discipline may best manifest its sweetness in contrast with the impurities of wickedness; and that honor may be given to Him, and fear and modesty of demeanor assumed by every one, who has either been kept from falling into such evils by His kingly power, or been raised out of them by His uplifting hand. Beware, with fear and prayer, of rushing into that mystery of Solomon's, where "the woman that is foolish and brazen-faced, and become destitute of bread," invites the passers-by with the words, "Come and make a pleasant feast on hidden bread, and the sweetness of stolen waters.

For the woman thus spoken of is the vanity of the impious, who, utterly senseless as they are, fancy that they know something, just as was said of that woman, that she had "become destitute of bread; who, though destitute of a single loaf, promises loaves; in other words, though ignorant of the truth, she promises the knowledge of the truth. But it is bread of a hidden character she promises, and which she declares is partaken of with pleasure, as well as the sweetness of stolen waters; in order that what is publicly forbidden to be

uttered or believed in the Church, may be listened to and acted upon with willingness and relish. For by such secrecy profane teachers give a kind of seasoning to their poisons for the curious, that thereby they may imagine that they learn something great, because counted worthy of holding a secret, and may imbibe the more sweetly the folly which they regard as wisdom, the hearing of which, as a thing prohibited, they are represented as stealing.

3. Hence the system of magical arts commends its nefarious rites to those who are deceived, or ready to be so, by a sacrilegious curiosity. Hence, also, those unlawful divinations by the inspection of the entrails of slain animals, or of the cries and flights of birds, or of multiform demoniacal signs, are distilled by converse with abandoned wretches into the ears of persons who are on the brink of destruction. And it is because of these unlawful and punishable secrets that the woman mentioned above is styled not merely "foolish," but also "audacious." But such things are alien not only to the reality, but to the very name of our religion. And what shall we say of this foolish and brazen-faced woman seasoning, as she does, so many wicked heresies, and serving up so many detestable fables with Christian forms of expression? Would that they were only such as are found in theatres, whether as the subjects of song or dancing, or turned into ridicule by a mimicking buffoonery; and not, some of them, such as makes us grieve at the foolishness, while wondering at the audacity that could have contrived them, against God! And yet all these utterly senseless heretics, who wish to be styled Christians, attempt to color the audacities of their devices, which are perfectly abhorrent to every human feeling, with the chance presented to them of that gospel sentence uttered by the Lord, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now:" as if these were the very things which the apostles could not then bear, and as if the Holy Spirit had taught them what the unclean spirit, with all the length he can carry his audacity, blushes to teach and to preach in broad daylight.

4. It is such whom the apostle foresaw through the Holy Spirit, when he said: "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. For that mentioning of secrecy and theft, whereof it is said, "Partake with pleasure of hidden bread and the sweetness of stolen waters," creates an itching in those who listen with ears that are lusting after spiritual

fornication, just as by a kind of itching also of desire in the flesh the soundness of chastity is corrupted. Hear, therefore, how the apostle foresaw such things, and gave salutary admonition about avoiding them, when he said, "Shun profane novelties of words; for they increase unto much ungodliness, and their speech insinuates itself as cloth a cancer. He did not say novelties of words merely; but added, "profane. For there are also novelties of words in perfect harmony with religious doctrine, as is told us in Scripture of the very name of Christians, when it began to be used. For it was in Antioch that the disciples were first called Christians after the Lord's ascension, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles: and certain houses were afterwards called by the new names of hospices and monasteries; but the things themselves existed prior to their names, and are confirmed by religious truth, which also forms their defense against the wicked.

In opposition also to the impiety of Arian heretics, they coined the new term, *Patris Homousios*; but there was nothing new signified by such a name; for what is called *Homousios* is just this: "I and my Father are one," to wit, of one and the same substance. For if every novelty were profane, as little should we have it said by the Lord, "A new commandment I give unto you; nor would the Testament be called New, nor the new song be sung throughout the whole earth. But there is profanity in the novelties of words, when it is said by "the foolish and audacious woman, Come and enjoy the tasting of hidden bread, and the sweetness of stolen waters. From such enticing words of false science the apostle also gives his prohibitory warning, in the passage where he says, "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane novelties of expression, and oppositions of science falsely so called; which some professing, have erred concerning the faith. For there is nothing that these men so love as to profess science, and to deride as utter silliness faith in those verities which the young are enjoined to believe.

5. But some one will say, Have spiritual men nothing in the matter of doctrine, which they are to say nothing about to the carnal, but to speak out upon to the spiritual? If I shall answer, They have not, I shall be immediately met with the words of the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians: "I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal. As unto babes in Christ I have given you milk to drink, and not meat to eat: for hitherto ye were not able; neither yet now are ye able; for ye are yet carnal;" and with these, "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect;" and with these also,

"Comparing spiritual things with spiritual: but the natural man perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him." The meaning of all this, in order that these words of the apostle may no longer lead to the hankering after secrets through the profane novelties of verbiage, and that what ought always to be shunned by the spirit and body of the chaste may not be asserted as only unable to be borne by the carnal, we shall, with the Lord's permission, make the subject of dissertation in another discourse, so that for the time we may bring the present to a close.

TRACTATE 98

John XVI. 12, 13 (continued). 1. From the words of our Lord, where He says, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now," there arose a difficult question, which I recollect to have put off, that it might be handled afterwards at greater leisure, because my last discourse had reached its proper limits, and required to be brought to a close. And now, accordingly, as we have time to redeem our promise, let us take up its discussion as the Lord Himself shall grant us ability, who put it into our heart to make the proposal. And the question is this: Whether spiritual men have aught in doctrine which they should withhold from the carnal, but declare to the spiritual. For if we shall say, They have not, we shall meet with the reply, What, then, is to be made of the words of the apostle in writing to the Corinthians: "I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal. As unto babes in Christ, I have given you milk to drink, and not meat to eat: for hitherto ye were not able; neither yet now are ye able; for ye are yet carnal?" But if we say, They have, we have cause to fear and take heed, lest under such a pretext detestable doctrines be taught in secret, and under the name of spiritual, as things which cannot be understood by the carnal, may seem not only capable of being whitewashed by plausible excuses, but deserving also to be lauded in preaching.

2. In the first place, then, your Charity ought to know that it is Christ Himself as crucified, wherewith the apostle says that he has fed those who are babes as with milk; but His flesh itself, in which was witnessed His real death, that is, both His real wounds when transfixed and His blood when pierced, does not present itself to the minds of the carnal in the same manner as to that of the spiritual, and so to the former it is milk, and to the latter it is meat; for if they do not hear more than others, they understand better. For the mind has not equal powers of perception even for that which is equally

received by both in faith. And so it happens that the preaching of Christ crucified, by the apostle, was at once to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Gentiles foolishness; and to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, the power of God, and the wisdom of God; but to the carnal, as babes who held it only as a matter of faith, and to the spiritual, as those of greater capacity, who perceived it as a matter of understanding; to the former, therefore, as a milk-draught, to the latter as solid food: not that the former knew it in one way out in the world at large, and the latter in another way in their secret chambers; but that what both heard in the same measure when it was publicly spoken, each apprehended in his own measure.

For inasmuch as Christ was crucified for the very purpose of shedding His blood for the remission of sins, and of divine grace being thereby commended in the passion of His Only-begotten, that no one should glory in man, what understanding had they of Christ crucified who were still saying, "I am of Paul"? Was it such as Paul himself had, who could say, "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ"? In regard, therefore, even to Christ crucified, he himself found food in proportion to his own capacity, and nourished them with milk in accordance with their infirmity. And still further, knowing that what he wrote to the Corinthians might doubtless be understood in one way by those who were still babes, and differently by those of greater capacity, he said, "If any one among you is a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandment of the Lord; but if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant. Assuredly he would have the knowledge of the spiritual to be substantial, wherever not only faith had found a suitable abode, but a certain power of understanding was possessed; and whereby such believed those very things which as spiritual they likewise acknowledged. But "let him be ignorant," he says, who "is ignorant; because it was not yet revealed to him to know that which he believes. When this takes place in a man's mind, he is said to be known of God;

for it is God who endows him with this power of understanding, as it is elsewhere said, "But now, knowing God, or rather, being known of God. For it was not then that God first knew those who were foreknown and chosen before the foundation of the world; but then it was that He made them to know Himself. 3. Having ascertained this, therefore, at the outset, that the very things, which are equally heard by the spiritual and the carnal, are re-

ceived by each according to the slender measure of his own capacity,-by some as babes, by others as those of riper years,-by one as milk nourishment, by another as solid food,-there seems no necessity for any matters of doctrine being retained in silence as secrets, and concealed from infant believers, as things to be spoken of apart to those who are older, or possessed of a riper understanding; and let us regard it as needful to act thus, just because of the words of the apostle, "I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal. For even this very statement of his, that he knew nothing among them but Jesus Christ and Him crucified, he could not speak unto them as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal; because even that they were not able to receive as spiritual. But all who were spiritual among them received with spiritual understanding the very same truths which the others only heard as carnal; and in this way may we understand the words, "I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal," as if he said, What I did speak, ye could not receive as spiritual, but as carnal.

For "the natural man"-that is, the man whose wisdom is of a mere human kind, and is called natural [literally, soulish] from the soul, and carnal from the flesh, because the complete man consists of soul and flesh-"perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; that is, the measure of grace bestowed on believers by the cross of Christ, and thinks that all that is effected by that cross is to provide us with an example for our imitation in contending even to death for the truth. For if men of this type, who have no desire to be aught else than men, knew how it is that Christ crucified is "made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption, that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. they would doubtless no longer glory in man, nor say in a carnal spirit, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas; but in a spiritual way, "I am of Christ."

4. But the question is still further raised by what we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "When now for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again to be taught which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk hath no experience in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are perfect, even those who by habit have their senses exercised to distinguish good from evil. For here we see, as if clearly defined, what he calls the strong meat of the perfect; and

which is the same as that which he writes to the Corinthians, "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect. But who it was that he wished in this passage to be understood as perfect, he proceeded to indicate in the words, "Even those who by habit have their senses exercised to distinguish good from evil. Those, therefore, who, through a weak and undisciplined mind, are destitute of this power, will certainly, unless enabled by what may be called the milk of faith to believe both the invisible things which they see not, and the comprehensible things which they do not yet comprehend, be easily seduced by the promise of science to vain and sacrilegious fables:

so as to think both of good and evil only under corporeal forms, and to have no idea of God Himself save as some sort of body, and be able only to view evil as a substance; while there is rather a kind of falling away from the immutable Substance in the case of all mutable substances, which were made out of nothing by the immutable and supreme substance itself, which is God. And assuredly whoever not only believes, but also through the exercised inner senses of his mind understands, and perceives, and knows this, there is no longer cause for fear that he will be seduced by those who, while accounting evil to be a substance uncreated by God, make God Himself a mutable substance, as is done by the Manicheans, or any other pests, if such there be, that fall into similar folly. 5. But to those who are still babes in mind, and who as carnal, the apostle says, require to be nourished with milk, all discoursing on such a subject, wherein we deal not only with the believing, but also with the understanding and the knowing of what is spoken, must be burdensome, as being still unable to perceive such things, and be more fitted to oppress than to feed them. Whence it comes to pass that the spiritual, while not altogether silent on such subjects to the carnal, because of the Catholic faith which is to be preached to all, yet do not so handle them as, in their wish to simplify them to understandings that are still deficient in capacity, to bring their discourse on the truth into disrepute, rather than the truth that is in their discourse within the perceptions of their hearers. Accordingly in his Epistle to the Colossians he says: "And though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying and beholding your order, and that which is lacking in your faith in Christ. And in that to the Thessalonians: "Night and day," he says, "praying more abundantly, that we might see your face, and might perfect that which is lacking in your faith. Here we are, of course, to understand

those who were under such primary catechetical instruction, as implied their nourishment with milk and not with strong meat;

of the former of which there is mention made in the Epistle to the Hebrews of an abundant supply for such as nevertheless he would now have had to be feeding on solid food. Accordingly he says: "Therefore leaving the word of the beginning of Christ, let us have regard to the completion; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of the baptismal font, and of the laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. This is the copious supply of milk, without which even they cannot live, who have already indeed their reason sufficiently in use to enable them to believe, but who cannot distinguish good from evil, so as to be not only a matter of faith, but also of understanding (which belongs to the department of solid food). But when he includes doctrine also in his description of the milk, it is that which has been delivered to us in the Creed and the Lord's Prayer.

6. But let us be far from supposing that there is any contrariety between this milk and the food of spiritual things that has to be received by the sound understanding, and which was wanting to the Colossians and Thessalonians, and had still to be supplied. For the supply of the deficiency implies no disapproval of that which existed. For even in the very food that we take, so far is there from being any contrariety between milk and solid food, that the latter itself becomes milk, in order to make it suitable to babes, whom it reaches through the medium of the mother's or the nurse's body; so did also mother Wisdom herself, who is solid food in the lofty sphere of angels, condescend in a manner to become milk for babes, when the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us. But the man Christ Himself, who in His true flesh, true cross, true death, and true resurrection is called the pure milk of babes, is, when rightly understood by the spiritual, found to be the Lord of angels. Accordingly, babes are not to be so fed with milk as always to remain without understanding the Godhead of Christ; nor are they to be so withdrawn from milk as to turn their backs on His manhood. And the same thing may also be stated in another way in this manner:

they are neither so to be fed with milk as never to understand Christ as Creator, nor so to be withdrawn from milk as ever to turn their backs on Christ as Mediator. In this respect, indeed, the similitude of maternal milk and solid food scarcely harmonizes with the reality as thus stated, but rather

that of a foundation: for when the child is weaned, so as to be withdrawn from the nourishment of infancy, he never looks again amongst solid food for the breasts which he sucked; but Christ crucified is both milk to sucklings and meat to the more advanced. And the similitude of a foundation is on this account the more suitable, because, for the Completion of the structure, the building is added without the foundation being withdrawn. 7. And since this is the case, do you, whoever you be, who are doubtless many of you still babes in Christ, be making advances towards the solid food of the mind, not of the belly. Grow in the ability to distinguish good from evil, and cleave more and more to the Mediator, who delivers you from evil; which does not admit of a local separation from you, but rather of being healed within you. But whoever shall say to you, Believe not Christ to be truly man, or that the body of any man or animal whatever was created by the true God, or that the Old Testament was given by the true God, and anything else of the same sort, for such things as these were not told you previously, when your nourishment was milk, because your heart was still unfit for the apprehension of the truth: such an one provides you not with meat, but with poison. For therefore it was that the blessed apostle, in addressing those who appeared to him already perfect, even after calling himself imperfect, said, "Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you."

And that they might not rush into the hands of seducers, whose desire would be to turn them away from the faith by promising them the knowledge of the truth, and suppose such to be the meaning of the apostle's words, "God shall reveal even this unto you," he forthwith added, "Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule. If, then, thou hast come to some understanding of what is not at variance with the rule of the Catholic faith, whereto thou hast attained as the way that is guiding thee to thy fatherland; and hast so understood it as to feel it a duty to dismiss all doubts whatever on the subject: add to the building, but do not abandon the foundation. And surely of such a character ought to be any teaching given by elders to those who are babes, as not to involve the assertion that Christ the Lord of all, and the prophets and apostles, who are much farther advanced in age than themselves, had in any respect spoken falsely. And not only ought you to avoid the babbling seducers of the mind, who prate away at their fables and falsehoods, and in such vanities make the promise, forsooth, of

profound science contrary to the rule of faith, which we have accepted as Catholic;

but avoid those also as a still more insidious pest than the others, who discuss truthfully enough the immutability of the divine nature, or the incorporeal creature, or the Creator, and fully prove what they affirm by the most conclusive documents and reasonings, and yet attempt to turn you away from the one Mediator between God and men. For such are those of whom the apostle says, "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God. For what advantage is it to have a true understanding of the immutable Good to one who has no hold of Him by whom there is deliverance from evil? And let not the admonition of the most blessed apostle by any means lose its place in your hearts: "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed. He does not say, More than ye have received; but, 'Other than ye have received. For had he said the former, he would be prejudging himself, inasmuch as he desired to come to the Thessalonians to supply what was lacking in their faith. But one who supplies, adds to what was deficient, without taking away what existed: while he that transgresses the rule of faith, is not progressing in the way, but turning aside from it.

8. Accordingly, when the Lord says, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now," He means that what they were still ignorant of had afterwards to be supplied to them, and not that what they had already learned was to be subverted. And He, indeed, as I have already shown in a former discourse, could so speak, because the very things which He had taught them, had He wished to unfold them to them in the same way as they are conceived in regard to Him by the angels, their still remaining human weakness would be unable to bear. But any spiritual man may teach another man what he knows, provided the Holy Spirit grant him an enlarged capacity for profiting, wherein also the teacher himself may get some further increase, in order that both may be taught of God. Although even among the spiritual themselves there are some, doubtless, who are of greater capacity and in a better condition than others; so that one of them attained even to things of which it is not lawful for a man to speak. Taking advantage of which, there have been some vain individuals, who, with a presumption that betrays the grossest folly, have forged a Revelation of Paul, crammed with all manner of fables, which has been rejected by the orthodox Church;

affirming it to be that whereof he had said that he was caught up into the third heavens, and there heard unspeakable words "which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Nevertheless, the audacity of such might be tolerable, had he said that he heard words which it is not as yet lawful for a man to utter; but when he said, "which it is not lawful for a man to utter," who are they that dare to utter them with such impudence and non-success? But with these words I shall now bring this discourse to a close; whereby I would have you to be wise indeed in that which is good, but untainted by that which is evil.

TRACTATE 99

John XVI. 13. I. What IS this that the Lord said of the Holy Spirit, when promising that He would come and teach His disciples all truth, or, guide them into all truth: "For He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak"? For this is similar to what He said of Himself, "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge. But when expounding that, we said that it might be taken as referring to His human nature; so that He seemed as the Son to announce beforehand that His own obedience, whereby He became obedient even unto the death of the cross, would have its place also in the judgment, when He shall judge the quick and the dead; for He shall do so for the very reason that He is the Son of man. Wherefore He said, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; for in the judgment He will appear, not in the form of God, wherein He is equal to the Father, and cannot be seen by the wicked, but in the form of man, in which He was made even a little lower than the angels; although then He will come in glory, and not in His original humility, yet in a way that will be conspicuous both to the good and to the bad. Hence He says further: "And He hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of man.

In these words of His own it is made clear that it is not that form that will be presented in the judgment, wherein He was when He thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but that which He assumed when He made Himself of no reputation. For He emptied Himself in assuming the form of a servant; in which, also, for the purpose of executing judgment, He seems to have commended His obedience, when He said, "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge. For Adam, by whose disobedience, as that of one man, many were made sinners, did not judge as he heard; for he prevaricated what he heard, and of his own self did the evil that he did; for he did not the

will of God, but his own: while this latter, by whose obedience, as that also of one man, many are made righteous, was not only obedient even unto the death of the cross, in respect of which He was judged as alive from the dead; but promised also that He would be showing obedience in the very judgment itself, wherein He is yet to act as judge of the quick and the dead, when He said, "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge. But when it is said of the Holy Spirit, "For He shall not speak of Himself;

but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak," shall we dare to harbor the notion that it was so said in reference to any human nature of His, or the assumption of any creature-form? For it was the Son alone in the Trinity who assumed the form of a servant, a form which in His case was fitted into the unity of His person, or, in other words, that the one person, Jesus Christ, should be the Son of God and the Son of man; and so that we should be kept from preaching a quaternity instead of the Trinity, which God forbid that we should do. And it is on account of this one personality as consisting of two substances, the divine and the human, that He sometimes speaks in accordance with that wherein He is God, as when He says, "I and my Father are one; and sometimes in accordance with His manhood, as in the words, "For the Father is greater than I; in accordance with which also we have understood those words of His that are at present under discussion, "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge. But in reference to the person of the Holy Spirit, a considerable difficulty arises how we are to understand the words, "For He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak; since in it there exists not one substance of Godhead and another of humanity, or of any other creature whatsoever.

2. For the fact that the Holy Spirit appeared in bodily form, as a dove, was a sight begun and ended at the time: just as also, when He descended upon the disciples, there were seen upon them cloven tongues as of fire, which also sat upon every one of them. Any one, therefore, who says that the dove was connected with the Holy Spirit in the unity of His person, as that it and Godhead (for the Holy Spirit is God) should go to constitute the one person of the Holy Spirit, is compelled also to affirm the same thing of that fire; and so may understand that he ought to assert neither. For those things in regard to the substance of God, which needed at any time to be represented in some outward way, and so exhibited themselves to men's bodily senses, and then passed away, were formed for the moment by divine power from the subser-

vient creation, and not from the dominant nature itself; which, ever abiding the same, excites into action whatever it pleases; and, itself unchangeable, changes all things else at its pleasure. In the same way also did that voice from the cloud actually strike upon the bodily ears, and on that bodily sense which is called the hearing; and yet in no way are we to believe that the Word of God, which is the only-begotten Son, is defined, because He is called the Word, by syllables and sounds:

for when a sermon is in course of delivery, all the sounds cannot be pronounced simultaneously; but the various individual sounds come, as it were, in their own order to the birth, and succeed those which are dying away, so that all that we have to say is completed only by the last syllable. Very different from this, surely, is the way in which the Father speaketh to the Son, that is to say, God to God, His Word. But this, so far as it can be understood by man, is a matter for the understanding of those who are fitted for the reception of solid food, and not of milk. Since, therefore, the Holy Spirit became not man by any assumption of humanity, and became not an angel by any assumption of angelic nature, and as little entered into the creature-state by the assumption of any creature-form whatever, how, in regard to Him, are we to understand those words of our Lord, "For He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak"? A difficult question; yea, too difficult. May the Spirit Himself be present, that, at least up to the measure of our power of thinking on such a subject, we may be able to express our thoughts, and that these, according to the little measure of my ability, may find entrance into your understanding.

3. You ought, then, to be informed in the first place, and, those of you who can, to understand, and the others, who cannot as yet understand, to believe, that in that substantial essence, which is God, the senses are not, as if through some material structure of a body, distributed in their appropriate places; as, in the mortal flesh of all animals there is in one place sight, in another hearing, in another taste, in another smelling, and over the whole the sense of touch. Far be it from us to believe so in the case of that incorporeal and immutable nature. In it, therefore, hearing and seeing are one and the same thing. In this way smelling also is said to exist in God; as the apostle says, "As Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor." And taste may be included, in accordance with which God hateth the bitter in temper, and

spueth out of His mouth those who are lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot: and Christ our God saith, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me.." There is also that divine sense of touch, in accordance with Which the spouse saith of the bridegroom: "His left hand is under my head, and his right hand shall embrace me." But these are not in God's case in different parts of the body. For when He is said to know, all are included: both seeing, and hearing, and smelling, and tasting, and touching; without any alteration of His substance, and without the existence of any material element which is greater in one place and smaller in another: and when there are any such thoughts of God in those even who are old in years, they are the thoughts only of a childish mind.

4. Nor need you wonder that the ineffable knowledge of God, whereby He is cognizant of all things, is, because of the various modes of human speech designated by the names of all those bodily senses; since even our own mind, in other words, the inner man,-to which, while itself exercising its knowing faculty in one uniform way, the different subjects of its knowledge are communicated by those five messengers, as it were, of the body, when it understands, chooses, and loves the unchangeable truth,-is said both to see the light, whereof it is said, "That was the true light; and to hear the word, whereof it is said, "In the beginning was the Word; and to be susceptible of smell, of which it is said, "We will run after the smell of thy ointments; and to drink of the fountain, whereof it is said, "With Thee is the fountain of life; and to enjoy the sense of touch, when it is said, "But it is good for me to cleave unto God; in all of which it is not different things, but the one intelligence, that is expressed by the names of so many senses. When, therefore, it is said of the Holy Spirit, "For He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak," so much the more is a simple nature, which is simple [uncompounded] in the truest sense, to be either understood or believed, which in its extent and sublimity far surpasses the nature of our minds.

For there is mutability in our mind, which comes by learning to the perception of what it was previously ignorant of, and loses by unlearning what it formerly knew; and is deceived by what has a similarity to truth, so as to approve of the false in place of the true, and is hindered by its own obscurity as by a kind of darkness from arriving at the truth. And so that substance is not in the truest sense simple, to which being is not identical with knowing; for

it can exist without the possession of knowledge. But it cannot be so with that divine substance, for it is what it has. And on this account it has not knowledge in any such way as that the knowledge whereby it knows should be to it one thing, and the essence whereby it exists another; but both are one. Nor ought that to be called both, which is simply one. "As the Father hath life in Himself," and He Himself is not something different from the life that is in Him; "so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself," that is, hath begotten the Son, that He also should Himself be the life. Accordingly we ought to accept what is said of the Holy Spirit, "For he shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak," in such a way as to understand thereby that He is not of Himself. Because it is the Father only who is not of another.

For the Son is born of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father; but the Father is neither born of, nor proceedeth from, another. And yet surely there should not on that account occur to human thought any idea of disparity in the supreme Trinity; for both the Son is equal to Him of whom He is born, and the Holy Spirit to Him from whom He proceedeth. But what difference there is in such a case between proceeding and being born, would be too lengthy to make the subject of inquiry and dissertation, and would make our definition liable to the charge of rashness, even after we had discussed it; for such a thing is of the utmost difficulty, both for the mind to comprehend in any adequate way, and even were it so that the mind has attained to any such comprehension, for the tongue to explain, however able the one that presides as a teacher, or he that is present as a hearer. Accordingly, "He shall not speak of Himself; because He is not of Himself." But whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak: He shall hear of Him from whom He proceedeth. To Him hearing is knowing; but knowing is being, as has been discussed above. Because, then, He is not of Himself, but of Him from whom He proceedeth, and of whom He has essence, of Him He has knowledge; from Him, therefore, He has hearing, which is nothing else than knowledge.

5. And be not disturbed by the fact that the verb is put in the future tense. For it is not said, whatsoever He hath heard, or, whatsoever He heareth; but, "whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak. For such hearing is everlasting, because the knowing is everlasting. But in the case of what is eternal, without beginning and without end, in whatever tense the verb is put,

whether in the past, or present, or future, there is no falsehood thereby implied. For although to that immutable and ineffable nature, there is no proper application of Was and Will be, but only Is: for that nature alone is in truth, because incapable of change; and to it therefore was it exclusively suited to say, "I Am That I Am," and "Thou shall say unto the children of Israel, He Who Is hath sent me unto you: yet on account of the changeableness of the times amid which our mortal and changeable life is spent, there is nothing false in our saying, both it was, and will be, and is. It was in past, it is in present, it will be in future ages. It was, because it never was wanting; it will be, because it will never be wanting; it is, because it always is. For it has not, like one who no longer survives, died with the past; nor, like one who abideth not, is it gliding away with the present; nor, as one who had no previous existence, will it rise up with the future.

Accordingly, as our human manner of speaking varies with the revolutions of time, He, who through all times was not, is not, and will not by any possibility be found wanting, may correctly bespoken of in any tense whatever of a verb. The Holy Spirit, therefore, is always hearing, because He always knows: ergo, He both knew, and knows, and will know; and in the same way He both heard, and hears, and will hear; for, as we have already said, to Him hearing is one with knowing, and knowing with Him is one with being. From Him, therefore, He heard, and hears, and will hear, of whom He is; and of Him He is, from whom He proceeds. 6. Some one may here inquire whether the Holy Spirit proceedeth also from the Son. For the Son is Son of the Father alone, and the Father is Father of the Son alone; but the Holy Spirit is not the Spirit of one of them, but of both. You have the Lord Himself saying, "For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you; and you have the apostle, "God hath sent forth the spirit of His Son into your hearts. Are there, then, two, the one of the Father, the other of the Son? Certainly not. For there is "one body," he said, when referring to the Church; and presently added, "and one Spirit. And mark how he there makes up the Trinity." As ye are called," he says, "in one hope of your calling. "One Lord," where he certainly meant Christ to be understood; but it remained that he should also name the Father: and accordingly there follows, "One faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. And since, then, just as there is one Father, and one Lord, namely, the Son, so also there is one Spirit; He is doubtless of

both: especially as Christ Jesus Himself saith, "The Spirit of your Father that dwelleth in you; and the apostle declares, "God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts.

You have the same apostle saying in another place, "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you," where he certainly intended the Spirit of the Father to be understood; of whom, however, he says in another place, "But if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His. And many other testimonies there are, which plainly show that He, who in the Trinity is styled the Holy Spirit, is the Spirit both of the Father and of the Son. 7. And for no other reason, I suppose, is He called in a peculiar way the Spirit; since though asked concerning each person in His turn, we cannot but admit that the Father and the Son are each of them a Spirit; for God is a Spirit, that is, God is not carnal, but spiritual. By the name, therefore, which they each also hold in common, it was requisite that He should be distinctly called, who is not the one nor the other of them, but in whom what is common to both becomes apparent. Why, then, should we not believe that the Holy Spirit proceedeth also from the Son, seeing that He is likewise the Spirit of the Son? For did He not so proceed, He could not, when showing Himself to His disciples after the resurrection, have breathed upon them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit. For what else was signified by such a breathing upon them, but that from Him also the Holy Spirit proceedeth? And of the same character also are His words regarding the woman that suffered from the bloody flux: "Some one hath touched me; for I perceive that virtue is gone out of me. For that the Holy Spirit is also designated by the name of virtue, is both clear from the passage where the angel, in reply to Mary's question, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? said, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power [virtue] of the highest shall overshadow thee;

and our Lord Himself when giving His disciples the promise of the Spirit, said, "But tarry ye in the city, until ye be endued with power [virtue] from on high; and on another occasion, "Ye shall receive the power [virtue] of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me. It is of this virtue that we are to believe, that the evangelist says, "Virtue went out of Him, and healed them all." 8. If, then, the Holy Spirit proceedeth both from the Father and from the Son, why said the Son, "He proceedeth from the Father"? Why, do you think, but just because it is to Him He is wont to at-

tribute even that which is His own, of whom He Himself also is? Hence we have Him saying, "My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me." If, therefore, in such a passage we are to understand that as His doctrine, which nevertheless He declared not to be His own, but the Father's, how much more in that other passage are we to understand the Holy Spirit as proceeding from Himself, where His words, "He proceedeth from the Father," were uttered so as not to imply, He proceedeth not from me? But from Him, of whom the Son has it that He is God (for He is God of God), He certainly has it that from Him also the Holy Spirit proceedeth: and in this way the Holy Spirit has it of the Father Himself, that He should also proceed from the Son, even as He proceedeth from the Father.

9. In connection with this, we come also to some understanding of the further point, that is, so far as it can be understood by such beings as ourselves, why the Holy Spirit is not said to be born, but to proceed: since, if He also were called by the name of Son, He could not avoid being called the Son of both, which is utterly absurd. For no one is a son of two, unless of a father and mother. But it would be utterly abhorrent to entertain the suspicion of any such intervention between God the Father and God the Son. For not even a son of human parents proceedeth at the same time from father and from mother: but at the time that he proceedeth from the father into the mother, it is not then that he proceedeth from the mother; and when he cometh forth from the mother into the light of day, it is not then that he proceedeth from the father. But the Holy Spirit proceedeth not from the Father into the Son, and then proceedeth from the Son to the work of the creature's sanctification; but He proceedeth at the same time from both: although this the Father hath given unto the Son, that He should proceed from Him also, even as He proceedeth from Himself. And as little can we say that the Holy Spirit is not the life, seeing that the Father is the life, and the Son is the life.

And in the same way as the Father, who hath life in Himself, hath given to the Son also to have life in Himself; so hath He also given that life should proceed from Him, even as it also proceedeth from Himself. But we come now to the words of our Lord that follow, when He saith: "And He will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore, said I, that He shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you. But as the

present discourse has already been protracted to some length, they must be left over for another.

TRACTATE 100

John XVI. 13-15 (continued). 1. When our Lord gave the promise of the coming of His Holy Spirit, He said, "He shall teach you all truth," or, as we read in some copies, "He shall guide you into all truth. For He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak. On these Gospel words we have already discoursed as the Lord enabled us; and now give your attention to those that follow. "And He will show you," He said, "things to come. Over this, which is perfectly plain, there is no need to linger; for it contains no question that demands from us any regular exposition. But the words that He proceeds to add, "He shall make me clearly known; for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you," are not to be carelessly passed over. For by the words, "He shall make me clearly known," we may understand, that by shedding abroad [God's] love in the hearts of believers, and making them spiritual, He showed them how it was that the Son was equal to the Father, whom previously they had only known according to the flesh, and as men themselves had thought of Him only as man. Or at least that, filled themselves through that very love with boldness, and divested of all fear, they might proclaim Christ unto men; and so His fame be spread abroad through the whole world.

So that He said, "He shall make me clearly known," as if meaning, He shall free you from fear, and endow you with a love that will so inflame your zeal in preaching me, that you will send forth the odor, and commend the honor of, my glory throughout the world. For what they were to do in the Holy Spirit, He said that the Spirit Himself would also do, as is implied in the words, "For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you. The Greek word, indeed, which is *docaQei*, has been rendered by the Latin interpreters in their respective translations, *clarificabit* ("shall make clearly known") by one, and *glorificabit* ("shall glorify") by another: for the idea expressed in Greek by the one term *doca*, from which is derived the verb *docaQei*, may be interpreted both by *claritas* (brightness) and *gloria* (glory). For by glory every one becomes bright, and glorious by brightness; and hence what is signified by both words, is one and the same thing. And, as the most famous writers of the Latin tongue in olden time have defined it, glory is the generally diffused and accepted fame of any one accompanied with

praise. But when this happened in the world in regard to Christ, we are not to suppose that it was the bestowing of any great thing on Christ, but on the world. For to praise what is good is not of benefit to that which receives, but to those who give the commendation.

2. But there is also a false glory, when the praise given is the result of a mistake, whether in regard to things or to persons, or to both. For men are mistaken in regard to things, when they think that to be good which is evil; and in regard to persons, when they think one to be good who is evil; and in regard to both, when what is actually a vice is esteemed a virtue; and when he who is praised for something is destitute of what he is supposed to have, whether he be good or evil. To credit vain-glorious persons with the things they profess, is surely a huge vice, and not a virtue; and yet you know how common is the laudatory fame of such; for, as Scripture says, "The sinner is praised in the desires of his soul, and he who practises iniquity is blessed. Here those who praise are not mistaken in the persons, but in the things; for that is evil which they believe to be good. But those who are morally corrupted with the evil of prodigality are undoubtedly such as those who praise them do not simply suspect, but perceive them to be.

But further, if one feign himself a just man, and be not so, but, as regards all that he seems to do in a praiseworthy way in the sight of men, does it not for God's sake, that is, for the sake of true righteousness, but makes glory from men the only glory he seeks and hankers after; while those with whom his extolled fame is generally accepted think of him only as living in a praiseworthy way for God's sake, -they are not mistaken in the thing, but are deceived in the person. For that which they believe to be good, is good; but the person whom they believe to be good, is the reverse. But if, for example, skill in magical arts be esteemed good, and any one, so long as he is believed to have delivered his country by those same arts whereof all the while he is utterly ignorant, attain amongst the irreligious to that generally accepted renown which is defined as glory, those who so praise err in both respects; to wit, both in the thing, for they esteem that good which is evil; and in the person, for he is not at all what they suppose him. But when, in regard to any one who is righteous by God's grace and for God's sake, in other words, truly righteous, there is on account of that very righteousness a generally accepted fame of a laudatory kind, then the glory is indeed a true one;

and yet we are not to suppose that thereby the righteous man is made blessed, but rather those who praise him are to be congratulated, because they judge rightly, and love the righteous. And how much more, then, did Christ the Lord, by His own glory, benefit, not Himself, but those whom He also benefited by His death? 3. But that is not a true glory which He has among heretics, with whom, nevertheless, He appears to have a generally accepted fame accompanied with praise. Such is no true glory, because in both respects they are mistaken, for they both think that to be good which is not good, and they suppose Christ to be what Christ is not. For to say that the only-begotten Son is not equal to Him that begat, is not good: to say that the only-begotten Son of God is man only, and not God, is not good: to say that the flesh of the Truth is not true flesh, is not good. Of the three doctrines which I have stated, the first is held by the Arians, the second by the Photinians, and the third by the Manicheans. But inasmuch as there is nothing in any of them that is good, and Christ has nothing to do with them, in both respects they are in the wrong; and they attach no true glory to Christ, although there may appear to be amongst them a generally accepted fame regarding Christ of a laudatory character. And accordingly all heretics together, whom it would be too tedious to enumerate, who have not right views regarding Christ, err on this account, that their views are untrue regarding both good things and evil.

The pagans, also, of whom great numbers are lauders of Christ, are themselves also mistaken in both respects, saying, as they do, not in accordance with the truth of God, but rather with their own conjectures, that He was a magician. For they reproach Christians as being destitute of skill; but Christ they laud as a magician, and so betray what it is that they love: Christ indeed they do not love, since what they love is that which Christ never was. And thus, then, in both respects they are in error, for it is wicked to be a magician; and as Christ was good, He was not a magician. Wherefore, as we have nothing to say in this place of those who malign and blaspheme Christ, -for it is of His glory we speak, wherewith He was glorified in the world, -it was only in the holy Catholic Church that the Holy Spirit glorified Him with His true glory. For elsewhere, that is, either among heretics or certain pagans, the glory He has in the world cannot be a true one, even where there is a generally accepted fame of Him accompanied with praise. His true glory, therefore, in the Catholic Church is celebrated in these words by the proph-

et: "Be thou exalted, O God, above the heavens; and Thy glory above all the earth. Accordingly, that after His exaltation the Holy Spirit was to come, and to glorify Him, the sacred psalm, and the Only-begotten Himself, promised as an event of the future, which we see accomplished.

4. But when He says, "He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you," listen thereto with Catholic ears, and receive it with Catholic minds. For not surely on that account, as certain heretics have imagined, is the Holy Spirit inferior to the Son; as if the Son received from the Father, and the Holy Spirit from the Son, in reference to certain gradations of natures. Far be it from us to believe this, or to say it, and from Christian hearts to think it. In fine, He Himself straightway solved the question, and explained why He said so. "All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore, said I, that He shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." What would you more? The Holy Spirit thus receives of the Father, of whom the Son receives; for in this Trinity the Son is born of the Father, and from the Father the Holy Spirit proceedeth. He, however, who is born of none, and proceedeth from none, is the Father alone. But in what sense it is that the only-begotten Son said, "All things that the Father hath are mine" (for it certainly was not in the same sense as when it was said to that son, who was not only begotten, but the elder of two, "Thou art ever with me; and all that I have is thine)," will have our careful consideration, if the Lord so will, in connection with the passage where the Only-begotten saith to the Father, "And all mine are Thine, and Thine are mine;" so that our present discourse may be here brought to a close, as the words that follow require a different opening for their discussion.

TRACTATE 101

John XVI. 16-23. 1. These words of the Lord, when He says, "A little while, and ye shall no more see me: and again a little while, and ye shall see me; because I go to the Father," were so obscure to the disciples, before what He thus says was actually fulfilled, that they inquired among themselves what it was that He said, and had to confess themselves utterly ignorant. For the Gospel proceeds, "Then said some of His disciples among themselves, What is this that He saith unto us, A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again a little while, and ye shall see me; and, Because I go to the Father? They said therefore, What is this that He saith, A little while we know not what He saith." This is what moved them, that He said, "A little while, and ye shall

not see me: and again a little while, and ye shall see me." For in what precedes, because He had not said, "A little while," but only, "I go to the Father and ye shall see me no more," He appeared to them to have spoken, as it were, quite plainly, and they had no inquiry among themselves, regarding it. But now, what was then obscure to them, and was shortly afterwards revealed, is already perfectly manifest to us: for after a little while He suffered, and they saw Him not; again, after a little while He rose, and they saw Him. But how the words are to be taken that He used, "Ye shall no more see me," inasmuch as by the word "more" He wished it to be understood that they would not see Him afterwards, we have explained at the passage where He said, The Holy Spirit "shall convince of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye shall see me no more;" meaning thereby, that they would never afterwards see Christ in His present state of subjection to death.

2. "Now Jesus knew," as the evangelist proceeds to say, "that they were desirous to ask Him, and said unto them, Ye inquire among yourselves of that I said, A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again a little while, and ye shall see me. Verily verily, I say unto you, That ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice; and ye shall be sorrowful, but your sorrow shall be turned into joy:" which may be understood in this way, that the disciples were thrown into sorrow over the death of the Lord, and straightway were filled with joy at His resurrection; but the world, whereby are signified the enemies that slew Christ, were, of course, in a state of rapture over the murder of Christ, at the very time when the disciples were filled with sorrow. For by the name of the world the wickedness of this world may be understood; in other words, those who are the friends of this world. As the Apostle James says in his epistle, "Whosoever will be a friend of this world, is become the enemy of God;" for the effect of that enmity to God was, that not even His Only-begotten was spared.

3. And then He goes on to say, "A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow, because her hour is come: but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world. And ye now therefore have sorrow; but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you." Nor does the metaphor here employed seem difficult to understand; for its key is at hand in the exposition given by Himself of its meaning. For the pangs of parturition are compared to sorrow, and the birth itself to joy; which is usually all

the greater when it is not a girl but a boy that is born. But when He said, "Your joy no man taketh from you," for their joy was Jesus Himself, there is implied what was said by the apostle, "Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; and death shall have no more dominion over Him."

4. Hitherto in this section of the Gospel, whereon we are discoursing to-day, the tenor of everything has been, I may say, of easy understanding: a much closer attention is needful in connection with the words that follow. For what does He mean by the words, "And in that day ye shall ask me nothing"? The verb to ask, used here, means not only to beg of, but also to question; and the Greek Gospel, of which this is a translation, has a word that may also be understood in both senses, so that by it the ambiguity is not removed; and even though it were so, every difficulty would not thereby disappear. For we read that the Lord Christ, after He rose again, was both questioned and petitioned. He was asked by the disciples, on the eve of His ascension into heaven, when He would be manifested, and when the kingdom of Israel would come; and even when already in heaven, He was petitioned [asked] by St. Stephen to receive his spirit. And who dare either think or say that Christ ought not to be asked, sitting as He does in heaven, and yet was asked while He abode on earth? or that He ought not to be asked in His state of immortality, although it was men's duty to ask Him while still in His state of subjection to death? Nay, beloved, let us ask Him to untie with His own hands the knot of our present inquiry, by so shining into our hearts that we may perceive what He saith.

5. For I think that His words, "But I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you," are not to be referred to the time of His resurrection, and when He showed them His flesh to be looked at and handled; but rather to that of which He had already said, "He that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. For He had already risen, He had already shown Himself to them in the flesh, and He was already sitting at the right hand of the Father, when that same Apostle John, whose Gospel this is, says in his epistle, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is. That vision belongs not to this life, but to the future; and is not temporal, but eternal. "And this is life eternal," in the words of Him who is that life, "that they might know Thee the only

true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent. Of this vision and knowledge the apostle says, "Now we see through a glass, in a riddle; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known."

At present the Church is in travail with the longing for this fruit of all her labor, but then she shall bring to the birth in its actual contemplation; now she travails in birth with groaning, then shall she bring forth in joy; now she travails in birth through her prayers, then shall she bring forth in her praises. Thus, too, is it a male child; since to such fruit in the contemplation are all the duties of her present conduct to be referred. For He alone is free; because He is desired on His own account, and not in reference to aught besides. Such conduct is in His service; for whatever is done in a good spirit has a reference to Him, because it is done on His behalf; while He, on the other hand, is got and held in possession on His own account, and not on that of aught besides. And there, accordingly, we find the only end that is satisfying to ourselves. He will therefore be eternal; for no end can satisfy us, save that which is found in Him who is endless. With this was Philip inspired, when he said, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. And in that showing the Son gave promise also of His own presence, when He said, "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? Of that, therefore, which alone sufficeth us, we are very appropriately informed, "Your joy no man taketh from you."

6. On this point, also, in reference to what has been said above, I think we may get a still better understanding of the words, "A little while, and ye shall no more see me: and again a little while, and ye shall see me. For the whole of that space over which the present dispensation extends, is but a little while; and hence this same evangelist says in his epistle, "It is the last hour. For in this sense also He added, "Because I go to the Father," which is to be referred to the preceding clause, where He saith, "A little while, and ye shall no more see me; and not to the subsequent, where He saith, "And again a little while, and ye shall see me. For by His going to the Father, He was to bring it about that they should not see Him. And on this account, therefore, His words did not mean that He was about to die, and to be withdrawn from their view till His resurrection; but that He was about to go to the Father, which He did after His resurrection, and when, after holding intercourse with them for forty days, He ascended into heaven. He therefore addressed the words, "A little while, and ye shall no more see me," to those who saw

Him at the time in bodily form; because He was about to go to the Father, and never thereafter to be seen in that mortal state wherein they now beheld Him when so addressing them.

But the words that He added, "And again a little while, and ye shall see me," He gave as a promise to the Church universal: just as to it, also, He gave the other promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world. The Lord is not slack concerning His promise: a little while, and we shall see Him, where we shall have no more any requests to make, any questions to put; for nothing shall remain to be desired, nothing lie hid to be inquired about. This little while appears long to us, because it is still in continuance; when it is over, we shall then feel what a little while it was. Let not, then, our joy be like that of the world, whereof it is said, "But the world shall rejoice; and yet let not our sorrow in travailing in birth with such a desire be unmingled with joy; but, as the apostle says, be "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation; for even the woman in travail, to whom we are compared, has herself more joy over the offspring that is soon to be, than sorrow over her present pains. But let us here close our present discourse, for the words that follow contain a very trying question, and must not be unduly curtailed, so that they may, if the Lord will, obtain a more befitting explanation.

TRACTATE 102

John XVI. 23-28 1. We have now to consider these words of the Lord, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, If ye shall ask anything of the Father in my name, He will give it you. It has already been said in the earlier portions of this discourse of our Lord's, on account of those who ask some things of the Father in Christ's name and receive them not, that there is nothing asked of the Father in the Saviour's name that is asked in contrariety to the method of salvation. For it is not the sound of the letters and syllables, but what the sound itself imports, and what is rightly and truly to be understood by that sound, that He is to be regarded as declaring, when He says, "in my name. Hence, he who has such ideas of Christ as ought not to be entertained of the only Son of God, asketh not in His name, even though he may not abstain from the mention of Christ in so many letters and syllables; since it is only in His name he asketh, of whom he is thinking when he asketh. But he who has such ideas of Him as ought to be entertained, asketh in His name, and receiveth what he asketh, if he asketh nothing that is contrary to his own everlasting salvation. And he receiveth it when he ought to receive it. For

some things are not refused, but are delayed till they can be given at a suitable time.

In this way, surely, we are to understand His words, "He will give you," so that thereby we may know that those benefits are signified which are properly applicable to those who ask. For all the saints are heard effectively in their own behalf, but are not so heard in behalf of all besides, whether friends or enemies, or any others: for it is not said in a general kind of way, "He will give; but, "He will give you." 2. "Hitherto," He says, "ye have not asked anything in my name. Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full. This that He calls a full joy is certainly no carnal joy, but a spiritual one; and when it shall be so great as to be no longer capable of any additions to it, it will then doubtless be full. Whatever, then, is asked as belonging to the attainment of this joy, is to be asked in the name of Christ, if we understand the grace of God, and if we are truly in quest of a blessed life. But if aught different from this is asked, there is nothing asked: not that the thing itself is nothing at all, but that in comparison with what is so great, anything else that is coveted is virtually nothing. For, of course, the man is not actually nothing, of whom the apostle says, "He who thinketh himself to be something, when he is nothing. But surely in comparison with the spiritual man, who knows that by the grace of God he is what he is, he who makes vain assumptions is nothing. In this way, then, may the words also be rightly understood, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if ye shall ask anything of the Father in my name, He will give [it] you; that by the words, "if anything," should not be understood anything whatever, but anything that is not really nothing in connection with the life of blessedness.

And what follows, "Hitherto ye have not asked anything in my name," may be understood in two ways: either, that ye have not asked in my name, because a name that ye have not known as it is yet to be known; or, ye have not asked anything, since in comparison with that which ye ought to have asked, what ye have asked is to be accounted as nothing. In order, then, that they may ask in His name, not that which is nothing, but a full joy (since anything different from this that they ask is virtually nothing), He addresses to them the exhortation, "Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full; that is, ask this in my name, that your joy may be full, and ye shall receive. For His saints, who persevere in asking such a good thing as this, will in no wise be defrauded by the mercy of God.

3. "These things," said He, "have I spoken to you in proverbs: but the hour cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you plainly of my Father." I might be disposed to say that this hour, whereof He speaketh, must be understood as that future period when we shall see openly, as the blessed Paul says, "face to face;" that what He says, "These things have I spoken to you in proverbs," is one with what has been said by the same apostle, "Now we see through a glass, in a riddle:" and "I will show you," because the Father shall be seen through the instrumentality of the Son, is akin to what He says elsewhere, "Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and [he] to whom the Son shall be pleased to reveal Him." But such a sense seems to be interfered with by that which follows: "At that day ye shall ask in my name." For in that future world, when we have reached the kingdom where we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is, what shall we then have to ask, when our desire shall be satisfied with good things? As it is also said in another psalm: "I shall be satisfied when Thy glory shall be revealed." For petition has to do with some kind of want, which can have no place there where such abundance shall reign.

4. It remains, therefore, for us, so far as my capacity to apprehend it goes, to understand Jesus as having promised that He would cause His disciples, from being carnal and natural, to become spiritual, although not yet such as we shall be, when a spiritual body shall also be ours; but such as was he who said, "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect; and, "I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal; and, "We have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God. And thus the natural man, perceiving not the things of the Spirit of God, hears in such a way whatever is told him of the nature of God, that he can conceive of nothing else but some bodily form, however spacious or immense, however lustrous and magnificent, yet still a body: and therefore he holds as proverbs all that is said of the incorporeal and immutable substance of wisdom; not that he accounts them as proverbs, but that his thoughts follow the same direction as those who habitually listen to proverbs without understanding them.

But when the spiritual man begins to discern all things, and he himself is discerned by no man, he perceives, even though in this life it still be through a glass and in part, not by any bodily sense, and not by any imaginative conception which catches at or devises the likenesses of all sorts of bodies, but by the clearest understanding of the mind, that God is not material, but spiritual: in such a way does the Son show us openly of the Father, that He, who thus shows, is also Himself seen to be of the same substance. And then it is that those who ask, ask in His name; for in the sound of that name they understand nothing else than what the reality is that is called by that name, and harbor not, in vanity or infirmity of mind, the fiction of the Father being in one place, and the Son in another, standing before the Father and making request in our behalf, with the material substances of both occupying each its own place, and the Word pleading verbally for us with Him whose Word He is, while a definite space interposes between the mouth of the speaker and the ears of the hearer; and other such absurdities which those who are natural, and at the same time carnal, fabricate for themselves in their hearts.

For any such thing, suggested by the experience of bodily habits, as occurs to spiritual men when thinking of God, they deny and reject, and drive away, like troublesome insects, from the eyes of their mind; and resign themselves to the purity of that light by whose testimony and judgment they prove these bodily images that thrust themselves on their inward vision to be altogether false. These are able to a certain extent to think of our Lord Jesus Christ, in respect of His manhood, as addressing the Father on our behalf; but in respect to His Godhead, as hearing [and answering] us along with the Father. And this I am of opinion that He indicated, when He said, "And I say not that I will pray the Father for you. But the intuitive perception of this, how it is that the Son asketh not the Father, but that Father and Son alike listen to those who ask, is a height that can be reached only by the spiritual eye of the mind.

5. "For the Father Himself," He says, "loveth you, because ye have loved me." Is it the case, then, that He loveth, because we love; or rather, that we love, because He loveth? Let this same evangelist give us the answer out of his own epistle: "We love Him," he says, "because He first loved us." This, then, was the efficient cause of our loving, that we were loved. And certainly to love God is the gift of God. He it was that gave the grace to love Him, who

loved while still unloved. Even when displeasing Him we were loved, that there might be that in us whereby we should become pleasing in His sight. For we could not love the Son unless we loved the Father also. The Father loveth us, because we love the Son; seeing it is of the Father and Son we have received [the power] to love both the Father and the Son: for love is shed abroad in our hearts by the Spirit of both, by which Spirit we love both the Father and the Son, and whom we love along with the Father and the Son. God, therefore, it was that wrought this religious love of ours whereby we worship God; and He saw that it is good, and on that account He Himself loved that which He had made. But He would not have wrought in us something He could love, were it not that He loved ourselves before He wrought it.

6. "And ye have believed," He adds, "that I came out from God. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world, and go to the Father." Clearly we have believed. For surely it ought not to be accounted a thing incredible because of this, that in coming to the world He came forth in such a sense from the Father that He did not leave the Father behind; and that, on leaving the world, He goes to the Father in such a sense that He does not actually forsake the world. For He came forth from the Father because He is of the Father; and He came into the world, in showing to the world His bodily form, which He had received of the Virgin. He left the world by a bodily withdrawal, He proceeded to the Father by His ascension as man, but He forsook not the world in the ruling activity of His presence.

TRACTATE 103

John XVI. 29-33. 1. The inward state of Christ's disciples, when before His passion He talked with them as with children of great things, but in such a way as befitted the great things to be spoken to children, because, having not yet received the Holy Spirit, as they did after His resurrection, either by His own breathing upon them, or by descent from above, they had a mental capacity for the human rather than the divine,-is everywhere declared through the Gospel by numerous testimonies; and of a piece therewith, is what they said in the lesson before us. For, says the evangelist, "His disciples say unto Him: Lo, now speakest Thou plainly, and utterest no proverb. Now we are sure that Thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask Thee: by this we believe that Thou camest forth from God. The Lord Him-

self had said shortly before, "These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs: the hour cometh, when I shall no more speak to you in proverbs. How, then, say they, "Lo, now speakest Thou plainly, and utterest no proverb"? Was the hour, indeed, already come, when He had promised that He would nomore speak unto them in proverbs? Certainly that such an hour had not yet come, is shown by the continuation of His words, which run in this way: "These things," said He, have I spoken unto you in proverbs: the hour cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you plainly of my Father.

At that day ye shall ask in my name: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you: for the Father Himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. I came forth from the Father, and have come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father" (vers. 25-28). Seeing that throughout all these words He is still promising that hour when He shall no more speak in proverbs, but shall show them openly of the Father; the hour, when He says that they will ask in His name, and that He will not pray the Father for them, on the ground that the Father Himself loveth them, and that they also have loved Christ, and have believed that He came forth from the Father, and was come into the world, and was again about to leave the world and go to the Father: when thus that hour is still the subject of promise when He was to speak without proverbs, why say they, "Lo, now speakest Thou plainly, and utterest no proverb; but just because those things, which He knows to be proverbs to those who have no understanding, they are still so far from understanding, that they do not even understand that they do not understand them? For they were babes, and had as yet no spiritual discernment of what they heard regarding things that had to do not with the body, but with the spirit.

2. And still further admonishing them of their age as still small and infirm in regard to the inner man, "Jesus answered them: Do ye now believe? Behold the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered every man to his own, and shall leave me alone. And yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me. He had said shortly before, "I leave the world, and go to the Father; now He says, "The Father is with me. Who goes to him who is with him? This is a word to him that understandeth, a proverb to him that understandeth not: and yet in such way that what at present is unintelligible to babes, is in some sort sucked in; and even though it yield them not solid

food, which they cannot as yet receive, it denies them not at least a milky diet. It was from this diet that they drew the knowledge that He knew all things, and needed not that any one should ask Him: and, indeed, why they said this, is a topic worthy of inquiry. For one would think they ought rather to have said, Thou needest not to ask any one; not, "That any one should ask Thee. They had just said, We are sure that Thou knowest all things: and surely He that knoweth all things is accustomed rather to be questioned by those who do not know, that in reply to their questions they may hear what they wish from Him who knoweth all things;

and not to be Himself the questioner, as if wishing to know something, when He knoweth all things. What, then, are we to understand by this, that, when apparently they ought to have said to Him, whom they knew to be omniscient, Thou needest not to ask any man, they considered it more befitting to say, "Thou needest not that any man should ask Thee"? Yea, is it not the case that we read of both being done; to wit, that the Lord both asked, and was asked questions? But this latter is speedily answered: for this was needful not for Him, but for those rather whom He questioned, or by whom He was questioned. For He never questioned any for the purpose of learning anything from them, but for the purpose rather of teaching them. And for those who put questions to Him, as desirous of learning something of Him, it was assuredly needful to be made acquainted with some things by Him who knew everything. And doubtless on the same account also it was that He needed not that any man should ask Him. As it is the case that we, when questioned by those who wish to get some information from us, discover by their very questionings what it is that they wish to know, we therefore need to be questioned by those whom we wish to teach, in order that we may be acquainted with their inquiries that call for an answer:

but He, who knew all things, had no need even of that, and as little need had He of discovering by their questions what it was that any one desired to know of Him, for before a question was put, He knew the intention of him who was to put it. But He suffered Himself to be questioned on this account, that He might show to those who were then present, or to those who should either hear the things that were to be spoken or read them when written, what was the character of those by whom He was questioned; and in this way we might come to know both the frauds that were powerless to impose upon Him, and the ways of approach that would turn to our profit in His sight. But

to foresee the thoughts of men, and thus to have no need that any one should ask Him, was no great matter for God, but great enough for the babes, who said to Him, "By this we believe that Thou camest forth from God. A much greater thing it was, for the understanding of which He wished to have their minds expanded and enlarged, that, on their saying, and saying truly, "Thou camest forth from God," He replied, "The Father is with me; in order that they should not think that the Son had come forth from the Father in any sense that would lead them to suppose that He had also withdrawn from His presence.

3. And then, in bringing to a close this weighty and protracted discourse, He said, "These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world. The beginning of such tribulation was to be found in that whereof, in order to show that they were infants, to whom, as still wanting in intelligence, and mistaking one thing for another, all the great and divine things He had said were little better than proverbs, He had previously said, "Do ye now believe? Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own. Such, I say, was the beginning of the tribulation, but not in the same measure of their perseverance. For in adding, "and ye shall leave me alone," He did not mean that they would be of such a character in the subsequent tribulation, which they should have to endure in the world after His ascension, as thus to desert Him; but that in Him they should have peace by still abiding in Him. But on the occasion of His apprehension, not only did they outwardly abandon His bodily presence, but they mentally abandoned their faith. And to this it is that His words have reference, "Do ye now believe? Behold, the hour cometh, that ye shall be scattered to your own, and shall leave me:

as if He had said, You will then be so confounded as to leave behind you even what you now believe. For they fell into such despair and such a death, so to speak, of their old faith, as was apparent in the case of Cleophas, who, after His resurrection, unaware that he was speaking with Himself, and narrating what had befallen Him, said, "We trusted that it had been He who should have redeemed Israel. That was the way in which they then left Him, abandoning even the very faith wherewith they had formerly believed in Him. But in that tribulation, which they encountered after His glorification and they themselves had received the Holy Spirit, they did not leave Him:

and though they fled from city to city, from Himself they did not flee; but in order that, while having tribulation in the world, they might have peace in Him, instead of being fugitives from Him, it was rather Himself that they made their refuge. For in receiving the Holy Spirit, there was wrought in them the very state described to them now in the words, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world. They were of good cheer, and they conquered. But in whom, save in Him? For He had not overcome the world, were it still to overcome His members. Hence said the apostle, "Thanks be unto God, who giveth us the victory; and immediately added, "through our Lord Jesus Christ:

through Him who had said to His own, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

TRACTATE 104

¹John XVII. 1. ²1. Before these words, which we are now, with the Lord's help, to make the subject of discourse, Jesus had said, "These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace; which we are to consider as referring, not to the later words uttered by Him immediately before, but to all that He had addressed to them, whether from the time that He began to account them disciples, or at least from the time after supper when He commenced this admirable and lengthened discourse. He gave them, indeed, such a reason for speaking to them, that either all He ever spake to them may with the utmost propriety be referred to that end, or those especially, as His last words, which He now spake when on the eve of dying for them, after that he who was to betray Him had quitted their company. For He gave this as the cause of His discourse, that in Him they might have peace, just as it is wholly on this account that we are Christians. For this peace will have no temporal end, but will itself be the end of every pious intention and action that are ours at present. For its sake we are endowed with His sacraments, for its sake we are instructed by His works and sayings, for its sake we have received the earnest of the Spirit, for its sake we believe and hope in Him, and according to His gracious giving are enkindled with His love:

³by this peace we are comforted in all our distresses, by it we are delivered from them all: for its sake we endure with fortitude every tribulation, that in it we may reign in happiness without any tribulation. Fitly therewith did He bring His words to a close, which were proverbs to the disciples, who as yet had little understanding, but would afterwards understand them, when He

had given them the Holy Spirit of promise, of whom He had said before: These things have I spoken unto you being yet present with you. But the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. Such, doubtless, was to be the hour, wherein He promised that He would no more speak unto them in proverbs, but show them openly of the Father. For these same words of His, when revealed by the Holy Spirit, were no more to be proverbs to those who had understanding. For when the Holy Spirit was speaking in their hearts, there was not to be silence on the part of the only-begotten Son, who had said that in that hour He would show them plainly of the Father, which, of course, would no longer be a proverb to them when now endowed with understanding.

⁴ But even this also, how it is that both the Son of God and the Holy Spirit speak at once in the hearts of their spiritual ones, yea the Trinity itself, which is ever inseparably at work, is a word to those who have, but a proverb to those who are without, understanding. ⁵ 2. When, therefore, He had told them on what account He had spoken all things, namely, that in Him they might have peace while having distress in the world, and had exhorted them to be of good cheer, because He had overcome the world; having thus finished His discourse to them, He then directed His words to the Father, and began to pray. For so the evangelist proceeds to say: "These things spake Jesus, and lifted up His eyes to heaven, and said: Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son. The Lord, the Only-begotten and coeternal with the Father, could in the form of a servant and out of the form of a servant, if such were needful, pray in silence; but in this other way He wished to show Himself as one who prayed to the Father, that He might remember that He was still our Teacher. Accordingly, the prayer which He offered for us, He made also known to us; seeing that it is not only the delivering of discourses to them by so great a Master, but also the praying for them to the Father, that is a means of edification to disciples. And if so to those who were present to hear what was said, it is certainly so also to us who were to have the reading of it when written. Wherefore in saying this, "Father, the hour is come;

⁶ glorify Thy Son," He showed that all time, and every occasion when He did anything or suffered anything to be done, were arranged by Him who was subject to no time: since those things, which were individually future in point of time, have their efficient causes in the wisdom of God, wherein

there are no distinctions of time. Let it not, then, be supposed that this hour came through any urgency of fate, but rather by the divine appointment. It was no necessary law of the heavenly bodies that tied to its time the passion of Christ; for we may well shrink from the thought that the stars should compel their own Maker to die. It was not the time, therefore, that drove Christ to His death, but Christ who selected the time to die: who also fixed the time, when He was born of the Virgin, with the Father, of whom He was born independently of time. And in accordance with this true and salutary doctrine, the Apostle Paul also says, "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son; and God declares by the prophet, "In an acceptable time have I heard Thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee; and yet again the apostle, "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation. He then may say, "Father, the hour is come," who has arranged every hour with the Father:

⁷ saying, as it were, "Father, the hour," which we fixed together for the sake of men and of my glorification among them, "is come, glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee."³ The glorification of the Son by the Father is understood by some to consist in this, that He spared Him not, but delivered Him up for us all. But if we say that He was glorified by His passion, how much more was He so by His resurrection! For in His passion our attention is directed more to His humility than to His glory, in accordance with the testimony of the apostle, who says, "He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross: and then he goes on to say of His glorification, "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father. This is the glorification of our Lord Jesus Christ, that took its commencement from His resurrection. His humility accordingly begins in the apostle's discourse with the passage where he says, "He emptied Himself, and took upon Him the form of a servant; and reaches "even to the death of the cross. But His glory begins with the clause where he says, "Wherefore God also hath exalted Him;

⁸ and reaches on to the words, "is in the glory of God the Father. For even the noun itself, if the language of the Greek codices be examined, from which the apostolic epistles have been translated into Latin, which in the

latter is read, glory, is in the former read, *doca*: whence we have the verb derived in Greek for the purpose of saying here, *docason* (glorify), which the Latin translator renders by "*clarifica*" (make illustrious), although he might as well have said "*glorifica*" (glorify), which is the same in meaning. And for the same reason, in the apostle's epistle where we find "*gloria*," "*claritas*" might have been used; for by so doing, the meaning would have been equally preserved. But not to depart from the sound of the words, just as "*clarificatio*" (the making lustrous) is derived from "*claritas*" (lustre), so is "*glorificatio*" (the making glorious) from "*gloria*" (glory). In order, then, that the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, might be made lustrous or glorious by His resurrection, He was first humbled by suffering; for had He not died, He would not have risen from the dead. Humility is the earning of glory; glory, the reward of humility. This, however, was done in the form of a servant; but He was always in the form of God, and always shall His glory continue: yea, it was not in the past as if it were no more so in the present, nor shall it be, as if it did not yet exist;

9 but without beginning and without end, His glory is everlasting. Accordingly, when He says, "Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son," it is to be understood as if He said, The hour is come for sowing the seed-corn of humility, delay not the fruit of my glory. But what is the meaning of the words that follow: "That Thy Son may glorify Thee"? Was it that God the Father likewise endured the humiliation of the body or of suffering, out of which He must needs be raised to glory? If not, how then was the Son to glorify Him, whose eternal glory could neither appear diminished through human form, nor be enlarged in the divine? But I will not confine such a question within the present discourse, or draw the latter out to greater length by such a discussion.

TRACTATE 105

John XVII. 1-5. 1. That the Son was glorified by the Father in His form of a servant, which the Father raised from the dead and set at His own right hand, is indicated by the event itself, and is nowhere doubted by the Christian. But as He not only said, "Father, glorify Thy Son," but likewise added, "that Thy Son may glorify Thee," it is worthy of inquiry how it was that the Son glorified the Father, seeing that the eternal glory of the Father neither suffered diminution in any human form, nor could be increased in respect of its own divine perfection. In itself, indeed, the glory of the Father could

neither be diminished nor enlarged; but without any doubt it was less among men when God was known only in Judea: and as yet children praised not the name of the Lord from the rising of the sun to its going down. But inasmuch as this was effected by the gospel of Christ, to wit, that the Father became known through the Son to the Gentiles, assuredly the Son also glorified the Father. Had the Son, however, only died, and not risen again, He would without doubt have neither been glorified by the Father, nor have glorified the Father; but now having been glorified through His resurrection by the Father, He glorifies the Father by the preaching of His resurrection. For this is disclosed by the very order of the words: "Glorify," He says, "Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee;" saying, as it were, Raise me up again, that by me Thou mayest become known to all the world.

2. And then expanding still further how it was that the Father should be glorified by the Son, He says: "As Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to all that Thou hast given Him." By all flesh, He meant every man, signifying the whole by a part; as, on the other hand, the whole man is signified by the superior part, when the apostle says, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." For what else did He mean by "every soul," save every man? And this, therefore, that power over all flesh was given to Christ by the Father, is to be understood in respect of His humanity; for in respect of His Godhead all things were made by Himself, and in Him were created all things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible. "As," then, He says, "Thou hast given Him power over all flesh," so may Thy Son glorify Thee, in other words, make Thee known to all flesh whom Thou hast given Him. For Thou hast so given, "that He should give eternal life to all that Thou hast given Him."

3. "And this," He adds, "is eternal life, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent. The proper order of the words is, "That they may know Thee and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent, as the only true God. Consequently, therefore, the Holy Spirit is also understood, because He is the Spirit of the Father and Son, as the substantial and consubstantial love of both. For the Father and Son are not two Gods, nor are the Father and Son and Holy Spirit three Gods; but the Trinity itself is the one only true God. And yet the Father is not the same as the Son, nor the Son the same as the Father, nor the Holy Spirit the same as the Father anti the Son; for the Father and Son and Holy Spirit are three [persons], yet the

Trinity itself is one God. If, then, the Son glorifies Thee in the same manner "as Thou hast given Him power over all flesh," and hast so given, "that He should give eternal life to all that Thou hast given Him," and "this is life eternal, that they may know Thee; in this way, therefore, the Son glorifies Thee, that He makes Thee known to all whom Thou hast given Him. Accordingly, if the knowledge of God is eternal life, we are making the greater advances to life, in proportion as we are enlarging our growth in such a knowledge. And we shall not die in the life eternal;

for then, when there shall be no death, the knowledge of God shall be perfected. Then will be effected the full effulgence of God, because then the completed glory, as expressed in Greek by *doca*. For from it we have the word *docason*, that is used here, and which some Latins have interpreted by "*clarifica*" (make effulgent), and some by "*glorifica*" (glorify). But by the ancients, glory, from which men are styled glorious, is thus defined: Glory is the widely-spread fame of any one accompanied with praise. But if a man is praised when the fame regarding him is believed, how will God be praised when He Himself shall be seen? Hence it is said in Scripture, "Blessed are they that dwell in Thy house; they will be praising Thee for ever and ever. There will God's praise continue without end, where there shall be the full knowledge of God; and because the full knowledge, therefore also the complete effulgence or glorification.

4. But God is first of all glorified here, while He is being made known to men by word of mouth, and preached through the faith of believers. Wherefore, He says, "I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do." He does not say, Thou orderedst; but, "Thou gavest:" where the evident grace of it is commended to notice. For what has the human nature even in the Only-begotten, that it has not received? Did it not receive this, that it should do no evil, but all good things, when it was assumed into the unity of His person by the Word, by whom all things were made? But how has He finished the work which was committed unto Him to do, when there still remains the trial of the passion wherein He especially furnished His martyrs with the example they were to follow, whereof, says the apostle Peter, "Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow His steps:" but just that He says He has finished, what He knew with perfect certainty that He would finish? Just as long before, in prophecy, He used words in the past tense, when what He said was to take place very

many years afterwards: "They pierced," He says, "my hands and my feet, they counted all my bones;" He says not, They will pierce, and, They will count. And in this very Gospel He says, "All things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you;" to whom He afterward declares, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." For He, who has predestinated all that is to be by sure and unchangeable causes, has done whatever He is to do: as it was also declared of Him by the prophet, "Who hath made the things that are to be."

5. In a way similar, also, to this, He proceeds to say: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was. For He had said above, "Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee: in which arrangement of the words He had shown that the Father was first to be glorified by the Son, in order that the Son might glorify the Father. But now He said, "I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do; and now glorify Thou me; as if He Himself had been the first to glorify the Father, by whom He then demands to be glorified. We are therefore to understand that He used both words above in accordance with that which was future, and in the order in which they were future, "Glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee: but that He now used the word in the past tense of that which was still future, when He said, "I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do. And then, when He said, "And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self," as if He were afterwards to be glorified by the Father, whom He Himself had first glorified;

what did He intimate but that, when He said above, "I have glorified Thee on the earth," He had so spoken as if He had done what He was still to do; but that here He demanded of the Father to do that whereby the Son should yet do so; in other words, that the Father should glorify the Son, by means of which glorification of the Son, the Son also was yet to glorify the Father? In fine, if, in connection with that which was still future, we put the verb also in the future tense, where He has used the past in place of the future tense, there will remain no obscurity in the sentence: as if He had said, "I will glorify Thee on the earth: I will finish the work which Thou hast given me to do; and now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self. In this way it is as plain as when He says, "Glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee: and

this is indeed the whole sentence, save that here we are told also the manner of that same glorification, which there was left unnoticed; as if the former were explained by the latter to those whose hearts it was able to stir, how it was that the Father should glorify the Son, and most of all how the Son also should glorify the Father.

For in saying that the Father was glorified by Himself on the earth, but He Himself by the Father with the Father's very self, He showed them assuredly the manner of both glorifications. For He Himself glorified the Father on earth by preaching Him to the nations; but the Father glorified Him with His own self in setting Him at His own right hand. But on that very account, when He says afterward in reference to the glorifying of the Father, "I have glorified Thee," He preferred putting the verb in the past tense, in order to show that it was already done in the act of predestination, and what was with perfect certainty yet to take place was to be accounted as already done; namely, that the Son, having been glorified by the Father with the Father, would also glorify the Father on the earth. 6. But this predestination He still more clearly disclosed in respect of His own glorification, wherewith He was glorified by the Father, when He added, "With the glory which I had, before the world was, with Thee." The proper order of the words is, "which I had with Thee before the world was." To this apply His words, "And now glorify Thou me;" that is to say, as then, so also now: as then, by predestination; so also now, by consummation: do Thou in the world what had already been done with Thee before the world: do in its own time what Thou hast determined before all times. This, some have imagined, should be so understood as if the human nature, which was assumed by the Word, were converted into the Word, and the man were changed into God; yea, were we reflecting with some care on the opinions they have advanced, as if the humanity were lost in the Godhead. For no one would go the length of saying that out of such a transmutation of the humanity the Word of God is either doubled or increased, so that either what was one should now be two, or what was less should now be greater. Accordingly, if with His human nature changed and converted into the Word, the Word of God will still be as great as He was, and what He was, where is the humanity, if it is not lost?

7. But to this opinion, which I certainly do not see to be conformable to the truth, there is nothing to urge us, if, when the Son says, "And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had

with Thee before the world was," we understand the predestination of the glory of His human nature, as thereafter, from being mortal, to become immortal with the Father: and that this had already been done by predestination before the world was, as also in its own time it was done in the world. For if the apostle has said of us, "According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world," why should it be thought incongruous with the truth, if the Father glorified our Head at the same time as; He chose us in Him to be His members? For we were chosen in the same way as He was glorified; inasmuch as before the world was, neither we nor the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, were yet in existence. But He who, in as far as He is His Word, of His own self "made even those things which are yet to come," and "callesth those things which are not as though they were," certainly, in respect of His manhood as Mediator between God and men, was Himself glorified on our behalf by God the Father before the foundation of the world, if it be so that we also were then chosen in Him. For what saith the apostle? "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren: and whom He did predestinate, them He also called."

8. But perhaps we shall have some fear in saying that He was predestinated, because the apostle seems to have said so only in reference to our being made conformable to His image. As if, indeed, any one, faithfully considering the rule of faith, were to deny that the Son of God was predestinated, who yet cannot deny that He was man. For it is rightly said that He was not predestinated in respect of His being the Word of God, God with God. For how could He be predestinated, seeing He already was what He was, without beginning and without ending, everlasting? But that, which as yet was not, had to be predestinated, in order that it might come to pass in its time, even as it was predestinated so to come before all times. Accordingly, whoever denies predestination of the Son of God, denies that He was also Himself the Son of man. But, on account of those who are disputatious, let us also on this subject listen to the apostle in the exordium of his epistles. For both in the first of his epistles, which is that to the Romans, and in the beginning of the epistle itself, we read:

"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called [to be] an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, which He had promised afore by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concerning His Son, who was made for Him of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was predestinated the Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead. In respect, then, of this predestination also, He was gloried before the world was, in order that His glory might be, by the resurrection from the dead, with the Father, at whose right hand He sitteth. Accordingly, when He saw that the time of this, His predestinated glorification, was now come, in order that what had already been done in predestination might also be done now in actual accomplishment, He said in His prayer, "And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was: as if He had said, The glory which I had with Thee, that is, that glory which I had with Thee in Thy predestination, it is time that I should have with Thee also in sitting at Thy right hand. But as the discussion of this question has already kept us long, what follows must be taken into consideration in another discourse.

TRACTATE 106

John XVII. 6-8. 1. In this discourse we purpose speaking, as He gives us grace, on these words of the Lord which run thus: "I have manifested Thy name unto the men whom Thou gavest me out of the world." If He said this only of those disciples with whom He had supped, and to whom, before beginning His prayer, He had said so much, it can have nothing to do with that clarification, or, as others have translated it, glorification, whereof He was previously speaking, and whereby the Son clarifies or glorifies the Father. For what great glory, or what like glory, was it to become known to twelve, or rather eleven mortal creatures? But if, in saying, "I have manifested Thy name unto the men whom Thou gavest me out of the world," He wished all to be understood, even those who were still to believe on Him, as belonging to His great Church which was yet to be made up of all nations, and of which it is said in the psalm, "I will confess to Thee in the great Church [congregation];" it is plainly that glorification wherewith the Son glorifies the Father, when He makes His name known to all nations and to so many generations of men. And what He says here, "I have manifested Thy name unto the men whom Thou gavest me out of the world," is similar to what He had said a little before, "I have glorified Thee upon the earth" ,(vet. 4); put-

ting both here and there the past for the future, as One who knew that it was predestinated to be done, and therefore saying that He had done what He had still to do, though without any uncertainty, in the future.

2. But what follows makes it more credible that His words, "I have manifested Thy name to the men whom Thou gavest me out of the world," were spoken by Him of those who were already His disciples, and not of all who were yet to believe on Him. For after these words, He added: "Thine they were, and Thou gavest them me; and they have kept Thy word. Now they have known that all things, whatsoever Thou hast given me, are of Thee: for I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send me. Although all these words also might have been said of all believers still to come, when that which was now a matter of hope had been turned into fact, inasmuch as they were words that still pointed to the future; yet we are impelled the more to understand Him as uttering them only of those who were at that time His disciples, by what He says shortly afterwards: "While I was with them, I kept them in Thy name: those that Thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the Scripture might be fulfilled" (ver. 12); meaning Judas, who betrayed Him, for He was the only one of the apostolic twelve that perished.

And then He adds, "And now come I to Thee," from which it is manifest that it was of His own bodily presence that He said, "While I was with them, I kept them," as if already that presence were no longer with them. For in this way He wished to intimate His own ascension as in the immediate future, when He said, "And now come I to Thee: going, that is, to the Father's right hand; whence He is hereafter to come to judge the quick and the dead in the self-same bodily presence, according to the rule of faith and sound doctrine: for in His spiritual presence He was still, of course, to be with them after His ascension, and with the whole of His Church in this world even to the end of time. We cannot, therefore, rightly understand of whom He said, "While I was with them, I kept them," save as those only who believed on Him, whom He had already begun to keep by His bodily presence, but was now to leave without it, in order that He might keep them with the Father by His spiritual presence. Thereafter, indeed, He also unites with them the

rest of His disciples, when He says, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for those also who shall believe on me through their word.

Where He shows still more clearly that He was not speaking before of all who belonged to Him, in the passage where He saith, "I have manifested Thy name unto the men whom Thou gavest me," but of those only who were listening to Him when He so spake. 3. From the very outset, therefore, of His prayer, when "He lifted up His eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee," on to what He said a little afterwards, "And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was," He wished all His disciples to be understood, to whom He makes the Father known, and thereby glorifies Him. For after saying, "That Thy Son may glorify Thee," He straightway showed how that was to be done, by adding, "As Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him: and this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." For the Father cannot be glorified through any knowledge attained by men, unless He also be known by whom He is glorified, that is to say, by whom He is made known to the nations of the world. The glorification of the Father is not that which was displayed in connection with the apostles only, but that which is displayed in all men, of whom as His members Christ is the head. For the words cannot be understood as applied to the apostles only, "As Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him;" but to all, assuredly, on whom, as believing on Him, eternal life is bestowed.

4. Accordingly, let us now see what He says about those disciples of His who were then listening to Him. "I have manifested," He says. "Thy name unto the men whom Thou gavest me. Did they not, then, know the name of God when they were Jews? And what of that which we read, "God is known in Judah; His name is great in Israel"? Therefore, "I have manifested Thy name unto these men whom Thou gavest me out of the world," and who are now hearing my words: not that name of Thine whereby Thou art called God, but that whereby Thou art called my Father: a name that could not be manifested without the manifestation of the Son Himself. For this name of God, by which He is called, could not but be known in some way to the whole creation, and so to every nation, before they believed in Christ For such is the

energy of true Godhead, that it cannot be altogether and utterly hidden from any rational creature, so long as it makes use of its reason. For, with the exception of a few in whom nature has become outrageously depraved, the whole race of man acknowledges God as the maker of this world. In respect, therefore, of His being the maker I of this world that is visible in heaven and earth around us, God was known unto all nations even before they were indoctrinated into the faith of Christ.

But in this respect, that He was not, without grievous wrong being done to Himself, to be worshipped alongside of false gods, God was known in Judah alone. But in respect of His being the Father of this Christ, by whom He taketh away the sin of the world, this name of His, previously kept secret from all, He now made manifest to those whom the Father Himself had given Him out of the world. But how had He done so, if the hour were not yet come, of which He had formerly said that the hour would come, "when I shall no more speak unto you proverbs, but I shall show you plainly of my Father"? Can it be supposed that the proverbs themselves contained such a plain announcement? Why, then, is it said, "I will declare to you openly," but just because that "in proverbs" is not "openly"? But when it is no longer concealed in proverbs, but uttered in plain words, then without a doubt it is spoken openly. How, then, had He manifested what He had not as yet openly declared? It must be understood, therefore, in this way, that the past tense is put for the future, like those other words, "All things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you: as something He had not yet done, but spoke of as if He had, because His doing of it He knew to be infallibly predetermined.

5. But what are we to make of the words. "Whom Thou gavest me out of the world"? For it is said of them that they were not of the world. But this they attained to by regeneration, and not by generation. And what, also, of that which follows, "Thine they were, and Thou gavest them me"? Was there a time when they belonged to the Father, and not to His only-begotten Son; and had the Father once on a time anything apart from the Son? Surely not. Nevertheless, there was a time when God the Son had something, which that same Son as man possessed not; for He had not yet become man of an earthly mother, when He possessed all things in common with the Father. Wherefore in saying, "Thine they were," there is thereby no self-disruption made by God the Son, apart from whom there was nothing ever possessed by the

Father; but it is His custom to attribute all the power He possesses to Him, of whom He Himself is, who has the power. For of whom He has it that He is, of Him He has it that He is able; and both together He always had, for He never had being without having ability. Accordingly, what ever the Father could [do], always side by side with Him could the Son; since He, who never had being without having ability, was never without the Father, as the Father never was without Him.

And thus, as the Father is eternally omnipotent, so is the Son co-eternally omnipotent; and if all-powerful, certainly all-possessing. For such rather, if we would speak exactly, is the word by which we translate what is called by the Greeks *pantokratwr* which our writers would not interpret by the term omnipotent, seeing that *pantokratwr* is all-possessing, were it not that they felt it to be equivalent in meaning. What, then, could the eternal all-possessing ever have, that the co-eternal all-possessing had not likewise? In saying, therefore, "And Thou gavest them me," He intimated that it was as man He had received this power to have them; seeing that He, who was always omnipotent, was not always man. Accordingly, while He seems rather to have attributed it to the Father, that He received them from Him, since all that is, is of Him, of whom He is; yet He also gave them to Himself, that is, Christ, God with the Father, gave men to the manhood of Christ, which had not its being with the Father. Finally, He who says in this place, "Thine they were, and Thou gavest them me," had already said in a previous passage to the same disciples, "I have chosen you out of the world. Here, then, let every carnal thought be crushed and annihilated. The Son says that the men were given Him by the Father out of the world, to whom He says elsewhere, "I have chosen you out of the world.

Those whom God the Son chose along with the Father out of the world, the very same Son as man received out of the world from the Father; for the Father had not given them to the Son had He not chosen them. And in this way, as the Son did not thereby set the Father aside, when He said, "I have chosen you out of the world," seeing that they were simultaneously chosen by the Father also: as little did He thereby exclude Himself, when He said, "Thine they were," for they were equally also the properly of the Son. But now that same Son as man received those who belonged not to Himself, because He also as God received a servant-form which was not originally His own. 6. He proceeds to say, "And they have kept Thy word: now they have

known that all things, whatsoever Thou hast given me, are of Thee; that is, they have known that I am of Thee. For the Father gave all things at the very time when He begat Him who was to have all things. "For I have given unto them," He says, "the words which Thou gavest me; and they have received them; that is, they have understood and kept hold of them. For the word is received when it is perceived by the mind. "And they have known truly," He adds, "that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send me. In this last clause we must also supply "truly; for when He said, "They have known truly," He intended its explanation by adding, "and they have believed. That, therefore, "they have believed truly" which "they have known truly; just as "I came out from Thee" is the same as "Thou didst send me. When, therefore, He said, "They have known truly," lest any might suppose that such a knowledge was already acquired by sight, and not by faith, He subjoined the explanation, "And they have believed," so that we should supply "truly," and understand the saying, "They have known truly," as equivalent to "They have believed truly:

not in the way which He intimated shortly before, when He said, "Do ye now believe? The hour cometh, and is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone. But "they have believed truly," that is, in the way it ought to be believed, without constraint, with firmness, constancy, and fortitude: no longer now to go to their own, and leave Christ alone. As yet, indeed, the disciples were not of the character He here describes in words of the past tense, as if they were so already, but as thereby declaring beforehand what sort they were yet to be, namely, when they had received the Holy Spirit, who, according to the promise, should teach them all things. For how was it, before they received the Spirit, that they kept that word of His which He spake regarding them, as if they had done so, when the chief of them thrice denied Him, after hearing from His lips the future fate of the man who denied Him before men? He had given them, therefore, as He said, the words which the Father gave Him; but when at length they received them spiritually, not in an outward way with their ears, but inwardly in their hearts, then they truly received them, for then they truly knew them; and they truly knew them, because they truly believed.

7. But what human language will suffice to explain how the Father gave those words to the Son? The question, of course, will appear easier if we sup-

pose Him to have received such words in His capacity as the Son of man. And yet, although thus born of the Virgin, who will undertake to relate when and how it was that He learned them, since even that very generation which He had of the Virgin who will venture to declare? But if our idea be that He received these words of the I Father in His capacity as begotten of, and co-eternal with, the Father, let us then exclude all such thoughts of time as if He existed previous to His possessing them, and so received the possession of that which He had not before; for whatever God the Father gave to God the Son, He gave in the act of begetting. For the Father gave those things to the Son without which He could not be the Son, in the same manner as He gave Him being itself. For how otherwise would He give any words to the Word, wherein in an ineffable way He hath spoken all things? But now, in reference to what follows, you must defer your expectations till another discourse.

TRACTATE 107

John XVII. 9-13. 1. When the Lord was speaking to the Father of those whom He already had as disciples, He said this also among other things: "I pray for them. I pray not for the world, but for those whom Thou hast given me." By the world, He now wishes to be understood those who live according to the lust of the word, and stand not in the gracious lot of such as were to be chosen by Him out of the world. Accordingly it is not for the world, but for those whom the Father hath given Him, that He expresses Himself as praying: for by the very fact of their having already been given Him by the Father, they have ceased to belong to that world for which He refrains from praying. 2. And then He adds, "For they are Thine. For the Father did not lose those whom He gave, in the act of giving them to the Son; since the Son still goes on to say, "And all mine are Thine, and Thine are mine. Where it is sufficiently apparent how it is that all that belongs to the Father belongs also to the Son; in this way, namely, that He Himself is also God, and, of the Father born, is the Father's equal: and not as was said to one of the two sons, to wit, the elder, "Thou art ever with me; and all that I have is thine. For that was said of all those creatures which are inferior to the holy rational creature, and are certainly subordinate to the Church; wherein its universal character is understood as including those two sons, the elder and the younger, along with all the holy angels, whose equals we shall be in the kingdom of Christ and of God: but here it was said, "And all mine are Thine, and Thine are mine," with this meaning, that even the rational creature is itself included,

which is subject only to God, so that all beneath it are also subject to Him. As it then belongs to God the Father, it would not at the same time be the Son's likewise, were He not equal to the Father: for to it He was referring when He said, "I pray not for the world, but for those whom Thou hast given me:

for they are Thine, and all mine are Thine, and Thine are mine. Nor is it morally admissible that the saints, of whom He so spake, should belong to any save to Him by whom they were created and sanctified: and for the same reason, everything also that is theirs must of necessity be His also to whom they themselves belong. Accordingly, since they belong both to the Father and to the Son, they demonstrate the equality of those to whom they equally belong. But when He says, speaking of the Holy Ghost, "All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore said I, that He shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you," He referred to those things which concern the actual deity of the Father, and in which He is equal to Him, in having all that He has. And no more was it of the creature, which is subject to the Father and the Son, that the Holy Spirit was to receive that whereof He said, "He shall receive of mine; but most certainly of the Father, from whom the Spirit proceedeth, and of whom also the Son is born.

3. He proceeds: "And I am glorified in them." He now speaks of His glorification as already accomplished, although it was still future; while a little before He was demanding of the Father its accomplishment. But whether this be the same glorification, whereof He had said, "And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was," is certainly a point worthy of examination. For if "with Thee," how can it be "in them"? Is it when this very knowledge is imparted to them, and, through them, to all who believe them as His witnesses? In such a way we may clearly understand Christ as having said of the apostles, that He was glorified in them; for in saying that it was already accomplished, He showed that it was already foreordained, and only wished what was future to be regarded as certain.

4. "And now," He adds, "I am no more in the world, and these are in the world. If your thoughts turn to the very hour in which He was speaking, both were still in the world; to wit, He Himself, and those of whom He was so speaking: for it is not in respect of the tendency of heart and life that we can or ought to understand it, so that they should be described as still in the world, on the ground that they still savored of the earthly; and that He was

no longer in the world, because divine in the disposition of His mind. For there is one word used here, which makes any such understanding altogether inadmissible; because He does not say, And I am not in the world; but, "I am no more in the world: thereby showing that He Himself had been in the world, but was no more so. And are we then at liberty to believe that He at one time savored of the worldly, and, delivered at length from such a mistake, no longer retained the old disposition? Who would venture to shut himself up in so profane a meaning. It remains, therefore, that in the same sense in which He Himself also was previously in the world, He declared that He was no longer in the world, that is to say, in His bodily presence;

in other words, showing thereby that His own absence from the world was now in the immediate future, and theirs later, when He said that He was no longer here, and that they were so, although both He and they were still present. For He thus spake, as a man in harmony with men, in accordance with the prevailing custom of human speech. Do we not say every day, he is no longer here, of one who is on the very point of departure? And such in particular is the way we are wont to speak of those who are at the point of death. And besides all else, the Lord Himself, as if foreseeing the thoughts that might possibly be excited in those who were afterwards to read these words, added, "And I come to Thee: explaining thereby in some measure why He said, "I am no more in the world."

5. Accordingly He commends to the Father's care those whom He was about to leave by His bodily absence, saying: "Holy Father, keep through Thine own name those whom Thou hast given me." That is to say, as man He prays to God in behalf of His disciples, whom He has received from God. But attend to what follows: "That they may be one," He says, "even as we." He does not say, That they may be one with us, or, that they and we may be one, as we are one; but He says, "That they may be one, even as we:" meaning, of course, that in their nature they may be one, even as we are one in ours, Which certainly would not be spoken with truth, unless in this respect, that He, as God, is of the same nature as the Father also, in accordance with what He has said elsewhere, "I and the Father are one;" and not with what He also is as man, for in this respect He said, "The Father is greater than I." But since one and the same person is God and man, we are to understand the manhood in respect of His asking; but the Godhead, in as far as He Himself, and

He whom He asks, are one. But there is still a passage in what follows, where we must have a more careful discussion of this subject.

6. But here He proceeds: "While I was with them, I kept them in Thy name. Since I am coming, He says, to Thee, keep them in Thy name, in which I myself have kept them while I was with them. In the Father's name, the Son as man kept His disciples, when placed side by side with them in human presence; but the Father also, in the name Of the Son, kept those whom He heard and answered when praying in the name of the Son. For to them had it also been said by the Son Himself: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name. He will give it you. But we are not to take this in any such carnal way, as that the Father and Son keep us in turn, with an alternation in the guardianship of both in guarding us, as if one succeeded when the other departed; for we are guarded all at once by the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, who is the one true and blessed God. But Scripture does not exalt us save by descending to us: as the Word, by becoming flesh, came down to lift us up, and fell not so as to remain Himself in the depths. If we have known Him who thus descendeth, let us rise with Him who lifteth us up; and let us understand, when He speaks thus, that He is marking a distinction in the persons, without making any separation of the natures.

While, therefore, the Son in bodily presence was keeping His disciples, the Father was not waiting the Son's departure in order to succeed to the guardianship, but both were keeping them by Their spiritual power; and when the Son withdrew from them His bodily presence, He retained along with the Father the spiritual guardianship. For when the Son also as man assumed the office of their guardian, He did not withdraw them from the Father's guardianship; and when the Father gave them to the guardianship of the Son, in the very giving He acted not apart from Him to whom He gave them, but gave them to the Son as man, yet not apart from that same Son Himself as God. 7. The Son therefore goes on to say: "Those that Thou gavest me, I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the Scripture might be fulfilled." The betrayer of Christ was called the son of perdition, as foreordained to perdition, according to the Scripture, where it is specially prophesied of him in the 109th Psalm. 8. "And now," He says, "come I to Thee; and these things I speak in the world, that they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves." See! He says that He speaketh in the world,

when He had said only a little before, "I am no more in the world:" the reason of which we have there explained, or rather have shown that He Himself explained it. Accordingly, on the one hand, as He had not yet departed, He was still here; and because He was on the very point of departure, in a kind of way He was no more here. But what this joy is whereof He says, "That they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves," has already been elucidated above, where He says, "That they may be one, even as we are." This joy of His that is bestowed on them by Him, was to be fulfilled, He says, in them; and for that very end declared that He had spoken in the world. This is that peace and blessedness in the world to come, for the attaining of which we must live temperately, and righteously, and godly in the present.

TRACTATE 108

John XVII. 14-19. I. While the Lord is still speaking to the Father, and praying for His disciples, He says: "I have given them Thy saying; and the world hath hated them." That hatred they had not yet experienced in those sufferings of their own, which afterwards overtook them; but He speaks thus in His usual way, foretelling the future in words of the past tense. And then, subjoining the reason of their being hated by the world, He says, "Because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." This was conferred on them by regeneration; for by generation they were of the world, as He had already said to them, "I have chosen you out of the world." It was therefore a gracious privilege bestowed upon them, that they, like Himself, should not be of the world, through the deliverance which He was giving them from the world. He, however, was never of the world; for even in respect of His servant-form He was born of that Holy Spirit of whom they were born again. For if on that account they were no more of the world, because born again of the Holy Spirit; on the same account He was never of the world, because born of the Holy Spirit.

2. "I pray not," He adds, "that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil." For they still accounted it necessary to be in the world, although they were no longer of it. Then He repeats the same statement: "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them in the truth." For are they kept from the evil, as He had previously prayed that they might be. But it may be inquired how they were no more of the world, if they were not yet sanctified in the truth; or, if they already were, why He requests that they should be so. Is it not because even

those who are sanctified still continue to make progress in the same sanctification, and grow in holiness; and do not so without the aid of God's grace, but by His sanctifying of their progress, even as He sanctified their outset? And hence the apostle likewise says: "He who hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." The heirs therefore of the New Testament are sanctified in that truth which was adumbrated in the purifications of the Old Testament; and when they are sanctified in the truth, they are in other words sanctified in Christ, who said in truth "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." As also when He said, "The truth shall make you free," in explanation of His words, He added soon after, "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed;" in order to show that what He had previously called the truth, He a minute afterwards denominates the Son. And what else did He mean by the words before us, "Sanctify them in the truth," but, Sanctify them in me?

3. Finally, He proceeds, and doing so fails not to suggest the same with increasing clearness: "Thy speech (sermo) is truth." What else did He mean than "I am the truth"? For the Greek Gospel has *loUoj*, which is also the word that is found in the passage where it is said, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." And that Word at least we know to be the only begotten Son of God, which "was made flesh, and dwelt among us." Hence also there might have been put here as it actually has been put in certain copies "Thy Word is truth;" just as in some copies that other passage is written, "In the beginning was the speech." But in the Greek without any variation it is *loUoj* in both cases. The Father therefore sanctifies in the truth, that is, in His own Word, in His Only begotten, His own heirs and His (the Son's) co-heirs.

4. But now He still goes on to speak of the apostles, for He proceeds to add, "As Thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." Whom did He so send but His apostles? For even the very name of apostles, which is a Greek word, signifies in Latin nothing more than, those that are sent. God, therefore, sent His Son, not in sinful flesh, but in the likeness of sinful flesh; and His Son sent those who, born themselves in sinful flesh, were sanctified by Him from the defilement of sin. 5. But since, on the ground that the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, has become Head of the Church, they are His members; therefore He says in the words that follow, "And for their sakes I sanctify myself. For what means He

by the words, "And for their sakes I sanctify myself," but I sanctify them in myself, since they also are [part of] myself? For those of whom He so speaks are, as I have said, His members; and the head and body are one Christ, as the apostle teaches when he says of the seed of Abraham, "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed," after having said before, "He saith not, And to seeds, as in many, but as in one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. If, then, the seed of Abraham is Christ, what else is declared to those to whom he says, "Then are ye Abraham's seed," but then are ye Christ? Of the same character is what this very apostle said in another place: "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh. He said not, of my afflictions, but "of Christ's; for he was a member of Christ, and in his persecutions, such as it behoved Christ to suffer in the whole of His body, he also was filling up his own share of His afflictions.

And to be assured of the certainty of this in the present passage, give heed to what follows. For after saying, "And for their sakes I sanctify myself," to let us understand that He thereby meant that He would sanctify them in Himself, He immediately added, "That they also may be sanctified in the truth. And what else is this but in me, in accordance with the fact that the truth is that Word in the beginning which is God? In whom also the Son of man was Himself sanctified from the beginning of His creation, when the Word was made flesh, for the Word and the man became one person. Then accordingly He sanctified Himself in Himself, that is, Himself the man in Himself the Word; for the Word and the man is one Christ, who sanctifies the manhood in the Word. But in behalf of His members He says, "And for their sakes I," -that is, that the benefit may be also theirs, for they too are [included in the] I, just as it benefited me in myself, because I am man apart from them-" I sanctify myself," that is, I sanctify them as if it were my own self in me, since in me they also are I. "That they also may be sanctified in the truth. For what else mean the words "they also," but ["they"] in the same way as I; "in the truth," and that "truth" am I?

After this He now begins to speak not only of the apostles, but also of the rest of His members, which we shall treat of, as grace may be granted us, in another discourse.

TRACTATE 109

John XVII. 20. 1 The Lord Jesus, in the now close proximity of His passion, after praying for His disciples, whom He also named apostles, with whom He

had partaken of that last supper from which His betrayer had taken his departure on being revealed by the sop of bread, and with whom, after the latter's departure, and before beginning His prayer in their behalf, He had already spoken at length, conjoined all others also who were yet to believe on Him, and said to the Father, "Neither pray I for these alone," that is, for the disciples who were with Him at the time, "but for them also," He adds, "who shall believe on me through their word." Whereby He wished all His own to be understood: not only such as were then in the flesh, but those also who were yet to come. For all that have since believed on Him have doubtless believed, and shall yet believe till He come, through the word of the apostles; for to themselves He had said, "And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning;" and by them was the gospel ministered even before it was written, and every one assuredly who believeth on Christ believeth the gospel. Accordingly, those who He says should believe on Him through their word, are not to be understood as referring only to such as heard the apostles themselves while they lived in the flesh; but others also after their decease, and we, too, born long afterwards, have believed on Christ through their word. For they that were then with Him preached to the others what they had heard from Him; and so their word, that we too might believe, has found its way to us, and wherever His Church exists, and shall yet reach down to posterity, whoever and wherever they be who shall hereafter believe on Him.

2. In this prayer, therefore, Jesus may seem to have omitted praying for some of His own, unless we carefully examine His words in the prayer itself. For if He prayed first for those, as we have already shown, who were then with Him, and afterwards for those also who should believe on Him through their word, it may be said that He prayed not for those who were neither with Him when He so spake, nor afterwards believed through their word, but had done so at some previous time either of themselves, or in some other supposable manner. For was Nathanael with Him at that time? Was Joseph of Arimathea, who begged His body from Pilate, and of whom this same evangelist John testifies that he was already His disciple? Were His mother, Mary, and other women who, we know from the Gospel, had been prior to that time His disciples? Were those with Him then, of whom this evangelist John frequently says, "Many believed on Him"? For whence came the multitude of those who, with branches of trees, partly preceded and partly followed Him

as He sat on the ass, saying, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord ; and along with them the children of whom He Himself declared that the prophecy had been uttered, "Out of the mouth of babes and of sucklings Thou hast perfected praise"?

Whence the five hundred brethren, to all of whom at once He would not have appeared after His resurrection had they not previously believed on Him? Whence that hundred and nine who, with the eleven, were a hundred and twenty, when, being assembled together after His ascension, they waited and received the promise of the Holy Spirit? Whence came all these, save from those of Whom it was said, "Many believed on Him"? For them, therefore, the Saviour did not at this time pray, seeing it was for those He prayed who were then with Him, and for others not who had already, but who were yet to believe on Him through their word. But these were certainly not with Him on that occasion, and had already believed on Him at some previous period. I say nothing of the aged Simeon, who believed on Him when an infant; of Anna the prophetess; of Zachariah and Elisabeth, who prophesied of Him before He was born of the Virgin; of their son John, His forerunner, the friend of the Bridegroom, who both recognized Him in the Holy Spirit, and preached Him in His absence, and pointed Him out when He was present to the recognition of others; -I say nothing of these, as it might be replied that He ought not to have prayed for such when dead, who had gone hence with their great merits, and having met with a welcome reception were now at rest; for a similar answer is also given in connection with the righteous of olden time.

For which of them could have been saved from the damnation awaiting the whole mass of perdition, which has been caused by one man, had he not believed, through the revelation of the Spirit, in the one Mediator between God and men as yet to come in the flesh? But behaved He to pray for the apostles, and not to pray for so many who were still alive, but were not then with Him, and had already at some previous period been brought to the faith? Who is there that would say so? 3. We are therefore to understand that their faith in Him was not yet such as He wished it to be, inasmuch as even Peter himself, to whom, on making the confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," He had borne so excellent a testimony, was disposed rather to hinder Him from dying than to believe in His resurrection when dead, and hence was called immediately thereafter by the same of

Satan. Those, accordingly, are found to be the greater in faith who were long since deceased, and yet, through the revelation of the Spirit, had no manner of doubt that Christ would rise again, than those who, after attaining to the belief that He should redeem Israel, at the sight of His death lost all the hope they previously possessed regarding Him. The best thing for us, therefore, to believe is, that after His resurrection, when the Holy Spirit was bestowed, and the apostles taught and confirmed, and from its outset constituted teachers in the Church, others, through their word, attained the proper faith in Christ, or, in other words, that they then got firm hold of the faith of His resurrection. And in this way also, that all those who seemed to have already believed on Him really belonged to the number of those for whom He prayed, when He said, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word."

4. But we have still in reserve for the further solution of this question the blessed apostle, and that robber who was a villain in wickedness, but a believer on the cross. For the Apostle Paul tells us that he was made an apostle not of men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ: and speaking of his own gospel, he says, "For I neither received it of man, neither did I learn it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." How then was he among those of whom it is said, "They shall believe on me through their word"? On the other hand, the robber believed at the very time when in the case of the teachers themselves such faith as they previously possessed had utterly failed. Not even he, therefore, believed on Christ through their word, and yet his faith was such that he confessed that He whom he saw nailed to the cross would not only rise again, but would also reign, when he said, "Remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom."

5. Accordingly it remains that if we are to believe that the Lord Jesus, in this prayer, prayed for all of His own who either then were or should thereafter be in this life, which is a state of trial upon earth, we must so understand the expression, "through their word," as to believe that it here signified the word of faith itself which they preached in the world, and that it was called their word because it was primarily and principally preached by them. For it was already in the course of being preached by them in the earth when Paul received that same word of theirs by the revelation of Jesus Christ. Whence also it came about that he compared the Gospel with them, lest by any means he had run, or should run, in vain; and they gave him their right

hand because in him also they found, although not given him by them, their own word which they were already preaching, and in which they were now established. And in regard to this word of the resurrection of Christ, it is said by the same apostle, "Whether it were I, or they, so we preach, and so ye believed; and again, "This is the word of faith," he says, "which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth that Jesus is the Lord, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.

And in the Acts of the Apostles we read that in Christ, God hath marked out [the ground of] faith unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead. Accordingly, this word of faith, because principally and primarily preached by the apostles who adhered to Him, was called their word. Not, however, on that account does it cease to be the word of God because it is called their word; for the same apostle says that the Thessalonians received it from him "not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God. "Of God," for the very reason that it was freely given by God; but called "their word," because primarily and principally committed to them by God to be preached. In the same way also the thief mentioned above had in the matter of his own faith their word, which was called theirs precisely because the preaching of it primarily and principally pertained to the office they filled. And once more, when murmuring arose among the Grecian widows in reference to the serving of the tables, previous to the time when Paul was brought to the faith of Christ, the reply given by the apostles, who before then had adhered to the Lord, was: "It is not good that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Then it was that they provided for the ordination of deacons, that they themselves might not be drawn aside from the duty of preaching the word.

Hence that was properly enough called their word which is the word of faith, whereby all, from whatever quarter they had heard it, believed on Christ, or, as yet to hear it, should thereafter believe. In this prayer, therefore, all whom He redeemed, whether then alive or thereafter to live in the flesh, were prayed for by our Redeemer when, praying for the apostles who were then with Him, He also conjoined those who were yet to believe on Him through their word. But what, after such conjunction, He then proceeds to say, must be reserved for discussion in another discourse.

TRACTATE 110

John XVII. 21-23. 1. After the Lord Jesus had prayed for His disciples whom He had with Him at the time, and had conjoined with them others who were also His own, by saying, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word," as if we were inquiring what or wherefore He prayed for them, He straightway subjoined, "That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, [art] in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us. And a little above, while still praying for the disciples alone who were then with Him, He said, "Holy Father, keep in Thine own name those whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are" ver. 11). It is the same thing, therefore, that He now also prayed for in our behalf, as He did at that time in theirs, namely, that all-to wit, both we and they-may be one. And here we must take particular notice that the Lord did not say that we all may be one, but, "that they all may be one; as Thou Father, in me, and I in Thee" (where is to be understood are one, as is more clearly expressed afterwards); because He had also said before of the disciples who were with Him, "That they may be one, as we are. The Father, therefore, is in the Son, and the Son in the Father, in such a way as to be one, because they are of one substance;

but while we may indeed be in them, we cannot be one with them; for they and we are not of one substance, in as far as the Son is God along with the Father. But in as far as He is man, He is of the same substance as we are. But at present He wished rather to call attention to that other statement which He made use of in another place, "I and the Father are one," where He intimated that His own nature was the same with that of the Father. And accordingly, though the Father and Son, or even the Holy Spirit, are in us, we must not suppose that they are of one nature with ourselves. And hence they are in us, or we are in them, in this sense, that they are one in their own nature, and we are one in ours. For they are in us, as God in His temple; but we are in them, as the creature in its Creator.

2. But then after saying, "That they also may be one in us," He added, "That the world may believe that Thou hast sent me. What does He mean by this? Is it that the world will then be brought to the faith, when we shall all be one in the Father and Son? Is not such a state the everlasting peace, and the reward of faith, rather than faith itself? For we shall be one not in order to our believing, but because we have believed. But although in this life, be-

cause of the common faith itself, all who believe in one are one according to the words of the apostle, "For ye are all one in Christ Jesus ; even thus we are one, not in order to our believing, but because we do believe. What, then, is meant by the words, "That they all may be one, that the world may believe"? This, doubtless, that the "all" are themselves the believing world. For those who shall be one are not of one class, and the world that is thereafter to believe on this very ground that these shall be one, of another; since it is perfectly certain that He says, "That they all may be one," of those of whom He had said before, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for those also who shall believe on me through their word," immediately adding as He does, "That they all may be one. And this "all," what is it but the world;

not certainly that which is hostile, but that which is believing? For you see here that He who had said, "I pray not for the world," now prayeth for the world that it may believe. For there is a world whereof it is written, "That we might not be condemned with this world. For that world He prayeth not, for He is fully aware to what it is predestinated. And there is a world whereof it is written, "For the Son of man came not to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved ; and hence the apostle also says, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself. For this world it is that He prayeth, in saying, "That the world may believe that Thou hast sent me. For through this faith the world is reconciled unto God when it believes in the Christ whom God has sent. How, then, are we to understand Him when He says, "That they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me," but just in this way, that He did not assign the cause of the world believing to the fact that those others are one, as if it believed on the ground that it saw them to be one; for the world itself here consisteth of all who by their own believing become one; but in His prayer He said, "That the world may believe," just as in His prayer He also said, "That they all may be one;

and still further in the same prayer, "That they also may be one in us. For the words, "they all may be one," are equivalent to "the world may believe," since it is by believing that they become one, perfectly one; that is, those who, although one by nature, had ceased to be so by their mutual dissensions. In fine, if the verb which He uses, "I pray," be understood in the third clause, or rather, to make the whole fuller, be everywhere supplied, the explanation of this sentence will be all the clearer: I pray "that they all may be

one; as Thou, Father, in me, and I in Thee ; I pray "that they also may be one in us ; I pray "that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me. And, mark, He added the words "in us" in order that we may know that our being made one in that love of unchanging faithfulness is to be attributed to the grace of God, and not to ourselves: just as the apostle, after saying, "For ye were at one time darkness, but now are ye light," that none might attribute the doing of this to themselves, added, "in the Lord."

3. Furthermore, our Saviour in thus praying to the Father showed Himself to be man; while He now also shows that He Himself, as being God along with the Father, doeth that which He prayeth for, when He says, "And the glory which Thou gavest me, I have given them. And what was that glory but immortality, which human nature was henceforth to receive in Him? For not even He Himself had as yet received it, but in His own customary way, on account of the absolute fixedness of predestination, He intimates what is future in verbs of the past tense, because being now on the point of being glorified, or in other words, raised up again by the Father, He Himself is going to raise us up to the same glory in the end. What we have here is similar to what He says elsewhere, "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will. And "whom," but just the same as the Father? "For what things soever the Father doeth," not other things, but "these also doeth the Son," not in a different way, but "in like manner. And in this way He also raised up even His own self. For to this effect he said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again. Accordingly the glory of immortality, which He says had been given Him by the Father, He must be also understood as having bestowed upon Himself, although He does not say it.

For on this very account He more frequently says that the Father alone doeth, what He Himself also doeth along with the Father, that everything whatever He may attribute to Him of whom He is. But sometimes also He is silent about the Father, and says that He Himself doeth what He only doeth along with the Father: that we may thereby understand that the Son is not to be separated from the working of the Father, when He is silent about Himself, and ascribes some work or other to the Father; as, on the other hand, the Father is not separated from the working of the Son, when the Son is said, without any mention being made of [the Father] Himself, to be doing some work in which nevertheless both are equally engaged. When, there-

fore, in some work of the Father, the Son says nothing of His own working, He commends humility, that He may become the source of sounder health to us; but when, in turn, in the case of some work of His own, He says nothing of the working of the Father, He commends His own equality, that we may not suppose Him to be inferior. In this way, then, and in this passage, He neither estranges Himself from the Father's working, although He has said, "The glory which Thou gavest me ; for He also gave it to Himself: nor does He estrange the Father from His own working, although saying, "I have given to them ; for the Father also gave it to them.

For the works not only of the Father and the Son, but also of the Holy Spirit, are inseparable. But just as, because of His praying the Father in behalf of all His people, it was His own pleasure that this should be done, "that they all may be one; so also on the ground of His own beneficence, as expressed in the words, "The glory which Thou gavest me, I have given them," the doing of that was none the less His pleasure; for He immediately added, "That they may be one, as we also are one." 4. And then He added: "I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one. Here He briefly intimated Himself as *tim* Mediator between God and men. Nor was this said in any such way as if the Father were not in us, or we were not in the Father; since He had also said in another place, "We will come unto him, and make our abode with him; and a little before in this present passage He had not said, "I in them and Thou in me," as He said now; or, They in me, and I in Thee; but, "Thou in me, and I in Thee, and they in us. Accordingly, when He now says, "I in them, and Thou in me," the words take this form in reference to the person of the Mediator, like that other expression used by the apostle, "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's. But in adding, "That they may be made perfect in one," He showed that the reconciliation, which is effected by the Mediator, is carried to the very length of bringing us to the enjoyment of that perfect blessedness, which is thenceforth incapable of further addition. Hence the words that follow, "That the world may know that Thou hast sent me," are not, I think, to be taken as if He had again said, "That the world may believe; for sometimes, to know, is also used in the same sense as to believe, as it is in the words He uttered some time before:

"And they have known truly that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send me. He expressed the same thing by the later words, "they have believed," as He had done by the earlier, "they have known.

But inasmuch as He here speaks of the consummation, the knowledge must be taken for such, as it shall then be by sight, and not, as it now is, by faith. For an order seems to have been preserved in reference to what He said a little before, "that the world may believe; while here it is, "that the world may know. For although He said there, "that they all may be one," and "may be one in us," yet He did not say, "they may be made perfect in one," and so subjoined the words, "that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me; but here He said, "That they may be made perfect in one," and then added, not, "that the world may believe," but, "that the world may know that Thou hast sent me. For so long as we believe what we do not see, we are not yet made perfect, as we shall be when we have merited the sight of that which we believe. Most correctly, therefore, did He say in that previous place, "That the world may believe," and here "That the world may know ; yet both there and here, "that Thou hast sent me ;

that we may know, so far as belongs to the inseparable love of the Father and the Son, that at present we only believe what we are on the way, by believing, to know. And had He said, That they may know that Thou hast sent me, it would be just of the same force as what He actually does say, "that the world may know. For they are the world that abideth not in enmity, as doth the world that is foreordained to damnation; but one that out of an enemy has been transformed into a friend, and on whose account "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. Therefore said He, "I in them, and Thou in me; as if He had said, I in those to whom Thou hast sent me; and Thou in me, reconciling the world unto Thyself through me. 5. In close relation to these come also His further words: "And Thou hast loved them as thou hast loved me. That is to say, in the Son the Father loveth us, because in Him He hath chosen us before the foundation of the world. For He who loveth the Only-begotten, certainly loveth also His members which, through His instrumentality, He engrafted into Him by adoption. But we are not on this account equal to the only-begotten Son, by whom we have been created and re-created, that it is said, "Thou hast loved them as [Thou hast] also [loved] me. For one does not always intimate equality when he says, As this, so also that other; but sometimes only, Because this is, so also is the other; or, That the one is, in order that the other may be also. For who could say that the apostles were sent by Christ into the world in exactly the same way as He Himself was sent by the Father? For, to say nothing of other differ-

ences, which it would be tedious to mention, they at all events were sent when they were already men; but He was sent in order that He might be man; and yet He said above, "As Thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I sent them into the world ; as if He had said, Because Thou hast sent me, I have sent them. So also in the passage before us He says, "Thou hast loved them, as Thou hast loved me ;

which is nothing else than this, Thou hast loved them because that Thou hast also loved me. For He could not but love the members of the Son, seeing that He loveth the Son Himself; nor is there any other reason for loving His members, save that He loveth Himself. But He loveth the Son as regards His Godhead, because He begat Him equal with Himself; He loveth Him also in regard to what He is as man, because the Only-begotten Word was Himself made flesh, and on account of the Word is the flesh of the Word dear to Him; but He loveth us, inasmuch as we are the members of Him whom He loveth; and in order that we might be so, He loved us on this account before we existed. 6. The love, therefore, wherewith God loveth, is incomprehensible and immutable. For it was not from the time that we were reconciled unto Him by the blood of His Son that He began to love us; but He did so before the foundation of the world, that we also might be His sons along with His Only-begotten, before as yet we had any existence of our own. Let not the fact, then, of our having been reconciled unto God through the death of His Son be so listened to or so understood, as if the Son reconciled us to Him in this respect, that He now began to love those whom He formerly hated, in the same way as enemy is reconciled to enemy, so that thereafter they become friends, and mutual love takes the place of their mutual hatred; but we were reconciled unto Him who already loved us, but with whom we were at enmity because of our sin. Whether I say the truth on this, let the apostle testify, when he says: "God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. He, therefore. had love toward us even when we were practising enmity against Him and working iniquity; and yet to Him it is said with perfect truth, "Thou hatest, O Lord, all workers of iniquity. Accordingly, in a wonderful and divine manner, even when He hated us, He loved us; for He hated us, in so far as we were not what He Himself had made;

and because our own iniquity had not in every part consumed His work, He knew at once both how, in each of us, to hate what we had done, and to

love what He had done. And this, indeed, may be understood in the case of all regarding Him to whom it is truly said, "Thou hatest nothing that Thou hast made. For He would never have wished anything that He hated to exist, nor would aught that the Omnipotent had not wished exist at all, were it not that in what He hated there was also something that He loved. For He justly hateth and reprobateh vice as utterly repugnant to the principle of His procedure, yet He loveth even in the persons of the vitiated what is susceptible either of His own beneficence through healing, or of His judgment by condemnation. In this way God at the same time hateth nothing of what He has made; for as the Creator of natures, and not of vices, it was not He who made the evil that He hateth; and of these same evils, all is good that He really doeth, either by mercifully healing them, or by judicially regulating them. Seeing, then, that He hateth nothing that He hath made, who can worthily describe how much He loveth the members of His Only-begotten, and how much more the Only-begotten Himself, in whom are hid all things visible and invisible, which were ordained in their various classes, and which He loves in fullest harmony with such ordination?

For the members of His Only-begotten He is leading on by the liberality of His grace to an equality with the holy angels; while the Only-begotten Himself, being Lord of all, is doubtless Lord of angels, being by nature, as God, the equal not of angels, but rather of the Father Himself; while through grace, in respect of which He is man, how can He otherwise than surpass all angelic excellence, seeing that in Him human flesh and the Word constitute but one personality? 7. Nevertheless there are not wanting some who place us likewise before the angels; because, they say, Christ died for us and not for angels. But what else is such a notion than the desire to glory over our very impiety? For "Christ," as the apostle says, "in due time died for the ungodly. Where it is not any desert of ours, but the mercy of God, that is commended. For what can be the character of the man who wishes himself to be lauded, because he has become so abominably diseased through his own wickedness, that he can only be healed by the death of his physician? That surely is not the glory of our deserts, but the medicine of our diseases. Or do we prefer ourselves to the angels on this account, that, while there are angels also who have sinned, there has been no such labor expended on their healing? As if something that was at least small in amount had been undertaken for them, and what was greater for us. But had even such been the case, it

might still be a subject of inquiry whether it was so because we had once stood in a position of superior excellence, or because we were now lying in a more desperate condition.

But knowing as we do that the Creator of all good has imparted no grace for the reparation of angelic evils, why do we not rather draw the inference that their fault was judged all the more damnable, that the nature of those who committed it was of a loftier sublimity? For to the same extent as they less than we ought to have fallen into sin, were they superior in nature to us. But now in offending against the Creator they became all the more detestably ungrateful for His beneficence, that they were created capable of exercising the greater beneficence; nor was it enough for them to become deserters from Him, but they must also become our deceivers. This, therefore, is the great goodness of which we are to be made the subjects by Him, who hath loved us even as He hath loved Christ, that, for His sake, whose members He wished us to be, we may be equal to the holy angels, to whom we were created with an inferiority of nature, and have by our sin fallen into such greater depths of unworthiness, as to make it incumbent that we should be in some sort their associates.

TRACTATE 111

John XVII. 24-26. 1. The Lord Jesus raises up His people to a great hope, than which there could not possibly be a greater. Listen and rejoice in hope, that, since the present is not a life to be loved, but to be tolerated, you may have the power of patient endurance amid all its tribulation. Listen, I say, and weigh well to what it is that our hopes are exalted. Christ Jesus saith, The Son of God, the Only-begotten, who is co-eternal and equal with the Father, saith: He, who for our sakes became man, but became not, like every man besides, a liar, saith: the Way, the Life, the Truth saith: He who overcame the world, saith of those for whom He overcame it: listen, believe, hope, desire what He saith: "Father," He says, "I will that they also whom Thou hast given me be with me where I am. Who are these whom He says were given Him by the Father? Are they not those of whom He says in another place, "No man cometh unto me, unless the Father, who hath sent me, draw him"? We already know if we have made any beneficial progress in this Gospel, how it is that the things which He says the Father doeth, He Himself doeth likewise along with the Father. They are those, therefore, whom He has received from the Father, whom He Himself has also chosen out of the world, and

chosen that they may be no more of the world, even as He also is not of the world;

and yet that they also may be a world that believeth and knoweth that Christ has been sent by God the Father that the world might be delivered from the world, and so, as a world that was to be reconciled unto God, might not be condemned with the world that lieth in enmity. For so He says in the beginning of this prayer: "Thou hast given Him power over all flesh," that is, over every man, "that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him. Here He makes it clear that He has indeed received power over all men, that, as the future Judge of quick and dead, He may deliver whom He pleases, and condemn whom He pleases; but that these were given Him that to all of them He should give eternal life. For so He says: "That He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him. Accordingly they were not given Him that from them He should withhold eternal life; although over them also the power has been given Him, inasmuch as He has received it over all flesh, in other words, over every man. In this way the world that has been reconciled will be delivered from the hostile world, when He putteth into exercise His power over it, to send it away into death eternal; but the other He maketh His own that He may give it everlasting life.

Accordingly, to every one, without fail, of His own sheep the Good Shepherd, as to every one of His members the great Head, hath promised this reward, that where He is, there also we shall be with Him; nor can that be otherwise which the omnipotent Son declared to be His will to the omnipotent Father. For there also is the Holy Spirit, equally eternal, equally God, the one Spirit of the two, the substance of the will of both. For the words that we read of Him as uttering on the eve of His passion, "Yet not, Father, as I will, but as Thou wilt," as if the Father has or had one will, and the Son another, are the echo of our infirmity, however faith-pervaded, which our Head transfigured in His own person, when He likewise bare our iniquities. But that the will of the Father and the Son is one, of both of whom also there is but one Spirit, by including whom we come to the knowledge of the Trinity, let piety believe, even though our infirmity meanwhile permitteth us not to understand.

2. But as we have already, in a way proportionate to the brevity of our discourse, spoken of the objects of the promise, and of its own stability; let us

now look at this one point, as far as we are able, what it is that He was pleased to promise when He said, "I will that they also whom Thou hast given me be with me where I am. As far as pertains to the creaturehood wherein He was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, not even He Himself was yet where He would afterwards be: but He could say in this way, "where I am," to let us understand that He was soon to ascend into heaven, so that He spake of Himself as being already there, where He was presently to be. He could do so also in the same way as He had said on a former occasion, when speaking to Nicodemus, "No man ascendeth into heaven, save He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man who is in heaven. For there also He did not say, Will be, but "is," because of the oneness of person, wherein God is at once man, and man God. He promised, therefore, that we should be in heaven; for thither the servant-form, which He received of the Virgin, has been elevated, and set at the right hand of the Father. Because of the same blessed hope the apostle also says:

"But God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ; by whose grace we are saved; and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. And so accordingly we may understand the Lord to have said, "That where I am, there they may be also. He, indeed, said of Himself that He was there already; but of us He merely declared that He wished us to be there with Him, without any indication that we were there already But what the Lord said that He wished to be done, the apostle spake of as already accomplished. For he said not, He will yet raise us up, and make us sit in heavenly places; but, "hath raised us up, and made us sit in heavenly places: for it is not without good grounds, but in believing assurance, that he reckons as already done what he is certain will yet be done. But if it is in respect of the form of God, wherein He is equal to the Father, that we would be inclined to understand His words, "I will that they also be with me, where I am," let our mind get quit of every thought of material images:

whatever the soul has had presented to it, that is endowed with length, or breadth, or thickness, tinted by the light with any sort of bodily hue, or diffused through local space of any kind, whether finite or infinite, let it, as far as possible, turn away from all such notions the glance of its contemplation on the inward bent of its thoughts. And let us not be making inquiries as to

where the Son, the Father's co-equal, is, since no one has yet found out where He is not. But if any one would inquire, let him inquire rather how he may be with Him; not everywhere as He is, but wherever He may be. For when He said to the man that was expiating his crimes on the tree, and making confession unto salvation, "Today shall thou be with me in paradise," in respect to His human nature His own soul was on that very day to be in hell, His flesh in the sepulchre; but as respected His Godhead He was certainly also in paradise. And therefore the soul of the thief, absolved from his by-gone crimes, and already in the blessed enjoyment of His grace, although it could not be everywhere as He was, yet could on that very day be also with Him in paradise, from which He, who is always everywhere, had not withdrawn. On this account, doubtless, it was not enough for Him to say, "I will that they also be where I am; but He added, "with me.

For to be with Him is the chief good. For even the miserable can be where He is, since wheresoever any are, there is He also; but the blessed only are with Him, because it is only of Him that they can be blessed. Was it not truly said to God, "If I ascend into heaven, Thou art there; and if I go down into hell, Thou art present? or is not Christ after all that Wisdom of God which "penetrateth everywhere because of its purity"? But the light shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehendeth it not. And similarly, to take a kind of illustration from what is visible, although greatly unlike, as the blind man, even though he be where the light is, is yet not himself with the light, but is really absent from that which is present; so the unbeliever and profane, or even the believer and pious, because not yet competent to gaze on the light of wisdom, although he cannot be anywhere that Christ is not there likewise, yet is not himself with Christ, I mean in actual sight. For we cannot doubt that the true believer is with Christ by faith; because in reference to this He saith, "He that is not with me is against me. But when He said to God the Father, "I will that they also whom Thou hast given me be with me where I am," He spake exclusively of that sight wherein we shall see Him as He is.

3. Let no one disturb the clearness of the meaning by any cloudy contradiction; but let what follows furnish its testimony to the words that precede. For after saying, "I will that they also be with me where I am," He went on immediately to add, "That they may behold my glory, which Thou gavest me: for Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. "That they may

behold," He said; not, that they may believe. This is faith's wages, not faith itself. For if faith has been correctly defined in the Epistle to the Hebrews as "the assurance [conviction] of things that are not seen," why may not the wages of faith be defined, the beholding of things which were hoped for in faith? For when we shall see the glory which the Father hath given the Son, even though we may understand what is spoken of in this passage, not as that [glory] which the Father gave His co-equal Son in begetting Him, but as that which He gave Him, when become the Son of man, after the death of the cross;-when, I say, we shall see that glory of the Son, then of a certainty shall take place the judgment of the quick and the dead, and then shall the wicked be taken away that he may not behold the glory of the Lord; and what [glory], save that of His Godhead? For blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God:

and because the wicked are not pure in heart, therefore they shall not see. Then shall they go away into everlasting punishment; for so shall the wicked be taken away, that he may not behold the glory of the Lord: but the righteous shall go into life eternal. And what is life eternal? "That they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent" (ver. 3): not, indeed, as those knew Him, who although impure in heart, yet were able to see Him as He sat in judgment in His glorified servant-form; but as He is yet to be known by the pure in heart, as the only true God, the Son along with the Father and Holy Spirit, because the Trinity itself is the only true God. If, then, it is in reference to His Godhead as the Son of God, equal and co-eternal with the Father, that we take the words, "I will that they also be with me where I am," we shall be with Christ in the Father; but He in His own way, we in ours, wherever we may be in body. For if localities are to be understood, and such as contain incorporeal beings, and everything has a place where it is, the eternal place of Christ where He always is, is the Father Himself, and the place of the Father is the Son; for "I," He said, "am in the Father, and the Father in me;

and in this prayer, "As Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee: and they are our place, because there follows, "That they also may be one in us: and we are God's place, inasmuch as we are His temple; even as He, who died for us and liveth for us, also prayeth for us, that we may be one in them; because "His [dwelling] place was made in peace, and His habitation in Zion," which we are. But who is qualified to think on such places or what is in them, apart

from the idea of space-defined capacities and material masses? Yet no little progress is made, if at least, when any such idea presents itself to the eye of the mind, it is denied, rejected, and reprobated: and a certain kind of light is, as far as possible, thought of, in which such things are perceived as deserving only to be denied, rejected, and reprobated; and the certainty of that light is known and loved, so that from thence an upward movement is begun in us, and an effort made to reach into places farther within: and when the mind through its own infirmity and still inferior purity has failed to penetrate them it is driven back again, not without the sighings of love and the tears of ardent longing, and continues to bear in patience until it is purified by faith, and prepared by the holiness of the inward life to be able to take up its abode therein.

4. How, then, shall we not be with Christ where He is, when we shall be with Him in the Father in whom He is? On this, also, the apostle is not without something to say to us, although we are not yet in possession of the reality, but only cherishing the hope. For he says, "If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God: set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye have died," he adds, "and your life is hid with Christ in God." Here, you see, our life is meanwhile in faith and hope with Christ, where He is; because it is with Christ in God. That, you see, is as if already accomplished for which He prayed, when He said, "I will that they also be with me where I am;" but now only by faith. And when will it be accomplished by actual sight? "When Christ," he says, "[who is] your life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory." Then shall we appear as that which we then shall be; for it shall then be apparent that it was not without good grounds that we believed and hoped we should become so, before it actually took place. He will do this, to whom the Son, after saying, "That they may behold my glory, which Thou gavest me," immediately added, "For Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." For in Him He loved us also before the foundation of the world, and then foreordained what He was to do in the end of the world.

5. "O righteous Father," He saith, "the world hath not known Thee." Just because Thou art righteous it hath not known Thee. It is as that world which has been predestined to condemnation really deserved, that it hath not known Him; while the world which He hath reconciled unto Himself

through Christ hath known Him not of merit, but by grace. For what else is the knowing of Him, but eternal life which, while He undoubtedly withheld it from the condemned world, He bestowed on the reconciled. On that very account, therefore, the world hath not known Thee, because Thou art righteous, and hast rendered unto it according to its deserts, that it should not know Thee: while on the same account the reconciled world hath known Thee, because Thou art merciful, and, not for any merit of its own, but by grace, hast supplied it with the needed help to know Thee. And then there follows, "But I have known Thee." He is the Fountain of grace, who is by nature God, and, by grace ineffable, man also of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin: and then on His own behalf, because the grace of God is through Jesus Christ our Lord, He adds, "And these have known that Thou hast sent me." Such is the reconciled world. But it is because Thou hast sent me that they have known: by grace, therefore, have they known.

6. "And I have made known to them," He says, "Thy name, and will make it known. I have made it known by faith, I will make it known by sight: I have made it known to those whose present sojourn in a strange land has its appointed end, I will make it known to those whose reign as kings shall be endless. "That the love," He adds, "wherewith [literally, which] Thou hast loved me, may be in them, and I in them. (The form of speech is unusual, "the love, which Thou hast loved me, may be in them, and I in them; for the common way of speaking is, the love wherewith thou hast loved me. Here, of course, it is a translation from the Greek: but there are similar forms also in Latin; as we say. He served a faithful service, He served as a soldier a strenuous soldier-service; when apparently we ought to have said, He served with a faithful service, he served as a soldier with a strenuous soldier-service. But such as the form of expression is, "the love which Thou hast loved me; one similar to it is also used by the apostle, "I have fought a good fight;

he does not say, in a good fight, which would be the more usual and perhaps correcter form of expression.) But how else is the love wherewith the Father loved the Son in us also, but because we are His members and are loved in Him, since He is loved in the totality of His person, as both Head and members? Therefore He added, "and I in them; as if saying, Since I am also in them. For in one sense He is in us as in His temple; but in another, because we are also Himself, seeing that, in accordance with His becoming man, that He might be our Head, we are His body. The Saviour's prayer is

finished, His passion begins; let us, therefore, also finish the present discourse, that we may treat of His passion, as He granteth us grace, in others to follow.

TRACTATE 112

John XVIII. 1-12. 1. When the grand and lengthened discourse was concluded which the Lord delivered after supper, and on the eve of shedding His blood for us, to the disciples who were then with Him, and had added the prayer addressed to His Father, the evangelist John began thereafter the narrative of His passion in these words: "When Jesus had so spoken, He went forth with His disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into the which He entered, and His disciples. And Judas also, who betrayed Him, knew the place; for Jesus oft-times resorted thither with His disciples. What he here relates of the Lord entering the garden with His disciples did not take place immediately after He had brought the prayer to a close, of which he says, "When Jesus had spoken these words: but certain other incidents were interposed, which are passed over by the present evangelist and found in the others; just as in this one are found many things on which the others are similarly silent in their own narratives. But any one who desires to know how they all agree together, and the truth which is advanced by one is never contradicted by another, may seek for what he wants, not in these present discourses, but in other elaborate treatises; but he will master the subject not by standing and listening, but rather by sitting down and reading, or by giving his closest attention and thought to one who does so.

Yet let him believe before he know, whether he be able also to come to such a knowledge in this life, or find it impossible through some existing entanglements, that there is nothing written by any one evangelist, as far as regards those who have been received by the Church into canonical authority, that can be contrary to his own or another's equally veracious narrative. At present, therefore, let us look at the narrative of the blessed John, which we have undertaken to expound, without any comparison with the others, and without lingering over anything in it that is already sufficiently clear; so that where it is needful to do so, we may the better answer the demand. Let us, therefore, not take His words, "When Jesus had spoken these words, He went forth with His disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into the which He entered, and His disciples," as if it were immediately after the utterance of these words that He entered the garden; but let the clause, "When

Jesus had spoken these words," bear this meaning, that we are not to suppose Him entering the garden before He had brought these words to a close.

2. "Judas also," he says, "who betrayed Him, knew the place; for Jesus oft-times resorted thither with His disciples." There, accordingly, the wolf, clad in a sheep's skin, and tolerated among the sheep by the profound counsel of the Father of the family, learned where he might opportunely scatter the slender flock, and lay his coveted snares for the Shepherd. "Judas then," he adds, "having received a cohort, and officers from the chief men and the Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns, and torches, and weapons." It was a cohort, not of Jews, but of soldiers. We are therefore to understand it as having been received from the governor, as if for the purpose of securing the person of a criminal, and by preserving the forms of legal power, to deter any from venturing to resist his captors: although at the same time so great a band had been assembled, and came armed in such a way as either to terrify or even attack any one who should dare to make a stand in Christ's defense. For only in so far was His power concealed and prominence given to His weakness, that these very measures were deemed necessary by His enemies to be taken against Him, for whose hurt nothing would have sufficed but what was pleasing to Himself; in His own goodness making a good use of the wicked, and doing what was good in regard to the wicked, that He might transform the evil into the good, and distinguish between the good and the evil.

3. "Jesus, therefore," as the evangelist proceeds to say, "knowing all things that should come upon Him, went forth and saith unto them, Whom seek ye? They answered Him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am [He]. And Judas also, who betrayed Him, stood with them. As soon then as He had said unto them, I am He, they went backward, and fell to the ground. Where now were the military cohort, and the servants of the chief men and the Pharisees? where the terror and protection of weapons? His own single voice uttering the words, "I am [He]," without any weapon, smote, repelled, prostrated that great crowd, with all the ferocity of their hatred and terror of their arms. For God lay hid in that human flesh; and eternal day was so obscured in those human limbs, that with lanterns and torches He was sought for to be slain by the darkness. "I am [He]," He says; and He casteth the wicked to the ground. What will He do when He cometh as judge, who did this when giving Himself up to be judged? What will be His power when He

cometh to reign, who had this power when He came to die? And now everywhere through the gospel Christ is still saying, "I am [He]; and the Jews are looking for antichrist, that they may go backward and fall to the ground, as those who have abandoned what is heavenly, and are hankering after the earthly.

It was for the very purpose of apprehending Jesus that His persecutors accompanied the traitor: they found the One they were seeking, for they heard, "I am [He]. Why, then, did they not seize Him, but went backward and fell, but just because so He pleased, who could do whatever He pleased? But had He never permitted them to apprehend Him, they would certainly not have done what they came to do, but no more would He be doing what He came to do. They, verily, in their mad rage, sought for Him to put Him to death; but He, too, in giving Himself to death, was seeking for us. Accordingly, having thus shown His power to those who had the will, but not the power, to hold Him; let them now hold Him that He may work His own will with those who know it not. 4. "Then asked He them again, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus answered, I have told you that I am [He]. If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way: that the saying might be fulfilled which He spake, That of those whom Thou hast given me I have lost none." "If ye seek me," He says, "let these go their way." He sees His enemies, and they do what He bids them: they let those go their way, whom He would not have perish. But were they not afterwards to die? How then, if they died now, should He lose them, were it not that as yet they did not believe in Him, as all believe who perish not?

5. "Then Simon Peter, having a sword, drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. And the servant's name was Malchus. This is the only evangelist who has given us the very name of this servant, as Luke is the only one who tells us that the Lord touched his ear and healed him. The interpretation of Malchus is, one who is destined to reign. What, then, is signified by the ear that was cut off in the Lord's behalf, and healed by the Lord, but the renewed hearing that has been pruned of its oldness, that it may henceforth be in the newness of the spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter? Who can doubt that he, who had such a thing done for him by Christ, was yet destined to reign with Christ? And his being found as a servant, pertains also to that oldness that gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. But when healing came, liberty also was shadowed forth. Peter's deed, how-

ever, was disapproved of by the Lord, and He prevented Him from proceeding further by the words: "Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? For in such a deed that disciple only sought to defend his Master, without any thought of what it was intended to signify. And he had therefore to be exhorted to the exercise of patience, and the event itself to be recorded as an exercise of understanding.

But when He says that the cup of suffering was given Him by the Father, we have precisely the same truth as that which was uttered by the apostle: "If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own Son, but gave Him up for us all. But the originator of this cup is also one with Him who drank it; and hence the same apostle likewise says, "Christ loved us, and gave Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God of a sweet-smelling savor." 6. "Then the cohort, and the tribune, and the officers of the Jews, took Jesus, and bound Him." They took Him to whom they had never found access: for He continued the day, while they remained as darkness; neither had they given heed to the words, "Come unto Him, and be enlightened." For had they so approached Him, they would have taken Him, not with their hands for the purpose of murder, but with their hearts for the purpose of a welcome reception. Now, however, when they laid hold of Him in this way, their distance from Him was vastly increased: and they bound Him by whom they themselves ought rather to have been loosed. And perhaps there were those among them who then fastened their fetters on Christ, and yet were afterwards delivered by Him, and could say, "Thou hast loosed my bonds." Let this be enough for to-day; we shall deal, God willing, with what follows in another discourse.

TRACTATE 113

John XVIII. 13-27. 1. After that His persecutors had, through the treason of Judas, taken and bound the Lord, who loved us, and gave Himself for us, and whom the Father spared not, but gave Him up for us all: that we may understand that there was no praise due to Judas for the usefulness of his treachery, but damnation for the willfulness of his wickedness: "They led Him," as John the evangelist tells us, "to Annas first." Nor does he withhold the reason for so doing: "For he was father-in-law to Caiaphas, who was the high priest that same year. Now Caiaphas was he," he says, "who gave counsel to the Jews, that it was expedient that one man should die for the people." And properly enough Matthew, when wishing to say the same in fewer words, tells us that

He was led to Caiaphas; for He was also taken in the first place to Annas, simply because he was his father-in-law; and where we have only to understand that such was the very thing that Caiaphas wished to be done.

2. "But Jesus was followed," he says, "by Simon Peter, and another disciple. Who that other disciple is, we cannot affirm with confidence, because it is left unnoticed here. But it is in this way that John usually refers to himself, with the addition, "whom Jesus loved. Perhaps, therefore, it is he also in the present case; but whoever it is, let us look at what follows. "And that disciple," he says, "was known unto the high priest, and went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest; but Peter stood at the door without. Then went out that other disciple, who was known unto the high priest, and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter. Then saith the damsel that kept the door unto Peter, Art thou also one of this man's disciples? He saith, I am not. Lo, the pillar of greatest strength has at a single breath of air trembled to its foundations. Where is now all that boldness of the promiser, and his overweening confidence in himself beforehand? What now of those words, when he said, "Why cannot I follow Thee now? I will lay down my life for Thy sake. Is this the way to follow the Master, to deny his own discipleship? is it thus that one's life is laid down for the Lord, when one is frightened at a maid-servant's voice, lest it should compel us to the sacrifice? But what wonder, if God foretold what was true, and man presumptuously imagined what was false?

Assuredly in this denial of the Apostle Peter, which had now entered on its first stage, we ought to take notice that not only is Christ denied by one who says that He is not Christ, but by him also who, while really a Christian, himself denies that he is so. For the Lord said not to Peter, Thou shall deny that thou art my disciple; but, "Thou shall deny me. Him, therefore, he denied, when he denied that he was His disciple. And what else did such a form of denial imply, but that of his own Christianity? For although the disciples of Christ were not yet called by such a name,-because it was after His ascension, in Antioch, first that the disciples began to be called Christians, -yet the thing itself, that afterwards assumed such a name, already existed, those who were afterwards called Christians were already disciples; and this common name, like the common faith, they transmitted to their posterity. He, therefore, who denied that he was Christ's disciple, denied the reality of the thing, of which the being called a Christian was only the name. How

many afterwards, not to speak of old men and women, whose satiated feelings as regards the present life might more easily enable them to brave death for the confession of Christ; and not merely the youth of both sexes, when of an age at which the exercise of fortitude seems to be fairly required;

but even boys and girls could do—even as an innumerable company of holy martyrs with brave hearts and by a violent death entered the kingdom of heaven—what at that moment he was unable to do, who received the keys of that kingdom. It is here we see why it was said, "Let these go their way," when He, who hath redeemed us by His own blood, gave Himself for us; that the saying which He spake might be fulfilled, "Of those whom Thou hast given me I have lost none. For assuredly, had Peter gone hence after denying the Christ, what else would have awaited him but destruction? 3. "And the servants and officers stood beside the fire of burning coals, for it was cold, and warmed themselves. Though it was not winter, it was cold: which is sometimes wont to be the case even at the vernal equinox. "And Peter was standing with them, and warming himself. The high priest then asked Jesus of His disciples, and of His doctrine. Jesus answered him, I spake openly to the world; I always taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither all the Jews resort, and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? ask those who heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said. A question occurs that ought not to be passed over, how it is that the Lord Jesus said, "I spake openly to the world; and in particular that which He afterwards added, "In secret have I said nothing. Did He not, even in that latest discourse which He delivered to the disciples after supper, say to them, "These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs; but the hour cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you plainly of my Father? If, then, He spake not openly even to the more intimate company of His disciples, but gave the promise of a time when He would speak openly, how was it that He spake openly to the world?

And still further, as is also testified on the authority of the other evangelists, to those who were truly His own, in comparison with others who were not His disciples, He certainly spake with much greater plainness when He was alone with them at a distance from the multitudes; for then He unfolded to them the parables, which He had uttered in obscure terms to others. What then is the meaning of the words, "In secret have I said nothing"? It is in this way we are to understand His saying, "I spake openly to the world; as if He

had said, There were many that heard me. And that word "openly" was in a certain sense openly and in another sense not openly. It was openly, because many heard Him; and again it was not openly, because they did not understand Him. And even what He spake to His disciples apart, He certainly spake not in secret. For who speaketh in secret, that speaketh before so many persons; as it is written, "At tim mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established: especially if that be spoken to a few which he wisheth to become known to many through them; as the Lord Himself said to the few whom He had as yet, "What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house-tops"?

And accordingly the very thing that seemed to be spoken by Himself in secret, was in a certain sense not spoken in secret; for it was not so spoken to remain unuttered by those to whom it was spoken; but rather so in order to be preached in every possible direction. A thing therefore may be uttered at once openly, and not openly; or at the same time in secret, and yet not in secret, as it is said, "That seeing, they may see, and not see. For how "may they see," save only because it is openly, and not in secret; and again, how is it that the same parties "may not see," save that it is not openly, but in secret? Howbeit the very things which they had heard without understanding, were such as could not with justice or truth be turned into a criminal charge against Him: and as often as they tried by their questions to find something whereof to accuse Him, He gave them such replies as utterly discomfited all their plots, and left no ground for the calumnies they devised. Therefore He said, "Why askest thou me? ask those who heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said."

4. "And when He had thus spoken, one of the officers who stood by gave Jesus a blow with his open hand, saying, Answerest thou the high priest so? Jesus answered him, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me? What could be truer, meeker, juster, than such an answer? For it is His [reply], from whom the prophetic voice had issued before, "Make for thy goal (literally, take aim), and advance prosperously and reign, because of truth, and meekness, and righteousness. If we consider who it was that received the blow, might we not well feel the wish that he who struck it were either consumed by fire from heaven, or swallowed up by the gaping earth, or seized and carried off by devils, or visited with some other or still heavier punishment of this kind? For what one of all these could not He,

who made the world, have commanded by His power, had He not wished rather to teach us the patience that overcometh the world? Some one will say here, Why did He not do what He Himself commanded? for to one that smote Him, He ought not to have answered thus, but to have turned to him the other cheek. Nay, more than this, did He not answer truthfully, and meekly, and righteously, and at the same time not only prepare His other cheek to him who was yet again to smite it, but His whole body to be nailed to the tree?

And hereby He rather showed, what needed to be shown, namely, that those great precepts of His are to be fulfilled not by bodily ostentation, but by the preparation of the heart. For it is possible that even an angry man may visibly hold out his other cheek. How much better, then, is it for one who is inwardly pacified to make a truthful answer, and with tranquil mind hold himself ready for the endurance of heavier sufferings to come? Happy is he who, in all that he suffers unjustly for righteousness' sake, can say with truth, "My heart is ready, O God, my heart is ready; for this it is that gives cause for that which follows: "I will sing and I give praise; which Paul and Barnabas could do even in the cruellest of bonds. 5. But let us return to what follows in the Gospel narrative. "And Annas sent Him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest." To him, according to Matthew's account, He was led at the outset, because he was the high priest that year. For both the pontiffs are to be understood as in the habit of acting year by year alternately, that is, as chief priests; and these were at that time Annas and Caiaphas, as recorded by the evangelist Luke, when telling of the time when John, the Lord's forerunner, began to preach the kingdom of heaven and to gather disciples. For he speaks thus: "Under the high priests Annas and Caiaphas, the word of the Lord came upon John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness," etc. Accordingly these twopontiffs fulfilled their years in turn: and it was the year of Caiaphas when Christ suffered. And so, according to Matthew, when He was apprehended, He was taken to him; but first, according to John, they came with Him to Annas; not because he was his colleague, but his father-in-law. And we must suppose that it was by Caiaphas' wish that it was so done; or that their houses were so situated, that Annas could not properly be overlooked by them as they passed on their way.

6. But the evangelist, after saying that Annas sent Him bound unto Caiaphas, returns to the place of his narrative, where he had left Peter, in order to

explain what had taken place in Annas' house in regard to his threefold denial. "But Peter was standing," he says, "and warming himself." He thus repeats what he had already stated before; and then adds what follows. "They said therefore unto him, Art thou also one of his disciples? He denied, and said, I am not." He had already denied once; this is the second time. And then, that the third denial might also be fulfilled, "one of the servants of the high priest, being his kinsman whose ear Peter cut off, saith, Did I not see thee in the garden with him? Peter then denied again, and immediately the cock crew." Behold, the prediction of the Physician is fulfilled, the presumption of the sick man is brought to the light. For there is no performance of what the latter had asserted, "I will lay down my life for Thy sake;" but a performance of what the former had predicted, "Thou shalt thrice deny me." But with the completion of Peter's threefold denial, let the present discourse be also now completed, that hereafter we may make a fresh start with the consideration of what was done respecting the Lord before Pontius Pilate the governor.

TRACTATE 114

John XVIII. 28-32. 1. Let us now consider, so far as indicated by the evangelist John, what was done with, or in regard to, our Lord Jesus Christ, when brought before Pontius Pilate the governor. For he returns to the place of his narrative where he had left it, to explain the denial of Peter. He had already, you know, said, "And Annas sent Him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest:" and having returned from where he had dismissed Peter as he was warming himself at the fire in the hall, after completing the whole of his denial, which was thrice repeated, he says, "Then they bring Jesus unto Caiaphas into the hall of judgment (pretorium);" for he had said that He was sent to Caiaphas by his colleague and father-in-law Annas. But if to Caiaphas, why into the hall of judgment? Nothing else is thereby meant to be understood than the place where Pilate the governor dwelt. And therefore, either for some urgent reason Caiaphas had proceeded from the house of Annas, where both had met to give Jesus a hearing, to the governor's pretorium, and had left the hearing of Jesus to his father-in-law; or Pilate had made his pretorium in the house of Caiaphas, which was so large as to contain separate apartments for its own master, and the like for the judge.

2. "And it was morning; and they themselves," that is, those who brought Jesus, "went not into the judgment hall," to wit, into that part of the house

which Pilate occupied, supposing it to be Caiaphas' house. And then in explanation of the reason why they went not into the judgment hall, he says, "lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover." For it was the commencement of the days of unleavened bread: on which they accounted it defilement to enter the abode of one of another nation. Impious blindness! Would they, forsooth, be defiled by a stranger's abode, and not bedefiled by their own wickedness? They were afraid of being defiled by the pretorium of a foreign judge, and had no fear of defilement from the blood of an innocent brother: not to say more than this meanwhile, which was enough to fix guilt on the conscience of the wicked. For the additional fact, that it was the Lord who was led to death by their impiety, and the giver of life that was on the way to be slain, may be charged, not to their conscience, but to their ignorance.

3. "Pilate then went out unto them, and said, What accusation bring ye against this man? They answered and said unto him, If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee." Let the question be put to, and the answer come from, those who had been delivered from foul spirits, from the sickly who had been healed, the lepers who had been cleansed, the deaf who were hearing, the dumb who were speaking, the blind who were seeing, the dead who were raised to life, and, above all, the foolish who were become wise, whether Jesus were a malefactor. But these things were said by those of whom He Himself had already foretold by the prophet, "They rewarded me evil for good." 4. "Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law. The Jews therefore said unto him. It is not lawful for us to put any man to death. What is this that their insane cruelty saith? Did not they put Him to death, whom they were here presenting for the very purpose? Or does the cross, forsooth, fail to kill? Such is the folly of those who do not pursue, but persecute wisdom. What then mean the words, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death"? If He is a malefactor, why is it not lawful? Did not the law command them not to spare malefactors, especially (as they accounted Him to be) those who seduced them from their God? We are, however, to understand that they said that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death, on account of the sanctity of the festal day, which they had just begun to celebrate, and on account of which they were afraid of being defiled even by entering the pretorium. Had you become so hardened, false Israelites? Were you by your excess-

ive malice so lost to all sense, as to imagine that you were unpolluted by the blood of the innocent, because you gave it up to be shed by another? Was even Pilate himself going to slay Him with his own hands, when made over by you into his power for the very purpose? If you did not wish Him to be slain;

if you did not lay snares for Him; if you did not get Him to be betrayed to you for money; if you did not lay hands upon Him, and bind Him, and bring Him there; if you did not with your own hands present Him, and with your voices demand Him to be slain,—then boast that He was not put to death by you. But if in addition to all these former deeds of yours, you also cried out, "Crucify, crucify [him]; then hear what it is against you that the prophet proclaims: "The sons of men, whose teeth are spears and arrows, and their tongue a sharp sword. These, look you, are the spears, the arrows, the sword, wherewith you slew the righteous, when you said that it was not lawful for you to put any man to death. Hence it is also that when for the purpose of apprehending Jesus the chief priests did not themselves come, but sent; yet the evangelist Luke says in the same passage of his narrative, "Then said Jesus unto those who were come to him, [namely] the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders, Be ye come out, as against a thief," etc?

As therefore the chief priests went not in their own persons, but by those whom they had sent, to apprehend Jesus, what else was that but coming themselves in the authority of their own order and so all, who cried out with impious voices for the crucifixion of Christ, slew Him, not, indeed, directly with their own hands, but personally through him who was impelled to such a crime by their clamor. 5. But when the evangelist John adds, "That the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, which He spake, signifying what death He should die: if we would understand such words as referring to the death of the cross, as if the Jews had said, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death," for this reason that it was one thing to be put to death, and another to be crucified: I do not see how such can be understood as a consequence, seeing that this was their answer to the words that Pilate had just addressed to them, "Take ye him, and judge him according to your law. If it were so, could they not then have taken Him, and crucified Him themselves, had they desired by any such form of punishment to avoid the putting of Him to death? But who is there that may not see the absurdity of allowing those to crucify any one, who were not allowed to put any one to death? Nay more,

did not the Lord Himself call that same death of His, that is, the death of the cross, a putting to death, as we read in Mark, where he says, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes; and they shall condemn Him to death, and shall deliver Him to the Gentiles:

and they shall mock Him, and shall spit upon Him, and shall scourge Him, and shall put Him to death, and the third day He shall rise again"? There is no doubt, therefore, that in so speaking the Lord signified what death He should die: not that He here meant the death of the cross to be understood, but that the Jews were to deliver Him up to the Gentiles, or, in other words, to the Romans. For Pilate was a Roman, and had been sent by the Romans into Judea as governor. That, then, this saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, namely, that, being delivered up to them, He should be put to death by the Gentiles, as Jesus had foretold would happen; therefore when Pilate, who was the Roman judge, wished to hand Him back to the Jews, that they might judge Him according to their law, they refused to receive Him. saying, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death. And so the saying of Jesus was fulfilled, which He foretold concerning His death, that, being delivered up by the Jews, He should be put to death by the Gentiles: whose crime was less than that of the Jews, who sought by this method to make themselves appear averse to His being put to death, to the end that, not their innocence, but their madness might be made manifest.

TRACTATE 115

John XVIII. 33-40. 1. What Pilate said to Christ, or what He replied to Pilate, has to be considered and handled in the present discourse. For after the words had been addressed to the Jews, "Take ye him, and judge him according to your law," and the Jews had replied, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death, Pilate entered again into the judgment hall, and called Jesus, and said unto Him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus answered, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me? The Lord indeed knew both what He Himself asked, and what reply the other was to give; but yet He wished it to be spoken, not for the sake of information to Himself, but that what He wished us to know might be recorded in Scripture. "Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation, and the chief priests, have delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done? Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my

servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence. This is what the good Master wished us to know; but first there had to be shown us the vain notion that men had regarding His kingdom, whether Gentiles or Jews, from whom Pilate had heard it; as if He ought to have been punished with death on the ground of aspiring to an unlawful kingdom;

or as those in the possession of royal power usually manifest their ill-will to such as are yet to attain it, as if, for example, precautions were to be used lest His kingdom should prove adverse either to the Romans or to the Jews. But the Lord was able to reply to the first question of the governor, when he asked Him, "Art thou the King of the Jews? with the words, "My kingdom is not of this world," etc.; but by questioning him in turn, whether he said this thing of himself, or heard it from others, He wished by his answer to show that He had been charged with this as a crime before him by the Jews: laying open to us the thoughts of men, which were all known to Himself, that they are but vain; and now, after Pilate's answer, giving them, both Jews and Gentiles, all the more reasonable and fitting a reply, "My kingdom is not of this world. But had He made an immediate answer to Pilate's question, His reply would have appeared to refer to the Gentiles only, without including the Jews, as entertaining such an opinion regarding Him. But now when Pilate replied, "Am I a Jew? Thine own nation, and the chief priests, have delivered thee to me; he removed from himself the suspicion of being possibly supposed to have spoken of his own accord, in saying that Jesus was the king of the Jews, by showing that such a statement had been communicated to him by the Jews.

And then by saying, "What hast thou done? he made it sufficiently clear that this was charged against Him as a crime: as if he had said, If thou deniest such kingly claims, what hast thou done to cause thy being delivered unto me? As if there would be no ground for wonder that one should be delivered up to a judge for punishment, who proclaimed himself a king; but if no such assertion were made, it became needful to inquire of Him, what else, if anything, He had done, that He should thus deserve to be delivered unto the judge. 2. Hear then, ye Jews and Gentiles; hear, O circumcision; hear, O uncircumcision; hear, all ye kingdoms of the earth: I interfere not with your government in this world, "My kingdom is not of this world. Cherish ye not the utterly vain terror that threw Herod the elder into consternation when

the birth of Christ was announced, and led him to the murder of so many infants in the hope of including Christ in the fatal number, made more cruel by his fear than by his anger: "My kingdom," He said, "is not of this world. What would you more? Come to the kingdom that is not of this world; come, believing, and fall not into the madness of anger through fear. He says, indeed, prophetically of God the Father, "Yet have I been appointed king by Him upon His holy hill of Zion; but that hill of Zion is not of this world. For what is His kingdom, save those who believe in Him, to whom He says, "Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world"? And yet He wished them to be in the world: on that very account saying of them to the Father, "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil. Hence also He says not here, "My kingdom is not" in this world; but, "is not of this world.

And when He proved this by saying, "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews," He saith not, "But now is my kingdom not" here, but, "is not from hence. For His kingdom is here until the end of the world, having tares intermingled therewith until the harvest; for the harvest is the end of the world, when the reapers, that is to say, the angels, shall come and gather out of His kingdom everything that offendeth; which certainly would not be done, were it not that His kingdom is here. But still it is not from hence; for it only sojourns as a stranger in the world: because He says to His kingdom, "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world. They were therefore of the world, so long as they were not His kingdom, but belonged to the prince of this world. Of the world therefore are all mankind, created indeed by the true God, but generated from Adam as a vitiated and condemned stock; and there are made into a kingdom no longer of the world, all from thence that have been regenerated in Christ. For so did God rescue us from the power of darkness, and translate us into the kingdom of the Son of His love: and of this kingdom it is that He saith, "My kingdom is not of this world; or, "My kingdom is not from hence."

3. "Pilate therefore said unto Him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king." Not that He was afraid to confess Himself a king, but "Thou sayest" has been so balanced that He neither denies Himself to be a king (for He is a king whose kingdom is not of this world), nor does He confess that He is such a king as to warrant the supposition that His

kingdom is of this world. For as this was the very idea in Pilate's mind when he said, "Art thou a king then?" so the answer he got was, "Thou sayest that I am a king." For it was said, "Thou sayest," as if it had been said, Carnal thyself, thou sayest it carnally. 4. Thereafter He adds, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." * * Whence it is evident that He here referred to His own temporal nativity, when by becoming incarnate He came into the world, and not to that which had no beginning, whereby He was God through whom the Father created the world. For this, then, that is, on this account, He declared that He was born, and to this end He came into the world, to wit, by being born of the Virgin, that He might bear witness unto the truth. But because all men have not faith, He still further said, "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice. He heareth, that is to say, with the ears of the inward man, or, in other words, He obeyeth my voice, which is equivalent to saying, He believeth me. When Christ, therefore, beareth witness unto the truth, He beareth witness, of course, unto Himself; for from His own lips are the words, "I am the truth; as He said also in another place, "I bear witness of myself. But when He said, "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice," He commendeth the grace whereby He calleth according to His own purpose.

Of which purpose the apostle says, "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to those who are called according to the purpose of God," to wit, the purpose of Him that calleth, not of those who are called; which is put still more clearly in another place in this way, "Labor together in the gospel according to the power of God, who saveth us and calleth us with His holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace. For if our thoughts turn to the nature wherein we have been created, inasmuch as we were all created by the Truth, who is there that is not of the truth? But it is not all to whom it is given of the truth to hear, that is, to obey the truth, and to believe in the truth; while in no case certainly is there any preceding of merit, lest grace should cease to be grace. For had He said, Every one that heareth my voice is of the truth, then it would be supposed that he was declared to be of the truth because he conforms to the truth; it is not this, however, that He says, but, "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice. And in this way he is not of the truth simply because he heareth His voice;

but only on this account he heareth, because he is of the truth, that is, because this is a gift bestowed on him of the truth. And what else is this, but that by Christ's gracious bestowal he believeth on Christ? 5. "Pilate said unto Him, What is truth?" Nor did he wait to hear the answer; but "when he had said this, he went out again unto the Jews, and said unto them, I find in him no fault. But ye have a custom that I should release unto you one at the passover: will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews?" I believe when Pilate said, "What is truth?" there immediately occurred to his mind the custom of the Jews, according to which he was wont to release unto them one at the passover; and therefore he did not wait to hear Jesus' answer to his question, What is truth? to avoid delay on recollecting the custom whereby He might be released unto them during the passover—a thing which it is clear he greatly desired. It could not, however, be torn from his heart that Jesus was the King of the Jews, but was fixed there, as in the superscription, by the truth itself, whereof he had just inquired what it was. "But on hearing this, they all cried again, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas. Now Barabbas was a robber." We blame you not, O Jews, for liberating the guilty during the passover, but for slaying the innocent; and yet unless that were done, the true passover would not take place. But a shadowy of the truth was retained by the erring Jews, and by a marvellous dispensation of divine wisdom the truth of that same shadow was fulfilled by deluded men; because in order that the true passover might be kept, Christ was led as a sheep to the sacrificial slaughter. Hence there follows the account of the injurious treatment received by Christ at the hands of Pilate and his cohort; but this must be taken up in another discourse.

TRACTATE 116

John XIX. 1-16. 1. On the Jews crying out that they did not wish Jesus to be released unto them all the passover, but Barabbas the robber; nottim Saviour, but the murderer; not the Giver of life, but the destroyer,—"then Pilate took Jesus and scourged Him." We must believe that Pilate acted thus for no other reason than that the Jews, glutted with the injuries done to Him, might consider themselves satisfied, and desist from madly pursuing Him even unto death. With a similar intention was it that, as governor, he also permitted his cohort to do what follows, or even perhaps ordered them, although the evangelist is silent on the subject. For he tells us what the soldiers did thereafter, but not that Pilate ordered it. "And the soldiers," he says,

"platted a crown of thorns, and put it on His head, and they clothed Him with a purple robe. And they came to Him and said, Hail, King of the Jews! And they smote Him with their hands." Thus were fulfilled the very things which Christ had foretold of Himself; thus were the martyrs moulded for the endurance of all that their persecutors should be pleased to inflict; thus, by concealing for a time the terror of His power, He commended to us the prior imitation of His patience; thus the kingdom which was not of this world overcame that proud world, not by the ferocity of fighting, but by the humility of suffering; and thus the grain of corn that was yet to be multiplied was sown amid the horrors of shame, that it might come to fruition amid the wonders of glory.

2. "Pilate went forth again, and saith unto them, Behold, I bring him forth, that ye may know that I find no fault in him. Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe. And he saith unto them, Behold the man!" Hence it is apparent that these things were done by the soldiers not without Pilate's knowledge, whether it was that he ordered them or only permitted them, namely, for the reason we have stated above, that His enemies might all the more willingly drink in the sight of such derisive treatment, and cease to thirst further for His blood. Jesus goes forth to them wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe, not resplendent in kingly power, but laden with reproach; and the words are addressed to them, Behold the man! If you hate your king, spare him now when you see him sunk so low; he has been scourged, crowned with thorns, clothed with the garments of derision, jeered at with the bitterest insults, struck with the open hand; his ignominy is at the boiling point, let your ill-will sink to zero. But there is no such cooling on the part of the latter, but rather a further increase of heat and vehemence.

3. "When the chief priests, therefore, and attendants saw Him, they cried out, saying, Crucify, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them Take ye him and crucify him; for I find no fault in him. The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by the law he ought to die because he made himself the Son of God." Behold another and still greater ground of hatred. The former, indeed, seemed but a small matter, as that shown towards the usurpation, by an unlawful act of daring, of the royal power; and yet of neither did Jesus falsely claim possession, but each of them is truly His as both the only-begotten Son of God, and by Him appointed King upon His holy hill of Zion; and both

might He now have shown to be His, were it not that in proportion to the greatness of His power, He preferred to manifest the corresponding greatness of His patience.

4. "When Pilate, therefore, heard that saying, he was the more afraid; and entered again into the judgment hall, and saith unto Jesus, Whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no answer." It is found, in comparing the narratives of all the evangelists, that this silence on the part of our Lord Jesus Christ took place more than once, both before the chief priests and before Herod, to whom, as Luke intimates, Pilate had sent Him for a hearing, and before Pilate himself; so that it was not in vain that the prophecy regarding Him had preceded, "As the lamb before its shearer was dumb, so He opened not His mouth," especially on those occasions when He answered not His questioners. For although He frequently replied to questions addressed to Him, yet because of those in regard to which He declined making any reply, the metaphor of the lamb is supplied, in order that in His silence He might be accounted not as guilty, but innocent. When, therefore, He was passing through the process of judgment, wherever He opened not His mouth it was in the character of a lamb that He did so; that is, not as one with an evil conscience who was convicted of his sins, but as one who in His meekness was sacrificed for the sins of others.

5. "Then saith Pilate unto Him, Speakest thou not unto me knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee? Jesus answered: Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin. Here, you see, He replied; and yet wherever He replied not, it is not as one who is criminal or cunning, but as a lamb; that is, in simplicity and innocence He opened not His mouth. Accordingly, where He made no answer, He was silent as a sheep; where He answered, He taught as the Shepherd. Let us therefore set ourselves to learn what He said, what He taught also by the apostle, that "there is no power but of God; and that he is a greater sinner who maliciously delivereth up to the power the innocent to be slain, than the power itself, if it slay him through fear of another power that is greater still. Of such a sort, indeed, was the power which God had given to Pilate, that he should also be under the power of Caesar. Wherefore "thou wouldest have," He says, "no power against me," that is, even the little measure thou really hast, "except" this very measure, whatever its amount, "were given thee

from above. But knowing as I do its amount, for it is not so great as to render thee altogether independent, "therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin.

He, indeed, delivered me to thy power at the bidding of envy, whilst thou art to exercise thy power upon me through the impulse of fear. And yet not even through the impulse of fear ought one man to slay another, especially the innocent; nevertheless to do so by an officious zeal is a much greater evil than under the constraint of fear. And therefore the truth-speaking Teacher saith not, "He that delivered me to thee," he only hath sin, as if the other had none; but He saith, "hath the greater sin," letting him understand that he himself was not exempt from blame. For that of the latter is not reduced to nothing because the other is greater. 6. "Hence Pilate sought to release Him." What is to be understood by the word here used, "hence," as if he had not been seeking to do so before? Read what precedes, and thou wilt find that he had already for some time been seeking to release Jesus. By the original word, therefore, we are to understand, on this account, that is, for this reason, that he might not contract sin by slaying an innocent man who had been delivered into his hands, even though his sin would be less than that of the Jews, who delivered Him to him to be put to death. "From thence," therefore, that is, for this reason, that he might not commit such a sin, "he sought" not now for the first time, but from the beginning, "to release Him." 7. "But the Jews cried out, saying, If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Caesar." They thought to inspire Pilate with greater fear by terrifying him about Caesar, in order that he might put Christ to death, than formerly when they said, "We have the law, and by the law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God." It was not their law, indeed, that impelled him through fear to the deed of murder, but rather it was his fear of the Son of God that held him back from the crime. But now he could not set Caesar, who was the author of his own power, at nought, in the same way as the law of another nation.

8. As yet, however, the evangelist proceeds to say: "But when Pilate heard these sayings, he brought Jesus forth, and sat down before the tribunal, in a place that is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha. And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour." The question, at what hour the Lord was crucified, because of the testimony supplied by an-

other evangelist, who says, "And it was the third hour, and they crucified Him," we shall consider as we can, if the Lord please, when we are come to the passage itself where His crucifixion is recorded. When Pilate, therefore, had sat down before the tribunal, "he saith unto the Jews, Behold your king! But they cried out, Away with him, away with him, crucify him. Pilate said unto them, Shall I crucify your king?" As yet he tries to overcome the terror with which they had inspired him about Caesar, by seeking to break them from their purpose on the ground of the ignominy it brought on themselves, with the words, "Shall I crucify your king?" when he failed to soften them on the ground of the ignominy done to Christ; but by and by he is overcome by fear.

9. For "the chief priests answered, We have no king but Caesar. Then delivered he Him therefore unto them to be crucified. For he would have every appearance of acting against Caesar if, on their declaration that they had no king but Caesar, he were wishing to impose on them another king by releasing without punishment one whom for these very attempts they had delivered unto him to be put to death. "Therefore he delivered Him unto them to be crucified. But was it, then, anything different that he had previously desired when he said, "Take ye him, and crucify him; or even earlier still, "Take ye him, and judge him according to your law? And why did they show so great reluctance, when they said, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death," and were in every way urgent to have Him slain not by themselves, but by the governor, and therefore refused to receive Him for the purpose of putting Him to death, if now for the same purpose they actually do receive Him? Or if such be not the case, why was it said, "Then delivered he Him therefore unto them to be crucified? Or is it of any importance? Plainly it is. For it was not said, "Then delivered he Him therefore unto them" that they might crucify Him, but "that He might be crucified," that is, that He might be crucified by the judicial sentence and power of the governor.

But it is for this reason that the evangelist has said that He was delivered to them, that he might show that they were implicated in the crime from which they tried to hold themselves aloof; for Pilate would have done no such thing, save to implement what he perceived to be their fixed desire. The words, however, that follow, "And they took Jesus, and led Him away," may now refer to the soldiers, the attendants of the governor. For it is more clearly stated afterwards, "When the soldiers therefore had crucified Him,"

although the evangelist properly does so even when he attributes the whole to the Jews, for they it was that received what they had with the utmost greediness demanded, and they it was that did all that they compelled to be done. But the events that follow must be made the subject of consideration in another discourse.

TRACTATE 117

John XIX. 17-22. 1. On Pilate's judgment and condemnation before the tribunal, they took the Lord Jesus Christ, about the sixth hour, and led Him away. "And He, bearing His cross, went forth into the place that is called Calvary, but in Hebrew, Golgotha; where they crucified Him." What else, then, is the meaning of the evangelist Mark saying, "And it was the third hour, and they crucified Him," but this, that the Lord was crucified at the third hour by the tongues of the Jews, at the sixth hour by the hands of the soldiers? That we may understand that the fifth hour was now completed, and there was some beginning made of the sixth, when Pilate took his seat before the tribunal, which is expressed by John as "about the sixth hour;" and when He was led forth, and nailed to the tree with the two robbers, and the events recorded were enacted beside His cross, the completion of the sixth hour was fully reached, being the hour from which, on to the ninth, the sun was obscured, and the darkness took place, we have it jointly attested on the authority of the three evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. But as the Jews attempted to transfer the crime of slaying Christ from themselves to the Romans, that is to say, to Pilate and his soldiers, therefore Mark suppresses the hour at which Christ was crucified by the soldiers, and which then began to enter upon the sixth, and remembers rather to give an express place to the third hour, at which they are understood to have cried out before Pilate, "Crucify, crucify him" (verse 6), that it not only may be seen that the former crucified Jesus, namely, the soldiers who hung Him on the tree at the sixth hour, but the Jews also, who at the third hour cried out to have Him crucified.

2. There is also another solution of this question, that we should not here understand the sixth hour of the day, because John says not, "And it was about the sixth hour of the day, or about the sixth hour," but says, "And it was the parasceve of the passover, about the sixth hour" (ver. 14). And parasceve is in Latin *praeparatio* (preparation); but the Jews are fonder of using the Greek words in observances of this sort, even those of them who speak Latin rather

than Greek. It was therefore the preparation of the passover. But "our passover, Christ," as the apostle says, "has been sacrificed; and if we reckon the preparation of this passover from the ninth hour of the night (for then the chief priests seem to have given their verdict for the sacrifice of the Lord, when they said, "He is guilty of death," and when the hearing of His case was still proceeding in the high priest's house: whence there is a kind of harmony in understanding that therewith began the preparation of the true passover, whose shadow was the passover of the Jews, that is, of the sacrificing of Christ, when the priests gave their sentence that He was to be sacrificed), certainly from that hour of the night, which is conjectured to have been then the ninth, on to the third hour of the day, when the evangelist Mark testifies that Christ was crucified, there are six hours, three of the night, and three of the day.

Hence in the case of this parasceve of the passover, that is, the preparation of the sacrifice of Christ, which began with the ninth hour of the night, it was about the sixth hour; that is to say, the fifth hour was completed, and the sixth had already begun to run, when Pilate ascended the tribunal: for that same preparation, which had begun with the ninth hour of the night, still continued till the sacrifice of Christ, which was the event in course of preparation, was completed, which took place at the third hour, according to Mark, not of the preparation, but of the day; while it was also the sixth hour, not of the day, but of the preparation, by reckoning, of course, six hours from the ninth hour of the night to the third of the day. Of these two solutions of this difficult question let each choose the one that pleases him. But one will judge better what to choose who reads the very elaborate discussions on "The Harmony of the Evangelists. And if other solutions of it can also be found, the stability of gospel truth will have a more cumulative defense against the calumnies of unbelieving and profane vanity. And now, after these brief discussions, let us return to the narrative of the evangelist John.

3. "And they took Jesus," he says, "and led Him away; and He, bearing His cross, went forth unto the place that is called Calvary, in the Hebrew, Golgotha; where they crucified Him." Jesus, therefore, went to the place where He was to be crucified, bearing His cross. A grand spectacle! but if it be impiety that is the onlooker, a grand laughing-stock; if piety, a grand mystery: if impiety be the onlooker, a grand demonstration of ignominy; if piety, a grand bulwark of faith: if it is impiety that looketh on, it laughs at the King

bearing, in place of His kingly rod, the tree of His punishment; if it is piety, it sees the King bearing the tree for His own crucifixion, which He was yet to affix even on the foreheads of kings, exposed to the contemptuous glances of the impious in connection with that wherein the hearts of saints were thereafter to glory. For to Paul, who was yet to say, "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ," He was commending that same cross of His by carrying it on His own shoulders, and bearing the candelabrum of that light that was yet to burn, and not to be placed under a bushel. "Bearing," therefore, "His cross, He went forth into the place that is called Calvary, in the Hebrew, Golgotha; where they crucified Him, and two others with. Him on either side one, and Jesus in the midst." These two, as we have learned in the narrative of the other evangelists, were thieves with whom He was crucified, and between whom He was fixed, whereof the prophecy sent before had declared, "And He was numbered among the transgressors."

4. "And Pilate wrote a title also, and put it on the cross, and the writing was, Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews. This title then read many of the Jews: for the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city: and it was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, The King of the Jews." For these three languages were conspicuous in that place beyond all others: the Hebrew on account of the Jews, who gloried in the law of God; the Greek, because of the wise men among the Gentiles; and the Latin, on account of the Romans, who at that very time were exercising sovereign power over many and almost all countries. 5. "Then said the chief priests of the Jews unto Pilate Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, I am King of the Jews. Pilate answered, What I have written I have written. Oh the ineffable power of the working of God, even in the hearts of the ignorant! Was there not some hidden voice that sounded through Pilate's inner man with a kind, if one may so say, of loud-toned silence, the words that had been prophesied so long before in the very letter of the Psalms, "Corrupt not the inscription of the title"? Here, then, you see, he corrupted it not; what he has written he has written. But the high priests, who wished it to be corrupted, what did they say? "Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, I am King of the Jews. What is it, madmen, that you say? Why do you oppose the doing of that which you are utterly unable to alter? Will it by any such means become the less true that Jesus said, "I am King of the Jews"? If that cannot be tampered

with which Pilate has written, can that be tampered with which the truth has uttered? But is Christ king only of the Jews, or of the Gentiles also? Yes, of the Gentiles also.

For when He said in prophecy, "I am set king by Him upon His holy hill of Zion, declaring the decree of the Lord," that no one might say, because of the hill of Zion, that He was set king over the Jews alone, He immediately added, "The Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of me, and I will give Thee the Gentiles for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy poossession. Whence He Himself, speaking now with His own lips among the Jews, said, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one flock and one Shepherd. Why then would we have some great mystery to be understood in this superscription, wherein it was written, "King of the Jews," if Christ is king also of the Gentiles? For this reason, because it was the wild olive tree that was made partaker of the fatness of the olive tree, and not the olive tree that was made partaker of the bitterness of the wild olive tree. For inasmuch as the title, "King of the Jews," was truthfully written regarding Christ, who are they that are to be understood as the Jews but the seed of Abraham, the children of the promise, who are also the children of God? For "they," saith the apostle, "who are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God;

but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. And the Gentiles were those to whom he said, "But if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. Christ therefore is king of the Jews, but of those who are Jews by the circumcision of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God; who belong to the Jerusalem that is free, our eternal mother in heaven, the spiritual Sarah, who casteth out the bond maid and her children from the house of liberty. And therefore what Pilate wrote he wrote, because what the Lord said He said.

TRACTATE 118

John XIX. 23, 24. 1. The things that were done beside the Lord's cross, when at length He was now crucified, we would take up, in dependence on His help, in the present discourse. "Then the soldiers, when they had crucified Him, took His garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and also His coat: now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout. They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots

for it, whose it shall be: that the scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, They parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots." It was done as the Jews wished; not that it was they themselves, but the soldiers who obeyed Pilate, who himself acted as judge, that crucified Jesus: and yet if we reflect on their wills, their plots, their endeavors, their delivering up, and, lastly, on their extorting clamors, it was the Jews certainly, more than any else, who crucified Jesus.

2. But we must not speak in a mere cursory way of the partition and dividing by lot of His garments. For although all the four evangelists make mention thereof, yet the others do so more briefly than John: and their notice of it is obscure, while his is in the plainest manner possible. For Matthew says, "And after they crucified Him, they parted His garments, casting lots. Mark: "And they crucified Him, and parted His garments, casting lots upon them, what every man should take. Luke: "And they parted His raiment, and cast lots. But John has told us also how many parts they made of His garments, namely, four, that they might take one part apiece. From which it, is apparent that there were four soldiers, who obeyed the governor's orders in crucifying Him. For he plainly says: "Then the soldiers, when they had crucified Him, took His garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and likewise the coat," where there is understood, they took: so that the meaning is, they took His garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and they took also His coat. And he so spake, that we might see that there was no lot cast on His other garments; but His coat, which they took along with the others, they did not similarly divide. For in regard to it he proceeds to explain, "Now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout.

And then telling us why they cast lots on it, he says, "They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be. Hence it is clear that in the case of the other garments they had equal parts, so that there was no need to cast lots: but that as regards this one, they could not have had a part each without rending it, and thereby possessing themselves only of useless fragments of it; to prevent which, they preferred letting it come to one of them by lot. The account given by this evangelist is also in harmony with the testimony of prophecy, which he likewise immediately subjoins, saying, "That the scripture might be fulfilled which saith, They parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots. For He says not, they cast lots, but "they parted: nor does He say, casting lots they

parted; but while making no mention whatever of the lot in regard to the rest of the garments, He afterwards said, "and for my vesture they did cast lots," in reference solely to the coat that remained. On which I shall speak as He Himself enables me, after I have first refuted the calumny, which may possibly arise, as if the evangelists disagreed with one another, by showing that the words of none of the others are inconsistent with the narrative of John.

3. For Matthew, in saying, "They parted His garments, casting lots," wished it to be understood, that in the whole affair of parting the garments, the coat was also included, on which they cast lots; for in course of parting all the garments, of which it also was one on it alone they cast lots. To the same purpose also are the words of Luke: "Parting His garments, they cast lots; for in the process of parting they came to the coat whereon the lot was cast, that the entire parting of His garments among them might be completed. And what difference is there whether it is said, "Parting they cast lots," according to Luke; or, "They parted, casting the lot," according to Matthew: unless it be that Luke, in saying "lots," used the plural for the singular number,-a form of speech that is not unusual in the Holy Scriptures, although some copies are found to have "lot," and not "lots"? Mark, therefore, is the only one who seems to have introduced any kind of difficulty; for in saying, "Casting the lot upon them, what every man should take," his words seem to imply, as if the lot was cast on all the garments, and not on the coat alone. But here also brevity is the cause of the obscurity; for the words, "Casting the lot upon them," are as if it were said, Casting the lot when they were in the process of division; which was also the case.

For the partition of all His garments would not have been complete, had it not been declared by lot which of them also should get possession of the coat, so as thereby to bring any contention on the part of the dividers to an end, or rather prevent any such from arising. In saying, therefore, "What every man should take," so far as that has to do with the lot, we must not take it as referring to all the garments that were divided; for the lot was cast, who should take the coat: whereof having omitted to describe the particular form, and how, in the equal division that was made of the parts, it remained by itself, in order, without being rent, to be awarded by lot, he therefore made use of the expression, "what every man should take," in other words, who it was that should take it: as if the whole were thus expressed, They par-

ted His garments, casting the lot upon them, who should take the coat, which had remained over in addition to their equal shares of the rest.

4. Some one, perhaps, may inquire what is signified by the division that was made of His garments into so many parts, and of the casting of lots for the coat. The raiment of the Lord Jesus Christ parted into four, symbolized His quadripartite Church, as spread abroad over the whole world, which consists of four quarters, and equally, that is to say, harmoniously, distributed over all these quarters. On which account He elsewhere says, that He will send His angels to gather His elect from the four winds: and what is that, but from the four quarters of the world, east, west, north, and south? But the coat, on which lots were cast, signifies the unity of all the parts, which is contained in the bond of charity. And when the apostle is about to speak of charity, he says, "I show you a more excellent way; and in another place, "To know also the love of Christ, which far excelleth knowledge; and still further elsewhere, "And above all these things charity which is the bond of perfectness. If, then, charity both has a more excellent way, and far excelleth knowledge, and is enjoined above all things, it is with great propriety that the garment, by which it is signified, is represented as woven from the top. And it was without seam, that its sewing might never be separated; and came into the possession of one man, because He gathereth all into one.

Just as in the case of the apostles, who formed the exact number of twelve, in other words, were divisible into four parts of three each, when the question was put to all of them, Peter was the only one that answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God; and to whom it was said, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," as if he alone received the power of binding and loosing: seeing, then, that one so spake in behalf of all, and received the latter along with all, as if personifying the unity itself; therefore one stands for all, because there is unity in all. Whence, also, after here saying, "woven from the top," he added, "throughout. And this also, if referred to its meaning, implies that no one is excluded from a share thereof, who is discovered to belong to the whole: from which whole, as the Greek language indicates, the Church derives her name of Catholic. And by the casting of lots, what else is commended but the grace of God? For in this way in the person of one it reached to all, since the lot satisfied them all, because the grace of God also in its unity reacheth unto all; and when the lot is cast,

the award is decided, not by the merits of each individual, hut by the secret judgment of God.

5. And yet let no one say that such things had no good signification because they were done by the bad, that is to say, not by those who followed Christ, but by those who persecuted Him. For what could we have to say of the cross itself, which every one knows was in like manner made and fastened to Christ by enemies and sinners? And yet it is to it we may rightly understand the words of the apostle to be applicable, "what is the breadth, and the length, and the height, and the depth. For its breadth lies in the transverse beam, on which the hands of the Crucified are extended; and signifies good works in all the breadth of love: its length extends from the transverse beam to the ground, and is that whereto the back and feet are affixed; and signifies perseverance through the whole length of time to the end: its height is in the summit, which rises upwards above the transverse beam; and signifies the supernal goal, to which all works have reference, since all things that are done well and perseveringly, in respect of their breadth and length, are to be done also with due regard to the exalted character of the divine rewards: its depth is found in the part that is fixed into the ground; for there it is both concealed and invisible, and yet from thence spring up all those parts that are outstanding and evident to the senses;

just as all that is good in us proceeds from the depths of the grace of God, which is beyond the reach of human comprehension and judgment. But even though the cross of Christ signified no more than what was said by the apostle, "And they who are Jesus Christ's have crucified the flesh with the passions and lusts," how great a good it is! And yet it does not this, unless the good spirit be lusting against the flesh, seeing that it was the opposing, or, in other words, the evil spirit that constructed the cross of Christ. And lastly, as every one knows, what else is the sign of Christ but the cross of Christ? For unless that sign be applied, whether it be to the foreheads of believers, or to the very water out of which they are regenerated, or to the oil with which they receive the anointing chrism, or to the sacrifice that nourishes them, none of them is properly administered. How then can it be that no good is signified by that which is done by the wicked, when by the cross of Christ, which the wicked made, every good thing is sealed to us in the celebration of His sacraments? But here we stop; and what follows we shall consider at another time in the course of dissertation, as God shall grant us assistance.

TRACTATE 119

John XIX. 24-30. 1. The Lord being now crucified, and the parting of His garments having also been completed by the casting of the lot, let us look at what the evangelist John thereafter relates. "And these things," he says, "the soldiers did. Now there stood by the cross of Jesus His mother, and His mother's sister, Mary [the wife] of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw His mother, and the disciple standing by whom He loved, He saith unto His mother, Woman, behold thy son! Then saith He to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour the disciple took her unto his own home." This, without a doubt, was the hour whereof Jesus, when about to turn the water into wine, had said to His mother, "Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come." This hour, therefore, He had foretold, which at that time had not yet arrived, when it should be His to acknowledge her at the point of death, and with reference to which He had been born as a mortal man. At that time, therefore, when about to engage in divine acts, He repelled, as one unknown, her who was the mother, not of His divinity, but of His [human] infirmity; but now, when in the midst of human sufferings, He commended with human affection [the mother] by whom He had become man. For then, He who had created Mary became known in His power; but now, that which Mary had brought forth was hanging on the cross.

2. A passage, therefore, of a moral character is here inserted. The good Teacher does what He thereby reminds us ought to be done, and by His own example instructed His disciples that care for their parents ought to be a matter of concern to pious children: as if that tree to which the members of the dying One were affixed were the very chair of office from which the Master was imparting instruction. From this wholesome doctrine it was that the Apostle Paul had learned what he taught in turn, when he said, "But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." And what are so much home concerns to any one, as parents to children, or children to parents? Of this most wholesome precept, therefore, the very Master of the saints set the example from Himself, when, not as God for the hand-maid whom He had created and governed, but as a man for the mother, of whom He had been created, and whom He was now leaving behind, He provided in some measure another son in place of Himself. And why He did so, He indicates in the

words that follow: for the evangelist says, "And from that hour the disciple took her unto his own," speaking of himself. In this way, indeed, he usually refers to himself as the disciple whom Jesus loved: who certainly loved them all, but him beyond the others, and with a closer familiarity, so that He even made him lean upon His bosom at supper; in order, I believe, in this way to commend the more highly the divine excellence of this very gospel, which He was thereafter to preach through his instrumentality.

3. But what was this "his own," unto which John took the mother of the Lord? For he was not outside the circle of those who said unto Him, "Lo, we have left all, and followed Thee." No, but on that same occasion he had also heard the words, Every one that hath forsaken these things for my sake, shall receive an hundred times as much in this world. That disciple, therefore, had an hundredfold more than he had cast away, whereunto to receive the mother of Him who had graciously bestowed it all. But it was in that society that the blessed John had received an hundredfold, where no one called anything his own, but they had all things in common; even as it is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. For the apostles were as if having nothing, and yet possessing all things. How was it, then, that the disciple and servant received unto his own the mother of his Lord and Master, where no one called anything his own? Or, seeing we read a little further on in the same book, "For as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of them, and laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need," are we not to understand that such distribution was made to this disciple of what was needful, that there was also added to it the portion of the blessed Mary, as if she were his mother; and ought we not the rather so to take the words, "From that hour the disciple took her unto his own," that everything necessary for her was entrusted to his care? He received her, therefore, not unto his own lands, for he had none of his own; but to his own dutiful services, the discharge of which, by a special dispensation, was entrusted to himself.

4. He then adds: "After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst. Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar: and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and fixed it upon hyssop, and put it to His mouth. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, He said, It is finished: and He bowed His head, and gave up the ghost. Who has the power of so adjusting what he does, as this Man

had of arranging all that He suffered? But this Man was the Mediator between God and men; the Man of whom we read in prophecy, He is man also, and who shall acknowledge Him for the men who did such things acknowledged not this Man as God. For He who was manifest as man, was hid as God: He who was manifest suffered all these things, and He Himself also, who was hid, arranged them all. He saw, therefore, that all was accomplished that required to be done before He received the vinegar, and gave up the ghost; and that this also might be accomplished which the scripture had foretold, "And in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink," He said, "I thirst: as if it were, One thing still you have failed to do, give me what you Are. For the Jews were themselves the vinegar, degenerated as they were from the wine of the patriarchs and prophets;

and filled like a full vessel with the wickedness of this world, with hearts like a sponge, deceitful in the formation of its cavernous and tortuous recesses. But the hyssop, whereon they placed the sponge filled with vinegar, being a lowly herb, and purging the heart, we fitly take for the humility of Christ Himself; which they thus enclosed, and imagined they had completely ensnared. Hence we have it said in the psalm, "Thou shalt purge me with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed. For it is by Christ's humility that we are cleansed; because, had He not humbled Himself, and became obedient unto the death of the cross, His blood certainly would not have been shed for the remission of sins, or, in other words, for our cleansing. 5. Nor need we be disturbed with the question, how the sponge could be applied to His mouth when He was lifted up from the earth on the cross. For as we read in the other evangelists, what is omitted by this one, it was fixed on a reed, so that such drink as was contained in the sponge might be raised to the highest part of the cross. By the reed, however, the scripture was signified, which was fulfilled by this very act. For as a tongue is called either Greek or Latin, or any other, significant of the sound, which is uttered by the tongue; so the reed may give its name to the letter which is written with a reed. We most usually, however, call those tongues that express the sounds of the human voice: while in calling scripture a reed, the very rareness of the thing only enhances the mystical nature of that which it symbolizes. A wicked people did such things, a compassionate Christ suffered them. They who did them, knew not what they did; but He who suffered, not only knew what was done, and why

it was so, but also wrought what was good through those who were doing what was evil.

6. "When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, He said, It is finished." What, but all that prophecy had foretold so long before? And then, because nothing now remained that still required to be done before He died, as if He, who had power to lay down His life and to take it up again, had at length completed all for whose completion He was waiting, "He bowed His head, and gave up the ghost." Who can thus sleep when he pleases, as Jesus died when He pleased? Who is there that thus puts off his garment when he pleases, as He put off His flesh at His pleasure? Who is there that thus departs when he pleases, as He departed this life at His pleasure? How great the power, to be hoped for or dreaded, that must be His as judge, if such was the power He exhibited as a dying man!

TRACTATE 120

John XIX. 31-42, and XX. 1-9. 1. After that the Lord Jesus had accomplished all that He foreknew required accomplishment before His death, and had, when it pleased Himself, given up the ghost, what followed thereafter, as related by the evangelist, let us now consider. "The Jews therefore," he says, "because it was the preparation (*parasceve*), that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath-day (for that Sabbath-day was an high day), besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away." Not that their legs might be taken away, but the persons themselves whose legs were broken for the purpose of effecting their death, and permitting them to be detached from the tree, lest their continuing to hang on the crosses should defile the great festal day by the horrible spectacle of their day-long torments. 2. "Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other who was, crucified with Him. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that He was dead already, they brake not His legs: but one of the soldiers with a spear laid open His side, and forthwith came there out blood and water." A suggestive word was made use of by the evangelist, in not saying pierced, or wounded His side, or anything else, but "opened; that thereby, in a sense, the gate of life might be thrown open, from whence have flowed forth the sacraments of the Church, without which there is no entrance to the life which is the true life. That blood was shed for the remission of sins; that water it is that makes up the health-giving cup, and supplies at once the layer of baptism and water for drinking. This was announced be-

forehand, when Noah was commanded to make a door in the side of the ark, whereby the animals might enter which were not destined to perish in the flood, and by which the Church was prefigured. Because of this, the first woman was formed from the side of the man when asleep, and was called Life, and the mother of all living. Truly it pointed to a great good, prior to the great evil of the transgression (in the guise of one thus lying asleep). This second Adam bowed His head and fell asleep on the cross, that a spouse might be formed for Him from that which flowed from the sleeper's side. O death, whereby the dead are raised anew to life! What can be purer than such blood? What more health-giving than such a wound?

3. "And he that saw it," he says, "bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also might believe." He said not, That ye also might know, but "that ye might believe;" for he knoweth who hath seen, that he who hath not seen might believe his testimony. And believing belongs more to the nature of faith than seeing. For what else is meant by believing than giving to faith a suitable reception? "For these things were done," he adds, "that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of Him ye shall not break. And again, another scripture saith, They shall look on Him whom they pierced." He has furnished two testimonies from the Scriptures for each of the things which he has recorded as having been done. For to the words, "But when they came to Jesus, and saw that He was dead already, they brake not His legs," belongeth the testimony, "A bone of Him ye shall not break:" an injunction which was laid upon those who were commanded to celebrate the passover by the sacrifice of a sheep in the old law, which went before as a shadow of the passion of Christ. Whence "our passover has been offered, even Christ," of whom the prophet Isaiah also had predicted, "He shall be led as a lamb to the slaughter." In like manner to the words which he subjoined, "But one of the soldiers laid open His side with a spear," belongeth the other testimony, "They shall look on Him whom they pierced;" where Christ is promised in the very flesh wherein He was afterwards to come to be crucified.

4. "And after this, Joseph of Arimathea (being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews) besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus: and Pilate gave him leave. He came therefore, and took the body of Jesus. And there came also Nicodemus, who came to Jesus by night at first, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound

weight." We are not to explain the meaning by saying, "first bringing a mixture of myrrh," but by attaching the word "first" to the preceding clause. For Nicodemus had at first come to Jesus by night, as recorded by this same John in the earlier portions of his Gospel. By the statement given us here, therefore, we are to understand that Nicodemus came to Jesus, not then only, but then for the first time; and that he was a regular comer afterwards, in order by hearing to become a disciple; which is certified, nowadays at least, to almost all nations in the revelation of the body of the most blessed Stephen. "Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury." The evangelist, I think, was not without a purpose in so framing his words, "as the manner of the Jews is to bury;" for in this way, unless I am mistaken, he has admonished us that, in duties of this kind, which are observed to the dead, the customs of every nation ought to be preserved.

5. "Now in the place where He was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid." As in the womb of the Virgin Mary no one was conceived before Him, and no one after Him, so in this sepulchre there was no one buried before Him, and no one after Him. "There laid they Jesus therefore, because of the Jews' preparation; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand." He would have us to understand that the burial was hurried, lest the evening should overtake them; when it was no longer permitted to do any such thing, because of the preparation, which the Jews among us are more in the habit of calling in Latin, *coena pura* (the pure meal). 6. "And on the first of the week came Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and saw the stone taken away from the sepulchre." The first of the week is what Christian practice now calls the Lord's day, because of the resurrection of the Lord. "She ran, therefore, and came to Simon Peter and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid Him." Some of the Greek codices have, "They have taken my Lord," which may likely enough have been said by the stronger than ordinary affection of love and handmaid relationship; but we have not found it in the several codices to which we have had access.

7. "Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre. So they ran both together: and that other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre." The repetition here is worthy of no-

tice and of commendation for the way in which a return is made to what had previously been omitted, and yet is added just as if it followed in due order. For after having already said, "they came to the sepulchre," he goes back to tell us how they came, and says, "so they ran both together," etc. Where he shows that, by outrunning his companion, there came first to the sepulchre that other disciple, by whom he means himself, while he relates all as if speaking of another. 8. "And he stooping down," he says, "saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lying, and the napkin, which had been about His head, not lying with the linen clothes, but folded up in one place by itself." Do we suppose these things have no meaning? I can suppose no such thing. But we hasten on to other points, on which we are compelled to linger by the need there is for investigation, or some other kind of obscurity. For in such things as are self-manifest, the inquiry into the meaning even of individual details is, indeed, a subject of holy delight, but only for those who have leisure, which is not the case with us.

9. "Then went in also that other disciple who had come first to the sepulchre." He came first, and entered last. This also of a certainty is not without a meaning, but I am without the leisure needful for its explanation. "And he saw, and believed." Here some, by not giving due attention, suppose that John believed that Jesus had risen again; but there is no indication of this from the words that follow. For what does he mean by immediately adding, "For as yet they knew not the scripture, that He must rise again from the dead"? He could not then have believed that He had risen again, when he did not know that it behoved Him to rise again. What then did he see? what was it that he believed? What but this, that he saw the sepulchre empty, and believed what the woman had said, that He had been taken away from the tomb? "For as yet they knew not the scripture, that He must rise again from the dead." Thus also when they heard of it from the Lord Himself, although it was uttered in the plainest terms, yet from their custom of hearing Him speaking by parables, they did not understand, and believed that something else was His meaning. But we shall put off what follows till another discourse.

TRACTATE 121

John XX. 10-29. 1. Mary Magdalene had brought the news to His disciples, Peter and John, that the Lord was taken away from the sepulchre; and they, when they came thither, found only the linen clothes wherewith the body

had been shrouded; and what else could they believe but what she had told them, and what she had herself also believed? "Then the disciples went away again unto their own" (home); that is to say, where they were dwelling, and from which they had run to the sepulchre. "But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping. For while the men returned, the weaker sex was fastened to the place by a stronger affection. And the eyes, which had sought the Lord and had not found Him, had now nothing else to do but weep, deeper in their sorrow that He had been taken away from the sepulchre than that He had been slam on the tree; seeing that in the case even of such a Master, when His living presence was withdrawn from their eyes, His remembrance also had ceased to remain. Such grief, therefore, now kept the woman at the sepulchre. "And as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre. Why she did so I know not. For she was not ignorant that He whom she sought was no longer there, since she had herself also carried word to the disciples that He had been taken from thence;

while they, too, had come to the sepulchre, and had sought the Lord's body, not merely by looking, but also by entering, and had not found it. What then does it mean, that, as she wept, she stooped down, and looked again into the sepulchre? Was it that her grief was So excessive that she hardly thought she could believe either their eyes or her own? Or was it rather by some divine impulse that her mind led her to look within? For look she did, "and saw two angels in white, sitting, the one at the head and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. Why is it that one was sitting at the head, and the other at the feet? Was it, since those who in Greek are called angelj are in Latin nuntii [in English, news-bearers], that in this way they signified that the gospel of Christ was to be preached from head to foot, from the beginning even to the end? "They say to her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him. The angels forbade her tears: for by such a position what else did they announce, but that which in some way or other was a future joy? For they put the question, "Why weepest thou? as if they had said, Weep not. But she, supposing they had put the question from ignorance, unfolded the cause of her tears.

"Because," she said, "they have taken away my Lord: calling her Lord's inanimate body her Lord, meaning a part for the whole; just as all of us acknowledge that Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, our Lord, who of course is

at once both the Word and soul and flesh, was nevertheless crucified and buried, while it was only His flesh that was laid in the sepulchre. "And I know not," she added, "where they have laid Him. This was the greater cause of sorrow, because she knew not where to go to mitigate her grief. But the hour had now come when the joy, in some measure announced by the angels, who forbade her tears, was to succeed the weeping. 2. Lastly, "when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing Him to be the gardener, saith unto Him, Sir, If thou hast borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him away. Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto Him, Rabboni, which is to say, Master." Let no one speak ill of the woman because she called the gardener, Sir (*domine*), and Jesus, Master. For there she was asking, here she was recognizing; there she was showing respect to a person of whom she was asking a favor, here she was recalling the Teacher of whom she was learning to discern things human and divine. She called one lord (*sir*), whose handmaid she was not, in order by him to get at the Lord to whom she belonged. In one sense, therefore, she used the word Lord when she said, "They have taken away my Lord; and in another, when she said, Sir (*lord*), if thou hast borne Him hence." For the prophet also called those lords who were mere men, but in a different sense from Him of whom it is written, "The Lord is His name." But how was it that this woman, who had already turned herself back to see Jesus, when she supposed Him to be the gardener, and was actually talking with Him, is said to have again turned herself, in order to say unto Him "Rabboni," but just because, when she then turned herself in body, she supposed Him to be what He was not, while now, when turned in heart, she recognized Him to be what He was.

3. "Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; to my God, and your God. There are points in these words which we must examine with brevity indeed, but with somewhat more than ordinary attention. For Jesus was giving a lesson in faith to the woman, who had recognized Him as her Master, and called Him so in her reply; and this gardener was sowing in her heart, as in His own garden, the grain of mustard seed. What then is meant by "Touch me not"? And just as if the reason of such a prohibition would be sought, He added, "for I am not yet ascended to

my Father. What does this mean? If, while standing on earth, He is not to be touched, how could He be touched by men when sitting in heaven? For certainly, before He ascended, He presented Himself to the touch of the disciples, when He said, as testified by the evangelist Luke, "Handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have; or when He said to Thomas the disciple, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and put forth thy hand, and thrust it into my side.

And who could be so absurd as to affirm that He was willing indeed to be touched by the disciples before He ascended to the Father, but refused it in the case of women till after His ascension? But no one, even had any the will, was to be allowed to run into such folly. For we read that women also, after His resurrection and before His ascension to the Father, touched Jesus, among whom was Mary Magdalene herself; for it is related by Matthew that Jesus met them, and said, "All hail. And they approached, and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him. This was passed over by John, but declared as the truth by Matthew. It remains, therefore, that some sacred mystery must lie concealed in these words; and whether we discover it or utterly fail to do so, yet we ought to be in no doubt as to its actual existence. Accordingly, either the words, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father," had this meaning, that by this woman the Church of the Gentiles was symbolized, which did not believe on Christ till He had actually ascended to the Father, or that in this way Christ wished Himself to be believed on; in other words, to be touched spiritually, that He and the Father are one. For He has in a manner ascended to the Father, to the inward perception of him who has made such progress in the knowledge of Christ that he acknowledges Him as equal with the Father:

in any other way He is not rightly touched, that is to say, in any other way He is not rightly believed on. But Mary might have still so believed as to account Him unequal with the Father, and this certainly is forbidden her by the words, "Touch me not; that is, Believe not thus on me according to thy present notions; let not your thoughts stretch outwards to what I have been made in thy behalf, without passing beyond to that whereby thou hast thyself been made. For how could it be otherwise than carnally that she still believed on Him whom she was weeping over as a man? "For I am not yet ascended," He says, "to my Father: there shalt thou touch me, when thou believest me to be God, in no wise unequal with the Father. "But go to my

brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father. He saith not, Our Father: in one sense, therefore, is He mine, in another sense, yours; by nature mine, by grace yours. "And my God, and your God. Nor did He say here, Our God: here, therefore, also is He in one sense mine, in another sense yours: my God; under whom I also am as man; your God, between whom and you I am mediator.

4. "Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples, I have seen the Lord, and He hath spoken these things unto me. Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when He had so said, He showed unto them His hands and His side. For nails had pierced His hands, a spear had laid open His side: and there the marks of the wounds are preserved for healing the hearts of the doubting. But the shutting of doors presented no obstacle to the matter of His body, wherein Godhead resided. He indeed could enter without their being opened, by whose birth the virginity of His mother remained inviolate, "Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord. Then said He unto them again, Peace be unto you. Reiteration is confirmation; for He Himself gives by the prophet a promised peace upon peace. "As the Father hath sent me," He adds, "even so send I you. We know the Son to be equal to the Father; but here we recognize the words of the Mediator. For He exhibits Himself as occupying a middle position when He says, He me, and I you. "And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.

By breathing on them He signified that the Holy Spirit was the Spirit, not of the Father alone, but likewise His own. "Whose so-ever sins," He continues, "ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever ye retain, they are retained. The Church's love, which is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, discharges the sins of all who are partakers with itself, but retains the sins of those who have no participation therein. Therefore it is, that after saying "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," He straightway added this regarding the remission and retention of sins. 5. "But Thomas, one of the twelve, who is called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came. The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the place of the nails, and put my hand into His side, I will not believe. And after

eight days, again His disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith He to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. Thomas answered and said unto Him, My Lord and my God. He saw and touched the man, and acknowledged the God whom he neither saw nor touched; but by the means of what he saw and touched, he now put far away from him every doubt, and believed the other. "Jesus saith unto him, Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed. He saith not, Thou hast touched me, but, "Thou hast seen me," because sight is a kind of general sense. For sight is also habitually named in connection with the other four senses: as when we say, Listen, and see how well it sounds; smell it, and see how well it smells; taste it, and see how well it savors; touch it, and see how hot it is.

Everywhere has the word, See, made itself heard, although sight, properly speaking, is allowed to belong only to the eyes. Hence here also the Lord Himself says, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands: and what else does He mean but, Touch and see? And yet he had no eyes in his finger. Whether therefore it was by looking, or also by touching, "Because thou hast seen me," He says, "thou hast believed. Although it may be affirmed that the disciple dared not so to touch, when He offered Himself for the purpose; for it is not written, And Thomas touched Him. But whether it was by gazing only, or also by touching that he saw and believed, what follows rather proclaims and commends the faith of the Gentiles: "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed. He made use of words in the past tense, as One who, in His predestinating purpose, knew what was future, as if it had already taken place. But the present discourse must be kept from the charge of prolixity: the Lord will give us the opportunity to discourse at another time on the topics that remain.

TRACTATE 122

John XX. 30, 31, and XXI. 1-11. 1. After telling us of the incident in connection with which the disciple Thomas had offered to his touch the places of the wounds in Christ's body, and saw what he would not believe, and believed, the evangelist John interposes these words, and says: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ,

the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life through His name." This paragraph indicates, as it were, the end of the book; but there is afterwards related how the Lord manifested Himself at the sea of Tiberias, and in the draught of fishes made special reference to the mystery of the Church, as regards its future character, in the final resurrection of the dead. I think, therefore, it is fitted to give special prominence thereto, that there has been thus interposed, as it were, an end of the book, and that there should be also a kind of preface to the narrative that was to follow, in order in some measure to give it a position of greater eminence. The narrative itself begins in this way: "After these things Jesus showed Himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias; and on this wise showed He (Himself). There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas called Didymus, and Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee, and two other of His disciples. Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing. They say unto him, We also go with thee."

2. The inquiry is usually made in connection with this fishing of the disciples, why Peter and the sons of Zebedee returned to what they were before being called by the Lord; for they were fishers when He said to them, "Come after me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they put such reality into their following of Him then, that they left all in order to cleave to Him as their Master: so much so, that when the rich man went away from Him in sorrow, because of His saying to him, "Go sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shall have treasure in heaven, and come follow me," Peter said unto Him, "Lo, we have forsaken all, and followed Thee. Why is it then that now, by the abandonment as it were of their apostleship, they become what they were, and seek again what they had forsaken, as if forgetful of the words they had once listened to, "No man, putting his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of heaven"? Had they done so when Jesus was lying in the grave, before He rose from the dead, - which of course they could not have done, as the day whereon He was crucified kept them all in closest attention till His burial, which took place before evening; while the next day was the Sabbath, when it was unlawful for those who observed the ancestral custom to work at all;

and on the third day the Lord rose again, and recalled them to the hope which they had not yet begun to entertain regarding Him; - yet had they then done so, we might suppose it had been done under the influence of that despair which had taken possession of their minds. But now, after His restor-

ation to them alive from the tomb, after the most evident truth of His revived flesh offered to their eyes and hands, not only to be seen, but also to be touched and handled; after inspecting the very marks of the wounds, even to the confession of the Apostle Thomas, who had previously declared that he would not otherwise believe; after the reception by His breathing on them of the Holy Spirit, and after the words poured from His lips into their ears, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever ye retain, they are retained: they suddenly become again what they had been, fishers, not of men, but of fishes.

3. We have therefore to give those who are disturbed by this the answer, that they were not prohibited from seeking necessary sustenance by their manual craft, when lawful in itself, and warranted so long as they preserved their apostleship intact, if at any time they had no other means of gaining a livelihood. Unless any one have the boldness to imagine or to affirm, that the Apostle Paul attained not to the perfection of those who left all and followed Christ, seeing that, in order not to become a burden to any of those to whom he preached the gospel, he worked with his own hands for his support: wherein we find rather the fulfillment of his own words, "I labored more abundantly than they all; and to which he added, "yet not I, but the grace of God that was with me: to make it manifest that this also was to be imputed to the grace of God, that both with mind and body he was able to labor so much more abundantly than they all, that he neither ceased from preaching the gospel, nor drew, like them, his present support out of the gospel; while he was sowing it much more widely and fruitfully through multitudes of nations where the name of Christ had never previously been proclaimed. Whereby he showed that living, that is, deriving their subsistence, by the gospel, was not imposed on the apostles as a necessity, but conferred on them as a power.

And of this power the same apostle makes mention when he says: "If we have sown to you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we reap your carnal things? If others are partakers of this power among you, are not we rather? But," he adds, "we have not used this power. And a little afterwards he says: "They who serve the altar are partakers with the altar: even so hath the Lord ordained, that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel; but I have used none of these things. It is clear enough, therefore, that it was not

enjoined on the apostles, but put in their power, not to find their living otherwise than by the gospel, and of those to whom by preaching the gospel they sowed spiritual things, to reap their carnal things; that is, to take their bodily support, and, as the soldiers of Christ, to receive the wages due to them, as from the inhabitants of provinces subject to Christ. Hence that same illustrious soldier had said a little before, in reference to this matter, "Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? Which he nevertheless did himself; for he labored more abundantly than they all.

If, then, the blessed Paul—that he might not use with them the power which he certainly possessed along with the other preachers of the gospel, but went a warfare at his own charges, that the Gentiles, who were utterly averse to the name of Christ, might not take offense at his teaching, as something offered them for a money equivalent,—in a way very different from that in which he had been educated, learned an altogether new art, that while the teacher supports himself with his own hands, none of his hearers might be burdened; how much rather did the blessed Peter, who had beforetimes been a fisherman, do what he was already acquainted with, if at that present time he found no other means of gaining a livelihood? 4. But some one will reply, And why did he not find them, when the Lord had promised, saying, "Seek first the kingdom and righteousness of God, and all these things shall be added unto you"? Precisely also in this very way did the Lord fulfill His promise. For who else placed there the fishes that were to be caught, but He, who, we are bound to believe, threw them into the penury that compelled them to go a fishing, for no other reason than that He wished to show them the miracle He had prepared, that so He might both feed the preachers of His gospel, and at the same time enhance that gospel itself, by the great mystery which He was about to impress on their minds by the number of the fishes? And on this subject we also ought now to be telling you what He Himself has set before us.

5. "Simon Peter," therefore, "saith, I go a fishing." Those who were with him "say unto him, We also go with thee. And they went forth, and entered into a ship; and that night they caught nothing. But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus. Then Jesus saith unto them, Children, have ye any meat? They answered Him, No. He saith unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for

the multitude of fishes. Therefore that disciple whom Jesus loved saith unto Peter, It is the Lord. When Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his coat unto him, for he was naked, and did cast himself into the sea. And the other disciples came in a little ship (for they were not far from the land, but as it were two hundred cubits), dragging the net with fishes. As soon then as they were come to land, they saw a fire of coals laid, and a fish laid thereon, and bread. Jesus saith unto them, Bring of the fish which ye have now caught. Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to land full of great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three: and for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken."

6. This is a great mystery in the great Gospel of John; and to commend it the more forcibly to our attention, the last chapter has been made its place of record. Accordingly, inasmuch as there were seven disciples taking part in that fishing, Peter, and Thomas, and Nathaneal, and the two sons of Zebedee, and two others whose names are withheld, they point, by their septenary number, to the end of time. For there is a revolution of all time in seven days. To this also pertains the statement, that when the morning was come, Jesus stood on the shore; for the shore likewise is the limit of the sea, and signifies therefore the end of the world. The same end of the world is shown also by the act of Peter, in drawing the net to land, that is, to the shore. Which the Lord has Himself elucidated, when in a certain other place He drew His similitude from a fishing net let down into the sea: "And they drew it," He said, "to the shore." And in explanation of what that shore was, He added, "So will it be in the end of the world."

7. That, however, is a parable in word, not one embodied in outward action; and just as in the passage before us the Lord indicated by an outward action the kind of character the Church would have in the end of the world, so in the same way, by that other fishing, He indicated its present character. In doing the one at the commencement of His preaching and this latter after His resurrection, He showed thereby in the former case that the capture of fishes signified the good and bad presently existing in the Church; but in the latter, the good only, whom it will contain everlastingly, when the resurrection of the dead shall have been completed in the end of this world. Furthermore, on that previous occasion Jesus stood not, as here, on the shore, when He gave orders for the taking of the fish, but "entered into one of the ships, which was Simon's, and prayed him that he would thrust out a

little from the land; and He sat down therein, and taught the crowds. And when He had left speaking, He said unto Simon, Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught. There also they put the fishes that were caught into the ship, and did not, as here, draw the net to the shore.

By these signs, and any others that may be found, on the former occasion the Church was prefigured as it exists in this world, and on the other, as it shall be in the end of the world: the one accordingly took place before, and the other subsequently to the resurrection of the Lord; because there we were signified by Christ as called, and here as raised from the dead. On that occasion the nets are not let down on the right side, that the good alone might not be signified, nor on the left, lest the application should be limited to the bad; but without any reference to either side, He says, "Let down your nets for a draught," that we may understand the good and bad as mingled together: while on this He says, "Cast the net on the right side of the ship," to signify those who stood on the right hand, the good alone. There the net was broken on account of the schisms that were meant to be signified; but here, as then there will be no more schisms in that supreme peace of the saints, the evangelist was entitled to say, "And for all they were so great," that is, so large, "yet was not the net broken; as if with reference to the previous time when it was broken, and a commendation of the good that was here in comparison with the evil that preceded.

There the multitude of fishes caught was so great, that the two vessels were filled and began to sink, that is, were weighed down to the point of sinking; for they did not actually sink, but were in extreme jeopardy. For whence exist in the Church the great evils under which we groan, save from the impossibility of withstanding the enormous multitude that, almost to the entire subversion of discipline, gain an entrance, with their morals so utterly at variance with the pathway of the saints? Here, however, they cast the net on the right side, "and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes. What is meant by the words, "Now they were not able to draw it," but this, that those who belong to the resurrection of life, that is to say, to the right hand, and depart this life within the nets of the Christian name, will be made manifest only on the shore, in other words, when they shall rise from the dead at the end of the world? Accordingly, they were not able to draw the nets so as to discharge into the vessel the fishes they had caught, as was done with all of those wherewith the net was broken, and the boats

laden to sinking. But the Church possesses those right-hand ones after the close of this life in the sleep of peace, lying hid as it were in the deep, till the net reach the shore whither it is being drawn, as it were two hundred cubits.

And as on that first occasion it was done by two vessels, with reference to the circumcision and the uncircumcision; so in this place, by the two hundred cubits, I am of opinion that there is symbolized, with reference to the elect of both classes, the circumcision and the uncircumcision, as it were two separate hundreds; because the number that passes to the right hand is represented summarily by hundreds. And last of all, in that former fishing the number of fishes is not expressed, as if the words were there acted on that were uttered by the prophet, "I have declared and spoken; they are multiplied beyond number: while here there are none beyond calculation, but the definite number of a hundred and fifty and three; and of the reason of this number we must now, with the Lord's help, give some account. 8. For if we determine on the number that should indicate the law, what else can it be but ten? For we have absolute certainty that the Decalogue of the law, that is, those ten well-known precepts, were first written by the finger of God on two tables of stone. But the law, when it is not aided by grace, maketh transgressors, and is only in the letter, on account of which the apostle specially declared, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. Let the spirit then be added to the letter, lest the letter kill him whom the spirit makethnot alive, and let us work out the precepts of the law, not in our own strength, but by the grace of the Saviour. But when grace is added to the law, that is, the spirit to the letter, there is, in a kind of way, added to ten the number of seven. For this number, namely seven, is testified by the documents of holy writ given us for perusal, to signify the Holy Spirit. For example, sanctity or sanctification properly pertains to the Holy Spirit, whence, as the Father is a spirit, and the Son a spirit, because God is a spirit, so the Father is holy and the Son holy, yet the Spirit of both is called peculiarly by the name of the Holy Spirit. Where, then, was there the first distinct mention of sanctification in the law but on the seventh day? For God sanctified not the first day, when He made the light;

nor the second, when He made the firmament; nor the third, when He separated the sea from the land, and the land brought forth grass and timber; nor the fourth, wherein the stars were created; nor the fifth, wherein were created the animals that live in the waters or fly in the air; nor the

sixth, when the terrestrial living soul and man himself were created; but He sanctified the seventh day, wherein He rested from all His works. The Holy Spirit, therefore, is aptly represented by the septenary number. The prophet Isaiah likewise says, "The Spirit of God shall rest on Him; and thereafter calls our attention to that Spirit in His septenary work or grace, by saying, "The spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and piety; and He shall be filled with the spirit of the fear of God. And what of the Revelation? Are they not there called the seven Spirits of God, while there is only one and the same Spirit dividing to every one severally as He will? But the septenary operation of the one Spirit was so called by the Spirit Himself, whose own presence in the writer led to their being spoken of as the seven Spirits. Accordingly, when to the number of ten, representing the law, we add the Holy Spirit as represented by seven, we have seventeen;

and when this number is used for the adding together of every several number it contains, from 1 up to itself, the sum amounts to one hundred and fifty-three. For if you add 2 to 1, you have 3 of course; if to these you add 3 and 4, the whole makes 10; and then if you add all the numbers that follow up to 17, the whole amounts to the foresaid number; that is, if to 10, which you had reached by adding all together from 1 to 4, you add 5, you have 15; to these add 6, and the result is 21; then add 7, and you have 28; to this add 8, and 9, and 10, and you get 55; to this add 11 and 12, and 13, and you have 91; and to this again add 14, 15, and 16, and it comes to 136; and then add to this the remaining number of which we have been speaking, namely, 17, and it will make up the number of fishes. But it is not on that account merely a hundred and fifty-three saints that are meant as hereafter to rise from the dead unto life eternal, but thousands of saints who have shared in the grace of the Spirit, by which grace harmony is established with the law of God, as with an adversary;

so that through the life-giving Spirit the letter no longer kills, but what is commanded by the letter is fulfilled by the help of the Spirit, and if there is any deficiency it is pardoned. All therefore who are sharers in such grace are symbolized by this number, that is, are symbolically represented. This number has, besides, three times over, the number of fifty, and three in addition, with reference to the mystery of the Trinity; while, again, the number of fifty is made up by multiplying 7 by 7, with the addition of 1, for 7 times 7

make 49. And the 1 is added to show that there is one who is expressed by seven on account of His sevenfold operation; and we know that it was on the fiftieth day after our Lord's ascension that the Holy Spirit was sent, for whom the disciples were commanded to wait according to the promise.

9. It was not, then, without a purpose that these fishes were described as so many in number, and so large in size, that is, as both an hundred and fifty-three, and large. For so it is written, "And He drew the net to land full of great fishes, an hundred and fifty andthree. For when the Lord said, "I am not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill "because about to give the Spirit, through whom the law might be fulfilled, and to add thereby, as it were, seven to ten; after interposing a few other words He proceeded, "Whosoever-therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shallbe called the least in the kingdom of heaven:] but whosoever shall do and teach them. thesame shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. The latter, therefore, may possibly belong to the number of great fishes. But he that is the least, who undoes in deed what he teaches in word, may be in such a church as is signified by that first capture of fishes, which contains both good and bad, for it also is called the kingdom of heaven, as He says, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of ever kind; where He wishes the good as well as the bad to be understood, and of whom He declares that they are yet to be separated on the shore, to wit, at the end of the world.

And lastly, to show that those least ones are reprobates who teach by word of mouth the good which they undo by their evil lives, and that they will not be even the least, as it were, in the life that is eternal, but will have no place there at all; after saying, "He shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven," He immediately added, "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed [the righteousness] of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Such, doubtless-these scribes and Pharisees-are those who sit in Moses' seat, and of whom He says, "Do ye what they gay, but do not what they do; for they say, and do not. They teach in sermons what they undo by their morals. It therefore follows that he who is least in the kingdom of heaven, as the Church now exists, shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven, as the Church shall be hereafter; for by teaching what he himself is in the habit of breaking, he can have no place in the company of those who do what they teach, and therefore will not be in the

number of great fishes, seeing it is he "who shall do and teach that shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. And because he will be great here, therefore shall he be there, where he that is least shall not be.

Yea, so great will they certainly be there, that he who is less there is greater than the greatest here. And yet those who are great here, that is, who do the good that they teach in that kingdom of heaven into which the net gathereth good and bad, shall be greater still in that eternal state of the heavenly kingdom, -those, I mean, who are indicated by the fishes here as belonging to the right hand and to the resurrection of life. We have still to discourse, as God shall grant us ability, on the meal that the Lord took with those seven disciples, and on the words He spake after the meal, as well as on the close of the Gospel itself; but these are topics that cannot be included in the present lecture.

TRACTATE 123

John XXI. 12-19. 1. With this third manifestation of Himself by the Lord to His disciples after His resurrection, the Gospel of the blessed Apostle John is brought to a close, of which we have already lectured through the earlier part as we were able, on to the place where it is related that an hundred and fifty-three fishes were taken by the disciples to whom He showed Himself, and for all they were so large, yet were not the nets broken. What follows we have now to take into consideration, and to discuss as the Lord enables us, and as the various points may appear to demand. When the fishing was over, "Jesus saith unto them, Come [and] dine. And none of those who sat down dared to ask Him, Who art Thou? knowing that it was the Lord." If, then, they knew, what need was there to ask? and if there was no need wherefore is it said, "they dared not," as if there were need, but, from some fear or other, they dared not? The meaning here, therefore, is: so great was the evidence of the truth that Jesus Himself had appeared to these disciples, that not one of them dared not merely to deny, but even to doubt it; for had any of them doubted it, he ought certainly to have asked. In this sense, therefore, it was said, "No one dared to ask Him, Who art Thou?" as if it were, No one dared to doubt that it was He Himself.

2. "And Jesus cometh, and taketh bread, and giveth them, and fish likewise. We are likewise told here, you see, on what they dined; and of this dinner we also will say something that is sweet and salutary, if we, too, are made by Him to partake of the food. It is related above that these disciples, when

they came to the land, "saw a fire of coals laid, and a fish laid thereon, and bread. Here we are not to understand that the bread also was laid upon the coals, but only to supply, They saw. And if we repeat this verbin the place where it ought to be supplied, the whole may read thus: They saw coals laid, and fish laid thereon, and they saw bread. Or rather in this way: They saw coals laid, and fish laid thereon; they saw a so bread. At the Lord's command they likewise brought of the fishes which they themselves had caught; and although their doing so might not be actually stated by the historian, yet there has been no silence in regard to the Lord's command. For He says, "Bring of the fishes which ye have now caught. And when we have such certainty that He gave the order, will any suppose that they failed to obey it?

Of this, therefore, the Lord prepared the dinner for these His seven disciples, namely, of the fish which they had seen laid upon the coals, with an addition thereto from those which they had caught, and of the bread which we are told with equal distinctness that they had seen. The fish roasted is Christ having suffered; He Himself also is the bread that cometh down from heaven. With Him is incorporated the Church, in order to the participation in everlasting blessedness. For this reason is it said, "Bring of the fish which ye have now caught," that all of us who cherish this hope may know that we ourselves, through that septenary number of disciples whereby our universal community may in this passage be understood as symbolized, partake in this great sacrament, and are associated in the same blessedness. This is the Lord's dinner with His own disciples, and herewith John, although having much besides that he might say of Christ, brings his Gospel, with profound thought and an eye to important lessons, to a close. For here the Church, such as it will be hereafter among the good alone, is signified by the draught of an hundred and fifty-three fishes; and to those who so believe, and hope, and love, there is demonstrated by this dinner their participation in such super-eminent blessedness.

3. "This was now," he says, "the third time that Jesus showed Himself to His disciples after that He was risen from the dead." And this we are to refer not to the manifestations themselves, but to the days that is to say, taking the first day when He rose again, and the [second] eight days after, when the disciple Thomas saw and believed, and [the third] on this day when He so acted in connection with the fishes, although how many days afterwards it was that He did so we are not told); for on that first day He was seen more than

once, as is shown by the collated testimonies of all the evangelists: but, as we have said, it is in accordance with the days that His manifestations are to be calculated, making this the third; for that [manifestation] is to be reckoned the first, and all one and the same, as included in one day, however often and to however many He showed Himself on the day of His resurrection; the second eight days afterwards, and this the third, and thereafter as often as He pleased on to the fortieth day, when He ascended into heaven, although all of them have not been recorded in Scripture.

4. "So when they had dined, He saith to Simon Peter, Simon, [son] of John, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again, Simon, [son] of John, lovest thou me? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto Him, Feed my lambs. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, [son] of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto Him, Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wilt not. And this spake He, signifying by what death he should glorify God. Such was the end reached by that denier and lover; elated by his presumption, prostrated by his denial, cleansed by his weeping, approved by his confession, crowned by his suffering, this was the end he reached, to die with a perfected love for the name of Him with whom, by a perverted forwardness, he had promised to die. He would do, when strengthened by His resurrection, what in his weakness he promised prematurely.

For the needful order was that Christ should first die for Peter's salvation, and then that Peter should die for the preaching of Christ. The boldness thus begun by human temerity was an utter inversion of the order that had been instituted by the Truth. Peter thought to lay down his life for Christ, the one to be delivered in behalf of the Deliverer, seeing that Christ had come to lay down His life for all His own, including Peter also, which, you see, was now done. Now and henceforth a true, because graciously bestowed, strength of heart may be assumed for incurring death itself for the name of the Lord, and not a false one presumptuously usurped through an erroneous

estimate of ourselves. Now there is no need that we should any more fear the passage out of the present life, because in the Lord's resurrection we have a foregoing illustration of the life to come. Now thou hast cause, Peter, to be no longer afraid of death, because He liveth whom thou didst mourn when dead, and whom in thy carnal love thou didst try to hinder from dying in our behalf. Thou didst dare to step in before the Leader, and thou didst tremble before His persecutor: now that the price has been paid for thee, it is thy duty to follow the Buyer, and follow Him even to the death of the cross. Thou hast heard the words of Him whom thou hast already proved to be truthful;

He Himself hath foretold thy suffering, who formerly foretold thy denial. 5. But first the Lord asks what He knew, and that not once, but a second and a third time, whether Peter loved Him; and just as often He has the same answer, that He is loved, while just as often He gives Peter the same charge to feed His sheep. To the threefold denial there is now appended a threefold confession, that his tongue may not yield a feebler service to love than to fear, and imminent death may not appear to have elicited more from the lips than present life. Let it be the office of love to feed the Lord's flock, if it was the signal of fear to deny the Shepherd. Those who have this purpose in feeding the flock of Christ, that they may have them as their own, and not as Christ's, are convicted of loving themselves, and not Christ, from the desire either of boasting, or wielding power, or acquiring gain, and not from the love of obeying, serving, and pleasing God. Against such, therefore, there stands as a wakeful sentinel this thrice inculcated utterance of Christ, of whom the apostle complains that they seek their own, not the things that are Jesus Christ's. For what else mean the words, "Lovest thou me? Feed my sheep," than if it were said, If thou lovest me, think not of feeding thyself, but feed my sheep as mine, and not as thine own; seek my glory in them, and not thine own; my dominion, and not thine; my gain, and not thine;

lest thou be found in the fellowship of those who belong to the perilous times, lovers of their own selves, and all else that is joined on to this beginning of evils? For the apostle, after saying, "For men shall be lovers of their own selves," proceeded to add, "Lovers of money, boastful, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, wicked, irreligious, without affection, false accusers, incontinent, implacable, without kindness, traitors, heady, blinded; lovers of pleasures more than of God; having a form of god-

liness, but denying the power thereof. All these evils flow from that as their fountain which he stated first, "lovers of their own selves. With great propriety, therefore, is Peter addressed, "Lovest thou me? and found replying, "I love Thee: and the command applied to him, "Feed my lambs," and this a second and a third time We have it also demonstrated here that love and liking are one and the same thing; for the Lord also in the last question said not Diligis me? but, Amas me? Let us, then, love not ourselves, but Him; and in feeding His sheep, let us be seeking the things which are His, not the things which are our own. For in some inexplicable way, I know not what, every one that loveth himself, and not God, loveth not himself; and whoever loveth God, and not himself, he it is that loveth himself. For he that cannot live by himself will certainly die by loving himself; he therefore loveth not himself who loves himself to his own loss of life.

But when He is loved by whom life is preserved, a man by not loving himself only loveth the more, when it is for this reason that he loveth not himself [namely] that he may love Him by whom he lives. Let not those, then, who feed Christ's sheep be "lovers of their own selves," test they feed them as if they were their own, and not His, and wish to make their own gain of them, as "lovers of money; or to domineer over them, as "boastful; or to glory in the honors which they receive at their hands, as "proud; or to go the length even of originating heresies, as "blasphemers; and not to give place to the holy fathers, as those who are "disobedient to parents; and to render evil for good to those who wish to correct them, because unwilling to let them perish, as "unthankful; to slay their own souls and those of others, as "wicked; to outrage the motherly bowels of the Church, as "irreligious; to have no sympathy with the weak, as those who are "without affection; to attempt to traduce the character of the saints, as "false accusers; to give loose reins to the basest lusts, as "incontinent; to make lawsuits their practice, as "implacable; to know nothing of loving service, as those who are "without kindness; to make known to the enemies of the godly what they are well aware ought to be kept secret, as "traitors; to disturb human modesty by shameless discussions, as "heady;

to understand neither what they say nor whereof they affirm, as "blinded; and to prefer carnal delights to spiritual joys, as those who are "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God. For these and such like vices, whether all of them meet in a single individual, or whether some dominate in one and

others in another, spring up in some form or another from this one root, when men are "lovers of their own selves. A vice which is specially to be guarded against by those who feed Christ's sheep, lest they be seeking their own, not the things that are Jesus Christ's, and be turning those to the use of their own lusts for whom the blood of Christ was shed. Whose love ought, in one who feedeth His sheep, to grow up unto so great a spiritual fervor as to overcome even the natural fear of death, that makes us unwilling to die even when we wish to live with Christ. For the Apostle Paul also says that he had a desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ, and yet he groans, being burdened, and wishes not to be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality may be swallowed up of life. And so to His present lover the Lord said, "When thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. For this He said to him, signifying by what death he should glorify God. "Thou shalt stretch forth thy hands," He said;

in other words, thou shalt be crucified. But that thou mayest come to this, "another shall gird thee, and carry thee," not whither thou wouldest, but "whither thou wouldest not. He told him first what would happen, and then how it should come to pass. For it was not after being crucified, but when actually about to be crucified, that he was carried whither he would not; for after being crucified he went his way, not whither he would not, but rather whither he would. And though when set free from the body he wished to be with Christ, yet, were it only possible, he had a desire for eternal life apart from the grievousness of death, to which grievous experience he was unwillingly carried, but from it [when all was over] he was willingly carried away; unwillingly he came to it, but willingly he conquered it, and left this feeling of infirmity behind that makes every one unwilling to die,-a feeling so permanently natural, that even old age itself was unable to set the blessed Peter free from its influence, even as it was said unto him, "When thou shalt be old," thou shalt be led "whither thou wouldest not. For our consolation the Saviour Himself transfigured also the same feeling in His own person when He said, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me;

and He certainly had come to die without having any necessity, but only the willingness to die, with power to lay down His life, and with power to take it again. But however great be the grievousness of death, it ought to be overcome by the power of that love which is felt to Him who, being our life,

was willing to endure even death in our behalf. For if there were no grievousness, even of the smallest kind, in death, the glory of the martyrs would not be so great. But if the good Shepherd, who laid down His own life for His sheep, has raised up so many martyrs for Himself out of the very sheep, how much more ought those to contend to death for the truth, and even to blood against sin, who are entrusted by Him with the feeding, that is, with the teaching and governing of these very sheep? And on this account, along with the preceding example of His own passion, who can fail to see that the shepherds ought all the more to set themselves closely to imitate the Shepherd, if He was so imitated even by many of the sheep under whom, as the one Shepherd and in the one flock, the shepherds themselves are likewise sheep? For He made all those His sheep for [all of] whom He died, because He Himself also became a sheep that He might suffer for all.

TRACTATE 124

John XXI. 19-25. 1. It is no unimportant question why the Lord, when He manifested Himself for the third time to the disciples, said unto the Apostle Peter, "Follow me; but of the Apostle John, "Thus I wish him to remain till I come, what is that to thee? To the discussion or solution of this question, according as the Lord shall grant us ability we devote the last discourse of this work When the Lord, then, had announced beforehand to Peter by what death he was to glorify God, "He saith unto him, Follow me. Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; who also leaned on His breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that shall betray Thee? Peter, therefore, seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what [of] this man? Jesus saith unto him, Thus do I wish him to remain till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple dieth not: yet Jesus said not unto him, He dieth not; but, Thus do I wish him to remain till I come, what is that to thee? You see the great extent in this Gospel of a question which, by its depth, must exercise in no ordinary way the mind of the inquirer. For why is it said to Peter, "Follow me," and not to the others who were likewise present? Surely the disciples followed Him also as their Master.

But if it is to be understood only in reference to his suffering, was Peter the only one that suffered for the truth of Christianity? Was there not present there amongst those seven, another son of Zebedee, the brother of John, who, after His ascension, is plainly recorded to have been slain by

Herod? But some one may say that, as James was not crucified, it was properly enough said to Peter, "Follow me," inasmuch as he underwent not only death, but, like Christ, even the death of the cross. Be it so, if no other explanation can be found that is more satisfactory. Why, then, was it said of John, "Thus do I wish him to remain till I come, what is that to thee? and the words repeated, "Follow thou me," as if that other, therefore, were not to follow, seeing He wished him to remain till He comes. Who can readily believe that anything else was meant than what the brethren who lived at the time believed, namely, that that disciple was not to die, but to abide in this life till Jesus came? But John himself removed such an idea, by giving a flat contradiction to the report that the Lord had said so. For why should he add, "Jesus saith not, He dieth not," save to prevent what was false from taking hold of the hearts of men?

2. But let any one who so listeth still refuse his assent, and declare that what John asserts is true enough, that the Lord said not that that disciple dieth not, and yet that this is the meaning of such words as He is here recorded to have used; and further assert that the Apostle John is still living, and maintain that he is sleeping rather than lying dead in his tomb at Ephesus. Let him employ as an argument the current report that there the earth is in sensible commotion, and presents a kind of heaving appearance, and assert whether it be steadfastly or obstinately that this is occasioned by his breathing. For we cannot fail to have some who so believe, if there is no want of those also who affirm that Moses is alive; because it is written that his sepulchre could not be found, and that he appeared with the Lord on the mountain along with Elias, of whom we read that he did not die, but was translated. As if Moses' body could not have been hid somewhere in such a way as that its position should altogether escape discovery by men, and be raised up therefrom by divine power at the time when Elias and he were seen with Christ just as at the time of Christ's passion many bodies of the saints arose, and after His resurrection appeared, according to Scripture, to many in the holy city.

But still, as I began to say, if some deny the death of Moses, whom Scripture itself, in the very passage where we read that his sepulchre could nowhere be found, explicitly declares to have died; how much more may occasion be taken from these words where the Lord says, "Thus do I wish him to stay till I come," to believe that John is sleeping, but still alive, beneath

the ground? Of whom we have also the tradition (which is found in certain apocryphal scriptures), that he was present, in good health, when he ordered a sepulchre to be made for him; and that, when it was dug and prepared with all possible care, he laid himself down there as in a bed, and became immediately defunct: yet as those think who so understand these words of the Lord, not really defunct, but only lying like one in such a condition; and, while accounted dead, was actually buried when asleep, and that he will so remain till the coming of Christ, making known meanwhile the fact of his life by the bubbling up of the dust, which is believed to be forced by the breath of the sleeper to ascend from the depths to the surface of the grave. I think it quite superfluous to contend with such an opinion. For those may see for themselves who know the locality whether the ground there does or suffers what is said regarding it, because, in truth, we too have heard of it from those who are not altogether unreliable witnesses.

3. Meanwhile let us yield to the opinion, which we are unable to refute by any certain evidence, lest we stir up still another question that may be put to us, Why the very ground should seem in a kind of way to live and breathe upon the interred corpse? But can so great a question as the one before us be settled on such grounds as these, if by a great miracle, such as can be wrought by the Almighty, the living body lies so long asleep beneath the ground, till the coming of the end of the world? Nay, rather, does there not arise a wider and more difficult one, why Jesus bestowed on the disciple, whom He loved beyond the others to such an extent that he was counted worthy to recline on His breast, the gift of a protracted sleep in the body, when He delivered the blessed Peter, by the eminent glory of martyrdom, from the burden of the body itself, and vouchsafed to him what the Apostle Paul said that he desired, and committed to writing, namely, "to be let loose, and to be with Christ"? But if, what is rather to be believed, Saint John declared that the Lord said not, "He dieth not," for the very purpose that no such meaning might be attached to the words which He used; and his body lieth in its sepulchre lifeless like those of others deceased;

it remains, if that really takes place which report has spread abroad regarding the soil, which grows up anew, though continually carried away, that it is either so done for the purpose of commending the preciousness of his death, seeing it wants the commendation of martyrdom (for he suffered not death at a persecutor's hand for the faith of Christ), or on some other ac-

count that is concealed from our knowledge. Still there remains the question, why the Lord said of one who was destined to die, "Thus I wish him to remain till I Come." 4. And who, besides, would not be disposed, in the case of these two apostles, Peter and John, to make this further inquiry, why the Lord loved John better, when He Himself was better loved by Peter? For wherever John has something to say of himself, in order that the reference may be understood without any mention of his name, he adds this, that Jesus loved him, as if he were the only one so loved, that he might be distinguished by this mark from the others, who were all of them certainly loved by Christ: and what else, when he so spake, did he wish to be understood but that he himself was more abundantly loved? and far be it that he should utter a falsehood. And what greater proof could Jesus have given of His own greater love to him than that this man, who was only a partner with the rest of his fellow-disciples in the great salvation, should be the only one that leaned on the breast of the Saviour Himself? And further, that the Apostle Peter loved Christ more than the others, may be adduced from many documentary evidences; but to go no further after others, it is plainly enough apparent in the lesson almost immediately preceding the present, in connection with that third manifestation of the Lord, when He put to him the question, "Lovest thou me more than these?"

He knew it, of course, and yet asked, in order that we also, who read the Gospel, might know Peter's love to Christ, both from the questions of the One and the answers of the other. But when Peter only replied, "I love Thee," without adding, "more than these," his answer contained all that he knew of himself. For he could not know how much He was loved by any other, not being able to look into that other's heart. But by saying in the earliest of his answers, "Yea, Lord, Thou knowest," he stated in clear enough terms, that it was with perfect knowledge of all that the Lord asked what He asked. The Lord therefore knew, not only that Peter loved Him, but also that he loved Him more than the others. And yet if we propose to ourselves, in the way of inquiry, which of the two is the better, he that loveth Christ more or he that loveth Him less, who will hesitate to answer, he is the better that loveth Him more? If, on the other hand, we propose this question, which of the two is the better, he that is loved less or he that is loved more by Christ, without any doubt we shall reply that he is the better who is loved the more by Christ. In the comparison therefore which I drew first, Peter is superior to

John; but in the latter, John is preferred to Peter. Accordingly, we have a third to propose in this form:

Which of the two disciples is the better, he that loveth Christ less than his fellow-disciple [does], and is loved more than his fellow-disciple by Christ? or he who is loved less than his fellow-disciple by Christ, while he, more than his fellow-disciple, loveth Christ? Here it is that the answer plainly halts, and the question grows in magnitude. As far, however, as my own wisdom goes, I might easily reply, that he is the better who loveth Christ the more, but he the happier who is loved the more by Christ; if only I could thoroughly see how to defend the justice of our Deliverer in loving him the less by whom He is loved the more, and him the more by whom He is loved the less. 5. I shall therefore, in the manifested mercy of Him whose justice is hidden, set about the discussion, in order to the solution of a question of such importance, in accordance with the strength which He may graciously bestow: for hitherto it has only been proposed, not expounded. Let this, then, be the commencement of its exposition, namely, that we bear in mind that in this corruptible body, which burdens the soul, we live a miserable life. But we who are now redeemed by the Mediator, and have received the earnest of the Holy Spirit, have a blessed life in prospect, although we possess it not as yet in reality. But a hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it. And it is in the evils that every one suffers, not in the good things that he enjoys, that he has need of patience. The present life, therefore, whereof it is written, "Is not the life of man a term of trial upon earth? in which we are daily crying to the Lord, "Deliver us from evil," a man is compelled to endure, even when his sins are forgiven him, although it was the first sin that caused his falling into such misery. For the penalty is more protracted than the fault; test the fault should be accounted small, were the penalty to end with itself.

On this account it is also, either for the demonstration of our debt of misery, or for the amendment of our passing life, or for the exercise of the necessary patience, that man is kept through time in the penalty, even when he is no longer held by his sin as liable to everlasting damnation. This is the truly lamentable but unblameable condition of the present evil days we pass in this mortal state, even while in it we look with loving eyes to the days that are good. For it comes from the righteous anger of God, whereof the Scrip-

tures say, "Man, that is born of woman, is of few days and full of anger: for the anger of God is not like that of man, the disturbance of an excited man, but the calm fixing of righteous punishment. In this anger of His, God restraineth not, as it is written, His tender mercies; but, besides other consolations to the miserable, which He ceaseth not to bestow on mankind, in the fullness of time, when He knew that such had to be done, He sent His only-begotten Son, by whom He created all things, that He might become man while remaining God, and so be the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus:

that those who believe in Him, being absolved by the layer of regeneration from the guilt of all their sins,-to wit, both of the original sin they have inherited by generation, and to meet which, in particular, regeneration was instituted, and of all others contracted by evil conduct,-might be delivered from perpetual condemnation, and live in faith and hope and love while sojourning in this world, and be walking onward to His visible presence amid its toilsome and perilous temptations on the one hand, but the consolations of God, bothbodily and spiritual, on the other, ever keeping to the way which Christ has become to them. And because, even while walking in Him, they are not exempt from sins, which creep in through the infirmities of this life, He has given them the salutary remedies of alms whereby their prayers might be aided when He taught them to say, "Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors. So does the Church act in blessed hope through this troublous life; and this Church symbolized in its generality, was personified in the Apostle Peter, on account of the primacy of his apostleship. For, as regards his proper personality, he was by nature one man, by grace one Christian, by still more abounding grace one, and yet also, the first apostle; but when it was said to him, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven;

and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven," he represented the universal Church, which in this world is shaken by divers temptations, that come upon it like torrents of rain, floods and tempests, and falleth not, because it is founded upon a rock (petra), from which Peter received his name. For petra (rock) is not derived from Peter, but Peter from petra; just as Christ is not called so from the Christian, but the Christian from Christ. For on this very account the Lord said, "On this rock will I build my Church," because Peter had said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of

the living God. On this rock, therefore, He said, which thou hast confessed. I will build my Church. For the Rock (Petra) was Christ; and on this foundation was Peter himself also built. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus. The Church, therefore, which is rounded in Christ received from Him the keys of the kingdom of heaven in the person of Peter, that is to say, the power of binding and loosing sins. For what the Church is essentially in Christ, such representatively is Peter in the rock (petra); and in this representation Christ is to be understood as the Rock, Peter as the Church. This Church, accordingly, which Peter represented, so long as it lives amidst evil, by loving and following Christ is delivered from evil. But its following is the closer in those who contend even unto death for the truth.

But to the universality [of the Church] is it said, "Follow me," even as it was for the same universality that Christ suffered: of whom this same Peter saith, "Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow His footsteps. This, then, you see is why it was said to him, "Follow me. But there is another, an immortal life, that is not in the midst of evil: there we shall see face to face what is seen here through a glass and in a riddle, even when much progress is made in the beholding of the truth. There are two states of life, therefore, preached and commended to herself from heaven, that are known to the Church, whereof the one is in faith, the other in sight; one in the temporal sojourn in a foreign land, the other in the eternity of the [heavenly] abode; one in labor, the other in repose; one on the way, the other in the fatherland; one in active work, the other in the wages of contemplation; one declines from evil and makes for good, the other has no evil to decline from, and has great good to enjoy; the one fights with a foe, the other reigns without a foe; the one is brave in the midst of adversities, the other has no experience of adversity; the one is bridling its carnal lusts, the other has full scope for spiritual delights; the one is anxious with the care of conquering, the other secure in the peace of victory;

the one is helped in temptations, the other, free from all temptations, rejoices in the Helper Himself; the one is occupied in relieving the indigent, the other is there, where no indigence is found; the one pardons the sins of others, that its own may be pardoned to itself, the other neither has anything to pardon nor does aught for which pardon has to be asked; the one is scourged with evils that it may not be elated with good things, the other is

free from all evil by such a fullness of grace that, without any temptation to pride, it may cleave to that which is supremely good; the one discerneth both good and evil, the other has only that which is good presented to view: therefore the one is good, but miserable as yet; the other, better and blessed. This one was signified by the Apostle Peter, that other by John. The whole of the one is passed here to the end of this world, and there finds its termination, the other is deferred for its completion till after the end of this world, but has no end in the world to come. Hence it is said to the latter, "Follow me; but of the former, "Thus I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee follow thou me. For what means this last? So far as my wisdom goes, so far as I comprehend, what is it but this, Follow thou me by imitating me in the endurance of temporal evils;

let him remain till I come to restore everlasting good? And this may be expressed more clearly in this way: Let perfected action, informed by the example of my passion, follow me; but let contemplation only begun remain [so] till I come, to be perfected when I come. For the godly plenitude of patience, reaching forward even unto death, followeth Christ; but the fullness of knowledge tarrieth till Christ come, to be manifested then. For here the evils of this world are endured in the land of the dying, while there shall be seen the good things of the Lord in the land of the living. For in saying, "I wish him to tarry till I come," we are not to understand Him as meaning to remain on, or abide permanently, but to wait; seeing that what is signified by him shall certainly not be fulfilled now, but when Christ is come. But what is signified by him to whom it was said, "Follow thou me," unless it be done now, will never attain to the expected end. And in this life of activity. the more we love Christ the more easily are we delivered from evil. But He loveth us less as we now are, and therefore delivers from it, that we may not be always such as we are. There, however, He loveth us more; for we shall not have aught about us to displease Him, or aught that He will have to separate us from:

nor is it for aught else that He loveth us here but that He may heal and translate us from everything He loveth not. Here, therefore, the loveth us] less, where He would not have us remain; there in larger measure, whither He would have us to be passing, and out of that wherein He would not that we should perish. Let Peter therefore love Him, that we may obtain deliverance from our present mortality; let John be loved by Him, that we may be

preserved in the immortality to come. 6. But by this line of argument we have shown why Christ loved John more than Peter, not why Peter loved Christ more than John. For if Christ loveth us more in the world to come, where we shall live unendingly with Him, than in the present, from which we are in the course of being rescued, that we may be always in the other, it does not follow on that account that we shall love Him less when better ourselves; since we can in no possible way be better ourselves, save by loving Him more. Why was it, then, that John loved Him less than Peter, if he signified that life, wherein He must be more abundantly loved, but because on that very account it was said, "I will that he tarry," that is wait, "till I come; for we have not yet the love itself, which will then be greater far, but are expecting that future, that we may have it when He shall come? Just as in his own epistle the same apostle declares, "It has not yet appeared what we shall be: but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is. Then accordingly shall we love the more that which we shall see. But the Lord Himself.

in His predestinating knowledge, loveth more that future life of ours that is yet to come, such as He knows it will be hereafter in us, in order that by so loving us He may draw us onward to its possession. Wherefore, as all the ways of the Lord are mercy and truth, we know our present misery, because we feel it; and therefore we love more the mercy of the Lord, which we wish to be exhibited in our deliverance from misery, and we ask and experience it daily, especially in the remission of sins: this it is that was signified by Peter, as loving more, but less beloved; because Christ loveth us less in our misery than in our blessedness. But the contemplation of the truth, such as it then shall be, we love less, because as yet we neither know nor possess it: this was signified by John as loving less, and therefore waiting both for that state itself, and for the perfecting in us of that love to Him, to which He is entitled, till the Lord come; but loved the more, because that it is, which is symbolized by him, that maketh him blessed.

7. Let no one, however, separate these distinguished apostles. In that which was signified by Peter, they were both alike; and in that which was signified by John, they will both be alike hereafter. In their representative character, the one was following, the other tarrying; but in their personal faith they were both of them enduring the present evils of the misery here, both of them expecting the future good things of the blessedness to come.

And such is the case, not with them alone, trot with the holy universal Church, the spouse of Christ, who has still to be rescued from the present trials, and to be preserved in the future happiness. And these two states of life were symbolized by Peter and John, the one by the one, the other by the other; but in this life they both of them walked for a time by faith, and the other they shall both of them enjoy eternally by sight. For the whole body of the saints, therefore, inseparably belonging to the body of Christ, and for their safe pilotage through the present tempestuous life, did Peter, the first of the apostles, receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven for the binding and loosing of sins; and for the same congregation of saints, in reference to the perfect repose in the bosom of that mysterious life to come did the evangelist John recline on the breast of Christ. For it is not the former alone but the whole Church, that bindeth and looseth sins;

nor did the latter alone drink at the fountain of the Lord's breast, to emit again in preaching, of the Word in the beginning, God with God, and those other sublime truths regarding the divinity of Christ, and the Trinity and Unity of the whole Godhead. which are to be yet beheld in that kingdom face to face, but meanwhile till the Lord's coming are only to be seen in a mirror and in a riddle; but the Lord has Himself diffused this very gospel through the whole world, that every one of His own may drink thereat according to his own individual capacity. There are some who have entertained the idea-and those, too, who are no contemptible handlers of sacred eloquence-that the Apostle John was more loved by Christ on the ground that he never married a wife, and lived in perfect chastity from early boyhood. There is, indeed, no distinct evidence of this in the canonical Scriptures: nevertheless it is an idea that contributes not a little to the suitableness of the opinion expressed above, namely, that that life was signified by him, where there will be no marriage.

8. "This is the disciple who testifieth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his testimony is true. And there are also," he adds, "many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. We are not to suppose that in regard to local space the world would be unable to contain them; for how could they be written in it if it could not hear them when written? but perhaps it is that they could not be comprehended by the capacity of the readers: although, while our faith in

certain things themselves remains unharmed, the words we use about them may not unfrequently appear to exceed belief. This will not take place when anything that was obscure or dubious is in course of exposition by the setting forth of its ground and reason, but only when that which is clear of itself is either magnified or extenuated, Without any real departure from the pathway of the truth to be intimated; for the words may outrun the thing itself that is indicated only in such a way, that the will of him that speaketh, but without any intention to deceive, may be apparent, so that, knowing how far he will be believed, he, orally, either diminishes or magnifies his subject beyond the limit to which credit will be given.

This mode of speaking is called by the Greek name hyperbole, by the masters not only of Greek, but also of Latin literature. And this mode is found not only here, but in several other parts also of the divine literature: as, "They set their mouths against the heavens; and, "The top of the hair of such as go on in their trespasses; and many others of the same kind, which are no more wanting in the sacred Scriptures than other tropes or modes of speaking. Of these I might give a more elaborate discussion, were it not that, as the evangelist here terminates his Gospel, I am also compelled to bring my discourse to a close.

P A R T T W O

The Harmony of the Gospels

*Augustine's four books on the agreement of the four Gospels,
written against those who said that they contradict each other.*

The Harmony of the Gospels

AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO

AD 354–430

Bishop of Hippo, the most influential Latin father.

INTRODUCTION

The treatise opens with a short statement on the subject of the authority of the evangelists, their number, their order, and the different plans of their narratives. Augustin then prepares for the discussion of the questions relating to their harmony, by joining issue in this book with those who raise a difficulty in the circumstance that Christ has left no writing of His own, or who falsely allege that certain books were composed by Him on the arts of magic. He also meets the objections of those who, in opposition to the evangelical teaching, assert that the disciples of Christ at once ascribed more to their master than he really was, when they affirmed that he was God, and inculcated what they had not been instructed in by him, when they interdicted the worship of the Gods. Against these antagonists he vindicates the teaching of the apostles, by appealing to the utterances of the prophets, and by showing that the God of Israel was to be the sole object of worship, who also, although he was the only deity to whom acceptance was denied in former times by the Romans, and that for the very reason that he prohibited them from worshipping other gods along with himself, has now in the end made the empire of Rome subject to his name, and among all nations has broken their idols in pieces through the preaching of the gospel, as he had promised by his prophets that the event should be.

CHAPTER I.—ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE GOSPELS.

1. In the entire number of those divine records which are contained in the sacred writings, the gospel deservedly stands pre-eminent. For what the law and the prophets aforetime announced as destined to come to pass, is exhibited in the gospel in its realization and fulfilment. The first preachers of this

gospel were the apostles, who beheld our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in person when He was yet present in the flesh. And not only did these men keep in remembrance the words heard from His lips, and the deeds wrought by Him beneath their eyes; but they were also careful, when the duty of preaching the gospel was laid upon them, to make mankind acquainted with those divine and memorable occurrences which took place at a period antecedent to the formation of their own connection with Him in the way of discipleship, which belonged also to the time of His nativity, His infancy, or His youth, and with regard to which they were able to institute exact inquiry and to obtain information, either at His own hand or at the hands of His parents or other parties, on the ground of the most reliable intimations and the most trustworthy testimonies. Certain of them also—namely, Matthew and John—gave to the world, in their respective books, a written account of all those matters which it seemed needful to commit to writing concerning Him.

2. And to preclude the supposition that, in what concerns the apprehension and proclamation of the gospel, it is a matter of any consequence whether the enunciation comes by men who were actual followers of this same Lord here when He manifested Himself in the flesh and had the company of His disciples attendant on Him, or by persons who with due credit received facts with which they became acquainted in a trustworthy manner through the instrumentality of these former, divine providence, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, has taken care that certain of those also who were nothing more than followers of the first apostles should have authority given them not only to preach the gospel, but also to compose an account of it in writing. I refer to Mark and Luke. All those other individuals, however, who have attempted or dared to offer a written record of the acts of the Lord or of the apostles, failed to commend themselves in their own times as men of the character which would induce the Church to yield them its confidence, and to admit their compositions to the canonical authority of the Holy Books. And this was the case not merely because they were persons who could make no rightful claim to have credit given them in their narrations, but also because in a deceitful manner they introduced into their writings certain matters which are condemned at once by the catholic and apostolic rule of faith, and by sound doctrine.

CHAPTER II.—ON THE ORDER OF THE EVANGELISTS, AND THE
PRINCIPLES ON WHICH THEY WROTE.

3. Now, those four evangelists whose names have gained the most remarkable circulation over the whole world, and whose number has been fixed as four,—it may be for the simple reason that there are four divisions of that world through the universal length of which they, by their number as by a kind of mystical sign, indicated the advancing extension of the Church of Christ,—are believed to have written in the order which follows: first Matthew, then Mark, thirdly Luke, lastly John. Hence, too, [it would appear that] these had one order determined among them with regard to the matters of their personal knowledge and their preaching [of the gospel], but a different order in reference to the task of giving the written narrative. As far, indeed, as concerns the acquisition of their own knowledge and the charge of preaching, those unquestionably came first in order who were actually followers of the Lord when He was present in the flesh, and who heard Him speak and saw Him act; and [with a commission received] from His lips they were despatched to preach the gospel. But as respects the task of composing that record of the gospel which is to be accepted as ordained by divine authority, there were (only) two, belonging to the number of those whom the Lord chose before the passover, that obtained places,—namely, the first place and the last. For the first place in order was held by Matthew, and the last by John. And thus the remaining two, who did not belong to the number referred to, but who at the same time had become followers of the Christ who spoke in these others, were supported on either side by the same, like sons who were to be embraced, and who in this way were set in the midst between these twain.

4. Of these four, it is true, only Matthew is reckoned to have written in the Hebrew language; the others in Greek. And however they may appear to have kept each of them a certain order of narration proper to himself, this certainly is not to be taken as if each individual writer chose to write in ignorance of what his predecessor had done, or left out as matters about which there was no information things which another nevertheless is discovered to have recorded. But the fact is, that just as they received each of them the gift of inspiration, they abstained from adding to their several labours any superfluous conjoint compositions. For Matthew is understood to have taken it in hand to construct the record of the incarnation of the Lord according to the

royal lineage, and to give an account of most part of His deeds and words as they stood in relation to this present life of men. Mark follows him closely, and looks like his attendant and epitomizer. For in his narrative he gives nothing in concert with John apart from the others: by himself separately, he has little to record; in conjunction with Luke, as distinguished from the rest, he has still less; but in concord with Matthew, he has a very large number of passages. Much, too, he narrates in words almost numerically and identically the same as those used by Matthew, where the agreement is either with that evangelist alone, or with him in connection with the rest.

On the other hand, Luke appears to have occupied himself rather with the priestly lineage and character of the Lord. For although in his own way he carries the descent back to David, what he has followed is not the royal pedigree, but the line of those who were not kings. That genealogy, too, he has brought to a point in Nathan the son of David, which person likewise was no king. It is not thus, however, with Matthew. For in tracing the lineage along through Solomon the king, he has pursued with strict regularity the succession of the other kings; and in enumerating these, he has also conserved that mystical number of which we shall speak hereafter.

CHAPTER III.—OF THE FACE THAT MATTHEW, TOGETHER WITH MARK,
HAD SPECIALLY IN VIEW THE KINGLY CHARACTER OF CHRIST,
WHEREAS LUKE DEALT WITH THE PRIESTLY.

5. For the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the one true King and the one true Priest, the former to rule us, and the latter to make expiation for us, has shown us how His own figure bore these two parts together, which were only separately commended [to notice] among the Fathers. This becomes apparent if (for example) we look to that inscription which was affixed to His cross "King of the Jews: in connection also with which, and by a secret instinct, Pilate replied, "What I have written, I have written. For it had been said aforetime in the Psalms, "Destroy not the writing of the title. The same becomes evident, so far as the part of priest is concerned, if we have regard to what He has taught us concerning offering and receiving. For thus it is that He sent us beforehand a prophecy respecting Himself, which runs thus, "Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedek. And in many other testimonies of the divine Scriptures, Christ appears both as King and as Priest.

Hence, also, even David himself, whose son He is, not without good reason, more frequently declared to be than he is said to be Abraham's son, and

whom Matthew and Luke have both alike held by,-the one viewing him as the person from whom, through Solomon, His lineage can be traced down, and the other taking him for the person to whom, through Nathan, His genealogy can be carried up,-did represent the part of a priest, although he was patently a king, when he ate the shew-bread. For it was not lawful for any one to eat that, save the priests only. To this it must be added that Luke is the only one who mentions how Mary was discovered by the angel, and how she was related to Elisabeth, who was the wife of Zacharias the priest. And of this Zacharias the same evangelist has recorded the fact, that the woman whom he had for wife was one of the daughters of Aaron, which is to say she belonged to the tribe of the priests.

6. Whereas, then, Matthew had in view the kingly character, and Luke the priestly, they have at the same time both set forth pre-eminently the humanity of Christ: for it was according to His humanity that Christ was made both King and Priest. To Him, too, God gave the throne of His father David, in order that of His kingdom there should be none end. And this was done with the purpose that there might be a mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, to make intercession for us. Luke, on the other hand, had no one connected with him to act as his summarist in the way that Mark was attached to Matthew. And it may be that this is not without a certain solemn significance. For it is the right of kings not to miss the obedient following of attendants; and hence the evangelist, who had taken it in hand to give an account of the kingly character of Christ, had a person attached to him as his associate who was in some fashion to follow in his steps. But inasmuch as it was the priest's want to enter all alone into the holy of holies, in accordance with that principle, Luke, whose object contemplated the priestly office of Christ, did not have any one to come after him as a confederate, who was meant in some way to serve as an epitomizer of his narrative.

CHAPTER IV.-OF THE FACT THAT JOHN UNDERTOOK THE EXPOSITION
OF CHRIST'S DIVINITY.

17. These three evangelists, however, were for the most part engaged with those things which Christ did through the vehicle of the flesh of man, and after the temporal fashion. But John, on the other hand, had in view that true divinity of the Lord in which He is the Father's equal, and directed his efforts above all to the setting forth of the divine nature in his Gospel in such a way as he believed to be adequate to men's needs and notions. There-

fore he is borne to loftier heights, in which he leaves the other three far behind him; so that, while in them you see men who have their conversation in a certain manner with the man Christ on earth, in him you perceive one who has passed beyond the cloud in which the whole earth is wrapped, and who has reached the liquid heaven from which, with clearest and steadiest mental eye, he is able to look upon God the Word, who was in the beginning with God, and by whom all things were made. And there, too, he can recognise Him who was made flesh in order that He might dwell amongst us; [that Word of whom we say,] that He assumed the flesh, not that He was changed into the flesh. For had not this assumption of the flesh been effected in such a manner as at the same time to conserve the unchangeable Divinity, Such a word as this could never have been spoken, -namely, "I and the Father are one.

2For surely the Father and the flesh are not one. And the same John is also the only one who has recorded that witness which the Lord gave concerning Himself, when He said: "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father also; and, "I am in the Father, and the Father is in me; "that they may be one, even as we are one; and, "Whatsoever the Father doeth, these same things doeth the Son likewise. And whatever other statements there may be to the same effect, calculated to betoken, to those who are possessed of right understanding, that divinity of Christ in which He is the Father's equal, of all these we might almost say that we are indebted for their introduction into the Gospel narrative to John alone. For he is like one who has drunk in the secret of His divinity more richly and somehow more familiarly than others, as if he drew it from the very bosom of his Lord on which it was his wont to recline when He sat at meat.

CHAPTER V.-CONCERNING THE TWO VIRTUES, OF WHICH JOHN IS
CONVERSANT WITH THE CONTEMPLATIVE, THE OTHER EVANGELISTS
WITH THE ACTIVE.

18. Moreover, there are two several virtues (or talents) which have been proposed to the mind of man. Of these, the one is the active, and the other the contemplative: the one being that whereby the way is taken, and the other that whereby the goal is reached; the one that by which men labour in order that the heart may be purified to see God, and the other that by which men are disengaged and God is seen. Thus the former of these two virtues is occupied with the precepts for the right exercise of the temporal life, whereas the

latter deals with the doctrine of that life which is everlasting. In this way, also, the one operates, the other rests; for the former finds its sphere in the purging of sins, the latter moves in the light of the purged. And thus, again, in this mortal life the one is engaged with the work of a good conversation; while the other subsists rather on faith, and is seen only in the person of the very few, and through the glass darkly, and only in part in a kind of vision of the unchangeable truth. Now these two virtues are understood to be presented emblematically in the instance of the two wives of Jacob. Of these I have discoursed already up to the measure of my ability, and as fully as seemed to be appropriate to my task, (in what I have written) in opposition to Faustus the Manichæan.

² For Lia, indeed, by interpretation means "labouring," whereas Rachel signifies "the first principle seen. And by this it is given us to understand, if one will only attend carefully to the matter, that those three evangelists who, with pre-eminent fulness, have handled the account of the Lord's temporal doings and those of His sayings which were meant to bear chiefly upon the moulding of the manners of the present life, were conversant with that active virtue; and that John, on the other hand, who narrates fewer by far of the Lord's doings, but records with greater carefulness and with larger wealth of detail the words which He spoke, and most especially those discourses which were intended to introduce us to the knowledge of the unity of the Trinity and the blessedness of the life eternal, formed his plan and framed his statement with a view to commend the contemplative virtue to our regard.

CHAPTER VI.-OF THE FOUR LIVING CREATURES IN THE APOCALYPSE,
WHICH HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY SOME IN ONE APPLICATION, AND BY
OTHERS IN ANOTHER, AS APT FIGURES OF THE FOUR EVANGELISTS.

9. For these reasons, it also appears to me, that of the various parties who have interpreted the living creatures in the Apocalypse as significant of the four evangelists, those who have taken the lion to point to Matthew, the man to Mark, the calf to Luke, and the eagle to John, have made a more reasonable application of the figures than those who have assigned the man to Matthew, the eagle to Mark, and the lion to John. For, in forming their particular idea of the matter, these latter have chosen to keep in view simply the beginnings of the books, and not the full design of the several evangelists in its completeness, which was the matter that should, above all, have

been thoroughly examined. For surely it is with much greater propriety that the one who has brought under our notice most largely the kingly character of Christ, should be taken to be represented by the lion. Thus is it also that we find the lion mentioned in conjunction with the royal tribe itself, in that passage of the Apocalypse where it is said, "The lion of the tribe of Judah hath prevailed. For in Matthew's narrative the magi are recorded to have come from the east to inquire after the King, and to worship Him whose birth was notified to them by the star.

Thus, too, Herod, who himself also was a king, is [said there to be] afraid of the royal child, and to put so many little children to death in order to make sure that the one might be slain. Again, that Luke is intended under the figure of the calf, in reference to the pre-eminent sacrifice made by the priest, has been doubted by neither of the two [sets of interpreters]. For in that Gospel the narrator's account commences with Zacharias the priest. In it mention is also made of the relationship between Mary and Elisabeth. In it, too, it is recorded that the ceremonies proper to the earliest priestly service were attended to in the case of the infant Christ; and a careful examination brings a variety of other matters under our notice in this Gospel, by which it is made apparent that Luke's object was to deal with the part of the priest. In this way it follows further, that Mark, who has set himself neither to give an account of the kingly lineage, nor to expound anything distinctive of the priesthood, whether on the subject of the relationship or on that of the consecration, and who at the same time comes before us as one who handles the things which the man Christ did, appears to be indicated simply under the figure of the man among those four living creatures. But again, those three living creatures, whether lion, man, or calf, have their course upon this earth;

and in like manner, those three evangelists occupy themselves chiefly with the things which Christ did in the flesh, and with the precepts which He delivered to men, who also bear the burden of the flesh, for their instruction in the rightful exercise of this mortal life. Whereas John, on the other hand, soars like an eagle above the clouds of human infirmity, and gazes upon the light of the unchangeable truth with those keenest and steadiest eyes of the heart. Chapter VII.-A Statement of Augustin's Reason for Undertaking This Work on the Harmony of the Evangelists, and an Example of the Method in Which He Meets Those Who Allege that Christ Wrote Nothing

Himself, and that His Disciples Made an Unwarranted Affirmation in Proclaiming Him to Be God. 10. Those sacred chariots of the Lord, however, in which He is borne throughout the earth and brings the peoples under His easy yoke and His light burden, are assailed with calumnious charges by certain persons who, in impious vanity or in ignorant temerity, think to rob of their credit as veracious historians those teachers by whose instrumentality the Christian religion has been disseminated all the world over, and through whose efforts it has yielded fruits so plentiful that unbelievers now scarcely dare so much as to mutter their slanders in private among themselves, kept in check by the faith of the Gentiles and by the devotion of all the peoples. Nevertheless, inasmuch as they still strive by their calumnious disputations to keep some from making themselves acquainted with the faith, and thus prevent them from becoming believers, while they also endeavour to the utmost of their power to excite agitations among others who have already attained to belief, and thereby give them trouble;

and further, as there are some brethren who, without detriment to their own faith, have a desire to ascertain what answer can be given to such questions, either for the advantage of their own knowledge or for the purpose of refuting the vain utterances of their enemies, with the inspiration and help of the Lord our God (and would that it might prove profitable for the salvation of such men), we have undertaken in this work to demonstrate the errors or the rashness of those who deem themselves able to prefer charges, the subtilty of which is at least sufficiently observable, against those four different books of the gospel which have been written by these four several evangelists. And in order to carry out this design to a successful conclusion, we must prove that the writers in question do not stand in any antagonism to each other. For those adversaries are in the habit of adducing this as the palmary allegation in all their vain objections, namely, that the evangelists are not in harmony with each other.

11. But we must first discuss a matter which is apt to present a difficulty to the minds of some. I refer to the question why the Lord has written nothing Himself, and why He has thus left us to the necessity of accepting the testimony of other persons who have prepared records of His history. For this is what those parties-the pagans more than any-allege when they lack boldness enough to impeach or blaspheme the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and when they allow Him-only as a man, however-to have been possessed of the

most distinguished wisdom. In making that admission, they at the same time assert that the disciples claimed more for their Master than He really was; so much more indeed that they even called Him the Son of God, and the Word of God, by whom all things were made, and affirmed that He and God are one. And in the same way they dispose of all other kindred passages in the epistles of the apostles, in the light of which we have been taught that He is to be worshipped as one God with the Father. For they are of opinion that He is certainly to be honoured as the wisest of men; but they deny that He is to be worshipped as God.

12. Wherefore, when they put the question why He has not written in His own person, it would seem as if they were prepared to believe regarding Him whatever He might have written concerning Himself, but not what others may have given the world to know with respect to His life, according to the measure of their own judgment. Well, I ask them in turn why, in the case of certain of the noblest of their own philosophers, they have accepted the statements which their disciples left in the records they have composed, while these sages themselves have given us no written accounts of their own lives? For Pythagoras, than whom Greece in those days did not possess any more illustrious personage in the sphere of that contemplative virtue, is believed to have written absolutely nothing, whether on the subject of his own personal history or on any other theme whatsoever. And as to Socrates, to whom, on the other hand, they have adjudged a position of supremacy above all others in that active virtue by which the moral life is trained, so that they do not hesitate also to aver that he was even pronounced to be the wisest of men by the testimony of their deity Apollo,—it is indeed true that he handled the fables of Aesop in some few short verses, and thus made use of words and numbers of his own in the task of rendering the themes of another. But this was all.

And so far was he from having the desire to write anything himself, that he declared that he had done even so much only because he was constrained by the imperial will of his demon, as Plato, the noblest of all his disciples, tells us. That was a work, also, in which he sought to set forth in fair form not so much his own thoughts, as rather the ideas of another. What reasonable ground, therefore, have they for believing, with regard to those sages, all that their disciples have committed to record in respect of their history, while at the same time they refuse to credit in the case of Christ what His

disciples have written on the subject of His life? And all the more may we thus argue, when we see how they admit that all other men have been excelled by Him in the matter of wisdom, although they decline to acknowledge Him to be God. Is it, indeed, the case that those persons whom they do not hesitate to allow to have been by far His inferiors, have had the faculty of making disciples who can be trusted in all that concerns the narrative of their careers, and that He failed in that capacity?

But if that is a most absurd statement to venture upon, then in all that belongs to the history of that Person to whom they grant the honour of wisdom, they ought to believe not merely what suits their own notions, but what they read in the narratives of those who learned from this sage Himself those various facts which they have left on record on the subject of His life.

CHAPTER VIII.—OF THE QUESTION WHY, IF CHRIST IS BELIEVED TO
HAVE BEEN THE WISEST OF MEN ON THE TESTIMONY OF COMMON
NARRATIVE REPORT, HE SHOULD NOT BE BELIEVED TO BE GOD ON THE
TESTIMONY OF THE SUPERIOR REPORT OF PREACHING.

113. Besides this, they ought to tell us by what means they have succeeded in acquiring their knowledge of this fact that He was the wisest of men, or how it has had the opportunity of reaching their ears. If they have been made acquainted with it simply by current report, then is it the case that common report forms a more trustworthy informant on the subject of His history than those disciples of His who, as they have gone and preached of Him, have disseminated the same report like a penetrating savour throughout the whole world? In fine, they ought to prefer the one kind of report to the other, and believe that account of His life which is the superior of the two. For this report, indeed, which is spread abroad with a wonderful clearness from that Church catholic at whose extension through the whole world those persons are so astonished, prevails in an incomparable fashion over the unsubstantial run, ours with which men like them occupy themselves. This report, furthermore, which carries with it such weight and such currency, that in dread of it they can only mutter their anxious and feeble snatches of paltry objections within their own breasts, as if they were more afraid now of being heard than wishful to receive credit, proclaims Christ to be the only-begotten Son of God, and Himself God, by whom all things were made.

2 If, therefore, they choose report as their witness, why does not their choice fix on this special report, which is so pre-eminently lustrous in its re-

markable definiteness? And if they desire the evidence of writings, why do they not take those evangelical writings which excel all others in their commanding authority? On our side, indeed, we accept those statements about their deities which are offered at once in their most ancient writings and by most current report. But if these deities are to be considered proper objects for reverence, why then do they make them the subject of laughter in the theatres? And if, on the other hand, they are proper objects for laughter, the occasion for such laughter must be all the greater when they are made the objects of worship in the theatres. It remains for us to look upon those persons as themselves minded to be witnesses concerning Christ, who, by speaking what they know not, divest themselves of the merit of knowing what they speak about. Or if, again, they assert that they are possessed of any books which they can maintain to have been written by Him, they ought to produce them for our inspection. For assuredly those books (if there are such) must be most profitable and most wholesome, seeing they are the productions of one whom they acknowledge to have been the wisest of men. If, however, they are afraid to produce them, it must be because they are of evil tendency;

3 but if they are evil, then the wisest of men cannot have written them. They acknowledge Christ, however, to be the wisest of men, and consequently Christ cannot have written any such thing.

CHAPTER IX.-OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO PRETEND THAT CHRIST
WROTE BOOKS ON THE ARTS OF MAGIC.

14. But, indeed, these persons rise to such a pitch of folly as to allege that the books which they consider to have been written by Him contain the arts by which they think He wrought those miracles, the fame of which has become prevalent in all quarters. And this fancy of theirs betrays what they really love, and what their aims really are. For thus, indeed, they show us how they entertain this opinion that Christ was the wisest of men only for the reason that He possessed the knowledge of I know not what illicit arts, which are justly condemned, not merely by Christian discipline, but even by the administration of earthly government itself. And, in good sooth, if there are people who affirm that they have read books of this nature composed by Christ, then why do they not perform with their own hand some such works as those which so greatly excite their wonder when wrought by Him, by tak-

ing advantage of the information which they have derived from these books?

CHAPTER X.-OF SOME WHO ARE MAN ENOUGH TO SUPPOSE THAT THE
BOOKS WERE INSCRIBED WITH THE NAMES OF PETER AND PAUL.

15. Nay more, as by divine judgment, some of those who either believe, or wish to have it believed, that Christ wrote matter of that description, have even wandered so far into error as to allege that these same books bore on their front, in the form of epistolary superscription, a designation addressed to Peter and Paul. And it is quite possible that either the enemies of the name of Christ, or certain parties who thought that they might impart to this kind of execrable arts the weight of authority drawn from so glorious a name, may have written things of that nature under the name of Christ and the apostles. But in such most deceitful audacity they have been so utterly blinded as simply to have made themselves fitting objects for laughter, even with young people who as yet know Christian literature only in boyish fashion, and rank merely in the grade of readers.

16. For when they made up their minds to represent Christ to have written in such strain as that to His disciples, they bethought themselves of those of His followers who might best be taken for the persons to whom Christ might most readily be believed to have written, as the individuals who had kept by Him on the most familiar terms of friendship. And so Peter and Paul occurred to them, I believe, just because in many places they chanced to see these two apostles represented in pictures as both in company with Him. For Rome, in a specially honourable and solemn manner, commends the merits of Peter and of Paul, for this reason among others, namely, that they suffered [martyrdom] on the same day. Thus to fall most completely into error was the due desert of men who sought for Christ and His apostles not in the holy writings, but on painted walls. Neither is it to be wondered at, that these fiction-limners were misled by the painters. For throughout the whole period during which Christ lived in our mortal flesh in fellowship with His disciples, Paul had never become His disciple.

Only after His passion, after His resurrection, after His ascension, after the mission of the Holy Spirit from heaven, after many Jews had been converted and had shown marvellous faith, after the stoning of Stephen the deacon and martyr, and when Paul still bore the name Saul, and was grievously persecuting those who had become believers in Christ, did Christ call that

man [by a voice] from heaven, and made him His disciple and apostle. How, then, is it possible that Christ could have written those books which they wish to have it believed that He did write before His death, and which were addressed to Peter and Paul, as those among His disciples who had been most intimate with Him, seeing that up to that date Paul had not yet become a disciple of His at all?

CHAPTER XI.-IN OPPOSITION TO THOSE WHO FOOLISHLY IMAGINE
THAT CHRIST CONVERTED THE PEOPLE TO HIMSELF BY MAGICAL ARTS.

17. Moreover, let those who madly fancy that it was by the use of magical arts that He was able to do the great things which He did, and that it was by the practice of such rites that He made His name a sacred thing to the peoples who were to be converted to Him, give their attention to this question,-namely, whether by the exercise of magical arts, and before He was born on this earth, He could also have filled with the Holy Spirit those mighty prophets who aforetime declared those very things concerning Him as things destined to come to pass, which we can now read in their accomplishment in the gospel, and which we can see in their present realization in the world. For surely, even if it was by magical arts that He secured worship for Himself, and that, too, after His death, it is not the case that He was a magician before He was born. Nay, for the office of prophesying on the subject of His coming, one nation had been most specially deputed; and the entire administration of that commonwealth was ordained to be a prophecy of this King who was to come, and who was to found a heavenly state drawnout of all nations.

CHAPTER XII.-OF THE FACT THAT THE GOD OF THE JEWS, AFTER THE
SUBJUGATION OF THAT PEOPLE, WAS STILL NOT ACCEPTED BY THE
ROMANS, BECAUSE HIS COMMANDMENT WAS THAT HE ALONE SHOULD BE
WORSHIPPED, AND IMAGES DESTROYED.

18. Furthermore, that Hebrew nation, which, as I have said, was commissioned to prophesy of Christ, had no other God but one God, the true God, who made heaven and earth, and all that therein is. Under His displeasure they were oftentimes given into the power of their enemies. And now, indeed, on account of their most heinous sin in putting Christ to death, they have been thoroughly rooted out of Jerusalem itself, which was the capital of their kingdom, and have been made subject to the Roman empire. Now the Romans were in the habit of propitiating the deities of those nations whom they conquered by worshipping these themselves, and they were accustomed

to undertake the charge of their sacred rites. But they declined to act on that principle with regard to the God of the Hebrew nation, either when they made their attack or when they reduced the people. I believe that they perceived that, if they admitted the worship of this Deity, whose commandment was that He only should be worshipped, and that images should be destroyed, they would have to put away from them all those objects to which formerly they had undertaken to do religious service, and by the worship of which they believed their empire had grown. But in this the falseness of their demons mightily deceived them. For surely they ought to have apprehended the fact that it is only by the hidden will of the true God, in whose hand resides the supreme power in all things, that the kingdom was given them and has been made to increase, and that their position was not due to the favour of those deities who, if they could have wielded any influence whatever in that matter, would rather have protected their own people from being over-mastered by the Romans, or would have brought the Romans themselves into complete subjection to them.

19. Certainly they cannot possibly affirm that the kind of piety and manners exemplified by them became objects of love and choice on the part of the gods of the nations which they conquered. They will never make such an assertion, if they only recall their own early beginnings, the asylum for abandoned criminals and the fratricide of Romulus. For when Remus and Romulus established their asylum, with the intention that whoever took refuge there, be the crime what it might be with which he stood charged, should enjoy impunity in his deed, they did not promulgate any precepts of penitence for bringing the minds of such wretched men back to a right condition. By this bribe of impunity did they not rather arm the gathered band of fearful fugitives against the states to which they properly belonged, and the laws of which they dreaded? Or when Romulus slew his brother, who had perpetrated no evil against him, is it the case that his mind was bent on the vindication of justice, and not on the acquisition of absolute power? And is it true that the deities did take their delight in manners like these, as if they were themselves enemies to their own states, in so far as they favoured those who were the enemies of these communities? Nay rather, neither did they by deserting them harm the one class, nor did they by passing over to their side in any sense help the other.

For they have it not in their power to give kingship or to remove it. But that is done by the one true God, according to His hidden counsel. And it is not His mind to make those necessarily blessed to whom He may have given an earthly kingdom, or to make those necessarily unhappy whom He has deprived of that position. But He makes men blessed or wretched for other reasons and by other means, and either by permission or by actual gift distributes temporal and earthly kingdoms to whomsoever He pleases, and for whatsoever period He chooses, according to the fore-ordained order of the ages.

CHAPTER XIII.-OF THE QUESTION WHY GOD SUFFERED THE JEWS TO BE REDUCED TO SUBJECTION.

20. Hence also they cannot meet us fairly with this question: Why, then, did the God of the Hebrews, whom you declare to be the supreme and true God, not only not subdue the Romans under their power, but even fail to secure those Hebrews themselves against subjugation by the Romans? For there were open sins of theirs that went before them, and on account of which the prophets so long time ago predicted that this very thing would overtake them; and above all, the reason lay in the fact, that in their impious fury they put Christ to death, in the commission of which sin they were made blind [to the guilt of their crime] through the deserts of other hidden transgressions. That His sufferings also would be for the benefit of the Gentiles, was foretold by the same prophetic testimony. Nor, in another point of view, did; the fact appear clearer, that the kingdom of that nation, and its temple, and its priesthood, and its sacrificial system, and that mystical unction which is called *kriQma* in Greek, from which the name of Christ takes its evident application, and on account of which that nation was accustomed to speak of its kings as anointed ones, were ordained with the express object of prefiguring Christ, than has the kindred fact become apparent, that after the resurrection of the Christ who was put to death began to be preached unto the believing Gentiles, all those things came to their end, all unrecognised as the circumstance was, whether by the Romans, through whose victory, or by the Jews, through whose subjugation, it was brought about that they did thus reach their conclusion.

CHAPTER XIV.-OF THE FACT THAT THE GOD OF THE HEBREWS,
ALTHOUGH THE PEOPLE WERE CONQUERED, PROVED HIMSELF TO BE
UNCONQUERED, BY OVERTHROWING THE IDOLS, AND BY TURNING ALL
THE GENTILES TO HIS OWN SERVICE.

21. Here indeed we have a wonderful fact, which is not remarked by those few pagans who have remained such,-namely, that this God of the Hebrews who was offended by the conquered, and who was also denied acceptance by the conquerors, is now preached and worshipped among all nations. This is that God of Israel of whom the prophet spake so long time since, when he thus addressed the people of God: "And He who brought thee out, the God of Israel, shall be called (the God) of the whole earth. What was thus prophesied has been brought to pass through the name of the Christ, who comes to men in the form of a descendant of that very Israel who was the grandson of Abraham, with whom the race of the Hebrews began. For it was to this Israel also that it was said, "In thy seed shall all the tribes of the earth be blessed. Thus it is shown that the God of Israel, the true God who made heaven and earth, and who administers human affairs justly and mercifully in such wise that neither does justice exclude mercy with Him, nor does mercy hinder justice, was not overcome Himself when His Hebrew people suffered their overthrow, in virtue of His permitting the kingdom and priesthood of that nation to be seized and subverted by the Romans.

For now, indeed, by the might of this gospel of Christ, the true King and Priest, the advent of which was prefigured by that kingdom and priesthood, the God of Israel Himself is everywhere destroying the idols of the nations. And, in truth, it was to prevent that destruction that the Romans refused to admit the sacred rites of this God in the way that they admitted those of the gods of the other nations whom they conquered. Thus did He remove both kingdom and priesthood from the prophetic nation, because He who was promised to men through the agency of that people had already come. And by Christ the King He has brought into subjection to His own name that Roman empire by which the said nation was overcome; and by the strength and devotion of Christian faith, He has converted it so as to effect a subversion of those idols, the honour ascribed to which precluded His worship from obtaining entrance.

22. I am of opinion that it was not by means of magical arts that Christ, previous to His birth among men, brought it about that those things which

were destined to come to pass in the course of His history, were pre-announced by so many prophets, and prefigured also by the kingdom and priesthood established in a certain nation. For the people who are connected with that now abolished kingdom, and who in the wonderful providence of God are scattered throughout all lands, have indeed remained without any unction from the true King and Priest; in which anointing the import of the name of Christ is plainly discovered. But notwithstanding this, they still retain remnants of some of their observances; while, on the other hand, not even in their state of overthrow and subjugation have they accepted those Roman rites which are connected with the worship of idols. Thus they still keep the prophetic books as the witness of Christ; and in this way in the documents of His enemies we find proof presented of the truth of this Christ who is the subject of prophecy. What, then, do these unhappy men disclose themselves to be, by the unworthy method in which they laud the name of Christ?

If anything relating to the practice of magic has been written under His name, while the doctrine of Christ is so vehemently antagonistic to such arts, these men ought rather in the light of this fact to gather some idea of the greatness of that name, by the addition of which even persons who live in opposition to His precepts endeavour to dignify their nefarious practices. For just as, in the course of the diverse errors of men, many persons have set up their varied heresies against the truth under the cover of His name, so the very enemies of Christ think that, for the purposes of gaining acceptance for opinions which they propound in opposition to the doctrine of Christ, they have no weight of authority at their service unless they have the name of Christ.

CHAPTER XV.-OF THE FACT THAT THE PAGANS, WHEN CONSTRAINED TO
LAUD CHRIST, HAVE LAUNCHED THEIR INSULTS AGAINST HIS
DISCIPLES.

23. But what shall be said to this, if those vain eulogizers of Christ, and those crooked slanderers of the Christian religion, lack the daring to blaspheme Christ, for this particular reason that some of their philosophers, as Porphyry of Sicily has given us to understand in his books, consulted their gods as to their response on the subject of [the claims of] Christ, and were constrained by their own oracles to laud Christ? Nor should that seem incredible. For we also read in the Gospel that the demons confessed Him; and in our prophets

it is written in this wise: "For the gods of the nations are demons." Thus it happens, then, that in order to avoid attempting aught in opposition to the responses of their own deities, they turn their blasphemies aside from Christ, and pour them forth against His disciples. It seems to me, however, that these gods of the Gentiles, whom the philosophers of the pagans may have consulted, if they were asked to give their judgment on the disciples of Christ, as well as on Christ Himself, would be constrained to praise them in like manner.

CHAPTER XVI.-OF THE FACT THAT, ON THE SUBJECT OF THE
DESTRUCTION OF IDOLS, THE APOSTLES TAUGHT NOTHING DIFFERENT
FROM WHAT WAS TAUGHT BY CHRIST OR BY THE PROPHETS.

24. Nevertheless these persons argue still to the effect that this demolition of temples, and this condemnation of sacrifices, and this shattering of all images, are brought about, not in virtue of the doctrine of Christ Himself, but only by the hand of His apostles, who, as they contend, taught something different from what He taught. They think by this device, while honouring and lauding Christ, to tear the Christian faith in pieces. For it is at least true, that it is by the disciples of Christ that at once the works and the words of Christ have been made known, on which this Christian religion is established, with which a very few people of this character are still in antagonism, who do not now indeed openly assail it, but yet continue even in these days to utter their mutterings against it. But if they refuse to believe that Christ taught in the way indicated, let them read the prophets, who not only enjoined the complete destruction of the superstitions of idols, but also predicted that this subversion would come to pass in Christian times. And if these spoke falsely, why is their word fulfilled with so mighty a demonstration? But if they spoke truly, why is resistance offered to such divine power?

CHAPTER XVII.-IN OPPOSITION TO THE ROMANS WHO REJECTED THE
GOD OF ISRAEL ALONE.

25. However, here is a matter which should meet with more careful consideration at their hands,-namely, what they take the God of Israel to be, and why they have not admitted Him to the honours of worship among them, in the way that they have done with the gods of other nations that have been made subject to the imperial power of Rome? This question demands an answer all the more, when we see that they are of the mind that all the gods ought to be worshipped by the man of wisdom. Why, then, has He been ex-

cluded from the number of these others? If He is very mighty, why is He the only deity that is not worshipped by them? If He has little or no might, why are the images of other gods broken in pieces by all the nations, while He is now almost the only God that is worshipped among these peoples? From the grasp of this question these men shall never be able to extricate themselves, who worship both the greater and the lesser deities, whom they hold to be gods, and at the same time refuse to worship this God, who has proved Himself stronger than all those to whom they do service. If He is [a God] of great virtue, why has He been deemed worthy only of rejection? And if He is [a God] of little or no power, why has He been able to accomplish so much, although rejected? If He is good, why is He the only one separated from the other good deities? And if He is evil, why is He, who stands thus alone, not subjugated by so many good deities? If He is truthful, why are His precepts scorned? And if He is a liar, why are His predictions fulfilled?

CHAPTER XVIII.-OF THE FACT THAT THE GOD OF THE HEBREWS IS NOT RECEIVED BY THE ROMANS, BECAUSE HIS WILL IS THAT HE ALONE SHOULD BE WORSHIPPED.

¹ 26. In fine, they may think of Him as they please. Still, we may ask whether it is the case that the Romans refuse to consider evil deities as also proper objects of worship,-those Romans who have erected fanes to Pallor and Fever, and who enjoin both that the good demons are to be treated, and that the evil demons are to be propitiated. Whatever their opinion, then, of Him may be, the question still is, Why is He the only Deity whom they have judged worthy neither of being called upon for help, nor of being propitiated? What God is this, who is either one so unknown, that He is the only one not discovered as yet among so many gods, or who is one so well known that He is now the only one worshipped by so many men? There remains, then, nothing which they can possibly allege in explanation of their refusal to admit the worship of this God, except that His will was that He alone should be worshipped; and His command was, that those gods of the Gentiles that they were worshipping at the time should cease to be worshipped.

² But an answer to this other question is rather to be required of them, namely, what or what manner of deity they consider this God to be, who has forbidden the worship of those other gods for whom they erected temples and images,-this God, who has also been possessed of might so vast that His will has prevailed more in effecting the destruction of their images than

theirs has availed to secure the non-admittance of His worship. And, indeed, the opinion of that philosopher of theirs is given in plain terms, whom, even on the authority of their own oracle, they have maintained to have been the wisest of all men. For the opinion of Socrates is, that every deity whatsoever ought to be worshipped just in the manner in which he may have ordained that he should be worshipped. Consequently it became a matter of the supremest necessity with them to refuse to worship the God of the Hebrews. For if they were minded to worship Him in a method different from the way in which He had declared that He ought to be worshipped, then assuredly they would have been worshipping not this God as He is, but some figment of their own. And, on the other hand, if they were willing to worship Him in the manner which He had indicated, then they could not but perceive that they were not at liberty to worship those other deities whom He interdicted them from worshipping.

³ Thus was it, therefore, that they rejected the service of the one true God, because they were afraid that they might offend the many false gods. For they thought that the anger of those deities would be more to their injury, than the goodwill of this God would be to their profit.

CHAPTER XIX.-THE PROOF THAT THIS GOD IS THE TRUE GOD.

¹ 27. But that must have been a vain necessity and a ridiculous timidity. We ask now what opinion regarding this God is formed by those men whose pleasure it is that all gods ought to be worshipped. For if He ought not to be worshipped, how are all worshipped when He is not worshipped? And if He ought to be worshipped, it cannot be that all others are to be worshipped along with Him. For unless He is worshipped alone, He is really not worshipped at all. Or may it perhaps be the case, that they will allege Him to be no God at all, while they call those gods who, as we believe, have no power to do anything except so far as permission is given them by His judgment,-have not merely no power to do good to any one, but no power even to do harm to any, except to those who are judged by Him, who possesses all power, to merit so to be harmed? But, as they themselves are compelled to admit, those deities have shown less power than He has done.

² For if those are held to be gods whose prophets, when consulted by men, have returned responses which, that I may not call them false, were at least most convenient for their private interests, how is not He to be regarded as God whose prophets have not only given the congruous answer on subjects

regarding which they were consulted at the special time, but who also, in the case of subjects respecting which they were not consulted, and which related to the universal race of man and all nations, have announced prophetically so long time before the event those very things of which we now read, and which indeed we now behold? If they gave the name of god to that being under whose inspiration the Sibyl sung of the fates of the Romans, how is not He (to be called) God, who, in accordance with the announcement aforetime given, has shown us how the Romans and all nations are coming to believe in Himself through the gospel of Christ, as the one God, and to demolish all the images of their fathers?

3 Finally, if they designate those as gods who have never dared through their prophets to say anything against this God, how is not He (to be designated) God, who not only commanded by the mouth of His prophets the destruction of their images, but who also predicted that among all the Gentiles they would be destroyed by those who should be enjoined to abandon their idols and to worship Him alone, and who, on receiving these injunctions, should be His servants?

CHAPTER XX.-OF THE FACT THAT NOTHING IS DISCOVERED TO HAVE
BEEN PREDICTED BY THE PROPHETS OF THE PAGANS IN OPPOSITION TO
THE GOD OF THE HEBREWS.

128. Or let them aver, if they are able, that some Sibyl of theirs, or any one whatever among their other prophets, announced long ago that it would come to pass that the God of the Hebrews, the God of Israel, would be worshipped by all nations, declaring, at the same time, that the worshippers of other gods before that time had rightly rejected Him; and again, that the compositions of His prophets would be in such exalted authority, that in obedience to them the Roman government itself would command the destruction of images, the said seers at the same time giving warning against acting upon such ordinances;-let them, I say, read out any utterances like these, if they can, from any of the books of their prophets. For I stop not to state that those things which we can read in their books repeat a testimony on behalf of our religion, that is, the Christian religion, which they might have heard from the holy angels and from our prophets themselves; just as the very devils were compelled to confess Christ when He was present in the flesh. But I pass by these matters, regarding which, when we bring them forward, their contention is that they were invented by our party. Most cer-

tainly, however, they may themselves be pressed to adduce anything which has been prophesied by the seers of their own gods against the God of the Hebrews;

2as, on our side, we can point to declarations so remarkable at once for number and for weight recorded in the books of our prophets against their gods, in which also we can both note the command and recite the prediction and demonstrate the event. And over the realization of these things, that comparatively small number of heathens who have remained such are more inclined to grieve than they are ready to acknowledge that God who has had the power to foretell these things as events destined to be made good; whereas in their dealings with their own false gods, who are genuine demons, they prize nothing else so highly as to be informed by their responses of something which is to take place with them.

CHAPTER XXI.-AN ARGUMENT FOR THE EXCLUSIVE WORSHIP OF THIS
GOD, WHO, WHILE HE PROHIBITS OTHER DEITIES FROM BEING
WORSHIPPED, IS NOT HIMSELF INTERDICTED BY OTHER DIVINITIES
FROM BEING WORSHIPPED.

129. Seeing, then, that these things are so, why do not these unhappy men rather apprehend the fact that this God is the true God, whom they perceive to be placed in a position so thoroughly separated from the company of their own deities, that, although they are compelled to acknowledge Him to be God, those very persons who profess that all gods ought to be worshipped are nevertheless not permitted to worship Him along with the rest? Now, since these deities and this God cannot be worshipped together, why is not He selected who forbids those others to be worshipped; and why are not those deities abandoned, who do not interdict Him from being worshipped? Or if they do indeed forbid His worship, let the interdict be read. For what has greater claims to be recited to their people in their temples, in which the sound of no such thing has ever been heard? And, in good sooth, the prohibition directed by so many against one ought to be more notable and more potent than the prohibition launched by one against so many. For if the worship of this God is impious, then those gods are profitless, who do not interdict men from that impiety; but if the worship of this God is pious, then, as in that worship the commandment is given that these others are not to be worshipped, their worship is impious.

2 If, again, those deities forbid His worship, but only so diffidently that they rather fear to be heard than dare to prohibit, who is so unwise as not to draw his own inference from the fact, who fails to perceive that this God ought to be chosen, who in so public a manner prohibits their worship, who commanded that their images should be destroyed, who foretold that demolition, who Himself effected it, in preference to those deities of whom we know not that they ordained abstinence from His worship, of whom we do not read that they foretold such an event, and in whom we do not see power sufficient to have it brought about? I put the question, let them give the answer: Who is this God, who thus harasses all the gods of the Gentiles, who thus betrays all their sacred rites, who thus renders them extinct?

CHAPTER XXII.-OF THE OPINION ENTERTAINED BY THE GENTILES
REGARDING OUR GOD.

30. But why do I interrogate men whose native wit has deserted them in answering the question as to who this God is? Some say that He is Saturn. I fancy the reason of that is found in the sanctification of the Sabbath; for those men assign that day to Saturn. But their own Varro, than whom they can point to no man of greater learning among them, thought that the God of the Jews was Jupiter, and he judged that it mattered not what name was employed, provided the same subject was understood under it; in which, I believe, we see how he was subdued by His supremacy. For, inasmuch as the Romans are not accustomed to worship any more exalted object than Jupiter, of which fact their Capitol is the open and sufficient attestation, and deem him to be the king of all gods; when he observed that the Jews worshipped the supreme God, he could not think of any object under that title other than Jupiter himself. But whether men call the God of the Hebrews Saturn, or declare Him to be Jupiter, let them tell us when Saturn dared to prohibit the worship of a second deity. He did not venture to interdict the worship even of this very Jupiter, who is said to have expelled him from his kingdom,-the son thus expelling the father. And if Jupiter, as the more powerful deity and the conqueror, has been accepted by his worshippers, then they ought not to worship Saturn, the conquered and expelled. But neither, on the other hand, did Jove put his worship under the ban. Nay, that deity whom he had power to overcome, he nevertheless suffered to continue a god.

CHAPTER XXIII.-OF THE FOLLIES WHICH THE PAGANS HAVE INDULGED
IN REGARDING JUPITER AND SATURN.

31. These narratives of yours, say they, are but fables which have to be interpreted by the wise, or else they are fit only to be laughed at; but we revere that Jupiter of whom Maro says that "All things are full of Jove," -Virgil's *Eclogues*, iii. v. 60; that is to say, the spirit of life that vivifies all things. It is not without some reason, therefore, that Varro thought that Jove was worshipped by the Jews; for the God of the Jews says by His prophet, "I fill heaven and earth." But what is meant by that which the same poet names Ether? How do they take the term? For he speaks thus: "Then the omnipotent father Ether, with fertilizing showers, Came down into the bosom of his fruitful spouse." -Virgil's *Georgics*, ii. 325. They say, indeed, that this Ether is not spirit, but a lofty body in which the heaven is stretched above the air. Is liberty conceded to the poet to speak at one time in the language of the followers of Plato, as if God was not body, but spirit, and at another time in the language of the Stoics, as if God was a body? What is it, then, that they worship in their Capitol? If it is a spirit, or if again it is, in short, the corporeal heaven itself, then what does that shield of Jupiter there which they style the Aegis? The origin of that name, indeed, is explained by the circumstance that a goat nourished Jupiter when he was concealed by his mother. Or is this a fiction of the poets? But are the capitol of the Romans, then, also the mere creations of the poets? And what is the meaning of that, certainly not poetical, but unmistakeably farcical, variability of yours, in seeking your gods according to the ideas of philosophers in books, and revering them according to the notions of poets in your temples?

32. But was that Euhemerus also a poet, who declares both Jupiter himself, and his father Saturn, and Pluto and Neptune his brothers, to have been men, in terms so exceedingly plain that their worshippers ought all the more to render thanks to the poets, because their inventions have not been intended so much to disparage them as rather to dress them up? Albeit Cicero mentions that this same Euhemerus was translated into Latin by the poet Ennius. Or was Cicero himself a poet, who, in counselling the person with whom he debates in his *Tusculan Disputations*, addresses him as one possessing knowledge of things secret, in the following terms: "If, indeed, I were to attempt to search into antiquity, and produce from thence the subjects which the writers of Greece have given to the world, it would be found that

even those deities who are reckoned gods of the higher orders have gone from us into heaven. Ask whose sepulchres are pointed out in Greece: call to mind, since you have been initiated, the things which are delivered in the mysteries: then, doubtless, you will comprehend how widely extended this belief is. This author certainly makes ample acknowledgment of the doctrine that those gods of theirs were originally, men. He does, indeed, benevolently surmise that they made their way into heaven. But he did not hesitate to say in public, that even the honour thus given them in general repute was conferred upon them by men, when he spoke of Romulus in these words:

"By good will and repute We have raised to the immortal gods that Romulus who rounded this city. How should it be such a wonderful thing, therefore, to suppose that the more ancient men did with respect to Jupiter and Saturn and the others what the Romans have done with respect to Romulus, and what, in good truth, they have thought of doing even in these more recent times also in the case of Caesar? And to these same Virgil has addressed the additional flattery of song, saying: "Lo, the star of Caesar, descendant of Dione, arose."-Eclouge, ix. ver. 47. Let them see to it, then, that the truth of history do not turn out to exhibit to our view. sepulchres erected for their false gods here upon the earth! and let them take heed lest the vanity of poetry, instead of fixing, may be but feigning stars for their deities there in heaven. For, in reality, that one is not the star of Jupiter, neither is this one the star of Saturn; but the simple fact is, that upon these stars, which were set from the foundation of the world, the names of those persons were imposed after their death by men who were minded to honour them as gods on their departure from this life. And with respect to these we may, indeed, ask how there should be such ill desert in chastity, or such good desert in voluptuousness, that Venus should have a star, and Minerva be denied one among those luminaries which revolve along with the sun and moon?

33. But it may be said that Cicero, the Academic sage, who has been bold enough to make mention of the sepulchres of their gods, and to commit the statement to writing, is a more doubtful authority than the poets; although he did not presume to offer that assertion simply as his own personal opinion, but put it on record as a statement contained among the traditions of their own sacred rites. Well, then, can it also be maintained that Varro either gives expression merely to an invention of his own, as a poet might do, or puts the matter only dubiously, as might be the case with an Academician,

because he declares that, in the instance of all such gods, the matters of their worship had their origin either in the life which they lived, or in the death which they died, among men? Or was that Egyptian priest, Leon, either a poet or an Academician, who expounded the origin of those gods of theirs to Alexander of Macedon, in a way somewhat different indeed from the opinion advanced by the Greeks, but nevertheless so far accordant therewith as to make out their deities to have been originally men?

34. But what is all this to us? Let them assert that they worship Jupiter, and not a dead man; let them maintain that they have dedicated their Capitol not to a dead man, but to the Spirit that vivifies all things and fills the world. And as to that shield of his, which was made of the skin of a she-goat in honour of his nurse, let them put upon it whatever interpretation they please. What do they say, however, about Saturn? What is it that they worship under the name of Saturn? Is not this the deity that was the first to come down to us from Olympus (of whom the poet sings): "Then from Olympus' height came down Good Saturn, exiled from his crown By Jove, his mightier heir: He brought the rate to union first Erewhile, on mountain-tops dispersed, And gave them statutes to obey, And willed the land wherein he lay

Should Latium's title bear." -Virgil's *Aeneid*, viii. 320-324, Conington's trans. Does not his very image, made as it is with the head covered, present him as one under concealment? Was it not he that made the practice of agriculture known to the people of Italy, a fact which is expressed by the reaping-hook? No, say they; for you may see whether the being of whom such things are recorded was a man, and indeed one particular king: we, however, interpret Saturn to be universal Time, as is signified also by his name in Greek: for he is called Chronus, which word, with the aspiration thus given it, is also the vocable for time: whence, too, in Latin he gets the name of Saturn, as if it meant that he is sated with years. But now, what we are to make of people like these I know not, who, in their very effort to put a more favourable meaning upon the names and the images of their gods, make the confession that the very god who is their major deity, and the father of the rest, is Time. For what else do they thus betray but, in fact, that all those gods of theirs are only temporal, seeing that the very parent of them all is made out to be Time?

35. Accordingly, their more recent philosophers of the Platonic school, who have flourished in Christian times, have been ashamed of such fancies,

and have endeavoured to interpret Saturn in another way, affirming that he received the name Cronoj in order to signify, as it were, the fulness of intellect; their explanation being, that in Greek fulness is expressed by the term koroj, and intellect or mind by the term nouj; which etymology seems to be favoured also by the Latin name, on the supposition that the first part of the word (Saturnus) came from the Latin, and the second part from the Greek: so that he got the title Saturnus as an equivalent to satur, nouj. For they saw how absurd it was to have that Jupiter regarded as a son of Time, whom they either considered, or wished to have considered, eternal deity. Furthermore, however, according to this novel interpretation, which it is marvellous that Cicero and Varro should have suffered to escape their notice, if their ancient authorities really had it, they call Jupiter the son of Saturn, thus denoting him, it may be, as the spirit that proceedeth forth from that supreme mind—the spirit which they choose to look upon as the soul of this world, so to speak, filling alike all heavenly and all earthly bodies. Whence comes also that saying of Maro, which I have cited a little ago, namely, "All things are full of Jove"?

Should they not, then, if they are possessed of the ability, alter the superstitions indulged in by men, just as they alter their interpretation; and either erect no images at all, or at least build capitols to Saturn rather than to Jupiter? For they also maintain that no rational soul can be produced gifted with wisdom, except by participation in that supreme and unchangeable wisdom of his; and this affirmation they advance not only with respect to the soul of a man, but even with respect to that same soul of the world which they also designate Jove. Now we not only concede, but even very particularly proclaim, that there is a certain supreme wisdom of God, by participation in which every soul whatsoever that is constituted truly wise acquires its wisdom. But whether that universal corporeal mass, which is called the world, has a kind of soul, or, so to speak, its own soul, that is to say, a rational life by which it can govern its own movements, as is the case with every sort of animal, is a question both vast and obscure. That is an opinion which ought not to be affirmed, unless its truth is clearly ascertained; neither ought it to be rejected, unless its falsehood is as clearly ascertained. And what will it matter to man, even should this question remain for ever unsolved, since, in any case, no soul becomes wise or blessed by drawing from any other soul but from that one supreme and immutable wisdom of God?

36. The Romans, however, who have rounded a Capitol in honour of Jupiter, but none in honour of Saturn, as also these other nations whose opinion it has been that Jupiter ought to be worshipped pre-eminently and above the rest of the gods, have certainly not agreed in sentiment with the persons referred to; who, in accordance with that mad view of theirs, would dedicate their loftiest citadels rather to Saturn, if they had any power in these things, and who most particularly would annihilate those mathematicians and nativity-spinners by whom this Saturn, whom their opponents would designate the maker of the wise, has been placed with the character of a deity of evil among the other stars. But this opinion, nevertheless, has prevailed so mightily against them in the mind of humanity, that men decline even to name that god, and call him Ancient rather than Saturn; and that in so fearful a spirit of superstition, that the Carthaginians have now gone very near to change the designation of their town, and call it the town of the Ancient more frequently than the town of Saturn.

CHAPTER XXIV.-OF THE FACT THAT THOSE PERSONS WHO REJECT THE
GOD OF ISRAEL, IN CONSEQUENCE FAIL TO WORSHIP ALL THE GODS;
AND, ON THE OTHER HAND, THAT THOSE WHO WORSHIP OTHER GODS,
FAIL TO WORSHIP HIM.

137. It is well understood, therefore, what these worshippers of images are convicted in reality of revering, and what they attempt to colour over. But even these new interpreters of Saturn must be required to tell us what they think of the God of the Hebrews. For to them also it seemed right to worship all the gods, as is done by the heathen nations, because their pride made them ashamed to humble themselves under Christ for the remission of their sins. What opinion, therefore, do they entertain regarding the God of Israel? For if they do not worship Him then they do not worship all gods; and if they do worship Him, they do not worship Him in the way that He has ordained for His own worship, because they worship others also whose worship He has interdicted. Against such practices He issued His prohibition by the mouth of those same prophets by whom He also announced beforehand the destined occurrence of those very things which their images are now sustaining at the hands of the Christians. For whatever the explanation may be, whether it be that the angels were sent to those prophets to show them figuratively, and by the congruous forms of visible objects, the one true God, the

Creator of all things, to whom the whole universe is made subject, and to indicate the method in which He enjoined His own worship to proceed;

2 or whether it was that the minds of some among them were so mightily elevated by the Holy Spirit, as to enable them to see those things in that kind of vision in which the angels themselves behold objects: in either case it is the incontestable fact, that they did serve that God who has prohibited the worship of other gods; and, moreover, it is equally certain, that with the faithfulness of piety, in the kingly and in the priestly office, they ministered at once for the good of their country, and in the interest of those sacred ordinances which were significant of the coming of Christ as the true King and Priest.

CHAPTER XXV.-OF THE FACT THAT THE FALSE GODS DO NOT FORBID OTHERS TO BE WORSHIPPED ALONG WITH THEMSELVES. THAT THE GOD OF ISRAEL IS THE TRUE GOD, IS PROVED BY HIS WORKS, BOTH IN PROPHECY AND IN FULFILMENT.

38. But further, in the case of the gods of the Gentiles (in their willingness to worship whom they exhibit their unwillingness to worship that God who cannot be worshipped together with them), let them tell us the reason why no one is found in the number of their deities who thinks of interdicting the worship of another; while they institute them in different offices and functions, and hold them to preside each one over objects which pertain properly to his own special province. For if Jupiter does not prohibit the worship of Saturn, because he is not to be taken merely for a man, who drove another man, namely his father, out of his kingdom, but either for the body of the heavens, or for the spirit that fills both heaven and earth, and because thus he cannot prevent that supernal mind from being worshipped, from which he is said to have emanated: if, on the same principle also, Saturn cannot interdict the worship of Jupiter, because he is not [to be supposed to be merely] one who was conquered by that other in rebellion,-as was the case with a person of the same name, by the hand of some one or other called Jupiter, from whose arms he was fleeing when he came into Italy,-and because the primal mind favours the mind that springs from it:

yet Vulcan at least might [be expected to] put under the ban the worship of Mars, the paramour of his wife, and Hercules [might be thought likely to interdict] the worship of Juno, his persecutor. What kind of foul consent must subsist among them, if even Diana, the chaste virgin, fails to interdict

the worship, I do not say merely of Venus, but even of Priapus? For if the same individual decides to be at once a hunter and a farmer, he must be the servant of both these deities; and yet he will be ashamed to do even so much as erect temples for them side by side. But they may aver, that by interpretation Diana means a certain virtue, be it what they please; and they may tell us that Priapus really denotes the deity of fecundity, -to such an effect, at any rate, that Juno may well be ashamed to have such a coadjutor in the task of making females fruitful. They may say what they please; they may put any explanation upon these things which in their wisdom they think fit: only, in spite of all that, the God of Israel will confound all their argumentations. For in prohibiting all those deities from being worshipped, while His own worship is hindered by none of them, and in at once commanding, foretelling, and effecting destruction for their images and sacred rites, He has shown with sufficient clearness that they are false and lying deities, and that He Himself is the one true and truthful God.

39. Moreover, to whom should it not seem strange that those worshippers, now become few in number, of deities both numerous and false, should refuse to do homage to Him of whom, when the question is put to them as to what deity He is; they dare not at least assert, whatever answer they may think to give, that He is no God at all? For if they deny His deity, they are very easily refuted by His works, both in prophecy and in fulfilment. I do not speak of those works which they deem themselves at liberty not to credit, such as His work in the beginning, when He made heaven and earth, and all that is in them. Neither do I specify here those events which carry us back into the remotest antiquity, such as the translation of Enoch, the destruction of the impious by the flood, and the saving of righteous Noah and his house from the deluge, by means of the [ark of] wood. I begin the statement of His doings among men with Abraham. To this man, indeed, was given by an angelic oracle an intelligible promise, which we now see in its realization. For to him it was said, "In thy seed shall all nations be blessed. Of his seed, then, sprang the people of Israel, whence came the Virgin Mary, who was the mother of Christ; and that in Him all the nations are blessed, let them now be hold enough to deny if they can.

This same promise was made also to Isaac the son of Abraham. It was given again to Jacob the grandson of Abraham. This Jacob was also called Israel, from whom that whole people derived both its descent and its name so that

indeed the God of this people was called the God of Israel: not that He is not also the God of the Gentiles, whether they are ignorant of Him or now know Him; but that in this people He willed that the power of His promises should be made more conspicuously apparent. For that people, which at first was multiplied in Egypt, and after a time was delivered from a state of slavery there by the hand of Moses, with many signs and portents, saw most of the Gentile nations subdued under it, and obtained possession also of the land of promise, in which it reigned in the person of kings of its own, who sprang from the tribe of Judah. This Judah, also, was one of the twelve sons of Israel, the grandson of Abraham. And from him were descended the people called the Jews, who, with the help of God Himself, did great achievements, and who also, when He chastised them, endured many sufferings on account of their sins, until the coming of that Seed to whom the promise was given, in whom all the nations were to be blessed, and [for whose sake] they were willingly to break in pieces the idols of their fathers.

CHAPTER XXVI.—OF THE FACT THAT IDOLATRY HAS BEEN SUBVERTED
BY THE NAME OF CHRIST, AND BY THE FAITH OF CHRISTIANS
ACCORDING TO THE PROPHECIES.

40. For truly what is thus effected by Christians is not a thing which belongs only to Christian times, but one which was predicted very long ago. Those very Jews who have remained enemies to the name of Christ, and regarding whose destined perfidy these prophetic writings have not been silent, do themselves possess and peruse the prophet who Says: "O Lord my God, and my refuge in the day of evil, the Gentiles shall come unto Thee from the ends of the earth, and shall say, Surely our fathers have worshipped mendacious idols, and there is no profit in them." Behold, that is now being done; behold, now the Gentiles are coining from the ends of the earth to Christ, uttering things like these, and breaking their idols! Of signal consequence, too, is this which God has done for His Church in its world-wide extension, in that the Jewish nation, which has been deservedly overthrown and scattered abroad throughout the lands, has been made to carry about with it everywhere the records of our prophecies, so that it might not be possible to look upon these predictions as concocted by ourselves; and thus the enemy of our faith has been made a witness to our truth. How, then, can it be possible that the disciples of Christ have taught what they have not learned from Christ, as those foolish men in their silly fancies object, with

the view of getting the superstitious worship of heathen gods and idols subverted? Can it be said also that those prophecies which are still read in these days, in the books of the enemies of Christ, were the inventions of the disciples of Christ?

41. Who, then, has effected the demolition of these systems but the God of Israel? For to this people was the announcement made by those divine voices which were addressed to Moses: "Hear, O Israel; the Lord thy God is one God. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath. And again, in order that this people might put an end to these things wherever it received power to do so, this commandment was also laid upon the nation: "Thou shalt not bow down to their gods, nor serve them; thou shalt not do after their works, but thou shalt utterly overthrow them, and quite break down their images. But who shall say that Christ and Christians have no connection with Israel, seeing that Israel was the grandson of Abraham, to whom first, as afterwards to his son Isaac, and then to his grandson Israel himself, that promise was given, which I have already mentioned, namely: "In thy seed shall all nations be blessed"? That prediction we see now in its fulfilment in Christ. For it was of this line that the Virgin was born, concerning whom a prophet of the people of Israel and of the God of Israel sang in these terms: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son; and they shall call His name Emmanuel. For by interpretation, Emmanuel means, "God with us.

This God of Israel, therefore, who has interdicted the worship of other gods, who has interdicted the making of idols, who has commanded their destruction, who by His prophet has predicted that the Gentiles from the ends of the earth would say, "Surely our fathers have worshipped mendacious idols, in which there is no profit; this same God is He who, by the name of Christ and by the faith of Christians, has ordered, promised, and exhibited the overthrow of all these superstitions. In vain, therefore, do these unhappy men, knowing that they have been prohibited from blaspheming the name of Christ, even by their own gods, that is to say, by the demons who fear the name of Christ, seek to make it out, that this kind of doctrine is something strange to Him, in the power of which the Christians dispute against idols, and root out all those false religions, wherever they have the opportunity.

CHAPTER XXVII.-AN ARGUMENT URGING IT UPON THE REMNANT OF
IDOLATERS THAT THEY SHOULD AT LENGTH BECOME SERVANTS OF
THIS TRUE GOD, WHO EVERYWHERE IS SUBVERTING IDOLS.

142. Let them now give their answer with respect to the God of Israel, to whom, as teaching and enjoining such things, witness is borne not only by the books of the Christians, but also by those of the Jews. Regarding Him, let them ask the counsel of their own deities, who have prevented the blaspheming of Christ. Concerning the God of Israel, let them give a contumelious response if they dare. But whom are they to consult? or where are they to ask counsel now? Let them peruse the books of their own authorities. If they consider the God of Israel to be Jupiter, as Varro has written (that I may speak for the time being in accordance with their own way of thinking), why then do they not believe that the idols are to be destroyed by Jupiter? If they deem Him to be Saturn, why do they not worship Him? Or why do they not worship Him in that manner in which, by the voice of those prophets through whom He has made good the things which He has foretold, He has ordained His worship to be conducted? Why do they not believe that images are to be destroyed by Him, and the worship of other gods forbidden?

2 If He is neither Jove nor Saturn (and surely, if He were one of these, He would not speak out so mightily against the sacred rites of their Jove and Saturn), who then is this God, who, with all their consideration for other gods, is the only Deity not worshipped by them, and who, nevertheless, so manifestly brings it about that He shall Himself be the sole object of worship, to the overthrow of all other gods, and to the humiliation of everything proud and highly exalted, which has lifted itself up against Christ in behalf of idols, persecuting and slaying Christians? But, in good truth, men are now asking into what secret recesses these worshippers withdraw, when they are minded to offer sacrifice; or into what regions of obscurity they thrust back these same gods of theirs, to prevent their being discovered and broken in pieces by the Christians. Whence comes this mode of dealing, if not from the fear of those laws and those rulers by whose instrumentality the God of Israel discovers His power, and who are now made subject to the name of Christ. And that it should be so He promised long ago, when He said by the prophet: "Yea, all kings of the earth shall worship Him: all nations shall serve Him."

CHAPTER XXVIII.-OF THE PREDICTED REJECTION OF IDOLS.

43. It cannot be questioned that what was predicted at sundry times by His prophets is now being realized,-namely, the announcement that He would disclaim His impious people (not, indeed, the people as a whole, because even of the Israelites many have believed in Christ; for His apostles themselves belonged to that nation), and would humble every proud and injurious person, so that He should Himself alone be exalted, that is to say, alone be manifested to men as lofty and mighty; until idols should be cast away by those who believe, and be concealed by those who believe not; when the earth is broken by His fear, that is to say, when the men of earth are subdued by fear, to wit, by fearing His law, or the law of those who, being at once believers in His name and rulers among the nations, shall interdict such sacrilegious practices.

44. For these things, which I have thus briefly stated in the way of introduction, and with a view to their readier apprehension, are thus expressed by the prophet: And now, O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord. For He has disclaimed His people the house of Israel, because the country was replenished, as from the beginning, with their sooth-sayings as with those of strangers, and many strange children were born to them. For their country was replenished with silver and gold, neither was there any numbering of their treasures; their land also is full of horses, neither was there any numbering of their chariots: their land also is full of the abominations of the works of their own hands, and they have worshipped that which their own fingers have made. And the mean man has bowed himself, and the great man has humbled himself; and I will not forgive it them. And now enter ye into the rocks, and hide yourselves in the earth from before the fear of the Lord, and from the majesty of His power, when He arises to crush the earth: for the eyes of the Lord are lofty, and man is low; and the haughtiness of men shall be humbled, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. For the day of the Lord of Hosts shall be upon every one that is injurious and proud, and upon every one that is lifted up and humbled, and they shall be brought low;

and upon every cedar of Lebanon of the high ones and the lifted up, and upon every tree of the Lebanon of Bashan, and upon every mountain, and upon every high hill, and upon every ship of the sea, and upon every spectacle of the beauty of ships. And the contumely of men shall be humbled and shall

fall, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day; and all things made by hands they shall hide in dens, and in holes of the rocks, and in caves of the earth, from before the fear of the Lord, and from the majesty of His power, when He arises to crush the earth: for in that day aman shall cast away the abominations of gold and silver, the vain and evil things which theymade for worship, in order to go into the cleftsof the solid rock, and into the holes of the rocks, from before the fear of the Lord, and from the majesty of His power, when He arises to break the earth in pieces.

CHAPTER XXIX.-OF THE QUESTION WHY THE HEATHEN SHOULD REFUSE TO WORSHIP THE GOD OF ISRAEL; EVEN ALTHOUGH THEY DEEM HIM TO BE ONLY THE PRESIDING DIVINITY OF THE ELEMENTS?

145. What do they say of this God of Sabaoth, which term, by interpretation, means the God of powers or of armies, inasmuch as the powers and the armies of the angels serve Him? What do they say of this God of Israel; for He is the God of that people from whom came the seed wherein all the nations were to be blessed? Why is He the only deity excluded from worship by those very persons who contend that all the gods ought to be worshipped? Why do they refuse their belief to Him who both proves other gods to be false gods, and also overthrows them? I have heard one of them declare that he had read, in some philosopher or other, the statement that, from what the Jews did in their sacred observances, he had come to know what God they worshipped. "He is the deity," said he, "that presides over those elements of which this visible and material universe is constructed; when in the Holy Scriptures of His prophets it is plainly shown that the people of Israel were commanded to worship that God who made heaven and earth, and from whom comes all true wisdom. But what need is there for further disputation on this subject, seeing that it is quite sufficient for my present purpose to point out how they entertain any kind of presumptuous opinions regarding that God whom yet they cannot deny to be a God?

2 If, indeed, He is the deity that presides over the elements of which this world consists, why is He not worshipped in preference to Neptune, who presides over the sea only? Why not, again, in preference to Silvanus, who presides over the fields and woods only? Why not in preference to the Sun, who presides over the day only, or who also rules over the entire heat of heaven? Why not in preference to the Moon, who presides over the night only, or who also shines pre-eminent for power over moisture? Why not in

preference to Juno, who is supposed to hold possession of the air only? For certainly those deities, whoever they may be, who preside over the parts, must necessarily be under that Deity who wields the presidency over all the elements, and over the entire universe. But this Deity prohibits the worship of all those deities. Why, then, is it that these men, in opposition to the injunction of One greater than those deities, not only choose to worship them, but also decline, for their sakes, to worship Him? Not yet have they discovered any constant and intelligible judgment to pronounce on this God of Israel; neither will they ever discover any such judgment, until they find out that He alone is the true God, by whom all things were created.

CHAPTER XXX.-OF THE FACT THAT, AS THE PROPHECIES HAVE BEEN
FULFILLED, THE GOD OF ISRAEL HAS NOW BEEN MADE KNOWN
EVERYWHERE.

146. Thus it was with a certain person named Lucan, one of their great declaimers in verse. For a long time, as I believe, he endeavored to find out, by his own cogitations, or by the perusal of the books of his own fellow-countrymen, who the God of the Jews was; and failing to prosecute his inquiry in the way of piety, he did not succeed. Yet he chose rather to speak of Him as the uncertain God whom he did not find out, than absolutely to deny the title of God to that Deity of whose existence he perceived proofs so great. For he says: "And Judaea, devoted to the worship of an uncertain God." -Lucan, Book ii. towards the end. 2 And as yet this God, the holy and true God of Israel, had not done by the name of Christ among all nations works so great as those which have been wrought after Lucan's times up to our own day. But now who is so obdurate as not to be moved, who so dull as not to be inflamed, seeing that the saying of Scripture is fulfilled, "For there is not one that is hid from the heat thereof; and seeing also that those other things which were predicted so long time ago in this same Psalm from which I have cited one little verse, are now set forth in their accomplishment in the clearest light? For under this term of the "heavens" the apostles of Jesus Christ were denoted, because God was to preside in them with a view to the publishing of the gospel. Now, therefore, the heavens have declared the glory of God, and the firmament has proclaimed the works of His hands. Day unto day has given forth speech, and night unto night has shown knowledge. Now there is no speech or language where their voices are not heard. Their sound has gone out into all the earth, and their words to the end of the

world. Now hath He set His tabernacle in the sun, that is, in manifestation; which tabernacle is His Church. For in order to do so (as the words proceed in the passage) He came forth from His chamber like a bridegroom;

³ that is to say, the Word, wedded with the flesh of man, came forth from the Virgin's womb. Now has He rejoiced as a strong man, and has run His race. Now has His going forth been made from the height of heaven, and His return even to the height of heaven. And accordingly, with the completest propriety, there follows upon this the verse which I have already mentioned: "And there is not one that is hid from the heat thereof [or, His heat]. And still these men make choice of their little, weak, prating objections, which are like stubble to be reduced to ashes in that fire, rather than like gold to be purged of its dross by it; while at once the fallacious monuments of their false gods have been brought to nought, and the veracious promises of that uncertain God have been proved to be sure.

CHAPTER XXXI.-THE FULFILMENT OF THE PROPHECIES CONCERNING
CHRIST.

47. Wherefore let those evil applauders of Christ, who refuse to become Christians, desist from making the allegation that Christ did not teach that their gods were to be abandoned, and their images broken in pieces. For the God of Israel, regarding whom it was declared aforetime that He should be called the God of the whole earth, is now indeed actually called the God of the whole earth. By the mouth of His prophets He predicted that this would come to pass, and by Christ He did bring it eventually to pass at the fit time. Assuredly, if the God of Israel is now named the God of the whole earth, what He has commanded must needs be made good; for He who has given the commandment is now well known. But, further, that He is made known by Christ and in Christ, in order that His Church may be extended throughout the world, and that by its instrumentality the God of Israel may be named the God of the whole earth, those who please may read a little earlier in the same prophet. That paragraph may also be cited by me. It is not so long as to make it requisite for us to pass it by. Here there is much said about the presence, the humility, and the passion of Christ, and about the body of which He is the Head, that is, His Church, where it is called barren, like one that did not bear.

For during many years the Church, which was destined to subsist among all the nations with its children, that is, with its saints, was not apparent, as

Christ remained yet unannounced by the evangelists to those to whom He had not been declared by the prophets. Again, it is said that there shall be more children for her who is forsaken than for her who has a husband, under which name of a husband the Law was signified, or the King whom the people of Israel first received. For neither had the Gentiles received the Law at the period at which the prophet spake; nor had the King of Christians yet appeared to the nations, although from these Gentile nations a much more fruitful and numerous multitude of saints has now proceeded. It is in this manner, therefore, that Isaiah speaks, commencing with the humility of Christ, and turning afterwards to an address to the Church, on to that verse which we have already instanced, where he says: And He who brought thee out, the same God of Israel, shall be called the God of the whole earth. Behold, says he, my Servant shall deal prudently, and shall be exalted and honoured exceedingly. As many shall be astonished at Thee; so shall Thy marred visage, nevertheless, be seen by all, and Thine honour by men. For so shall many nations be astonished at Him, and the kings shall shut their mouths. For they shall see to whom it has not been told of Him;

and those who have not heard shall understand. O Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? We have proclaimed before Him as a servant, as a root in a thirsty soil; He hath no form nor comeliness. And we have seen Him, and He had neither beauty nor seemliness; but His countenance is despised, and His state rejected by all men: a man stricken, and acquainted with the bearing of infirmities; on account of which His face is turned aside, injured, and little esteemed. He bears our infirmities, and is in sorrows for us. And we did esteem Him to be in sorrows, and to be stricken and in punishment. But He was wounded for our transgressions, and He was enfeebled for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. All we, like sheep, have gone astray, and the Lord hath given Him up for our sins. And whereas He was evil entreated, He opened not His mouth; He was brought as a sheep to the slaughter; and as a lamb before him who shears it is dumb, so He opened not His mouth. In humility was His judgment taken. Who shall declare His generation? For His life shall be cut off out of the land; by the iniquities of my people is He led to death. Therefore shall I give the wicked for His sepulture, and the rich on account of His death;

because He did no iniquity, neither was any deceit in His mouth. The Lord is pleased to clear Him in regard to His stroke. If ye shall give your soul for your offences, ye shall see the seed of the longest life. And the Lord is pleased to take away His soul from sorrows, to show Him the light, and to set Him forth in sight, and to justify the righteous One who serves many well; and He shall bear their sins. Therefore shall He have many for His inheritance, and shall divide the spoils of the strong; for which reason His soul was delivered over to death, and He was numbered with the transgressors, and He bare the sins of many, and was delivered for their iniquities. Rejoice, O barren, thou that dost not bear: exult, and cry aloud, thou that dost not travail with child; for more are the children of the desolate than those of her who has a husband. For the Lord hath said, Enlarge the place of thy tent, and fix thy courts; there is no reason why thou shouldst spare: lengthen thy cords, and strengthen Thy stakes firmly. Yea, again and again break thou forth on the right hand and on the left. For thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and thou shall inhabit the cities which were desolate. There is nothing for thee to fear. For thou shall prevail, and be not thou confounded as if thou shall be put to shame. For thou shall forget thy confusion for ever:

thou shall not remember the shame of thy widowhood, since I who made thee am the Lord; the Lord is His name: and He who brought thee out, the very God of Israel, shall be called the God of the whole earth. 48. What can be said in opposition to this evidence, and this expression of things both foretold and fulfilled? If they suppose that His disciples have given a false testimony on the subject of the divinity of Christ, will they also doubt the passion of Christ? No: they are not accustomed to believe that He rose from the dead; but, at the same time, they are quite ready to believe that He suffered all that men are wont to suffer, because they wish Him to be held to be a man and nothing more. According to this, then, He was led like a sheep to the slaughter; He was numbered with the transgressors; He was wounded for our sins; by His stripes were we healed; His face was marred, and little esteemed, and smitten with the palms, and defiled with the spittle; His position was disfigured on the cross; He was led to death by the iniquities of the people Israel; He is the man who had no form nor comeliness when He was buffeted with the fists, when He was crowned with the thorns, when He was derided as He hung (upon the tree); He is the than who, as the lamb is dumb before its shearer, opened not His mouth, when it was said to Him by those

who mocked Him, "Prophesy to us, thou Christ. Now, however, He is exalted verily, now He is honoured exceedingly; truly many nations are now astonished at Him.

Now the kings have shut their mouth, by which they were wont to promulgate the most ruthless laws against the Christians. Truly those now see to whom it was not told of Him, and those who have not heard understand. For those Gentile nations to whom the prophets made no announcement, do now rather see for themselves how true these things are which were of old reported by the prophets; and those who have not heard Isaiah speak in his own proper person, now understand from his writings the things which he spoke concerning Him. For even in the said nation of the Jews, who believed the report of the prophets, or to whom was that arm of the Lord revealed, which is this very Christ who was announced by them, seeing that by their own hands they perpetrated those crimes against Christ, the commission of which had been predicted by the prophets whom they possessed? But now, indeed, He possesses many by inheritance; and He divides the spoils of the strong, since the devil and the demons have now been cast out and given up, and the possessions once held by them have been distributed by Him among the fabrics of His churches and for other necessary services.

CHAPTER XXXII.—A STATEMENT IN VINDICATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF
THE APOSTLES AS OPPOSED TO IDOLATRY, IN THE WORDS OF THE
PROPHECIES.

49. What, then, do these men, who are at once the perverse applauders of Christ and the slanderers of Christians, say to these facts? Can it be that Christ, by the use of magical arts, caused those predictions to be uttered so long ago by the prophets? or have His disciples invented them? Is it thus that the Church, in her extension among the Gentile nations, though once barren, has been made to rejoice now in the possession of more children than that synagogue had which, in its Law or its King, had received, as it were, a husband? or is it thus that this Church has been led to enlarge the place of her tent, and to occupy all nations and tongues, so that now she lengthens her cords beyond the limits to which the rights of the empire of Rome extend, yea, even on to the territories of the Persians and the Indians and other barbarous nations? or that, on the right hand by means of true Christians, and on the left hand by means of pretended Christians, His name is being made known among such a multitude of peoples? or that His seed is made to

inherit the Gentiles, so as now to inhabit cities which had been left desolate of the true worship of God and the true religion?

or that His Church has been so little daunted by the threats and furies of men, even at times when she has been covered with the blood of martyrs, like one clad in purple array, that she has prevailed over persecutors at once so numerous, so violent, and so powerful? or that she has not been confounded, like one put to shame, when it was a great crime to be or to become a Christian? or that she is made to forget her confusion for ever, because, where sin had abounded, grace did much more abound? or that she is taught not to remember the shame of her widowhood, because only for a little was she forsaken and subjected to opprobrium, while now she shines forth once more with such eminent glory? or, in fine, is it only a fiction concocted by Christ's disciples, that the Lord who made her, and brought her forth from the denomination of the devil and the demons, the very God of Israel is now called the God of the whole earth; all which, nevertheless, the prophets, whose books are now in the hands of the enemies of Christ, foretold so long before Christ became the Son of man?

50. From this, therefore, let them understand that the matter is not left obscure or doubtful even to the slowest and dullest minds: from this, I say, let these perverse applauders of Christ and execrators of the Christian religion understand that the disciples of Christ have learned and taught, in opposition to their gods, precisely what the doctrine of Christ contains. For the God of Israel is found to have enjoined in the books of the prophets that all these objects which those men are minded to worship should be held in abomination and be destroyed, while He Himself is now named the God of the whole earth, through the instrumentality of Christ and the Church of Christ, exactly as He promised so long time ago. For if, indeed, in their marvellous folly, they fancy that Christ worshipped their gods, and that it was only through them that He had power to do things so great as these, we may well ask whether the God of Israel also worshipped their gods, who has now fulfilled by Christ what He promised with respect to the extension of His own worship through all the nations, and with respect to the detestation and subversion of those other deities? Where are their gods? Where are the vaticinations of their fanatics, and the divinations of their prophets? Where are the auguries, or the auspices, or the soothsayings, or the oracles of demons?

Why is it that, out of the ancient books which constitute the records of this type of religion, nothing in the form either of admonition or of prediction is advanced to oppose the Christian faith, or to controvert the truth of those prophets of ours, who have now come to be so well understood among all nations? "We have offended our gods," they say in reply, "and they have deserted us for that reason: that explains it also why the Christians have prevailed against us, and why the bliss of human life, exhausted and impaired, goes to wreck among us. We challenge them, however, to take the books of their own seers, and read out to us any statement purporting that the kind of issue which has come upon them would be brought on them by the Christians: nay, we challenge them to recite any passages in which, if not Christ (for they wish to make Him out to have been a worshipper of their own gods), at least this God of Israel, who is allowed to be the subverter of other deities, is held up as a deity destined to be rejected and worthy of detestation. But never will they produce any such passage, unless, perchance, it be some fabrication of their own. And if ever they do cite any such statement, the fact that it is but a fiction of their own will betray itself in the unnoticeable manner in which a matter of so grave importance is found adduced;

whereas, in good truth, before what has been predicted should have come to pass, it behoved to have been proclaimed in the temples of the gods of all nations, with a view to the timeous preparation and warning of all who are now minded to be Christians.

CHAPTER XXXIII.—A STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THOSE WHO MAKE
THE COMPLAINT THAT THE BLISS OF HUMAN LIFE HAS BEEN IMPAIRED
BY THE ENTRANCE OF CHRISTIAN TIMES.

151. Finally, as to the complaint which they make with respect to the impairing of the bliss of human life by the entrance of Christian times, if they only peruse the books of their own philosophers, who reprehend those very things which are now being taken out of their way in spite of all their unwillingness and murmuring, they will indeed find that great praise is due to the times of Christ. For what diminution is made in their happiness, unless it be in what they most basely and luxuriously abused, to the great injury of their Creator? or unless, perchance, it be the case that evil times originate in such circumstances as these, in which throughout almost all states the theatres are failing, and with them, too, the dens of vice and the public profession of iniquity: yea, altogether the forums and cities in which the

demons used to be worshipped are falling. How comes it, then, that they are falling, unless it be in consequence of the failure of those very things, in the lustful and sacrilegious use of which they were constructed? Did not their own Cicero, when commending a certain actor of the name of Roscius, call him a man so clever as to be the only one worthy enough to make it due for him to come upon the stage; and yet, again, so good a man as to be the only one so worthy as to make it due for him not to approach it?

² What else did he disclose with such remarkable clearness by this saying, but the fact that the stage was so base there, that a person was under the greater obligation not to connect himself with it, in proportion as he was a better man than most? And yet their gods were pleased with such things of shame as he deemed fit only to be removed to a distance from good men. But we have also an open confession of the same Cicero, where he says that he had to appease Flora, the mother of sports, by frequent celebration; in which sports such an excess of vice is wont to be exhibited, that, in comparison with them, others are respectable, from engaging in which, nevertheless, good men are prohibited. Who is this mother Flora, and what manner of goddess is she, who is thus conciliated and propitiated by a practice of vice indulged in with more than usual frequency and with looser reins? How much more honourable now was it for a Roscius to step upon the stage, than for a Cicero to worship a goddess of this kind! If the gods of the Gentile nations are offended because the supplies are lessened which are instituted for the purpose of such celebrations, it is apparent of what character those must be who are delighted with such things. But if, on the other hand, the gods themselves in their wrath diminish these supplies, their anger yields us better services than their placability.

³ Wherefore let these men either confute their own philosophers, who have reprehended the same practices on the side of wanton men; or else let them break in pieces those gods of theirs who have made such demands upon their worshippers, if indeed they still find any such deities either to break in pieces or to conceal. But let them cease from their blasphemous habit of charging Christian times with the failure of their true prosperity,-a prosperity, indeed, so used by them that they were sinking into all that is base and hurtful,-lest thereby they be only putting us all the more emphatically in mind of reasons for the ampler praise of the power of Christ.

CHAPTER XXXIV.-EPILOGUE TO THE PRECEDING.

152. Much more might I say on this subject, were it not that the requirements of the task which I have undertaken compel me to conclude this book, and revert to the object originally proposed. When, indeed, I took it in hand to solve those problems of the Gospels which meet us where the four evangelists, as it seems to certain critics, fail to harmonize with each other, by setting forth to the best of my ability the particular designs which they severally have in view, I was met first by the necessity of discussing a question which some are accustomed to bring before us,-the question, namely, as to the reason why we cannot produce any writings composed by Christ Himself. For their aim is to get Him credited with the writing of some other composition, I know not of what sort, which may be suitable to their inclinations, and with having indulged in no sentiments of antagonism to their gods, but rather with having paid respect to them in a kind of magical worship; and their wish is also to get it believed that His disciples not only gave a false account of Him when they declared Him to be the God by whom all things were made, while He was really nothing more than a man, although certainly a man of the most exalted wisdom, but also that they taught with regard to these gods of theirs something different from what they had themselves learned from Him.

2 This is how it happens that we have been engaged preferentially in pressing them with arguments concerning the God of Israel, who is now worshipped by all nations through the medium of the Church of the Christians, who is also subverting their sacrilegious vanities the whole world over, exactly as He announced by the mouth of the prophets so long ago, and who has now fulfilled those predictions by the name of Christ, in whom He had promised that all nations should be blessed. And from all this they ought to understand that Christ could neither have known nor taught anything else with regard to their gods than what was enjoined and foretold by the God of Israel through the agency of these prophets of His by whom He promised, and ultimately sent, this very Christ, in whose name, according to the promise given to the fathers, when all nations were pronounced blessed, it has come to pass that this same God of Israel should be called the God of the whole earth. By this, too, they ought to see that His disciples did not depart from the doctrine of their Master when they forbade the worship of the gods of the Gentiles, with the view of preventing us from addressing our supplica-

tions to insensate images, or from having fellowship with demons, or from serving the creature rather than the Creator with the homage of religious worship.

CHAPTER XXXV.-OF THE FACT THAT THE MYSTERY OF A MEDIATOR WAS MADE KNOWN TO THOSE WHO LIVED IN ANCIENT TIMES BY THE AGENCY OF PROPHECY, AS IT IS NOW DECLARED TO US IN THE GOSPEL.

53. Wherefore, seeing that Christ Himself is that Wisdom of God by whom all things were created, and considering that no rational intelligences, whether of angels or of men, receive wisdom except by participation in this Wisdom wherewith we are united by that Holy Spirit through whom charity is shed abroad in our hearts (which Trinity at the same time constitutes one God), Divine Providence, having respect to the interests of mortal men whose time-bound life was held engaged in things which rise into being and die, decreed that this same Wisdom of God, assuming into the unity of His person the (nature of) man, in which He might be born according to the conditions of time, and live and die and rise again, should utter and perform and bear and sustain things congruous to our salvation; and thus, in exemplary fashion, show at once to men on earth the way for a return to heaven, and to those angels who are above us, the way to retain their position in heaven. For unless, also, in the nature of the reasonable soul, and under the conditions of an existence in time, something came newly into being,-that is to say, unless that began to be which previously was not,-there could never be any passing from a life of utter corruption and folly into one of wisdom and true goodness.

And thus, as truth in the contemplative lives in the enjoyment of things eternal, while faith in the believing is what is due to things which are made, man is purified through that faith which is conversant with temporal things, in order to his being made capable of receiving the truth of things eternal. For one of their noblest intellects, the philosopher Plato, in the treatise which is named the *Timaeus*, speaks also to this effect: "As eternity is to that which is made, so truth to faith. Those two belong to the things above,-namely, eternity and truth; these two belong to the things below,-namely, that which is made and faith. In order, therefore, that we may be called off from the lowest objects, and led up again to the highest, and in order also that what is made may attain to the eternal, we must come through faith to truth. And because all contraries are reduced to unity by some middle factor,

and because also the iniquity of time alienated us from the righteousness of eternity, there was need of some mediatorial righteousness of a temporal nature; which mediatizing factor might be temporal on the side of those lowest objects, but also righteous on the side of these highest, and thus, by adapting itself to the former without cutting itself off from the latter, might bring back those lowest objects to the highest.

Accordingly, Christ was named the Mediator between God and men, who stood between the immortal God and mortal man, as being Himself both God and man, who reconciled man to God, who continued to be what He (formerly) was, but was made also what He (formerly) was not. And the same Person is for us at once the (centre of the) said faith in things that are made, and the truth in things eternal. 54. This great and unutterable mystery, this kingdom and priesthood, was revealed by prophecy to the men of ancient time, and is now preached by the gospel to their descendants. For it behoved that, at some period or other, that should be made good among all nations which for a long time had been promised through the medium of a single nation. Accordingly, He who sent the prophets before His own. descent also despatched the apostles after His ascension. Moreover, in virtue of the man assumed by Him, He stands to all His disciples in the relation of the head to the members of His body. Therefore, when those disciples have written matters which He declared and spake to them, it ought not by any means to be said that He has written nothing Himself; since the truth is, that His members have accomplished only what they became acquainted with by the repeated statements of the Head. For all that He was minded to give for our perusal on the subject of His own doings and sayings, He commanded to be written by those disciples, whom He thus used as if they were His own hands.

Whoever apprehends this correspondence of unity and this concordant service of the members, all in harmony in the discharge of diverse offices under the Head, will receive the account which he gets in the Gospel through the narratives constructed by the disciples, in the same kind of spirit in which he might look upon the actual hand of the Lord Himself, which He bore in that body which was made His own, were he to see it engaged in the act of writing. For this reason let us now rather proceed to examine into the real character of those passages in which these critics suppose the evangelists to have given contradictory accounts (a thing which only those who fail to understand the matter aright can fancy to be the case); so that, when these

problems are solved, it may also be made apparent that the members in that body have preserved a befitting harmony in the unity of the body itself, not only by identity in sentiment, but also by constructing records consonant with that identity.

INTRODUCTION

1 In this book Augustin undertakes an orderly examination of the Gospel according to Matthew, on to the narrative of the Supper, and institutes a comparison between it and the other gospels by Mark, Luke, and John, with the view of demonstrating a complete harmony between the four evangelists throughout all these sections.

The Prologue.

21. Whereas, in a discourse of no small length and of imperative importance, which we have finished within the compass of one book, we have refuted the folly of those who think that the disciples who have given us these Gospel histories deserve only to be disparagingly handled, for the express reason that no writings are produced by us with the claim of being compositions which have proceeded immediately from the hand of that Christ whom they refuse indeed to worship as God, but whom, nevertheless, they do not hesitate to pronounce worthy to be honoured as a man far surpassing all other men in wisdom; and as, further, we have confuted those who strive to make Him out to have written in a strain suiting their perverted inclinations, but not in terms calculated, by their perusal and acceptance, to set men right, or to turn them from their perverse ways, let us now look into the accounts which the four evangelists have given us of Christ, with the view of seeing how self-consistent they are, and how truly in harmony with each other. And let us do so in the hope that no offence, even of the smallest order may be felt in this line of things in the Christian faith by those who exhibit more curiosity than capacity, in so far as they think that a study of the evangelical books, conducted not in the way of a merely cursory perusal, but in the form of a more than ordinarily careful investigation, has disclosed to them certain matters of an inapposite and contradictory nature, and in so far as their notion is, that these things are to be held up as objections in the spirit of contention, rather than pondered in the spirit of consideration.

CHAPTER I.—A STATEMENT OF THE REASON WHY THE ENUMERATION OF
THE ANCESTORS OF CHRIST IS CARRIED DOWN TO JOSEPH, WHILE
CHRIST WAS NOT BORN OF THAT MAN'S SEED, BUT OF THE VIRGIN
MARY.

2. The evangelist Matthew has commenced his narrative in these terms: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. By this exordium he shows with sufficient clearness that his undertaking is to give an account of the generation of Christ according to the flesh. For, according to this, Christ is the Son of man, - a title which He also gives very frequently to Himself, thereby commending to our notice what in His compassion He has condescended to be on our behalf. For that heavenly and eternal generation, in virtue of which He is the only-begotten Son of God, before every creature, because all things were made by Him, is so ineffable, that it is of it that the word of the prophet must be understood when he says, "Who shall declare His generation? Matthew therefore traces out the human generation of Christ, mentioning His ancestors from Abraham downwards, and carrying them on to Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom Jesus was born. For it was not held allowable to consider him dissociated from the married estate which was entered into with Mary, on the ground that she gave birth to Christ, not as the wedded wife of Joseph, but as a virgin.

For by this example an illustrious recommendation is made to faithful married persons of the principle, that even when by common consent they maintain their continence, the relation can still remain, and can still be called one of wedlock, inasmuch as, although there is no connection between the sexes of the body, there is the keeping of the affections of the mind; particularly so for this reason, that in their case we see how the birth of a son was a possibility apart from anything of that carnal intercourse which is to be practised with the purpose of the procreation of children only. Moreover, the mere fact that he had not begotten Him by act of his own, was no sufficient reason why Joseph should not be called the father of Christ; for indeed he could be in all propriety the father of one whom he had not begotten by his own wife, but had adopted from some other person.

3. Christ, it is true, was also supposed to be the son of Joseph in another way, as if He had been born simply of that man's seed. But this supposition was entertained by persons whose notice the virginity of Mary escaped. For Luke says: "And Jesus Himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as

was supposed) the son of Joseph." This Luke, however, instead of naming Mary His only parent, had not the slightest hesitation in also speaking of both parties as His parents, when he says: "And the boy grew and waxed strong, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was in Him: and His parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the passover." But lest any one may fancy that by the "parents" here are rather to be understood the blood relations of Mary along with the mother herself, what shall be said to that preceding word of the same Luke, namely, "And His father and mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of Him"? Since, then, he also makes the statement that Christ was born, not in consequence of Joseph's connection with the mother, but simply of Mary the virgin, how can he call him His father, unless it be that we are to understand him to have been truly the husband of Mary, without the intercourse of the flesh indeed, but in virtue of the real union of marriage; and thus also to have been in a much closer relation the father of Christ, in so far as He was born of his wife, than would have been the case had He been only adopted from some other party? And this makes it clear that the clause, "as was supposed," is inserted with a view to those who are of opinion that He was begotten by Joseph in the same way as other men are begotten.

CHAPTER II.—AN EXPLANATION OF THE SENSE IN WHICH CHRIST IS THE SON OF DAVID, ALTHOUGH HE WAS NOT BEGOTTEN IN THE WAY OF ORDINARY GENERATION BY JOSEPH THE SON OF DAVID.

4. Thus, too, even if one were able to demonstrate that no descent, according to the laws of blood, could be claimed from David for Mary, we should have warrant enough to hold Christ to be the son of David, on the ground of that same mode of reckoning by which also Joseph is called His father. But seeing that the Apostle Paul unmistakably tells us that "Christ was of the seed of David according to the flesh," how much more ought we to accept without any hesitation the position that Mary herself also was descended in some way, according to the laws of blood, from the lineage of David? Moreover, since this woman's connection with the priestly family also is a matter not left in absolute obscurity, inasmuch as Luke inserts the statement that Elisabeth, whom he records to be of the daughters of Aaron, was her cousin, we ought most firmly to hold by the fact that the flesh of Christ sprang from both lines; to wit, from the line of the kings, and from that of the priests, in the case of which persons there was also instituted a certain mystical unction

which was symbolically expressive among this people of the Hebrews. In other words, there was a chrism; which term makes the import of the name of Christ patent, and presents it as something indicated so long time ago by an intimation so very intelligible.

CHAPTER III.-A STATEMENT OF THE REASON WHY MATTHEW
ENUMERATES ONE SUCCESSION OF ANCESTORS FOR CHRIST, AND LUKE
ANOTHER.

5. Furthermore, as to those critics who find a difficulty in the circumstance that Matthew enumerates one series of ancestors, beginning With David and travelling downwards to Joseph, while Luke specifies a different succession, tracing it from Joseph upwards as far as to David, they might easily perceive that Joseph may have had two fathers,-namely, one by whom he was begotten, and a second by whom he may have been adopted. For it was an ancient custom also among that people to adopt children with the view of making sons for themselves of those whom they had not begotten. For, leaving out of sight the fact that Pharaoh's daughter adopted Moses (as she was a foreigner), Jacob himself adopted his own grandsons, the sons of Joseph, in these very intelligible terms: "Now, therefore, thy two sons which were born unto thee before I came unto thee, are mine: Ephraim and Manasseh shall be mine, as Reuben and Simeon: and thy issue which thou begettest after them shall be thine. Whence also it came to pass that there were twelve tribes of Israel, although the tribe of Levi was omitted, which did service in the temple; for along with that one the whole number was thirteen, the sons of Jacob themselves being twelve.

Thus, too, we can understand how Luke, in the genealogy contained in his Gospel, has named a father for Joseph, not in the person of the father by whom he was begotten, but in that of the father by whom he was adopted, tracing the list of the progenitors upwards until David is reached. For, seeing that there is a necessity, as both evangelists give a true narrative,-to wit, both Matthew and Luke,-that one of them should hold by the line of the father who begat Joseph, and the other by the line of the father who adopted him, whom should we suppose more likely to have preserved the lineage of the adopting father, than that evangelist who has declined to speak of Joseph as begotten by the person whose son he has nevertheless reported him to be? For it is more appropriate that one should have been called the son of the man by whom he was adopted, than that he should be said to have been begotten by

the man of whose flesh he was not descended. Now when Matthew, accordingly, used the phrases, "Abraham begat Isaac," "Isaac begat Jacob," and so on, keeping steadily by the term "begat," until he said at the close, "and Jacob begat Joseph," he gave us to know with sufficient clearness, that he had traced out the order of ancestors on to that father by whom Joseph was not adopted, but begotten.

6. But even although Luke had said that Joseph was begotten by Heli, that expression ought not to disturb us to such an extent as to lead us to believe anything else than that by the one evangelist the father begetting was mentioned, and by the other the father adopting. For there is nothing absurd in saying that a person has begotten, not after the flesh, it may be, but in love, one whom he has adopted as a son. Those of us, to wit, to whom God has given power to become His sons, He did not beget of His own nature and substance, as was the case with His only Son; but He did indeed adopt us in His love. And this phrase the apostle is seen repeatedly to employ just in order to distinguish from us the only-begotten Son who is before every creature, by whom all things were made, who alone is begotten of the substance of the Father; who, in accordance with the equality of divinity, is absolutely what the Father is, and who is declared to have been sent with the view of assuming to Himself the flesh proper to that race to which we too belong according to our nature, in order that by His participation in our mortality, through His love for us, He might make us partakers of His own divinity in the way of adoption. For the apostle speaks thus:

"But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And yet we are also said to be born of God,-that is to say, in so far as we, who already were men, have received power to be made the sons of God,-to be made such, moreover, by grace, and not by nature. For if we were sons by nature, we never could have been aught else. But when John said, "To them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name," he proceeded at once to add these words, "which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. Thus, of the same persons he said, first, that having received power they became the sons of God, which is what is meant by that adoption which Paul mentions; and secondly, that they were born of God. And in order the more plainly to show by what grace this is effected, he

continued thus: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," -as if he meant to say, What wonder is it that those should have been made sons of God, although they were flesh, on whose behalf the only Son was made flesh, although He was the Word?

Howbeit there is this vast difference between the two cases, that when we are made the sons of God we are changed for the better; but when the Son of God was made the son of man, He was not indeed changed into the worse, but He did certainly assume to Himself what was below Him. James also speaks to this effect: "Of His own will begat He us by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of His creatures. And to preclude our supposing, as it might appear from the use of this term "begat," that we are made what He is Himself, he here points out very plainly, that what is conceded to us in virtue of this adoption, is a kind of headship among the creatures. 7. It would be no departure from the truth, therefore, even had Luke said that Joseph was begotten by the person by whom he was really adopted. Even in that way he did in fact beget him, not indeed to be a man, but certainly to be a son; just as God has begotten us to be His sons, whom He had previously made to the effect of being men. But He begat only one to be not simply the Son, which the Father is not, but also God, which the Father in like manner is. At the same time, it is evident that if Luke had employed that phraseology, it would be altogether a matter of dubiety as to which of the two writers mentioned the father adopting, and which the father begetting of his own flesh; just as, on the other hand, although neither of them had used the word "begat," and although the former evangelist had called him the son of the one person, and the latter the son of the other, it would nevertheless be doubtful which of them named the father by whom he was begotten, and which the father by whom he was adopted. As the case stands now, however, -the one evangelist saying that "Jacob begat Joseph," and the other speaking of "Joseph who was the son of Heli,"-by the very distinction which they have made between the expressions, they have elegantly indicated the different objects which they have taken in hand.

But surely it might easily suggest itself, as I have said, to a man of piety decided enough to make him consider it right to seek some worthier explanation than that of simply crediting the evangelist with stating what is false; it might, I repeat, readily suggest itself to such a person to examine what reasons there might be for one man being (supposed) capable of having two fath-

ers This, indeed, might have suggested itself even to those detractors, were it not that they preferred contention to consideration.

CHAPTER IV.-OF THE REASON WHY FORTY GENERATIONS (NOT INCLUDING CHRIST HIMSELF) ARE FOUND IN MATTHEW, ALTHOUGH HE DIVIDES THEM INTO THREE SUCCESSIONS OF FOURTEEN EACH.

8. The matter next to be introduced, moreover, is one requiring, in order to its right apprehension and contemplation, a reader of the greatest attention and carefulness. For it has been acutely observed that Matthew, who had proposed to himself the task of commending the kingly character in Christ, named, exclusive of Christ Himself, forty men in the series of generations. Now this number denotes the period in which, in this age and on this earth, it behoves us to be ruled by Christ in accordance with that painful discipline whereby "God scourgeth," as it is written, "every son that He receiveth;" and of which also an apostle says that "we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." This discipline is also signified by that rod of iron, concerning which we read this statement in a Psalm: "Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron;" which words occur after the saying, "Yet I am set king by Him upon His holy hill of Zion!" For the good, too, are ruled with a rod of iron, as it is said of them: "The time is come that judgment should begin at the house of God; and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be to them that obey not the gospel of God? and if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" To the same persons the sentence that follows also applies: "Thou shall dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." For the good, indeed, are ruled by this discipline, while the wicked are crushed by it. And these two different classes of persons are mentioned here as if they were the same, on account of the identity of the signs employed in reference to the wicked in common with the good.

9. That this number, then, is a sign of that laborious period in which, under the discipline of Christ the King, we have to fight against the devil, is also indicated by the fact that both the law and the prophets solemnized a fast of forty days,-that is to say, a humbling of the soul,-in the person of Moses and Elias, who fasted each for a space of forty days. And what else does the Gospel narrative shadow forth under the fast of the Lord Himself, during which forty days He was also tempted of the devil, than that condition of temptation which appertains to us through all the space of this age, and which He bore in the flesh which He condescended to take to Himself from

our mortality? After the resurrection also, it was His will to remain with His disciples on the earth not longer than forty days, continuing to mingle for that space of time with this life of theirs in the way of human intercourse, and partaking along with them of the food needful for mortal men, although He Himself was to die no more; and all this was done with the view of signifying to them through these forty days, that although His presence should be hidden from their eyes, He would yet fulfil what He promised when He said, "Lo, I am with you, even to the end of the world.

And in explanation of the circumstance that this particular number should denote this temporal and earthly life, what suggests itself most immediately in the meantime, although there may be another and subtler method of accounting for it, is the consideration that the seasons of the years also revolve in four successive alternations, and that the world itself has its bounds determined by four divisions, which Scripture sometimes designates by the names of the winds, -East and West, Aquilo [or North] and Meridian [or South]. But the number forty is equivalent to four times ten. Furthermore, the number ten itself is made up by adding the several numbers in succession from one up to four together. 10. In this way, then, as Matthew undertook the task of presenting the record of Christ as the King who came into this world, and into this earthly and mortal life of men, for the purpose of exercising rule over us who have to struggle with temptation, he began with Abraham, and enumerated forty men. For Christ came in the flesh from that very nation of the Hebrews with a view to the keeping of which as a people distinct from the other nations, God separated Abraham from his own country and his own kindred. And the circumstance that the promise contained an intimation of the race from which He was destined to come, served very specially to make the prediction and announcement concerning Him something all the clearer. Thus the evangelist did indeed mark out fourteen generations in each of three several members, stating that from Abraham until David there were fourteen generations, and from David until the carrying away into Babylon other fourteen generations, and another fourteen from that period on to the nativity of Christ. But he did not then reckon them all up in one sum, counting them one by one, and saying that thus they make up forty-two in all. For among these progenitors there is one who is enumerated twice, namely Jechonias, with whom a kind of deflection

was made in the direction of extraneous nations at the time when the transmigration into Babylon took place.

When the enumeration, moreover, is thus bent from the direct order of progression, and is made to form, if we may so say, a kind of corner for the purpose of taking a different course, what meets us at that corner is mentioned twice over,—namely, at the close of the preceding series, and at the head of the deflection specified. And this, too, was a figure of Christ as the one who was, in a certain sense, to pass from the circumcision to the uncircumcision, or, so to speak, from Jerusalem to Babylon, and to be, as it were, the corner-stone to all who believe on Him, whether on the one side or on the other. Thus was God making preparations then in a figurative manner for things which were to come in truth. For Jechonias himself, with whose name the kind of corner which I have in view was prefigured, is by interpretation the "preparation of God. In this way, therefore, there are really not forty-two distinct generations named here, which would be the proper sum of three times fourteen; but, as there is a double enumeration of one of the names, we have here forty generations in all, taking into account the fact that Christ Himself is reckoned in the number, who, like the kingly president over this [significant] number forty, superintends the administration of this temporal and earthly life of ours.

11. And inasmuch as it was Matthew's intention to set forth Christ as descending with the object of sharing this mortal state with us, he has mentioned those same generations from Abraham on to Joseph, and on to the birth of Christ Himself, in the form of a descending scale, and at the very beginning of his Gospel. Luke, on the other hand, details those generations not at the commencement of his Gospel, but at the point of Christ's baptism, and gives them not in the descending, but in the ascending order, ascribing to Him preferentially the character of a priest in the expiation of sins, as where the voice from heaven declared Him, and where John himself delivered his testimony in these terms: "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!" Besides, in the process by which he traces the genealogy upwards, he passes Abraham and carries us back to God, to whom, purified and atoned for, we are reconciled. Of merit, too, He has sustained in Himself the origination of our adoption; for we are made the sons of God through adoption, by believing on the Son of God. Moreover, on our account the Son of God was pleased to be made the son of man by the gener-

ation which is proper to the flesh. And the evangelist has shown clearly enough that he did not name Joseph the son of Hell on the ground that he was begotten of him, but only on the ground that he was adopted by him. For he has spoken of Adam also as the son of God, who, strictly speaking, was made by God, but was also, as it may be said, constituted a son in paradise by the grace which afterwards he lost through his transgression.

12. In this way, it is the taking of our sins upon Himself by the Lord Christ that is signified in the genealogy of Matthew, while in the genealogy of Luke it is the abolition of our sins by the Lord Christ that is expressed. In accordance with these ideas, the one details the names in the descending scale, and the other in the ascending. For when the apostle says, "God sent His Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin," he refers to the taking of our sins upon Himself by Christ. But when he adds, "for sin, to condemn sin in the flesh," he expresses the expiation of sins. Consequently Matthew traces the succession downwards from David through Solomon, in connection with whose mother it was that he sinned; while Luke carries the genealogy upwards to the same David through Nathan, by which prophet God took away his sin. The number, also, which Luke follows does most certainly best indicate the taking away of sins. For inasmuch as in Christ, who Himself had no sin, there is assuredly no iniquity allied to the iniquities of men which He bore in His flesh, the number adopted by Matthew makes forty when Christ is excepted. On the contrary, inasmuch as, by clearing us of all sin and purging us, He places us in a right relation to His own and His Father's righteousness (so that the apostle's word is made good:

"But he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit"), in the number used by Luke we find included both Christ Himself, with whom the enumeration begins, and God, with whom it closes; and the sum becomes thus seventy-seven, which denotes the through remission and abolition of all sins. This perfect removal of sins the Lord Himself also clearly represented under the mystery of this number, when He said that the person sinning ought to be forgiven not only seven times, but even unto seventy times seven. 13. A careful inquiry will make it plain that it is not without some reason that this latter number is made to refer to the purging of all sins. For the number ten is shown to be, as one may say, the number of justice [righteousness] in the instance of the ten precepts of the law. Moreover, sin is the transgression of the law. And the transgression of the number ten is expressed suitably in the el-

even; whence also we find instructions to have been given to the effect that there should be eleven curtains of haircloth constructed in the tabernacle; for who can doubt that the haircloth has a bearing upon the expression of sin? Thus, too, inasmuch as all time in its revolution runs in spaces of days designated by the number seven, we find that when the number eleven is multiplied by the number seven, we are brought with all due propriety to the number seventy-seven as the sign of sin in its totality. In this enumeration, therefore, we come upon the symbol for the full remission of sins, as expiation is made for us by the flesh of our Priest, with whose name the calculation of this number starts here; and as reconciliation is also effected for us with God, with whose name the reckoning of this number is here brought to its conclusion by the Holy Spirit, who appeared in the form of a dove on the occasion of that baptism in connection with which the number in question is mentioned.

Chapter V.-A Statement of the Manner in Which Luke's Procedure is Proved to Be in Harmony with Matthew's in Those Matters Concerning the Conception and the Infancy or Boyhood of Christ, Which are Omitted by the One and Recorded by the Other. 14. After the enumeration of the generations, Matthew proceeds thus: Now the birth of Christ was on this wise. Whereas His mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. What Matthew has omitted to state here regarding the way in which that came to pass, has been set forth by Luke after his account of the conception of John. His narrative is to the following effect: And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David: and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women. And when she saw these things, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said unto her: Fear not, Mary; for thou hast found favour with God. Behold, thou shall conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shall call His name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David: and He shall reign in the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end.

Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born shall be called the Son of God; and then follow matters not belonging to the question at present in hand. Now all this Matthew has recorded [summarily], when he tells us of Mary that "she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Neither is there any contradiction between the two evangelists, in so far as Luke has set forth in detail what Matthew has omitted to notice; for both bear witness that Mary conceived by the Holy Ghost. And in the same way there is no want of concord between them, when Matthew, in his turn, connects with the narrative something which Luke leaves out. For Matthew proceeds to give us the following statement: Then Joseph, her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus; for He shall save His people from their sins.

Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son; and His name shall be called Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us. Then Joseph, being raised from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife; and knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son; and he called His name Jesus. Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea, in the days of Herod the king, and so forth. 15. With respect to the city of Bethlehem, Matthew and Luke are at one. But Luke explains in what way and for what reason Joseph and Mary came to it; whereas Matthew gives no such explanation. On the other hand, while Luke is silent on the subject of the journey of the magi from the east, Matthew furnishes an account of it. That narrative he constructs as follows, in immediate connection with what he has already offered: Behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is He that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen His star in the east, and are come to worship Him. Now, when Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled. And in this manner the account goes on, down to the pas-

sage where of these magi it is written that, "being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod, they departed into their own country another way." This entire section is omitted by Luke, just as Matthew fails to mention some other circumstances which are mentioned by Luke: as, for example, that the Lord was laid in a manger; and that an angel announced His birth to the shepherds; and that there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God; and that the shepherds came and saw that that was true which the angel had announced to them; and that on the day of His circumcision He received His name; as also the incidents reported by the same Luke to have occurred after the days of the purification of Mary were fulfilled, -namely, their taking Him to Jerusalem, and the words spoken in the temple by Simeon or Anna concerning Him, when, filled with the Holy Ghost, they recognized Him. Of all these things Matthew says nothing.

16. Hence, a subject which deserves inquiry is the question concerning the precise time when these events took place which are omitted by Matthew and given by Luke, and those, on the other hand, which have been omitted by Luke and given by Matthew. For after his account of the return of the magi who had come from the east to their own country, Matthew proceeds to tell us how Joseph was warned by an angel to flee into Egypt with the young child, to prevent His being put to death by Herod; and then how Herod failed to find Him, but slew the children from two years old and under; thereafter, how, when Herod was dead, Joseph returned from Egypt, and, on hearing that Archelaus reigned in Judaea instead of his father Herod, went to reside with the boy in Galilee, at the city Nazareth. All these facts, again, are passed over by Luke. Nothing, however, like a want of harmony can be made out between the two writers merely on the ground that the latter states what the former omits, or that the former mentions what the latter leaves unnoticed. But the real question is as to the exact period at which these things could have taken place which Matthew has linked on to his narrative;

to wit, the departure of the family into Egypt, and their return from it after Herod's death, and their residence at that time in the town of Nazareth, the very place to which Luke tells us that they went back after they had performed in the temple all things regarding the boy according to the law of the Lord. Here, accordingly, we have to take notice of a fact which will also hold good for other like cases, and which will secure our minds against similar agitation or disturbance in subsequent instances. I refer to the

circumstance that each evangelist constructs his own particular narrative on a kind of plan which gives it the appearance of being the complete and orderly record of the events in their succession. For, preserving a simple silence on the subject of those incidents of which he intends to give no account, he then connects those which he does wish to relate with what he has been immediately recounting, in such a manner as to make the recital seem continuous.

At the same time, when one of them mentions facts of which the other has given no notice, the order of narrative, if carefully considered, will be found to indicate the point at which the writer by whom the omissions are made has taken the leap in his account, and thus has attached the facts, which it was his purpose to introduce, in such a manner to the preceding context as to give the appearance of a connected series, in which the one incident follows immediately on the other, without the interposition of anything else. On this principle, therefore, we understand that where he tells us how the wise men were warned in a dream not to return to Herod, and how they went back to their own country by another way, Matthew has simply omitted all that Luke has related respecting all that happened to the Lord in the temple, and all that was said by Simeon and Anna; while, on the other hand, Luke has omitted in the same place all notice of the journey into Egypt, which is given by Matthew, and has introduced the return to the city of Nazareth as if it were immediately consecutive.

17. If any one wishes, however, to make up one complete narrative out of all that is said or left unsaid by these two evangelists respectively, on the subject of Christ's nativity and infancy or boyhood, he may arrange the different statements in the following order:-Now the birth of Christ was on this wise. There was, in the days of Herod the king of Judaea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abia; and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elisabeth. And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. And they had no child, because that Elisabeth was barren, and they both were well stricken in years. And it came to pass, that while he executed the priest's office before God, in the order of his course, according to the custom of the priest's office, his lot was to burn incense when he went into the temple of the Lord: and the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense. And there appeared unto him an angel of the

Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense. And when Zacharias saw him he was troubled, and fear fell upon him. But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth.

For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord: and he shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people perfect for the Lord. And Zacharias said unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years. And the angel, answering, said unto him, I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God; and am sent to speak unto thee, and to show thee these glad tidings. And, behold, thou shalt be dumb, and not able to speak, until the day that these things shall be performed, because thou hast not believed my words, which shall be fulfilled in their season. And the people waited for Zacharias, and marvelled that he tarried in the temple. And when he came out, he could not speak unto them: and they perceived that he had seen a vision in the temple: and he beckoned unto them, and remained speechless. And it came to pass that, as soon as the days of his ministration were accomplished, he departed to his own house.

And after those days his wife Elisabeth conceived, and hid herself five months, saying, Thus hath the Lord dealt with me in the days wherein He looked upon me, to take away my reproach among men. And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women. And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shall call His name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David: and He shall reign in the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall

be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee:

therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth month with her who is called barren. For with God nothing shall be impossible. And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word. And the angel departed from her. And Mary arose in those days, and went into the hill country with haste, into a city of Juda; and entered into the house of Zacharias, and saluted Elisabeth. And it came to pass, that when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost: and she spake out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? for, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. And blessed art thou that didst believe, for there shall be a performance of those things which were told thee from the Lord. And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. For He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden: for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.

For He that is mighty hath done to me great things, and holy is His name. And His mercy is on them that fear Him, from generation to generation. He hath made strength with His arm; He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their heart. He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and exalted them of low degree. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich He hath sent empty away. He hath holpen His servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy: as He spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever. And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned to her own house. Then it proceeds thus:-She was found with child of the Holy Ghost Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy

Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus: for He shall save His people from their sins.

Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel; which, being interpreted, is, God with us. Then Joseph, being raised from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife, and knew her not. Now Elisabeth's full time came that she should be delivered, and she brought forth a son. And her neighbours and her relatives heard that the Lord magnified His mercy with her; and they congratulated her. And it came to pass, that on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child; and they called him Zacharias, after the name of his father. And his mother answered and said, Not so; but he shall be called John. And they said unto her, There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name. And they made signs to his father, how he would have him called. And he asked for a writing table, and wrote, saying, His name is John. And they marvelled all. And his mouth was opened immediately, and his tongue, and he spake and praised God. And fear came on all them that dwelt round about them: and all these sayings were noised abroad throughout all the hill country of Judaea. And all they that had heard them laid them up in their heart, saying, What manner of child, thinkest thou, shall this be? For the hand of the Lord was with him. And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for He hath visited and redeemed His people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of His servant David; as He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began;

(to give) salvation from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us: to perform mercy with our fathers, and to remember His holy covenant, the oath which He sware to Abraham our father that He would give to us; in order that, being saved out of the hand of our enemies, we might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all our days. And thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare His ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto His people, for the remission of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet

into the way of peace. And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts until the day of his showing unto Israel. And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed. This first taxing was made when Syrinus was governor of Syria. And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city.

And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and lineage of David, to be taxed with Mary his espoused wife, being great with child. And so it was, that while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered. And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped Him in swaddling-clothes, and laid Him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn. And there were in the same country shepherds watching and keeping the virgils of the night over their flock. And, lo, the angel of the Lord stood by them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them; and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling-clothes, lying in a manger. And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of goodwill.

And it came to pass, as the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, Let us now go even unto Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord hath made known unto us. And they came with haste, and found Mary and Joseph, and the babe lying in a manger. And when they had seen it, they understood the saying which had been told them concerning this child. And all they that heard it, wondered also at those things which were told them by the shepherds. But Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart. And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all the things that they had heard and seen, as it was told unto them. And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, His name was called Jesus, which was so named of the angel before He was conceived in the womb. And then it proceeds thus: Behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying. Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen His star in

the east, and are come to worship Him. Now when Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea;

for thus it is written by the prophet, And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule my people Israel. Then Herod, when he had privily called the wise men, inquired of them diligently the time of the star which appeared unto them. And he sent them to Bethlehem, and said, Go and search diligently for the young child; and when ye have found him, bring me word again, that I may come and worship him also. When they had heard the king, they departed; and, lo, the star which they had seen in the east went before them, until it came and stood over where the young child was. And when they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy. And when they were come into the house, they found the child with Mary His mother, and fell down and worshipped Him: and when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto Him gifts, gold, frankincense, and myrrh. And being warned of God in a dream that they should not return unto Herod, they departed into their town country another way. Then, after this account of their return, the narrative goes on thus:

When the days of her (His mother's) purification, according to the law of Moses, were accomplished, they brought Him to Jerusalem, to present Him to the Lord (as it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord), and to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons. And, behold, there was a man in Jerusalem whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel: and the Holy Ghost was in him. And it had been revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ. And he came by the Spirit into the temple. And when His parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for Him after the custom of the law, then took he Him up in his arms, and said, Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word: for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation, which Thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of Thy people Israel. And His father and

mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of Him. And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary His mother, Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign that shall be spoken against; and a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed. And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser: she was of a great age, and had lived with her husband seven years from her virginity; and she was a widow of about fourscore and four years, which departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers day and night. And she, coming in that instant, gave thanks also unto the Lord, and spake of Him to all them that looked for the redemption of Jerusalem.

And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and His mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word; for Herod will seek the young child to destroy Him. When he arose, he took the young child and His mother by night, and departed into Egypt, and was there until the death of Herod; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my Son. Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not. But when Herod was dead, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, saying, Arise, and take the young child and His mother, and go into the land of Israel; for they are dead which sought the young child's life.

And he arose, and took the young child and His mother, and came into the land of Israel. But when he heard that Archelaus did reign in Judaea, in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither; and being warned of God in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Galilee; and came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene. And the child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was in Him. And His

parents went to Jerusalem every year, at the feast of the passover. And when He was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem, after the custom of the feast. And when they had fulfilled the days, as they returned, the child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem; and His parents knew not of it. But they, supposing Him to have been in the company, went a day's journey; and they sought Him among their kinsfolk and acquaintance. And when they found Him not, they turned back again to Jerusalem seeking Him. And it came to pass, that after three days they found Him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions. And all that heard Him were astonished at His understanding and answers. And when they saw Him, they were amazed. And His mother said to Him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us?

behold, thy father and I sought thee sorrowing. And He said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? And they understood not the saying which He spake unto them. And He went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them; and His mother kept all these sayings in her heart. And Jesus increased in wisdom and age, and in favour with God and men.

CHAPTER VI.-ON THE POSITION GIVEN TO THE PREACHING OF JOHN
THE BAPTIST IN ALL THE FOUR EVANGELISTS.

18. Now at this point commences the account of the preaching of John, which is presented by all the four. For after the words which I have placed last in the order of his narrative thus far,-the words with which he introduces the testimony from the prophet, namely, He shall be called a Nazarene,-Matthew proceeds immediately to give us this recital: "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea," etc. And Mark, who has told us nothing of the nativity or infancy or youth of the Lord, has made his Gospel begin with the same event,-that is to say, with the preaching of John. For it is thus that he sets out: The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; as it is written in the prophet Isaiah, Behold, I send a messenger before Thy face, which shall prepare Thy way before Thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight. John was in the wilderness baptizing, and preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, etc. Luke, again, follows up the passage in which he says, "And Jesus increased in wis-

dom and age, and in favour with God and man," by a section in which he speaks of the preaching of John in these terms:

Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness, etc. The Apostle John, too, the most eminent of the four evangelists, after discoursing of the Word of God, who is also the Son, antecedent to all the ages of creaturely existence, inasmuch as all things were made by Him, has introduced in the immediate context his account of the preaching and testimony of John, and proceeds thus: There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. This will be enough at once to make it plain that the narratives concerning John the Baptist given by the four evangelists are not at variance with one another.

And there will be no occasion for requiring or demanding that to be done in all detail in this instance which we have already done in the case of the genealogies of the Christ who was born of Mary, to the effect of proving how Matthew and Luke are in harmony with each other, of showing how we might construct one consistent narrative out of the two, and of demonstrating on behalf of those of less acute perception, that although one of these evangelists may mention what the other omits, or omit what the other mentions, he does not thereby make it in any sense difficult to accept the veracity of the account given by the other. For when a single example [of this method of harmonizing] has been set before us, whether in the way in which it has been presented by me, or in some other method in which it may more satisfactorily be exhibited, every man can understand that, in all other similar passages, what he has seen done here may be done again.

19. Accordingly, let us now study, as I have said, the harmony of the four evangelists in the narratives regarding John the Baptist. Matthew proceeds in these terms: In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea. Mark has not used the phrase "In those days," because he has given no recital of any series of events at the head of his Gospel immediately before this narrative, so that he might be understood to speak in reference to the dates of such events under the terms, "In those days. Luke, on the other hand, with greater precision has defined those times of the preaching or bap-

tism of John, by means of the notes of the temporal power. For he says: Now, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness. We ought not, however, to understand that what was actually meant by Matthew when He said, "In those days," was simply the space of days literally limited to the specified period of these powers. On the contrary, it is apparent that he intended the note of time which was conveyed in the phrase "In those days," to be taken to refer to a much longer period.

For he first gives us the account of the return of Christ from Egypt after the death of Herod,—an incident, indeed, which took place at the time of His infancy or childhood, and with which, consequently, Luke's statement of what befell Him in the temple when He was twelve years of age is quite consistent. Then, immediately after this narrative of the recall of the infant or boy out of Egypt, Matthew continues thus in due order: "Now, in those days came John the Baptist. And thus under that phrase he certainly covers not merely the days of His childhood, but all the days intervening between His nativity and this period at which John began to preach and to baptize. At this period, moreover, Christ is found already to have attained to man's estate; for John and he were of the same age; and it is stated that He was about thirty years of age when He was baptized by the former.

CHAPTER VII.—OF THE TWO HERODS.

20. But with respect to the mention of Herod, it is well understood that some are apt to be influenced by the circumstance that Luke has told us how, in the days of John's baptizing, and at the time when the Lord, being then a grown man, was also baptized, Herod was tetrarch of Galilee; whereas Matthew tells us that the boy Jesus returned from Egypt after the death of Herod. Now these two accounts cannot both be true, unless we may also suppose that there were two different Herods. But as no one can fail to be aware that this is a perfectly possible case, what must be the blindness in which those persons pursue their mad follies, who are so quick to launch false charges against the truth, of the Gospels; and how miserably inconsiderate must they be, not to reflect that two men may have been called by the same name? Yet this is a thing of which examples abound on all sides. For this latter Herod is under-

stood to have been the son of the former Herod: just as Archelaus also was, whom Matthew states to have succeeded to the throne of Judaea on the death of his father; and as Philip was, who is introduced by Luke as the brother of Herod the tetrarch, and as himself tetrarch of Ituraea. For the Herod who sought the life of the child Christ was king; whereas this other Herod, his son, was not called king, but tetrarch, which is a Greek word, signifying etymologically one set over the fourth part of a kingdom.

Chapter VIII.-An Explanation of the Statement Made by Matthew, to the Effect that Joseph Was Afraid to Go with the Infant Christ into Jerusalem on Account of Archelaus, and Yet Was Not Afraid to Go into Galilee, Where Herod, that Prince's Brother, Was Tetrarch. 21. Here again, however, it may happen that a difficulty will be found, and that some, seeing that Matthew has told us how Joseph was afraid to go into Judaea with the child on his return, expressly for the reason that Archelaus the son reigned there in place of his father Herod, may be led to ask how he could have gone into Galilee, where, as Luke bears witness, there was another son of that Herod, namely, Herod the tetrarch. But such a difficulty can only be founded on the fancy that the times indicated as those in which there was such apprehension on the child's account were identical with the times dealt with now by Luke: whereas it is conspicuously evident that there is a change in the periods, because we no longer find Archelaus represented as king in Judaea; but in place of him we have Pontius Pilate, who also was not the king of the Jews, but only their governor, in whose times the sons of the eider Herod, acting under Tiberius Caesar, held not the kingdom, but the tetrarchy. And all this certainly had not come to pass at the time when Joseph, in fear of the Archelaus who was then reigning in Judaea, betook himself, together with the child, into Galilee, where was also his city Nazareth.

Chapter IX.-An Explanation of the Circumstance that Matthew States that Joseph's Reason for Going into Galilee with the Child Christ Was His Fear of Archelaus, Who Was Reigning at that Time in Jerusalem in Place of His Father, While Luke Tells Us that the Reason for Going into Galilee Was the Fact that Their City Nazareth Was There. 22. Or may a question perchance be raised as to how Matthew tells us that His parents went with the boy Jesus into Galilee, because they were unwilling to go into Judaea in consequence of their fear of Archelaus; whereas it would rather appear that the reason for their going into Galilee was, as Luke has not failed to indicate,

the consideration that their city was Nazareth of Galilee? Well, but we must observe, that when the angel said to Joseph in his dreams in Egypt, "Arise, and take the young child and His mother, and go into the land of Israel," the words were understood at first by Joseph in a way that made him consider himself commanded to journey into Judaea. For that was the first interpretation that could have been put upon the phrase, "the land of Israel. But again, after ascertaining that Archelaus, the son of Herod, was reigning there, he declined to expose himself to such danger, inasmuch as this phrase, "the land of Israel," was capable also of being so understood as to cover Galilee too, because the people of Israel were occupants of that territory as well as the other. At the same time, this question also admits of being solved in another manner. For it might have appeared to the parents of Christ that they were called to take up their residence along with the boy, concerning whom such information had been conveyed to them through the responses of angels, just in Jerusalem itself, where was the temple of the Lord:

and it may thus be, that when they came back out of Egypt, they would have gone directly thither in that belief, and have taken up their abode there, had it not been that they were terrified at the presence of Archelaus. And certainly they did not receive any such instructions from heaven to take up their residence there as would have made it their imperative duty to set at nought the fears they entertained of Archelaus. Chapter X.-A Statement of the Reason Why Luke Tells Us that "His Parents Went to Jerusalem Every Year at the Feast of the Passover" Along with the Boy; While Matthew Intimates that Their Dread of Archelaus Made Them Afraid to Go There on Their Return from Egypt. 23. Or does any one put to us this question, How was it, then, that His parents went up to Jerusalem every year during the boyhood of Christ, as Luke's narrative bears, if they were prevented from going there by the fear of Archelaus? Well, I should not deem it any very difficult task to solve this question, even although none of the evangelists has given us to understand how long Archelaus reigned there. For it might have been the case that, simply for that one day, and with the intention of returning forthwith, they went up on the day of the feast, without attracting any notice among the vast multitudes then assembled, to the city where, nevertheless, they were afraid to make their residence on other days. And thus they might at once have saved themselves from the appearance of being so irreligious as to neglect the observance of the feast, and have avoided drawing attention upon

themselves by a continued sojourn. But further, although all the evangelists have omitted to tell us what was the length of the reign of Archelaus, we have still open to us this obvious method of explaining the matter, namely, to understand the custom to which Luke refers, when he says that they were in the habit of going to Jerusalem every year, as one prosecuted at a time when Archelaus was no more an object of fear.

But if the reign of Archelaus should be made out to have lasted for a somewhat longer period on the authority of any extra-evangelical history which appears to deserve credit, the consideration which I have indicated above should still prove quite sufficient,-namely, the supposition that the fear which the parents of the child entertained of a residence in Jerusalem was, nevertheless, not of such a nature as to lead them to neglect the observance of the sacred festival to which they were under obligation in the fear of God, and which they might very easily go about in a manner that would not attract public attention to them. For surely it is nothing incredible that, by taking advantage of favourable opportunities, whether by day or by hour, men may (safely venture to) approach places in which they nevertheless are afraid to be found tarrying. Chapter XI.-An Examination of the Question as to How It Was Possible for Them to Go Up, According to Luke's Statement, with Him to Jerusalem to the Temple, When the Days of the Purification of the Mother of Christ Were Accomplished, in Order to Perform the Usual Rites, If It is Correctly Recorded by Matthew, that Herod Had Already Learned from the Wise Men that the Child Was Born in Whose Stead, When He Sought for Him, He Slew So Many Children.

24. Hereby also we see how another question is solved, if any one indeed finds a difficulty in it. I allude to the question as to how it was possible, on the supposition that the elder Herod was already anxious (to obtain information regarding Him), and agitated by the intelligence received from the wise men concerning the birth of the King of the Jews, for them, when the days of the purification of His mother were accomplished, to go up in any safety with Him to the temple, in order to see to the performance of those things which were according to the law of the Lord, and which are specified by Luke. For who can fail to perceive that this solitary day might very easily have escaped the notice of a king, whose attention was engaged with a multitude of affairs? Or if it does not appear probable that Herod, who was waiting in the extremest anxiety to see what report the wise men would bring

back to him concerning the child, should have been so long in finding out how he had been mocked, that, only after the mother's purification was already past, and the solemnities proper to the first-born were performed with respect to the child in the temple, nay more, only after their departure into Egypt, did it come into his mind to seek the life of the child, and to slay so many little ones;-if, I say, any one finds a difficulty in this, I shall not pause to state the numerous and important occupations by which the king's attention may have been engaged, and for the space of many days either wholly diverted from such thoughts, or prevented from following them out. For it is not possible to enumerate all the cases which might have made that perfectly possible. No one, however, is so ignorant of human affairs as either to deny or to question that there may very easily have been many such matters of importance (to preoccupy the king).

For to whom will not the thought occur, that reports, whether true or false, of many other more terrible things may possibly have been brought to the king, so that the person who had been apprehensive of a certain royal child, who after a number of years might prove an adversary to himself or to his sons, might be so agitated with the terrors of certain more immediate dangers, as to have his attention forcibly removed from that earlier anxiety, and engaged rather with the devising of measures to ward off other more instantly threatening perils? Wherefore, leaving all such considerations unspecified, I simply venture on the assertion that, when the wise men failed to bring back any report to him, Herod may have believed that they had been misled by a deceptive vision of a star, and that, after their want of success in discovering Him whom they had supposed to have been born, they had been ashamed to return to him; and that in this way the king, having his fears allayed, had given up the idea of asking after and persecuting the child.

Consequently, when they had gone with Him to Jerusalem after the purification of His mother, and when those things had been performed in the temple which are recounted by Luke, inasmuch as the words which were spoken by Simeon and Anna in their prophesyings regarding Him, when publicity began to be given to them by the persons who had heard them, were like to call back the king's mind then to its original design, Joseph obeyed the warning conveyed to him in the dream, and fled with the child and His mother into Egypt. Afterwards, when the things which had been done and said in the temple were made quite public, Herod perceived that he

had been mocked; and then, in his desire to get at the death of Christ, he slew the multitude of children, as Matthew records.

CHAPTER XII.—CONCERNING THE WORDS ASCRIBED TO JOHN BY ALL
THE FOUR EVANGELISTS RESPECTIVELY.

25. Moreover, Matthew makes up his account of John in the following manner:—Now in those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea, and saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is He that is spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight. Mark also and Luke agree in presenting this testimony of Isaiah as one referring to John. Luke, indeed, has likewise recorded some other words from the same prophet, which follow those already cited, when he gives his narrative of John the Baptist. The evangelist John, again, mentions that John the Baptist did also personally advance this same testimony of Isaiah regarding himself. And, to a similar effect, Matthew here has given us certain words of John which are unrecorded by the other evangelists. For he speaks of him as "preaching in the wilderness of Judaea, and saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand; "which words of John have been omitted by the others. In what follows, however, in immediate connection with that passage in Matthew's Gospel,—namely, the sentence, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight,"—the position is ambiguous;

and it does not clearly appear whether this is something recited by Matthew in his own person, or rather a continuance of the words spoken by John himself, so as to lead us to understand the whole passage to be the reproduction of John's own utterance, in this way: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand; for this is He that was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah," and so on. For it ought to create no difficulty against this latter view, that he does not say, "For I am He that was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah," but employs the phraseology, "For this is He that was spoken of. For that, indeed, is a mode of speech which the evangelists Matthew and John are in the habit of using in reference to themselves. Thus Matthew has adopted the phrase, "He found a man sitting at the receipt of custom," instead of "He found me. John, too, says, "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things, and we know that his testimony is true," instead of "I am," etc., or, "My testimony is true. Yea, our Lord Himself very frequently uses the

words, "The Son of man," or, "The Son of God," instead of saying, "I. So, again, He tells us that "it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day," instead of saying, "It behoved me to suffer.

Consequently it is perfectly possible that the clause, "For this is He that was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah," which immediately follows the saying, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," may be but a continuation of what John the Baptist said of himself; so that only after these words cited from the speaker himself will Matthew's own narrative proceed, being thus resumed: "And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair," and so forth. But if this is the case, then it need not seem wonderful that, when asked what he had to say regarding himself, he should reply, according to the narrative of the evangelist John, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness," as he had already spoken in the same terms when enjoining on them the duty of repentance. Accordingly, Matthew goes on to tell us about his attire and his mode of living, and continues his account thus: And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his meat was locusts and wild honey. Mark also gives us this same statement almost in so many words. But the other two evangelists omit it.

26. Matthew then proceeds with his narrative, and says: Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judaea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized by him in Jordan, confessing their sins. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance; and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. For now the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, shall be hewn down and cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but He that is to come after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire: whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner; but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. This whole passage is also given by Luke, who ascribes almost the same words to John.

And where there is any variation in the words, there is nevertheless no real departure from the sense. Thus, for example, Matthew tells us that John

said, "And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father," where Luke puts it thus: "And begin not to say, We have Abraham to our father. Again, in the former we have the words, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; whereas the latter brings in the questions put by the multitudes as to what they should do, and represents John to have replied to them with a statement of good works as the fruits of repentance,-all which is omitted by Matthew. So, when Luke tells us what reply the Baptist made to the people when they were musing in their hearts concerning Him, and thinking whether He were the Christ, he gives us simply the words, "I indeed baptize you with water," and does not add the phrase, "unto repentance. Further, in Matthew the Baptist says, "But he that is to come after me is mightier than I; while in Luke he is exhibited as saying, "But one mightier than I cometh. In like manner, according to Matthew, he says, "whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; but according to the other, his words are, "the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose. The latter sayings are recorded also by Mark, although he makes no mention of those other matters. For, after noticing his attire and his mode of living, he goes on thus:

"And preached, saying, There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose: I have baptized you with water, but He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit. In the notice of the shoes, therefore, he differs from Luke in so far as he has added the words, "to stoop down; and in the account of the baptism he differs from both these others in so far as he does not say, "and in fire," but only, "in the Holy Spirit. For as in Matthew, so also in Luke, the words are the same, and they are given in the same order, "He shall baptize you in the Spirit and in fire,"-with this single exception, that Luke has not added the adjective "Holy," while Matthew has given it thus: "in the Holy Spirit and in fire. The statements made by these three are attested by the evangelist John, when he says: "John bears witness of Him, and cries, saying, This was He of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me; for He was before me. For thus he indicates that the thing was spoken by John at the time at which those other evangelists record him to have uttered the words. Thus, too, he gives us to understand that John was repeating and calling into notice again something which he had already spoken, when he said, "This was He of whom I spake, He that cometh after me."

27. If now the question is asked, as to which of the words we are to suppose the most likely to have been the precise words used by John the Baptist, whether those recorded as spoken by him in Matthew's Gospel, or those in Luke's, or those which Mark has introduced, among the few sentences which he mentions to have been uttered by him, while he omits notice of all the rest, it will not be deemed worth while creating any difficulty for oneself in a matter of that kind, by any one who wisely understands that the real requisite in order to get at the knowledge of the truth is just to make sure of the things really meant, whatever may be the precise words in which they happen to be expressed. For although one writer may retain a certain order in the words, and another present a different one, there is surely no real contradiction in that. Nor, again, need there be any antagonism between the two, although one may state what another omits. For it is evident that the evangelists have set forth these matters just in accordance with the recollection each retained of them, and just according as their several predilections prompted them to employ greater brevity or richer detail. On certain points, while giving, nevertheless, the same account of the subjects themselves.

28. Thus, too, in what more pertinently concerns the matter in hand, it is sufficiently obvious that, since the truth of the Gospel, conveyed in that word of God which abides eternal and unchangeable above all that is created, but which at the same time has been disseminated throughout the world by the instrumentality of temporal symbols, and by the tongues of men, has possessed itself of the most exalted height of authority, we ought not to suppose that any one of the writers is giving an unreliable account, if, when several persons are recalling some matter either heard or seen by them, they fail to follow the very same plan, or to use the very same words, while describing, nevertheless, the self-same fact. Neither should we indulge such a supposition, although the order of the words may be varied; or although some words may be substituted in place of others, which nevertheless have the same meaning; or although something may be left unsaid, either because it has not occurred to the mind of the recorder, or because it becomes readily intelligible from other statements which are given; or although, among other matters which (may not bear directly on his immediate purpose, but which) he decides on mentioning rather for the sake of the narrative, and in order to preserve the proper order of time, one of them may introduce some-

thing which he does not feel called upon to expound as a whole at length, but only to touch upon in part;

or although, with the view of illustrating his meaning, and making it thoroughly clear, the person to whom authority is given to compose the narrative makes some additions of his own, not indeed in the subject-matter itself, but in the words by which it is expressed; or although, while retaining a perfectly reliable comprehension of the fact itself, he may not be entirely successful, however he may make that his aim, in calling to mind and reciting anew with the most literal accuracy the very words which he heard on the occasion. Moreover, if any one affirms that the evangelists ought certainly to have had that kind of capacity imparted to them by the power of the Holy Spirit, which would secure them against all variation the one from the other, either in the kind of words, or in their order, or in their number, that person fails to perceive, that just in proportion as the authority of the evangelists [under their existing conditions] is made pre-eminent, the credit of all other men who offer true statements of events ought to have been established on a stronger basis by their instrumentality: so that when several parties happen to narrate the same circumstance, none of them can by any means be rightly charged with untruthfulness if he differs from the other only in such a way as can be defended on the ground of the antecedent example of the evangelists themselves.

For as we are not at liberty either to suppose or to say that any one of the evangelists has stated what is false, so it will be apparent that any other writer is as little chargeable with untruth, with whom, in the process of recalling anything for narration, it has fared only in a way similar to that in which it is shown to have fared with those evangelists. And just as it belongs to the highest morality to guard against all that is false, so ought we all the more to be ruled by an authority so eminent, to the effect that we should not suppose ourselves to come upon what must be false, when we find the narratives of any writers differ from each other in the manner in which the records of the evangelists are proved to contain variations. At the same time, in what most seriously concerns the faithfulness of doctrinal teaching, we should also understand that it is not so much in mere words, as rather truth in the facts themselves, that is to be sought and embraced; for as to writers who do not employ precisely the same modes of statement, if they only do not present

discrepancies with respect to the facts and the sentiments themselves, we accept them as holding the same position in veracity.

29. With respect, then, to those comparisons which I have instituted between the several narratives of the evangelists, what do these present that must be considered to be of a contradictory order? Are we to regard in this light the circumstance that one of them has given us the words, "whose shoes I am not worthy to bear," whereas the others speak of the "unloosing of the latchet of the shoe"? For here, indeed, the difference seems to be neither in the mere words, nor in the order of the words, nor in any matter of simple phraseology, but in the actual matter of fact, when in the one case the "bearing of the shoe" is mentioned, and in the other the "unloosing of the shoe's latchet. Quite fairly, therefore, may the question be put, as to what it was that John declared himself unworthy to do—whether to bear the shoes, or to unloose the shoe's latchet. For if only the one of these two sentences was uttered by him, then that evangelist will appear to have given the correct narrative who was in a position to record what was said; while the writer who has given the saying in another form, although he may not indeed have offered an [intentionally] false account of it, may at any rate be taken to have made a slip of memory, and will be reckoned thus to have stated one thing instead of another.

It is only seemly, however, that no charge of absolute unverity should be laid against the evangelists, and that, too, not only with regard to that kind of unverity which comes by the positive telling of what is false, but also with regard to that which arises through forgetfulness. Therefore, if it is pertinent to the matter to deduce one sense from the words "to bear the shoes," and another sense from the words "to unloose the shoe's latchet," what should one suppose the correct interpretation to be put on the facts, but that John did give utterance to both these sentences, either on two different occasions or in one and the same connection? For he might very well have expressed himself thus, "whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose, and whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: and then one of the evangelists may have reproduced the one portion of the saying, and the rest of them the other; while, notwithstanding this, all of them have really given a veracious narrative.

But further, if, when he spoke of the shoes of the Lord, John meant nothing more than to convey the idea of His supremacy and his own lowliness,

then, whichever of the two sayings may have actually been uttered by him, whether that regarding the unloosing of the latchet of the shoes, or that respecting the bearing of the shoes, the self-same sense is still correctly preserved by any writer who, while making mention of the shoes in words of his own, has expressed at the same time the same idea of lowliness, and thus has not made any departure from the real mind [of the person of whom he writes]. It is therefore a useful principle, and one particularly worthy of being borne in mind, when we are speaking of the concord of the evangelists, that there is no divergence [to be supposed] from truth, even when they introduce some saying different from what was actually uttered by the person concerning whom the narrative is given, provided that, notwithstanding this, they set forth as his mind precisely what is also so conveyed by that one among them who reproduces the words as they were literally spoken. For thus we learn the salutary lesson, that our aim should be nothing else than to ascertain what is the mind and intention of the person who speaks.

CHAPTER XIII.-OF THE BAPTISM OF JESUS.

30. Matthew then continues his narrative in the following terms: "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade Him, saying, I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me? And Jesus answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered Him." The others also attest the fact that Jesus came to John. The three also mention that He was baptized. But they omit all mention of one circumstance recorded by Matthew, namely, that John addressed the Lord, or that the Lord made answer to John.

CHAPTER XIV.-OF THE WORDS OR THE VOICE THAT CAME FROM
HEAVEN UPON HIM WHEN HE HAD BEEN BAPTIZED.

131. Thereafter Matthew proceeds thus: "And Jesus, when He was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and, lo, the heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon Him; and, lo, a voice from heaven saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. This incident is also recorded in a similar manner by two of the others, namely Mark and Luke. But at the same time, while preserving the sense intact, they use different modes of expression in reproducing the terms of the voice which came from heaven. For although Matthew tells us that the words were, "This is my beloved Son," while the other

two put them in this form, "Thou art my beloved Son," these different methods of speech serve but to convey the same sense, according to the principle which has been discussed above. For the heavenly voice gave utterance only to one of these sentences; but by the form of words thus adopted, namely, "This is my beloved Son," it was the evangelist's intention to show that the saying was meant to intimate specially to the hearers there [and not to Jesus] the fact that He was the Son of God. With this view, he chose to give the sentence, "Thou art my beloved Son," this turn, "This is my beloved Son," as if it were addressed directly to the people. For it was not meant to intimate to Christ a fact which He knew already;

² but the object was to let the people who were present hear it, for whose sakes indeed the voice itself was given. But furthermore now, with regard to the circumstance that the first of them puts the saying thus, "In whom I am well pleased," the second thus, "In Thee I am well pleased; and the third thus, "In Thee it has pleased me;" -if you ask which of these different modes represents what was actually expressed by the voice, you may fix on whichever you will, provided only that you understand that those of the writers who have not reproduced the self-same form of speech have still reproduced the identical sense intended to be conveyed. And these variations in the modes of expression are also useful in this way, that they make it possible for us to reach a more adequate conception of the saying than might have been the case with only one form, and that they also secure it against being interpreted in a sense not consonant with the real state of the case. For as to the sentence, "In whom I am well pleased," if any one thinks of taking it as if it meant that God is pleased with Himself in the Son, he is taught a lesson of prudence by the other turn which is given to the saying, "In Thee I am well pleased.

³ And on the other hand, if, looking at this last by itself, any one supposes the meaning to be, that in the Son the Father had favour with men, he learns something from the third form of the utterance, "In Thee it has pleased me. From this it becomes sufficiently apparent, that whichever of the evangelists may have preserved for us the words as they were literally uttered by the heavenly voice, the others have varied the terms only with the object of setting forth the same sense more familiarly; so that what is thus given by all of them might be understood as if the expression were: In Thee I have set my good pleasure; that is to say, by Thee to do what is my pleasure. But once

more, with respect to that rendering which is contained in some codices of the Gospel according to Luke, and which bears that the words heard in the heavenly voice were those that are written in the Psalm, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee; although it is said not to be found in the more ancient Greek codices, yet if it can be established by any copies worthy of credit, what results but that we suppose both voices to have been heard from heaven, in one or other verbal order?

CHAPTER XV.-AN EXPLANATION OF THE CIRCUMSTANCE THAT, ACCORDING TO THE EVANGELIST JOHN, JOHN THE BAPTIST SAYS, "I KNEW HIM NOT;" WHILE, ACCORDING TO THE OTHERS, IT IS FOUND THAT HE DID ALREADY KNOW HIM.

32. Again, the account of the dove given in the Gospel according to John does not mention the time at which the incident happened, but contains a statement of the words of John the Baptist as reporting what he saw. In this section, the question rises as to how it is said, "And I knew Him not: but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Spirit." For if he came to I know Him only at the time when he saw the dove descending upon Him, the inquiry is raised as to how he could have said to Him, as He came to be baptized, "I ought rather to be baptized of Thee." For the Baptist addressed Him thus before the dove descended. From this, however, it is evident that, although he did know Him [in a certain sense] before this time,-for he even leaped in his mother's womb when Mary visited Elisabeth, -there was yet something which was not known to him up to this time, and which he learned by the descending of the dove,-namely, the fact that He baptized in the Holy Spirit by a certain divine power proper to Himself; so that no man who received this baptism from God, even although he baptized some, should be able to say that that which he imparted was his own, or that the Holy Spirit was given by him.

CHAPTER XVI.-OF THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS.

33. Matthew proceeds with his narrative in these terms: "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil. And when He had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungered. And when the tempter came to Him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. But He answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out

of the mouth of God. And so the account continues, until we come to the words, Then the devil left him: and, behold, angels came and ministered unto Him." This whole narrative is given also in a similar manner by Luke, although not in the same order. And this makes it uncertain which of the two latter temptations took place first: whether it was that the kingdoms of the world were shown Him first, and then that He Himself was taken up to the pinnacle of the temple thereafter; or whether it was that this latter act occurred first, and that the other scene followed it. It is, however, a matter of no real consequence, provided it be clear that all these incidents did take place. And as Luke sets forth the same events and ideas in different words, attention need not ever be called to the fact that no loss results thereby to truth. Mark, again, does indeed attest the fact that He was tempted of the devil in the wilderness for forty days and forty nights; but he gives no statement of what was said to Him, or of the replies He made. At the same time, he does not fail to notice the circumstance which is omitted by Luke, namely, that the angels ministered unto Him. John, however, has left out this whole passage.

CHAPTER XVII.-OF THE CALLING OF THE APOSTLES AS THEY WERE
FISHING.

34. Matthew's narrative is continued thus: "Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, He departed into Galilee. Mark states the same fact, as also does Luke, only Luke says nothing in the present section as to John being cast into prison. The evangelist John, again, tells us that, before Jesus went into Galilee, Peter and Andrew were with Him one day, and that on that occasion the former had this name, Peter, given him, while before that period he was called Simon. Likewise John tells us, that on the day following, when Jesus was now desirous of going forth unto Galilee, He found Philip, and said to him that he should follow Him. Thus, too, the evangelist comes to give the narrative about Nathanael. Further, he informs us that on the third day, when He was yet in Galilee, Jesus wrought the miracle of the turning of the water into wine at Cana. All these incidents are left unrecorded by the other evangelists, who continue their narratives at once with the statement of the return of Jesus into Galilee. Hence we are to understand that there was an interval here of several days, during which those incidents took place in the history of the disciples which are inserted at this point by John. Neither is there anything contradictory here to that other passage

where Matthew tells us how the Lord said to Peter, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church.

But we are not to understand that that was the time when he first received this name; but we are rather to suppose that this took place on the occasion when it was said to him, as John mentions, "Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, A stone. Thus the Lord could address him at that later period by this very name, when He said, "Thou art Peter. For He does not say then, "Thou shalt be called Peter," but, "Thou art Peter; because on a previous occasion he had already been spoken to in this manner, "Thou shalt be called." 35. After this, Matthew goes on with his narrative in these terms: "And leaving the city of Nazareth, He came and dwelt in Capharnaum, which is upon the sea-coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephtholim;" and so forth, until we come to the conclusion of the sermon which He delivered on the mount. In this section of the narrative, Mark agrees with him in attesting the calling of the disciples Peter and Andrew, and a little after that, the calling of James and John. But whereas Matthew introduces in this immediate context his account of that lengthened sermon which He delivered on the mount, after He cured a multitude, and when great crowds followed Him, Mark has inserted other matters at this point, touching His teaching in the synagogue, and the people's amazement at His doctrine. Then, too, he has stated what Matthew also states, although not till after that lengthened sermon has been given, namely, that "He taught them as one that had authority, and not as the scribes." He has likewise given us the account of the man out of whom the unclean spirit was cast; and after that the story of Peter's mother-in-law. In these things, moreover, Luke is in accord with him. But Matthew has given us no notice of the evil spirit here. The story of Peter's mother-in-law, however, he has not omitted, only he brings it in at a later stage.

36. In this paragraph, moreover, which we are at present considering, the same Matthew follows up his account of the calling of those disciples to whom, when they were engaged in fishing, He gave the command to follow Him, by a narrative to the effect that He went about Galilee, teaching in the synagogues, and preaching the gospel, and healing all manner of sickness; and that when multitudes had gathered about Him, He went up into a mountain, and delivered that lengthened sermon [already alluded to]. Thus the evangelist gives us ground for understanding that those incidents which

are recorded by Mark after the election of those same disciples, took place at the period when He was going about Galilee, and teaching in their synagogues. We are at liberty also to suppose that what happened to Peter's mother-in-law came in at this point; and that he has mentioned at a later stage what he has passed over here, although he has not indeed brought up at that later point, for direct recital, everything else which is omitted at the earlier.

37. The question may indeed be raised as to how John gives us this account of the calling of the disciples, which is to the effect that, certainly not in Galilee, but in the vicinity of the Jordan, Andrew first of all became a follower of the Lord, together with another disciple whose name is not declared; that, in the second place, Peter got that name from Him; and thirdly, that Philip was called to follow Him; whereas the other three evangelists, in a satisfactory concord with each other, Matthew and Mark in particular being remarkably at one here, tell us that the men were called when they were engaged in fishing. Luke, it is true, does not mention Andrew by name. Nevertheless, we can gather that he was in that same vessel, from the narrative of Matthew and Mark, who furnish a concise history of the manner in which the affair was gone about. Luke, however, presents us with a fuller and clearer exposition of the circumstances, and gives us also an account of the miracle which was performed there in the haul of fishes, and of the fact that previous to that the Lord spake to the multitudes when He was seated in the boat. There may also seem to be a discrepancy in this respect, that Luke records the saying, "From henceforth thou shalt catch men," as if it had been addressed by the Lord to Peter alone, while the others have exhibited it as spoken to both the brothers.

But it may very well be the case that these words were spoken first to Peter himself, when he was seized with amazement at the immense multitude of fishes which were caught, and this will then be the incident introduced by Luke; and that they were addressed to the two together somewhat later, which [second utterance] will be the one noticed by the other two evangelists. Therefore the circumstance which we have mentioned with regard to John's narrative deserves to be carefully considered; for it may indeed be supposed to bring before us a contradiction of no slight importance. For if it be the case that in the vicinity of the Jordan, and before Jesus went into Galilee, two men, on hearing the testimony of John the Baptist, followed Jesus; that

of these two disciples the one was Andrew, who at once went and brought his own brother Simon to Jesus; and that on this occasion that brother received the name Peter, by which he was thereafter to be called,—how can it be said by the other evangelists that He found them engaged in fishing in Galilee, and called them there to be His disciples?

How can these diverse accounts be reconciled, unless it be that we are to understand that those men did not gain such a view of Jesus on the occasion connected with the vicinity of the Jordan as would lead them to attach themselves to Him for ever, but that they simply came to know who He was, and, after their first wonder at His Person, returned to their former engagements? 38. For [it is noticeable that] again in Cana of Galilee, after He had turned the water into wine, this same John tells us how His disciples believed on Him. The narrative of that miracle proceeds thus: "And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there. And both Jesus was called and His disciples to the marriage." Now, surely, if it was on this occasion that they believed on Him, as the evangelist tells us a little further on, they were not yet His disciples at the time when they were called to the marriage. This, however, is a mode of speech of the same kind with what is intended when we say that the Apostle Paul was born in Tarsus of Cilicia; for certainly he was not an apostle at that period. In like manner are we told here that the disciples of Christ were invited to the marriage, by which we are to understand, not that they were already disciples, but only that they were to be His disciples. For, at the time when this narrative was prepared and committed to writing, they were the disciples of Christ in fact; and that is the reason why the evangelist, as the historian of past times, has thus spoken of them.

39. But further, as to John's statement, that "after this He went down to Capharnaum, He and His mother, and His brethren and His disciples; and they continued there not many days; it is uncertain whether by this period these men had already attached themselves to Him, in particular Peter and Andrew, and the sons of Zebedee. For Matthew first of all tells us that He came and dwelt in Capharnaum, and then that He called them from their boats as they were engaged in fishing. On the other hand, John says that His disciples came with Him to Capharnaum. Now it may be the case that Matthew has but gone over here something he had omitted in its proper order. For he does not say, "After this, walking by the sea of Galilee, He saw two

brethren," but, without any indication of the strict consecution of time, simply, "And walking by the sea of Galilee, He saw two brethren," and so forth: consequently it is quite possible that he has recorded at this later period not something which took place actually at that later time, but only something which he had omitted to introduce before;

so that the men may be understood in this way to have come along with Him to Capharnaum, to which place John states that He did come, He and His mother and His disciples: or should we rather suppose that these were a different body of disciples, as He [may already have] had a follower in Philip, whom He called in this particular manner, by saying to him, "Follow me"? For in what order all the twelve apostles were called is not apparent from the narratives of the evangelists. Indeed, not only is the succession of the various callings left unrecorded; but even the fact of the calling is not mentioned in the case of all of them, the only vocations specified being those of Philip, and Peter and Andrew, and the sons of Zebedee, and Matthew the publican, who was also called Levi. The first and only person, however, who received a separate name from Him was Peter. For He did not give the sons of Zebedee their names individually, but He called them both together the sons of thunder.

40. Besides, we ought certainly to note the fact that the evangelical and apostolical Scriptures do not confine this designation of His "disciples" to those twelve alone, but give the same appellation to all those who believed on Him, and were educated under His instruction for the kingdom of heaven. Out of the whole number of such He chose twelve, whom He also named apostles, as Luke mentions. For a little further on he says: And He came down with them, and stood in the plain, and the concourse of His disciples and a great multitude of people. And surely he would not speak of a "concourse" [or "crowd"] of disciples if he referred only to twelve men. In other passages of the Scriptures also the fact is plainly apparent, that all those were called His disciples who were instructed by Him in what pertained to eternal life. 41. But the question may be asked, how He called the fishermen from their boats two by two, namely, calling Peter and Andrew first, and then going forward a little and calling other two, namely the sons of Zebedee, according to the narratives of Matthew and Mark; whereas Luke's version of the matter is, that both their boats were filled with the immense haul of fishes. And his statement bears further, that Peter's partners, to wit, James

and John, the sons of Zebedee, were summoned to the men's help when they were unable to drag out their crowded nets, and that all who were there were astonished at the enormous draught of fishes which had been taken; and that when Jesus said to Peter, "Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men," although the words had been addressed to Peter alone, they all nevertheless followed Him when they had brought their ships to land. Well, we are to understand by this, that what Luke introduces here was what took place first, and that these men were not called by the Lord on this occasion, but only that the prediction was uttered to Peter by himself, that he would be a fisher of men. That saying, moreover, was not intended to convey that they would never thereafter be catchers of fish. For we read that even after the Lord's resurrection they were engaged again in fishing. The words, therefore, imported simply that thereafter he would catch men, and they did not bear that henceforth he would not catch fish.

And in this way we are at perfect liberty to suppose that they returned to the catching of fish, according to their habit; so that those incidents which are related by Matthew and Mark might easily take place at a period subsequent to this. I refer to what occurred at the time when He called the disciples two by two, and Himself gave them the command to follow Him, at first addressing Peter and Andrew, and then the others, namely, the two sons of Zebedee. For on that occasion they did not follow Him only after they had drawn up their ships on shore, as with the intention of returning to them, but they went after Him immediately, as after one who summoned and commanded them to follow Him.

CHAPTER XVIII.-OF THE DATE OF HIS DEPARTURE INTO GALILEE.

142. Furthermore, we must consider the question how the evangelist John, before there is any mention of the casting of John the Baptist into prison, tells us that Jesus went into Galilee. For, after relating how He turned the water into wine at Cana of Galilee, and how He came down to Capernaum with His mother and His disciples, and how they abode there not many days, he tells us that He went up then to Jerusalem on account of the passover; that after this He came into the land of Judaea along with His disciples, and tarried there with them, and baptized; and then in what follows at this point the evangelist says: "And John also was baptizing in Aenon, near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came, and were baptized: for John was not yet cast into prison. On the other hand, Matthew says: "Now

when He had heard that John was cast into prison, Jesus departed into Galilee. In like manner, Mark's words are: "Now, after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee. Luke, again, says nothing indeed about the imprisonment of John; but notwithstanding this, after his account of the baptism and temptation of Christ, he also makes a statement to the same effect with that of these other two, namely, that Jesus went into Galilee. For he has connected the several parts of his narrative here in this way: "And when all the temptation was ended, the devil departed from Him for a season;

2 and Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, and there went out a fame of Him through all the region round about," From all this, however, we may gather, not that these three evangelists have made any statement opposed to the evangelist John, but only that they have left unrecorded the Lord's first advent in Galilee after His baptism; on which occasion also He turned the water into wine there. For at that period John had not yet been cast into prison. And we are also to understand that these three evangelists have introduced into the context of these narratives an account of another journey of His into Galilee, which took place after John's imprisonment, regarding which return into Galilee the evangelist John himself furnishes the following notice: "When, therefore, Jesus knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus makes and baptizes more disciples than John (though Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples), he left Judaea, and departed again into Galilee. So, then, we perceive that by that time John had been already cast into prison; and further, that the Jews had heard that He was making and baptizing more disciples than John had made and baptized.

CHAPTER XIX.-OF THE LENGTHENED SERMON WHICH, ACCORDING TO
MATTHEW, HE DELIVERED ON THE MOUNT.

43. Now, regarding that lengthened sermon which, according to Matthew, the Lord delivered on the mount, let us at present see whether it appears that the rest of the evangelists stand in no manner of antagonism to it. Mark, it is true, has not recorded it at all, neither has he preserved any utterances of Christ's in any way resembling it, with the exception of certain sentences which are not given connectedly, but occur here and there, and which the Lord repeated in other places. Nevertheless, he has left a space in the text of his narrative indicating the point at which we may understand this sermon to have been spoken, although it has been left unrecited. That is the place where he says: "And He was preaching in their synagogues, and in all Galilee,

and was casting out devils." Under the head of this preaching, in which he says Jesus engaged in all Galilee, we may also understand that discourse to be comprehended which was delivered on the mount, and which is detailed by Matthew. For the same Mark continues his account thus: "And there came a leper to Him, beseeching Him; and kneeling down to Him, said, If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean." And he goes on with the rest of the story of the cleansing of this leper, in such a manner as to make it intelligible to us that the person in question is the very man who is mentioned by Matthew as having been healed at the time when the Lord came down from the mount after the delivery of His discourse. For this is how Matthew gives the history there: "Now, when He was come down from the mountain, great multitudes followed Him; and, behold, there came a leper, and worshipped Him, saying, Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean;" and so on.

44. This leper is also referred to by Luke? not indeed in this order, but after the manner in which the writers are accustomed to act, recording at a subsequent point things which have been omitted at a previous stage, or bringing in at an earlier point occurrences which took place at a later period, according as they had incidents suggested to their minds by the heavenly influence, with which indeed they had become acquainted before, but which they were afterwards prompted to commit to writing as they came up to their recollection. This same Luke, however, has also left us a version of his own of that copious discourse of the Lord, in a passage which he commences just as the section in Matthew begins. For in the latter the words run thus: "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven;" while in the former they are put thus: "Blessed be ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God." Then, too, much of what follows in Luke's narrative is similar to what we have in the other. And finally, the conclusion given to the sermon is repeated in both Gospels in its entire identity,-namely, the story of the wise man who builds upon the rock, and the foolish man who builds upon the sand; the only difference being, that Luke speaks only of the stream beating against the house, and does not mention also the rain and the wind, as they occur in Matthew. Accordingly, it might very readily be believed that he has there introduced the self-same discourse of the Lord, but that at the same time he has omitted certain sentences which Matthew has inserted; that he has also brought in other sayings which Matthew has not mentioned; and that, in a similar manner, he has expressed certain of these utterances in

somewhat different terms, but without detriment to the integrity of the truth.

45. This we might very well suppose to have been the case, as I have said, were it not that a difficulty is felt to attach to the circumstance that Matthew tells us how this discourse was delivered on a mount by the Lord in a sitting posture; while Luke says that it was spoken on a plain by the Lord in a standing posture. This difference, accordingly, makes it seem as if the former referred to one discourse, and the latter to another. And what should there be, indeed, to hinder [us from supposing] Christ to have repeated elsewhere some words which He had already spoken, or from doing a second time certain things which He had already done on some previous occasion? However, that these two discourses, of which the one is inserted by Matthew and the other by Luke, are not separated by a long space of time, is with much probability inferred from the fact that, at once in what precedes and in what follows them, both the evangelists have related certain incidents either similar or perfectly identical, so that it is not unreasonably felt that the narrations of the writers who introduce these things are occupied with the same localities and days. For Matthew's recital proceeds in the following terms: "And there followed Him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Jerusalem, and from Judaea, and from beyond Jordan. And seeing the multitudes, He went up into a mountain; and when He was set, His disciples came unto Him:

and He opened His mouth, and taught them, saying, Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven ; and so forth. Here it may appear that His desire was to free Himself from the great crowds of people, and that for this reason He went up into the mountain, as if He meant to withdraw Himself from the multitudes, and seek an opportunity of speaking with His disciples alone. And this seems to be certified also by Luke, whose account is to the following effect: "And it came to pass in those days, that He went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God. And when it was day, He called unto Him His disciples: and of them He chose twelve, whom also He named apostles; Simon, whom He also named Peter, and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon, who is called Zelotes, Judas the brother of James, and Judas Scarioth, which was the traitor. And He came down with them, and stood in the plain, and the company

of His disciples, and a great multitude of people out of all Judaea and Jerusalem, and from the sea-coast of Tyre and Sidon, which had come to hear Him, and to be healed of their diseases; and they that were vexed with unclean spirits were healed. And the whole multitude sought to touch Him; for there went virtue out of Him, and healed them all.

And He lifted up His eyes on His disciples, and said, Blessed be ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of heaven; and so on. Here the relation permits us to understand that, after selecting on the mountain twelve disciples out of the larger body, whom He also named apostles (which incident Matthew has omitted), He then delivered that discourse which Matthew has introduced, and which Luke has left unnoticed,-that is to say, the one on the mount; and that thereafter, when He had now come down, He spoke in the plain a second discourse similar to the first, on which Matthew is silent, but which is detailed by Luke; and further, that both these sermons were concluded in the same manner. 46. But, again, as regards what Matthew proceeds to state after the termination of that discourse-namely this, "And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at His doctrine," -it may appear that the speakers there were those multitudes of disciples out of whom He had chosen the twelve. Moreover, when the evangelist goes on immediately in these terms, "And when He was come down from the mountain, great multitudes followed Him; and, behold, there came a leper and worshipped Him," we are at liberty to suppose that that incident took place subsequently to both discourses,-not only after the one which Matthew records, but also after the one which Luke inserts. For it is not made apparent what length of time elapsed after the descent from the mountain. But Matthew's intention was simply to indicate the fact itself, that after that descent there were great multitudes of people with the Lord on the occasion when He cleansed the leper, and not to specify what period of time had intervened. And this supposition may all the more readily be entertained, since [we find that] Luke tells us how the same leper was cleansed at a time when the Lord was now in a certain city,-a circumstance which Matthew has not cared to mention.

47. After all, however, this explanation may also be suggested,-namely, that in the first instance the Lord, along with His disciples and no others, was on some more elevated portion of the mountain, and that during the period of His stay there He chose out of the number of His followers those

twelve; that then He came down in company with them, not indeed from the mountain itself, but from that said altitude on the mountain, into the plain—that is to say, into some level spot which was found on the slope of the mountain, and which was capable of accommodating great multitudes; and that thereafter, when He had seated Himself, His disciples took up their position next Him, and in these circumstances He delivered both to them and to the other multitudes who were present one discourse, which Matthew and Luke have both recorded, their modes of narrating it being indeed different, but the truth being given with equal fidelity by the two writers in all that concerns the facts and sayings which both of them have recounted. For we have already prefaced our inquiry with the position, which indeed ought of itself to have been obvious to all without the need of any one to give them counsel to that effect beforehand, that there is not [necessarily] any antagonism between writers, although one may omit something which another mentions; nor, again, although one states a fact in one way, and another in a different method, provided that the same truth is set forth in regard to the objects and sayings themselves. In this way, therefore, Matthew's sentence, "Now when He was come down from the mountain," may at the same time be understood to refer also to the plain, which there might very well have been on the slope of the mountain. And thereafter Matthew tells the story of the cleansing of the leper, which is also given in a similar manner by Mark and Luke.

CHAPTER XX.—AN EXPLANATION OF THE CIRCUMSTANCE THAT
MATTHEW TELLS US HOW THE CENTURION CAME TO JESUS ON BEHALF
OF HIS SERVANT, WHILE LUKE'S STATEMENT IS THAT THE CENTURION
DESPATCHED FRIENDS TO HIM.

48. After these things, Matthew proceeds with his narrative in the following terms: "And when Jesus was entered into Capharnaum, there came unto Him a centurion, beseeching Him, and saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsy, and he is grievously tormented;" and so forth, on to the place where it is said, "And his servant was healed in the self-same hour." This case of the centurion's servant is related also by Luke; only Luke does not bring it in, as Matthew does, after the cleansing of the leper, whose story he has recorded as something suggested to his recollection at a later stage, but introduces it after the conclusion of that lengthened sermon already discussed. For he connects the two sections in this way: "Now when He had

ended all His sayings in the audience of the people, He entered into Capharnaum; and a certain centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, was sick and ready to die;" and so forth, until we come to the verse where it is said that he was healed. Here, then, we notice that it was not till after He had ended all His words in the hearing of the people that Christ entered Capharnaum; by which we are to understand simply that He did not make that entrance before He had brought these sayings to their conclusion; and we are not to take it as intimating the length of that period of time which intervened between the delivery of these discourses and the entrance into Capharnaum. In this interval that leper was cleansed, whose case is recorded by Matthew in its own proper place, but is given by Luke only at a later point.

49. Accordingly, let us proceed to consider whether Matthew and Luke are at one in the account of this servant. Matthew's words, then, are these: "There came unto Him a centurion, beseeching Him, and saying, My servant lieth at home sick of the palsy. Now this seems to be inconsistent with the version presented by Luke, which runs thus: "And when he heard of Jesus, he sent unto Him the elders of the Jews, beseeching Him that He would come and heal his servant. And when they came to Jesus, they besought Him instantly, saying, That he was worthy for whom He should do this: for he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue. Then Jesus went with them. And when He was now not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to Him, saying unto Him, Lord, trouble not Thyself; for I am not worthy that Thou shouldest enter under my roof: wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto Thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed. For if this was the manner in which the incident took place, how can Matthew's statement, that there "came to Him a certain centurion," be correct, seeing that the man did not come in person, but sent his friends? The apparent discrepancy, however, will disappear if we look carefully into the matter, and observe that Matthew has simply held by a very familiar mode of expression.

For not only are we accustomed to speak of one as coming even before he actually reaches the place he is said to have approached, whence, too, we speak of one as making small approach or making great approach to what he is desirous of reaching; but we also not unfrequently speak of that access, for the sake of getting at which the approach is made, as reached even although

the person who is said to reach another may not himself see the individual whom he reaches, inasmuch as it may be through a friend that he reaches the person whose favour is necessary to him. This, indeed, is a custom which has so thoroughly established itself, that even in the language of every-day life now those men are called *Perventores* who, in the practice of canvassing, get at the inaccessible ears, as one may say, of any of the men of influence, by the intervention of suitable personages. If, therefore, access itself is thus familiarly said to be gained by the means of other parties, how much more may an approach be said to take place, although it be by means of others, which always remains something short of actual access! For it is surely the case, that a person may be able to do very much in the way of approach, but yet may have failed to succeed in actually reaching what he sought to get at.

Consequently it is nothing out of the way for Matthew,-a fact, indeed, which may be understood by any intelligence,-when thus dealing with an approach on the part of the centurion to the Lord, which was effected in the person of others, to have chosen to express the matter in this compendious method, "There came a centurion to Him." 50. At the same time, however, we must be careful enough to discern a certain mystical depth in the phras-eology adopted by the evangelist, which is in accordance with these words of the Psalm, "Come ye to Him, and be ye lightened." For in this way, inasmuch as the Lord Himself commended the faith of the centurion, in which indeed his approach was really made to Jesus, in such terms that He declared, "I have not found so great faith in Israel," the evangelist wisely chose to speak of the man himself as coming to Jesus, rather than to bring in the persons through whom he had conveyed his words. And furthermore, Luke has unfolded the whole incident to us just as it occurred, in a form constraining us to understand from his narrative in what manner another writer, who was also incapable of making any false statement, might have spoken of the man himself as coming. It is in this way, too, that the woman who suffered from the issue of blood, although she took hold merely of the hem of His garment, did yet touch the Lord more effectually than those multitudes did by whom He was thronged. For just as she touched the Lord the more effectually, in so far as she believed the more earnestly, so the centurion also came the more really to the Lord, inasmuch as he believed the more thoroughly. And now, as regards the rest of this paragraph, it would be a superfluous task to go over in detail the various matters which are recoun-

ted by the one and omitted by the other. For, according to the principle brought under notice at the outset, there is not to be found in these peculiarities any actual antagonism between the writers.

CHAPTER XXI.—OF THE ORDER IN WHICH THE NARRATIVE CONCERNING
PETER'S MOTHER-IN-LAW IS INTRODUCED.

51. Matthew proceeds in the following terms: "And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, He saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever. And He touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose, and ministered unto them. Matthew has not indicated the date of this incident; that is to say, he has specified neither before what event nor after what occurrence it took place. For we are certainly under no necessity of supposing that, because it is recorded after a certain event, it must also have happened in actual matter of fact after that event. And unquestionably, in this case, we are to understand that he has introduced for record here something which he had omitted to notice previously. For Mark brings in this narrative before his account of that cleansing of the leper which he would appear to have placed after the delivery of the sermon on the mount; which discourse, however, he has left unrelated. And thus, too Luke inserts this story of Peter's mother-in-law after an occurrence which it follows likewise in Mark's version, but also before that lengthened discourse, which has been reproduced by him, and which may appear to be one with the sermon which Matthew states to have been delivered on the mount. For of what consequence is it in what place any of them may give his account;

or what difference does it make whether he inserts the matter in its proper order, or brings in at a particular point what was previously omitted, or mentions at an earlier stage what really happened at a later, provided only that he contradicts neither himself nor a second writer in the narrative of the same facts or of others? For as it is not in one's own power, however admirable and trustworthy may be the knowledge he has once obtained of the facts, to determine the order in which he will recall them to memory (for the way in which one thing comes into a person's mind before or after another is something which proceeds not as we will, but simply as it is given to us), it is reasonable enough to suppose that each of the evangelists believed it to have been his duty to relate what he had to relate in that order in which it had pleased God to suggest to his recollection the matters he was engaged in recording. At least this might hold good in the case of those incidents with

regard to which the question of order, whether it were this or that, detracted nothing from evangelical authority and truth.

52. But as to the reason why the Holy Spirit, who divideth to every man severally as He will, and who therefore undoubtedly, with a view to the establishing of their books on so distinguished an eminence of authority, also governs and rules the minds of the holy men themselves in the matter of suggesting the things they were to commit to writing, has left one historian at liberty to construct his narrative in one way, and another in a different fashion, that is a question which any one may look into with pious consideration, and for which, by divine help, the answer also may possibly be found. That, however, is not the object of the work which we have taken in hand at present. The task we have proposed to ourselves is simply to demonstrate that not one of the evangelists contradicts either himself or his fellow-historians, whatever be the precise order in which he may have had the ability or may have preferred to compose his account of matters belonging to the doings and sayings of Christ; and that, too, at once in the case of subjects identical with those recorded by others, and in the case of subjects different from these. For this reason, therefore, when the order of times is not apparent, we ought not to feel it a matter of any consequence what order any of them may have adopted in relating the events. But wherever the order is apparent, if the evangelist then presents anything which seems to be inconsistent with his own statements, or with those of another, we must certainly take the passage into consideration, and endeavour to clear up the difficulty.

CHAPTER XXII.—OF THE ORDER OF THE INCIDENTS WHICH ARE
RECORDED AFTER THIS SECTION AND OF THE QUESTION WHETHER
MATTHEW MARK, AND LUKE ARE CONSISTENT WITH EACH OTHER IN
THESE.

153. Matthew, accordingly, continues his narration thus: "Now when the even was come, they brought unto Him many that were possessed with devils; and He cast out the spirits with His word, and healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses. That this belongs in date to the same day, he indicates with sufficient clearness by these words which he subjoins, "Now when the even was come. In a similar manner, after concluding his account of the healing of Peter's mother-in-law with the sentence, "And she ministered unto them," Mark has appended the following

statement: "And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto Him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed of the devils. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And He healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew Him. And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, He went out, and departed into a solitary place. Here Mark appears to have preserved the order in such wise, that after the statement conveyed in the words "And at even," he gives this note of time: "And in the morning, rising up a great while before day.

2 And although there is no absolute necessity for supposing either that, when we have the words "And at even," the reference must be to the evening of the very same day, or that when the phrase "In the morning" meets us, it must mean the morning after the self-same night; still, however that may be, this order in the occurrences may fairly appear to have been preserved with a view to an orderly arrangement of the times. Moreover, Luke, too, after relating the story of Peter's mother-in-law, while he does not indeed say expressly, "And at even," has at least used a phrase which conveys the same sense. For he proceeds thus: "Now when the sun had set, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto Him; and He laid His hands on every one of them, and healed them. And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And He, rebuking them, suffered them not to speak: for they knew that He was Christ. And when it was day, He departed and went into a desert place. Here, again, we see precisely the same order of times preserved as we discovered in Mark.

3 But Matthew, who appears to have introduced the story of Peter's mother-in-law not according to the order in which the incident itself took place, but simply in the succession in which he had it suggested to his mind after previous omission, has first recorded what happened on that same day, to wit, when even was come; and thereafter, instead of subjoining the notice of the morning, goes on with his account in these terms: "Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about Him, He gave commandment to depart unto the other side of the lake. This, then, is something new, differing from what is given in the context by Mark and Luke, who, after the notice of the even, bring in the mention of the morning. Consequently, as regards this verse in Matthew, "Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about Him, He gave commandment to depart unto the other side of the lake," we ought simply to un-

derstand that he has introduced here another fact which he has had brought to mind at this point,-namely, the fact that on a certain day, when Jesus had seen great multitudes about Him, He gave instructions to cross to the other side of the lake.

CHAPTER XXIII.-OF THE PERSON WHO SAID TO THE LORD, "I WILL FOLLOW THEE WHITHERSOEVER THOU GOEST;" AND OF THE OTHER THINGS CONNECTED THERewith, AND OF THE ORDER IN WHICH THEY ARE RECORDED BY MATTHEW AND LUKE.

54. He next appends the following statement: "And a certain scribe came and said unto Him, Master, I will follow Thee whithersoever thou goest; and so on, down to the words, "Let the dead bury their dead. We have a narrative in similar terms also in Luke. But he inserts it only after a variety of other matters, and without any explicit note of the order of time, but after the fashion of one only bethinking himself of the incident at that point. He leaves us also uncertain whether he brings it in there as something previously omitted, or as an anticipatory notice of something which in actual fact took place subsequently to those incidents by which it is followed in the history. For he proceeds thus: "And it came to pass, that as they went in the way, a certain man said unto Him, I will follow Thee whithersoever Thou goest. And the Lord's answer is given here in precisely the same terms as we find recited in Matthew. Now, although Matthew tells us that this took place at the time when He gave commandment to depart unto the other side of the lake, and Luke, on the other hand, speaks of an occasion when they "went in the way," there is no necessary contradiction in that. For it may be the case that they went in the way just in order to come to the lake.

Again, in what is said about the person who begged to be allowed first to bury his father, Matthew and Luke are thoroughly at one. For the mere fact that Matthew has introduced first the words of the man who made the request regarding his father, and that he has put after that the saying of the Lord, "Follow me," whereas Luke puts the Lord's command, "Follow me," first, and the declaration of the petitioner second, is a matter of no consequence to the sense itself. Luke has also made mention of yet another person, who said, "Lord, I will follow Thee, but let me first bid them farewell which are at home at my house; of which individual Matthewsays nothing. And thereafter Luke proceeds to another subject altogether, and not to what followed in the actual order of time. The passage runs: "And after these

things, the Lord appointed other seventy-two also. That this occurred "after these things" is indeed manifest; but at what length of time after these things the Lord did so is not apparent. Nevertheless, in this interval that took place which Matthew subjoins next in succession. For the same Matthew still keeps up the order of time, and continues his narrative, as we shall now see.

Chapter XXIV.—Of the Lord's Crossing the Lake on that Occasion on Which He Slept in the Vessel, and of the Casting Out of Those Devils Whom He Suffered to Go into the Swine; And of the Consistency of the Accounts Given by Matthew, Mark, and Luke of All that Was Done and Said on These Occasions. 55. "And when He was entered into a ship, His disciples followed Him. And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea. And so the story goes on, until we come to the words, "And He came into His own city. Those two narratives which are told by Matthew in continuous succession,—namely, that regarding the calm upon the sea after Jesus was roused from His sleep and had commanded the winds, and that concerning the persons who were possessed with the fierce devil, and who brake their bands and were driven into the wilderness,—are given also in like manner by Mark and Luke. Some parts of these stories are expressed, indeed, in different terms by the different writers, but the sense remains the same. This is the case, for example, when Matthew represents the Lord to have said, "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? while Mark's version is, "Why are ye fearful? Is it that ye have no faith? For Mark's word refers to that perfect faith which is like a grain of mustard seed; and so he, too, speaks in effect of the "little faith. Luke, again, puts it thus: "Where is your faith? Accordingly, the whole utterance may perhaps have gone thus: "Why are ye fearful? Where is your faith, O ye of little faith? And so one of them records one part, and another another part, of the entire saying. The same may be the case with the words spoken by the disciples when they awoke Him. Matthew gives us: "Lord, save us:

we perish. Mark has: "Master, carest Thou not that we perish? And Luke says simply, "Master, we perish. These different expressions, however, convey one and the same meaning on the part of those who were awaking the Lord, and who were wishful to secure their safety. Neither need we inquire which of these several forms is to be preferred as the one actually addressed to Christ. For whether they really used the one or the other of these three phraseologies, or expressed themselves in different words, which are unrecorded by any one of the evangelists, but which were equally well adapted to

give the like representation of what was meant, what difference does it make in the fact itself? At the same time, it may also possibly have been the case that, when several parties in concert were trying to awake Him, all these various modes of expression had been used, one by one person, and another by another. In the same way, too, we may deal with the exclamation on the stilling of the tempest, which, according to Matthew, was, "What manner of man is this, that the winds and the sea obey Him? according to Mark, "What man, thinkest thou, is this, that both the wind and the sea obey Him? and according to Luke, "What man, thinkest thou, is this? for He commandeth both the winds and the sea, and they obey Him. Who can fail to see that the sense in all these forms is quite identical? For the expression, "What man, thinkest thou, is this?

has precisely the same import with the other, "What manner of man is this? And where the words "He commandeth "are omitted, it can at least be understood as a matter of course that the obedience is rendered to the person commanding. 56. Moreover, with respect to the circumstance that Matthew states that there were two men who were afflicted with the legion of devils which received permission to go into the swine, whereas Mark and Luke instance only a single individual, we may suppose that one of these parties was a person of some kind of superior notability and repute, whose case was particularly lamented by that district, and for whose deliverance there was special anxiety. With the intention of indicating that fact, two of the evangelists have judged it proper to make mention only of the one person, in connection with whom the fame of this deed had been spread abroad the more extensively and remarkably. Neither should any scruple be excited by the different forms in which the words uttered by the possessed have been reproduced by the various evangelists. For we may either resolve them all into one and the same thing, or suppose them all to have been actually spoken. Nor, again, should we find any difficulty in the circumstance that with Matthew the address is couched in the plural number, but with Mark and Luke in the singular. For these latter two tell us at the same time, that when the man was asked what was his name, he answered that he was Legion, because the devils were many. Nor, once more, is there any discrepancy between Mark's statement that the herd of swine was round about the mountain, and Luke's, that they were on the mountain. For the herd of swine was so great that one por-

tion of it might be on the mountain, and another only round about it. For, as Mark has expressly informed us, there were about two thousand swine.

Chapter XXV.-Of the Man Sick of the Palsy to Whom the Lord Said, "Thy Sins are Forgiven Thee," And "Take Up Thy Bed;" And in Especial, of the Question Whether Matthew and Mark are Consistent with Each Other in Their Notice of the Place Where This Incident Took Place, in So Far as Matthew Says It Happened "In His Own City," While Mark Says It Was in Capharnaum. 57. Hereupon Matthew proceeds with his recital, still preserving the order of time, and connects his narrative in the following manner:-"And He entered into a ship, and passed over, and came into His own city. And, behold, they brought to Him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed;" and so on down to where it is said "But when the multitude saw it, they marvelled; and glorified God, which had given such power unto men." Mark and Luke have also told the story of this paralytic. Now, as regards Matthew's stating that the Lord said, "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee;" while Luke makes the address run, not as "son," but as "man,"-this only helps to bring out the Lord's meaning more explicitly. For these sins were [thus said to be] forgiven to the "man," inasmuch as the very fact that he was a man would make it impossible for him to say, "I have not sinned;" and at the same time, that mode of address served to indicate that He who forgave sins to man was Himself God. Mark, again, has given the same form of words as Matthew, but he has left out the terms, "Be of good cheer." It is also possible, indeed, that the whole saying ran thus: "Man, be of good cheer: son, thy sins are forgiven thee;" or thus: "Son, be of good cheer: man, thy sins are forgiven thee;" or the words may have been spoken in some Other congruous order.

58. A difficulty, however, may certainly arise when we observe how Matthew tells the story of the paralytic after this fashion: "And He entered into a ship, and passed over, and came into His own city. And, behold, they brought to Him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed; whereas Mark speaks of the incident as taking place not in His own city, which indeed is called Nazareth, but in Capharnaum. His narrative is to the following effect:-" And again He entered into Capharnaum after some days; and it was noised that He was in the house. And straightway many were gathered together, inasmuch that there was no room to receive them, no, not so much as about the door: and He spake a word unto them. And they came unto Him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne of four. And when they could not

come nigh unto Him for the press, they uncovered the roof where He was: and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed wherein the sick of the palsy lay. And when Jesus saw their faith; and so forth. Luke, on the other hand, does not mention the place in which the incident happened, but gives the tale thus: "And it came to pass on a certain day that He was sitting teaching, and there were Pharisees and doctors of the law also sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judaea, and Jerusalem:

and the power of the Lord was present to heal them. And, behold, men brought in a bed a man which was taken with a palsy: and they sought means to bring him in, and to lay him before Him. And when they could not find by what way they might bring him in because of the multitude, they went upon the house-top, and let him down through the tiling with his couch into the midst before Jesus. And when He saw their faith, He said, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee; and so forth. The question, therefore, remains one between Mark and Matthew, in so far as Matthew writes of the incident as taking place in the Lord's city; while Mark locates it in Capharnaum. This question would be more difficult to solve if Matthew mentioned Nazareth by name. But, as the case stands, when we reflect that the state of Galilee itself might have been called Christ's city, because Nazareth was in Galilee, just as the whole region which was made up of so many cities is yet called a Roman state; when, further, it is considered that so many nations are comprehended in that city, of which it is written, "Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God;

and also that God's ancient people, though dwelling in so many cities, have yet been spoken of as one house, the house of Israel, -who can doubt-that [it may be fairly said that] Jesus wrought this work in His own city [or, state], inasmuch as He did it in the city of Capharnaum, which was a city of that Galilee to which He had returned when He crossed over again from the country of the Gerasenes, so that when He came into Galilee He might correctly be said to have come into His own city [or, state], in which ever town of Galilee He might happen to be? This explanation may be vindicated more particularly on the ground that Capharnaum itself held a position of such eminence in Galilee that it was reckoned to be a kind of metropolis. But even were it altogether illegitimate to take the city of Christ in the sense either of Galilee itself, in which Nazareth was situated, or of Capharnaum, which was distinguished as in a certain sense the capital of Galilee, we might

still affirm that Matthew has simply passed over all that happened after Jesus came into His own city until He reached Capharnaum, and that he has simply tacked on the narrative of the healing of the paralytic at this point; just as the writers do in many instances, leaving unnoticed much that intervenes, and, without any express indication of the omissions they are making, proceeding precisely as if what they subjoin, followed actually in literal succession.

CHAPTER XXVI.-OF THE CALLING OF MATTHEW, AND OF THE QUESTION WHETHER MATTHEW'S OWN ACCOUNT IS IN HARMONY WITH THOSE OF MARK AND LUKE WHEN THEY SPEAK OF LEVI THE SON OF ALPHAEUS.

59. Matthew next continues his narrative in the following terms:-" And as Jesus passed forth from thence, He saw a man named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and He saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose and followed Him." Mark gives this story also, and keeps the same order, bringing it in after the notice of the healing of the man who was sick of the palsy. His version runs thus: "And He went forth again by the sea-side; and all the multitude resorted unto Him, and He taught them. And as He passed by, He saw Levi the son of Alphaeus sitting at the receipt of custom, and said unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed Him." There is no contradiction here; for Matthew is the same person with Levi. Luke also introduces this after the story of the healing of the same man who was sick of the palsy. He writes in these terms: "And after these things He went forth, and saw a publican, named Levi, sitting at the receipt of custom: and He said unto him, Follow me. And he left all, rose up, and followed Him." Now, from this it will appear to be the most reasonable explanation to say that Matthew records these things here in the form of things previously passed over, and now brought to mind. For certainly we must believe that Matthew's calling took place before the delivery of the sermon on the mount. For Luke tells us that on this mountain on that occasion the election was made of all these twelve, whom Jesus also named apostles, out of the larger body of the disciples.

Chapter XXVII.-Of the Feast at Which It Was Objected at Once that Christ Ate with Sinners, and that His Disciples Did Not Fast; Of the Circumstance that the Evangelists Seem to Give Different Accounts of the Parties by Whom These Objections Were Alleged; And of the Question Whether Matthew and Mark and Luke are Also in Harmony with Each Oth-

er in the Reports Given of the Words of These Persons, and of the Replies Returned by the Lord. 60. Matthew, accordingly, goes on to say: "And it came to pass, as He sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with Jesus and His disciples;" and so on, down to where we read, "But they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved." Here Matthew has not told us particularly in whose house it was that Jesus was sitting at meat along with the publicans and sinners. This might make it appear as if he had not appended this notice in its strict order here, but had introduced at this point, in the way of reminiscence, something which actually took place on a different occasion, were it not that Mark and Luke, who repeat the account in terms thoroughly similar, have made it plain that it was in the house of Levi-that is to say, Matthew-that Jesus sat at meat, and all these sayings were uttered which follow. For Mark states the same fact, keeping also the same order, in the following manner: "And it came to pass, as He sat at meat in his house, many publicans and sinners sat also together with Jesus." Accordingly, when he says, "in his house," he certainly refers to the person of whom he was speaking directly before, and that was Levi. To the same effect, after the words, "He saith unto him, Follow me; and he left all, rose up, and followed Him," Luke has appended immediately this statement: "And Levi made Him a great feast in his own house: and there was a great company of publicans and of others that sat down with them." And thus it is manifest in whose house it was that these things took place.

61. Let us next look into the words which these three evangelists have all brought in as having been addressed to the Lord, and also into the replies which were made by Him. Matthew says: "And when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto His disciples, Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners? This reappears very nearly in the same words in Mark: "How is it that He eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? Only we find thus that Matthew has omitted one thing which Mark inserts-namely, the addition "and drinketh. But of what consequence can that be, since the sense is fully given, the idea suggested being that they were partaking of a repast in company? Luke, on the other hand, seems to have recorded this scene somewhat differently. For his version proceeds thus: "But their scribes and Pharisees murmured against His disciples, saying, Why do ye eat and drink with publicans and sinners? But his intention in this certainly is not to indicate that

their Master was not referred to on that occasion, but to intimate that the objection was levelled against all of them together, both Himself and His disciples; the charge, however, which was to be taken to be meant both of Him and of them, being addressed directly not to Him, but to them. For the fact is that Luke himself, no less than the others, represents the Lord as making the reply, and saying, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

And He would not have returned that answer to them, had not their words, "Why do ye eat and drink? been directed very specially to Himself. For the same reason, Matthew and Mark have told us that the objection which was brought against Him was stated immediately to His disciples, because, when the allegation was addressed to the disciples, the charge was thereby laid all the more seriously against the Master whom these disciples were imitating and following. One and the same sense, therefore, is conveyed; and it is expressed all the better in consequence of these variations employed in some of the terms, while the matter of fact itself is left intact. In like manner we may deal with the accounts of the Lord's reply. Matthew's runs thus: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick; but go ye and learn what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners. Mark and Luke have also preserved for us the same sense in almost the same words, with this exception, that they both fail to introduce that quotation from the prophet, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice. Luke, again, after the words, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners," has added the term, "unto repentance. This addition serves to bring out the sense more fully, so as to preclude any one from supposing that sinners are loved by Christ, purely for the very reason that they are sinners.

For this similitude also of the sick indicates clearly what God means by the calling of sinners, -that it is like the physician with the sick,-and that its object verily is that men should be saved from their iniquity as from disease; which healing is effected by repentance. 62. In the same way, we may subject what is said about the disciples of John to examination. Matthew's words are these: "Then came to Him the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft? The purport of Mark's version is similar: "And the disciples of John and the Pharisees used to fast. And they come and say unto Him, Why do the disciples of John and the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not?

The only semblance of a discrepancy that can be found here, is in the possibility of supposing that the mention of the Pharisees as having spoken along with the disciples of John is an addition of Mark's, while Matthew states only that the disciples of John expressed themselves to the above effect. But the words which were actually uttered by the parties, according to Mark's version, rather indicate that the speakers and the persons spoken of were not the same individuals. I mean, that the persons who came to Jesus were the guests who were then present, that they came because the disciples of John and the Pharisees were fasting, and that they uttered the above words with respect to these parties. In this way, the evangelist's phrase, "they come," would not refer to the persons regarding whom he had just thrown in the remark, "And the disciples of John and the Pharisees were fasting."

But the case would be, that as those parties were fasting, some others here, who are moved by that fact, come to Him, and put this question to Him, "Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not? This is more clearly expressed by Luke. For, evidently with the same idea in his mind, after stating what answer the Lord returned in the words in which He spoke about the calling of sinners under the similitude of those who are sick, he proceeds thus: "And they said unto Him, Why do the disciples of John fast often, and make prayers, and likewise the disciples of the Pharisees, but thine eat and drink? Here, then, we see that, as was the case with Mark, Luke has mentioned one party as speaking to this intent in relation to other parties. How comes it, therefore, that Matthew says, "Then came to Him the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast? The explanation may be, that those individuals were also present, and that all these various parties were eager to advance this charge, as they severally found opportunity. And the sentiments which sought expression on this occasion have been conveyed by the three evangelists undervaried terms, but yet without any divergence from a true statement of the fact itself.

63. Once more, we find that Matthew and Mark have given similar accounts of what was said about the children of the bridegroom not fasting as long as the bridegroom is with them, with this exception, that Mark has named them the children of the bridals, while Matthew has designated them the children of the bridegroom. That, however, is a matter of no moment. For by the children of the bridals we understand at once those connected with the bridegroom, and those connected with the bride. The sense, there-

fore, is obvious and identical, and neither different nor contradictory. Luke, again, does not say, "Can the children of the bridegroom fast? but, "Can ye make the children of the bridegroom fast, while the bridegroom is with them? By expressing it in this method, the evangelist has elegantly opened up the self-same sense in a way calculated to suggest something else. Forthus the idea is conveyed, that those very persons who were speaking would try to make the children of the bridegroom mourn and fast, inasmuch as they would [seek to] put the bridegroom to death. Moreover, Matthew's phrase, "mourn," is of the same import as that used by Mark and Luke, namely, "fast. For Matthew also says further on, "Then shall they fast," and not, "Then shall they mourn. But by the use of this phrase, he has indicated that the Lord spoke of that kind of fasting which pertains to the lowliness of tribulation.

In the same way, too, the Lord may be understood to have pictured out a different kind of fasting, which stands related to the rapture of a mind dwelling in the heights of things spiritual, and for that reason estranged in a certain measure from the meats that are for the body, when He made use of those subsequent similitudes touching the new cloth and the new wine, by which He showed that this kind of fasting is an incongruity for sensual and carnal people, who are taken up with the cares of the body, and who consequently still remain in the old mind. These similitudes are also embodied in similar terms by the other two evangelists. And it should be sufficiently evident that there need be no real discrepancy, although one may introduce something, whether belonging to the subject-matter itself, or merely to the terms in which that subject is expressed, which another leaves out; provided only that there be neither any departure from a genuine identity in sense, nor any contradiction created between the different forms which may be adopted for expressing the same thing.

Chapter XXVIII.-Of the Raising of the Daughter of the Ruler of the Synagogue, and of the Woman Who Touched the Hem of His Garment; Of the Question, Also, as to Whether the Order in Which These Incidents are Narrated Exhibits Any Contradiction in Any of the Writers by Whom They are Reported; And in Particular, of the Words in Which the Ruler of the Synagogue Addressed His Request to the Lord. 64. Still keeping by the order of time, Matthew next continues to the following effect: "While He spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain ruler, and worshipped Him, saying, My daughter is even now dead; but come and lay Thy hand upon her,

and she shall live; and so on, until we come to the words, "and the maid arose. And the fame hereof went abroad into all that land. The other two, namely, Mark and Luke, in like manner give this same account, only they do not keep by the same order now. For they bring up this narrative in a different place, and insert it in another connection; to wit, at the point where He crosses the lake and returns from the country of the Gerasenes, after casting out the devils and permitting them to go into the swine. Thus Mark introduces it, after he has related what took place among the Gerasenes, in the following manner: "And when Jesus was passed over again by ship unto the other side, much people gathered unto Him: and He was nigh unto the sea. And there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name; and when he saw Him, he fell at His feet," etc. By this, then, we are certainly to understand that the occurrence in connection with the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue did take place after Jesus had passed across the lake again in the ship.

It does not, however, appear from the words themselves how long after that passage this thing happened. But that some time did elapse is clear. For had there not been an interval, no period would be left within which those circumstances might fall which Matthew has just related in the matter of the feast in his house. These, indeed, he has told after the fashion of the evangelists, as if they were the story of another person's doings. But they are the story really of what took place in his own case, and at his own house. And after that narrative, what follows in the immediate context is nothing else than this notice of the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue. For he has constructed the whole recital in such a manner, that the mode of transition from one thing to the other has itself indicated with sufficient clearness that the words immediately following give the narrative of what actually took place in immediate consecution. For after mentioning, in connection with the former incident, those words which Jesus spake with respect to the new cloth and the new wine, he has subjoined these other words, without any interruption in the narrative, namely, "While He spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain ruler. And this shows that, if the person approached Him while He was speaking these things, nothing else either done or said by Him could have intervened.

In Mark's account, on the other hand, the place is quite apparent, as we have already pointed out, where other things [left unrecorded by him] might

very well have come in. The case is much the same also with Luke, who, when he proceeds to follow up his version of the story of the miracle wrought among the Gerasenes, by giving his account of the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue, does not pass on to that in any such way as to place it in antagonism with Matthew's version, who, by his words, "While He yet spake these things," gives us plainly to understand that the occurrence took place after those parables about the cloth and the wine. For when he has concluded his statement of what happened among the Gerasenes, Luke passes to the next subject in the following manner; "And it came to pass that, when Jesus was returned, the people gladly received Him; for they were all waiting for Him. And, behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue, and he fell down at Jesus' feet," and so on. Thus we are given to understand that the crowd did indeed receive Jesus forthwith on the said occasion: for He was the person for whose return they, were waiting. But what is conveyed in the words which are directly added, "And, behold, there came a man whose name was Jairus," is not to be taken to have occurred literally in immediate succession.

On the contrary, the feast with the publicans, as Matthew records it, took place before that. For Matthew connects this present incident with that feast in such a way as to make it impossible for us to suppose that any other sequence of events can be the correct order. 65. In this narrative, then, which we have undertaken to consider at present, all these three evangelists indeed are unquestionably at one in the account which they give of the woman who was afflicted with the issue of blood. Nor is it a matter of any real consequence, that something which is passed by in silence by one of them is related by another; or that Mark says, "Who touched my clothes?" while Luke says, "Who touched me?" For the one has only adopted the phrase in use and wont, whereas the other has given the stricter expression. But for all that, both of them convey the same meaning. For it is more usual with us to say, "You are tearing me," than to say, "You are tearing my clothes;" as, notwithstanding the term, the sense we wish to convey is obvious enough.

66. At the same time, however, there remains the fact that Matthew represents the ruler of the synagogue to have spoken to the Lord of his daughter, not merely as one likely to die, or as dying, or as on the very point of expiring, but as even then dead; while these other two evangelists report her as now nigh unto death, but not yet really dead, and keep so strictly to that ver-

sion of the circumstances, that they tell us how the persons came at a later stage with the intelligence of her actual death, and with the message that for this reason the Master ought not now to trouble Himself by coming, with the purpose of laying His hand upon her, and so preventing her from dying,-the matter not being put as if He was one possessed of ability to raise the once dead to life. It becomes necessary for us, therefore, to investigate this fact lest it may seem to exhibit any contradiction between the accounts. And the way to explain it is to suppose that, by reason of brevity in the narrative, Matthew has preferred to express it as if the Lord had been really asked to do what it is clear He did actually do, namely, raise the dead to life. For what Matthew directs our attention to, is not the mere words spoken by the father about his daughter, but what is of more importance, his mind and purpose. Thus he has given words calculated to represent the father's real thoughts.

For he had so thoroughly despaired of his child's case, that not believing that she whom he had just left dying, could possibly now be found yet in life, his thought rather was that she might be made alive again. Accordingly two of the evangelists have introduced the words which were literally spoken by Jairus. But Matthew has exhibited rather what the man secretly wished and thought. Thus both petitions were really addressed to the Lord; namely, either that He should restore the dying damsel, or that, if she was already dead, He might raise her to life again. But as it was Matthew's object to tell the whole story in short compass, he has represented the father as directly expressing in his request what, it is certain, had been his own real wish, and what Christ actually did. It is true, indeed, that if those two evangelists, or one of them, had told us that the father himself spake the words which the parties who came from his house uttered,-namely, that Jesus should not now trouble Himself, because the damsel had died,-then the words which Matthew has put into his mouth would not be in harmony with his thoughts. But, as the case really stands, it is not said that he gave his consent to the parties who brought that report, and who bade the Master no more think of coming now. And together with this, we have to observe, that when the Lord addressed him in these terms, "Fear not:

believe only, and she shall be made whole," He did not find fault with him on the ground of his want of belief, but really encouraged him to a yet stronger faith. For this ruler had faith like that which was exhibited by the person who said, "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief." 67. Seeing,

then, that the case stands thus, from these varied and yet not inconsistent modes of statement adopted by the evangelists, we evidently learn a lesson of the utmost utility, and of great necessity,-namely, that in any man's words the thing which we ought narrowly to regard is only the writer's thought which was meant to be expressed, and to which the words ought to be subservient; and further, that we should not suppose one to be giving an incorrect statement, if he happens to convey in different words what the person really meant whose words he fails to reproduce literally. And we ought not to let the wretched cavillers at words fancy that truth must be tied somehow or other to the jots and tittles of letters; whereas the fact is, that not in the matter of words only, but equally in all other methods by which sentiments are indicated, the sentiment itself, and nothing else, is what ought to be looked at.

68. Moreover, as to the circumstance that some codices of Matthew's Gospel contain the reading, "For the woman is not dead, but sleepeth," while Mark and Luke certify that she was a damsel of the age of twelve years, we may suppose that Matthew has followed the Hebrew mode of speech here. For in other passages of Scripture, as well as here, it is found that not only those who had already known a man, but all females in general, including untouched virgins, are called women. That is the case, for instance, where it is written of Eve, "He made it into a woman;" and again, in the book of Numbers, where the women who have not known a man by lying with him, that is to say, the virgins, are ordered to be saved from being put to death. Adopting the same phraseology, Paul, too, says of Christ Himself, that He was "made of a woman." And it is better, therefore, to understand the matter according to these analogies, than to suppose that this damsel of twelve years of age was already married, or had known a man.

CHAPTER XXIX.-OF THE TWO BLIND MEN AND THE DUMB DEMONIA C
WHOSE STORIES ARE RELATED ONLY BY MATTHEW.

69. Matthew proceeds with his narrative in the following terms: "And when Jesus departed thence, two blind men followed Him, crying and saying, Thou son of David, have mercy on us;" and so on, down to the verse where we read, "But the Pharisees said, He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils." Matthew is the only one who introduces this account of the two blind men and the dumb demoniac. For those two blind men, whose story is given also by the others, are not the two before us here. Nevertheless there is

such similarity in the occurrences, that if Matthew himself had not recorded the latter incident as well as the former, it might have been thought that the one which he relates at present has also been given by these other two evangelists. There is this fact, therefore, which we ought to bear carefully in mind,—namely, that there are some occurrences which resemble each other. For we have a proof of this in the circumstance that the very same evangelist mentions both incidents here. And thus, if at any time we find any such occurrences narrated individually by the several evangelists, and discover some contradiction in the accounts, which seems not to admit of being solved [on the principle of harmonizing], it may occur to us that the explanation simply is, that this [apparently contradictory] circumstance did not take place [on that particular occasion], but that what did happen then was only something resembling it, or something which was gone about in a similar manner.

Chapter XXX.—Of the Section Where It is Recorded, that Being Moved with Compassion for the Multitudes, He Sent His Disciples, Giving Them Power to Work Cures, and Charged Them with Many Instructions, Directing Them How to Live; And of the Question Concerning the Proof of Matthew's Harmony Here with Mark and Luke, Especially on the Subject of the Staff, Which Matthew Says the Lord Told Them They Were Not to Carry, While According to Mark It is the Only Thing They Were to Carry; And Also of the Wearing of the Shoes and Coats. 70. As to the events next related, it is true that their exact order is not made apparent by Matthew's narrative. For after the notices of the two incidents in connection with the blind men and the dumb demoniac, he continues in the following manner: "And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the kingdom of the gospel, and healing every sickness and every disease. But when He saw the multitudes, He was moved with compassion on them, because they were troubled and prostrate, as sheep having no shepherd. Then saith He unto His disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth labourers into His harvest. And when He had called unto Him His twelve disciples, He gave them power against unclean spirits; and so forth, down to the words, "Verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. This whole passage which we have now mentioned shows how He gave many counsels to His disciples. But whether Matthew has subjoined this section in

its historical order, or has made its order dependent only on the succession in which it came up to his own mind, as has already been said, is not made apparent. Mark appears to have handled this paragraph in a succinct method, and to have entered upon its recital in the following terms: "And He went round about the villages, teaching in their circuit:

and He called unto Him the twelve, and began to send them by two and two, and gave them power over unclean spirits; and so on, down to where we read, "Shake off the dust from your feet for a testimony against them. But before narrating this incident, Mark has inserted, immediately after the story of the raising of the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue, an account of what took place on that occasion on which, in His own country, the people were astonished at the Lord, and asked from whence He had such wisdom and such capabilities, when they perceived His judgment: which account is given by Matthew after these counsels to the disciples, and after a number of other matters. It is uncertain, therefore, whether what thus happened in His own country has been recorded by Matthew in the succession in which it came to mind, after having been omitted at first, or whether it has been introduced by Mark in the way of an anticipation; and which of them, in short, has kept the order of actual occurrence, and which of them the order of his own recollection. Luke, again, in immediate succession to the mention of the raising of the daughter of Jairus to life, subjoins this paragraph, bearing on the power and the counsels given to the disciples, and that indeed with as great brevity as Mark.

This evangelist, however, does not, any more than the others, introduce the subject in such a way as to produce the impression that it comes in also in the strictly historical order. Moreover, with regard to the names of the disciples, Luke, who gives their names in another place, -that is to say, in the earlier passage, where they are [represented as being] chosen on the mountain,-is not at variance in any respect with Matthew, with the exception of the single instance of the name of Judas the brother of James, whom Matthew designates Thaddaeus, although some codices also read Lebbaeus. But who would ever think of denying that one man may be known under two or three names? 71. Another question which it is also usual to put is this: How comes it that Matthew and Luke have stated that the Lord said to His disciples that they were not to take a staff with them, whereas Mark puts the matter in this way: "And He commanded them that they should take noth-

ing for their journey, save a staff only;" and proceeds further in this strain, "no scrip, no bread, no money in their purse:" thereby making it quite evident that his narrative belongs to the same place and circumstances with which the narratives of those others deal who have mentioned that the staff was not to be taken? Now this question admits of being solved on the principle of understanding that the staff which, according to Mark, was to be taken, bears one sense, and that the staff which, according to Matthew and Luke, was not to be taken with them, is to be interpreted in a different sense; just in the same way as we find the term "temptation" used in one meaning, when it is said, "God tempteth no man," and in a different meaning where it is said, "The Lord your God tempteth [proveth] you, to know whether ye love Him." For in the former case the temptation of seduction is intended; but in the latter the temptation of probation. Another parallel occurs in the case of the term "judgment," which must be taken in one way, where it is said, "They that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of judgment;" and in another way, where it is said, "Judge me, O God, and discern my cause, in respect of an ungodly nation." For the former refers to the judgment of damnation, and the latter to the judgment of discrimination.

72. And there are many other words which do not retain one uniform signification, but are introduced so as to suit a variety of connections, and thus are understood in a variety of ways, and sometimes, indeed, are adopted along with an explanation. We have an example in the saying, "Be not children in understanding; howbeit in malice be ye little children, that in understanding ye may be perfect. For here is a sentence which, in a brief and pregnant form, might have been expressed thus: "Be ye not children; howbeit be ye children. The same is the case with the words, "If any man among you thinketh himself to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise. For what else is the statement there but this: "Let him not be wise, that he may be wise"? Moreover, the sentences are sometimes so put as to exercise the judgment of the inquirer. An instance of this kind occurs in what is said in the Epistle to the Galatians: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so ye will fulfil the law of Christ. For if a man thinketh himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself. But it is meet that every man should prove his own work; and then shall he have rejoicing in himself, and not in another. For every man shall bear his own burden.

Now, unless the word "burden" can be taken in different senses, without doubt one would suppose that the same writer contradicts himself in what he says here, and that, too, when the words are placed in such close neighbourhood in one paragraph. For when he has just said, "One shall bear another's burdens," after the lapse of a very brief interval he says, "Every man shall bear his own burden. But the one refers to the burdens which are to be borne in sharing in one's infirmity, the other to the burdens borne in the rendering of an account of our own actions to God: the former are burdens to be borne in our [duties of] fellowship with brethren; the latter are those peculiar to ourselves, and borne by every man for himself. And in the same way, once more, the "rod" of which the apostle spoke in the words, "Shall I come unto you with a rod? is meant in a spiritual sense; while the same term bears the literal meaning when it occurs of the rod applied to a horse, or used for some other purpose of the kind, not to mention, in the meantime, also other metaphorical significations of this phrase.

73. Both these counsels, therefore, must be accepted as having been spoken by the Lord to the apostles; namely, at once that they should not take a staff, and that they should take nothing save a staff only. For when He said to them, according to Matthew, "Provide neither gold nor silver, nor money in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet a staff," He added immediately, "for the workman is worthy of his meat. And by this He makes it sufficiently obvious why it is that He would have them provide and carry none of these things. He shows that His reason was, not that these things are not necessary for the sustenance of this life, but because He was sending them in such a manner as to declare plainly that these things were due to them by those very persons who were to hear believingly the gospel preached by them; just as wages are the soldier's due, and as the fruit of the vine is the right of the planters, and the milk of the flock the right of the shepherds. For which reason Paul also speaks in this wise: "Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? For under these figures he was speaking of those things which are necessary to the preachers of the gospel. And so, a little further on, he says:

"If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? If others are partakers of this power over you, are not

we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power. This makes it apparent that by these instructions the Lord did not mean that the evangelists should not seek their support in any other way than by depending on what was offered them by those to whom they preached the gospel (otherwise this very apostle acted contrary to this precept when he acquired a livelihood for himself by the labours of his own hands, because he would not be chargeable to any of them), but that He gave them a power in the exercise of which they should know such things to be their due. Now, when any commandment is given by the Lord, there is the guilt of non-obedience if it is not observed; but when any power is given, any one is at liberty to abstain from its use, and, as it were, to recede from his right. Accordingly, when the Lord spake these things to the disciples, He did what that apostle expounds more clearly a little further on, when he says, "Do ye not know that they who minister in the temple live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. But I have used none of these things.

When he says, therefore, that the Lord ordained it thus, but that he did not use the ordinance, he certainly indicates that it was a power to use that was given him, and not a necessity of service that was imposed upon him. 74. Accordingly, as our Lord ordained what the apostle declares Him to have ordained,-namely, that those who preach the gospel should live of the gospel,-He gave these counsels to the apostles in order that they might be without the care of providing or of carrying with them things necessary for this life, whether great or the very smallest; consequently He introduced this term, "neither a staff," with the view of showing that, on the part of those who were faithful to Him, all things were due to His ministers, who themselves, too, required nothing superfluous. And thus, when He added the words, "For the workman is worthy of his meat," He indicated quite clearly, and made it thoroughly plain, how and for what reason it was that He spake all these things. It is this kind of power, therefore, that the Lord denoted under the term "staff," when He said that they should "take nothing" for their journey, save a staff only. For the sentence might also have been briefly expressed in this way: "Take with you none of the necessities of life, neither a staff, save a staff only. So that the phrase "neither a staff" may be taken to be equivalent to "not even the smallest things; while the addition, "save a staff only," may

be understood to mean that, in virtue of that power which they received from the Lord, and which was signified by the name "staff" [or, "rod"], even those things which were not carried with them would not be wanting to them.

Our Lord therefore used both phrases. But inasmuch as one and the same evangelist has not recorded them both, the writer who has told us that the rod, as introduced in the one sense, was to be taken, is supposed to be in antagonism to him who has told us that the rod, as occurring again in the other sense, was not to be taken. After this explanation of the matter, however, no such supposition ought to be entertained. 75. In like manner, also, when Matthew tells us that the shoes were not to be carried with them on the journey, what is intended is the checking of that care which thinks that such things must be carried with them, because otherwise they might be unprovided. Thus, too, the import of what is said regarding the two coats is, that none of them should think of taking with him another coat in addition to the one in which he was clad, as if he was afraid that he might come to be in want, while all the time the power (which was received from the Lord) made him sure of getting what was needful. To the same effect, when Mark says that they were to be shod with sandals or soles, he gives us to understand that this matter of the shoe has some sort of mystical significance, the point being that the foot is to be neither covered, nor yet left bare to the ground; by which the idea may be conveyed that the gospel was neither to be concealed, nor yet made to depend on the good things of earth. And as to the fact that what is forbidden is neither the carrying nor the possessing of two coats, but more distinctly the putting of them on,-the words being, "and not put on two coats,"-what counsel is conveyed to them therein but this, that they ought to walk not in duplicity, but in simplicity?

76. Thus it is not by any means to be made a matter of doubt that the Lord Himself spake all these words, some of them with a literal import, and others of them with a figurative, although the evangelists may have introduced them only in part into their writings,-one inserting one section, and another giving a different portion. Certain passages, at the same time, have been recorded in identical terms either by some two of them, or by some three, or even by all the four together. And yet not even when this is the case can we take it for granted that everything has been committed to writing which was either uttered or done by Him. Moreover, if any one fancies that

the Lord could not in the course of the same discourse have used some expressions with a figurative application and others with a literal, let him but examine His other addresses, and he will see how rash and inconsiderate such a notion is. For, then (to mention but a single instance which occurs meantime to my mind), when Christ gives the counsel not to let the left hand know what the right hand doeth, he may suppose himself under the necessity of accepting in the same figurative sense at once the almsgivings themselves referred to, and the other instructions offered on that occasion.

77. In good truth, I must repeat here once more an admonition which it behoves the reader to keep in mind, so as not to be requiring that kind of advice so very frequently, namely, that in various passages of His discourses, the Lord has reiterated much which He had uttered already on other occasions. It is needful, indeed, to call this fact to mind, lest, when it happens that the order of such passages does not appear to fit in with the narrative of another of the evangelists, the reader should fancy that this establishes some contradiction between them; whereas he ought really to understand it to be due to the fact that something is repeated a second time in that connection which had been already expressed elsewhere. And this is a remark that should be held applicable not only to His words, but also to His deeds. For there is nothing to hinder us from believing that the same thing may have taken place more than once. But for a man to impeach the gospel simply because he does not believe in the repeated occurrence of some incident, which no one [at least] can prove to be an impossible event, betrays mere sacrilegious vanity.

CHAPTER XXXI.-OF THE ACCOUNT GIVEN BY MATTHEW AND LUKE OF
THE OCCASION WHEN JOHN THE BAPTIST WAS IN PRISON, AND
DESPATCHED HIS DISCIPLES ON A MISSION TO THE LORD.

78. Matthew proceeds with his narrative in the following terms: "And it came to pass, when Jesus had made an end of commanding His twelve disciples, He departed thence to teach and to preach in their cities. Now, when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and said unto Him, Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" and so on, until we come to the words, "And Wisdom is justified of her children." This whole section relating to John the Baptist, touching the message which he sent to Jesus, and the tenor of the reply which those whom he despatched received, and the terms in which the Lord spoke of John after the

departure of these persons, is introduced also by Luke. The order, however, is not the same. But it is not made clear which of them gives the order of his own recollections, and which keeps by the historical succession of the things themselves.

CHAPTER XXXII.-OF THE OCCASION ON WHICH HE UPBRAIDED THE CITIES BECAUSE THEY REPENTED NOT, WHICH INCIDENT IS RECORDED BY LUKE AS WELL AS BY MATTHEW; AND OF THE QUESTION REGARDING MATTHEW'S HARMONY WITH LUKE IN THE MATTER OF THE ORDER.

179. Thereafter Matthew goes on as follows: "Then began He to upbraid the cities wherein most of His mighty works were done, because they repented not; and so on, down to where we read, "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom at the day of judgment, than for you. This section likewise is given by Luke, who reports it also as an utterance from the lips of the Lord in connection with a certain continuous discourse which He delivered. This circumstance makes it the rather appear that Luke has recorded these words in the strict consecution in which they were spoken by the Lord, while Matthew has kept by the order of his own recollections. Or if it is supposed that Matthew's words, "Then began He to upbraid the cities," must be taken in such a way as to imply that the intention was to express, by the term "then," the precise point of time at which the saying was uttered, and not to signify in a somewhat broader way the period at which many of these things were done and spoken, then I say that any one entertaining that idea may equally well believe these sentences to have been pronounced on two different occasions.

² For if it is the fact that even in one and the same evangelist some things are found which the Lord utters twice over, as is the case with this very Luke in the instance of the counsel not to take a scrip for the journey, and so with other things in like manner which we find to have been spoken by the Lord in two different places, -why should it seem strange if some other word of the Lord, which was originally uttered on two separate occasions, may happen also to be recorded by two several evangelists, each of whom gives it in the order in which it was actually spoken, and if thus the order seems to be different in the two, simply because the sentences were uttered both on the occasion noticed by the one, and on that referred to by the other?

CHAPTER XXXIII.-OF THE OCCASION ON WHICH HE CALLS THEM TO
TAKE HIS YOKE AND BURDEN UPON THEM, AND OF THE QUESTION AS
TO THE ABSENCE OF ANY DISCREPANCY BETWEEN MATTHEW AND LUKE
IN THE ORDER OF NARRATION.

80. Matthew proceeds thus: "At that time Jesus answered and said, I make my acknowledgment to Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent," and so on, down to where we read, "For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." This passage is also noticed by Luke, but only in part. For he does not give us the words, "Come unto me, all ye that labour," and the rest. It is, however, quite legitimate to suppose that all this may have been said on one occasion by the Lord, and yet that Luke has not recorded the whole of what was said on that occasion. For Matthew's phrase is, that "at that time Jesus answered and said;" by which is meant the time after His upbraiding of the cities. Luke, on the other hand, interposes some matters, although they are not many, after that upbraiding of the cities; and then he subjoins this sentence: "In that hour He rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said." Thus, too, we see that even if Matthew's expression had been, not "at that time," but "in that very hour," still what Luke inserts in the interval is so little that it would not appear an unreasonable thing to give it as all spoken in the same hour.

Chapter XXXIV.-Of the Passage in Which It is Said that the Disciples Plucked the Ears of Corn and Ate Them; And of the Question as to How Matthew, Mark, and Luke are in Harmony with Each Other with Respect to the Order of Narration There. 81. Matthew continues his history in the following terms: "At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath-day through the corn; and His disciples were an hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat;" and so forth, on to the words, "For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath-day." This is also given both by Mark and by Luke, in a way precluding any idea of antagonism. At the same time, these latter do not employ the definition "at that time." That fact, consequently, may perhaps make it the more probable that Matthew has retained the order of actual occurrence here, and that the others have kept by the order of their own recollections; unless, indeed, this phrase "at that time" is to be taken in a broader sense, that is to say, as indicating the period at which these many and various incidents took place.

Chapter XXXV.-Of the Man with the Withered Hand, Who Was Restored on the Sabbath-Day; And of the Question as to How Matthew's Narrative of This Incident Can Be Harmonized with Those of Mark and Luke, Either in the Matter of the Order of Events, or in the Report of the Words Spoken by the Lord and by the Jews. 82. Matthew continues his account thus: "And when He was departed thence, He went into their synagogue: and, behold, there was a man which had his hand withered; and so on, down to the words, "And it was restored whole, like as the other. The restoring of this man who had the withered hand is also not passed over in silence by Mark and Luke. Now, the circumstance that this day is also designated a Sabbath might possibly lead us to suppose that both the plucking of the ears of corn and the healing of this man took place on the same day, were it not that Luke has made it plain that it was on a different Sabbath that the cure of the withered hand was wrought. Accordingly, when Matthew says, "And when He was departed thence, He came into their synagogue," the words do indeed import that the said coming did not take place until after He had departed from the previously mentioned locality; but, at the same time, they leave the question undecided as to the number of days which may have elapsed between His passing from the aforesaid corn-field and His coming into their synagogue; and they express nothing as to His going there in direct and immediate succession. And thus space is offered us for getting in the narrative of Luke, who tells us that it was on another Sabbath that this man's hand was restored.

But it is possible that a difficulty may be felt in the circumstance that Matthew has told us how the people put this question to the Lord, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-day? wishing thereby to find an occasion for accusing Him; and that in reply He set before them the parable of the sheep in these terms: "What man shall there be among you that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will he not lay hold on it and lift it out? How much, then, is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days; whereas Mark and Luke rather represent the people to have had this question put to them by the Lord, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath-day, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? We solve this difficulty, however, by the supposition that the people in the first instance asked the Lord, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-day? that thereupon, knowing the thoughts of the men who were thus seeking an occasion for ac-

cusing Him, He set the man whom He had been on the point of healing in their midst, and addressed to them the interrogations which Mark and Luke mention to have been put; that, as they remained silent, He next put before them the parable of the sheep, and drew the conclusion that it was lawful to do good on the Sabbath-day;

and that, finally, when He had looked round about on them with anger, as Mark tells us, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, He said to the man, "Stretch forth thine hand." Chapter XXXVI.-Of Another Question Which Demands Our Consideration, Namely, Whether, in Passing from the Account of the Man Whose Withered Hand Was Restored, These Three Evangelists Proceed to Their Next Subjects in Such a Way as to Create No Contradictions in Regard to the Order of Their Narrations. 83. Matthew continues his narrative, connecting it in the following manner with what precedes: "But the Pharisees went out and held a council against Him, how they might destroy Him. But when Jesus knew it, He withdrew Himself from thence: and great multitudes followed Him, and He healed them all; and charged them that they should not make Him known: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Esaias, saying;" and so forth, down to where it is said, "And in His name shall the Gentiles trust." He is the only one that records these facts. The other two have advanced to other themes. Mark, it is true, seems to some extent to have kept by the historical order: for he tells us how Jesus, on discovering the malignant disposition which was entertained toward Him by the Jews, withdrew to the sea along with His disciples, and that then vast multitudes flocked to Him, and He healed great numbers of them. But, at the same time, it is not quite clear at what precise point He begins to pass to a new subject, different from what would have followed in strict succession. He leaves it uncertain whether such a transition is made at the point where he tells us how the multitudes gathered about Him (for if that was the case now, it might equally well have been the case at some other time), or at the point where He says that "He goeth up into a mountain." It is this latter circumstance that Luke also appears to notice when he says, "And it came to pass in those days, that He went out into a mountain to pray." For by the expression "in those days," he makes it plain enough that the incident referred to did not occur in immediate succession upon what precedes.

CHAPTER XXXVII.-OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE ACCOUNTS GIVEN BY
MATTHEW AND LUKE REGARDING THE DUMB AND BLIND MAN WHO WAS
POSSESSED WITH A DEVIL.

84. Matthew then goes on with his recital in the following fashion: "Then was brought unto Him one possessed with a devil, blind and dumb; and He healed him, insomuch that he both spake and saw." Luke introduces this narrative, not in the same order, but after a number of other matters. He also speaks of the man only as dumb, and not as blind in addition. But it is not to be inferred, from the mere circumstance of his silence as to some portion or other of the account, that he speaks of an entirely different person. For he has likewise recorded what followed [immediately after that cure], as it stands also in Matthew. Chapter XXXVIII.-Of the Occasion on Which It Was Said to Him that He Cast Out Devils in the Power of Beelzebub, and of the Declarations Drawn Forth from Him by that Circumstance in Regard to the Blasphemy Against the Holy Spirit, and with Respect to the Two Trees; And of the Question Whether There is Not Some Discrepancy in These Sections Between Matthew and the Other Two Evangelists, and Particularly Between Matthew and Luke.

85. Matthew proceeds with his narrative in the following term: "And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David? But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils but in Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself shall be brought to desolation;" and so on, down to the words, "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." Mark does not bring in this allegation against Jesus, that He cast out devils in [the power of] Beelzebub, in immediate sequence on the story of the dumb man; but after certain other matters, recorded by himself alone, he introduces this incident also, either because he recalled it to mind in a different connection, and so appended it there, or because he had at first made certain omissions in his history, and after noticing these, took up this order of narration again. On the other hand, Luke gives an account of these things almost in the same language as Matthew has employed. And the circumstance that Luke here designates the Spirit of God as the finger of God, does not betray any departure from a genuine identity in sense; but it rather teaches us an additional lesson, giving us to know in what manner we are to interpret the phrase "the finger of God"

wherever it occurs in the Scriptures. Moreover, with regard to other matters which are left unmentioned in this section both by Mark and by Luke, no difficulty can be raised by these. Neither can that be the case with some other circumstances which are related by them in somewhat different terms, for the sense still remains the same.

Chapter XXXIX.-Of the Question as to the Manner of Matthew's Agreement with Luke in the Accounts Which are Given of the Lord's Reply to Certain Persons Who Sought a Sign, When He Spoke of Jonas the Prophet, and of the Ninevites, and of the Queen of the South, and of the Unclean Spirit Which, When It Has Gone Out of the Man, Returns and Finds the House Garnished. 86. Matthew goes on and relates what followed thus: "Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign of thee; and so on, down to where we read, "Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation. These words are recorded also by Luke in this connection, although in a somewhat different order. For he has mentioned the fact that they sought of the Lord a sign from heaven at an earlier point in his narrative, which makes it follow immediately on his version of the miracle wrought on the dumb man. He has not, however, recorded there the reply which was given to them by the Lord. But further on, after [telling us how] the people were gathered together, he states that this answer was returned to the persons who, as he gives us to understand, were mentioned by him in those earlier verses as seeking of Him a sign from heaven. And that reply he also subjoins, only after introducing the passage regarding the woman who said to the Lord, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee. This notice of the woman, moreover, he inserts after relating the Lord's discourse concerning the unclean spirit that goes out of the man, and then returns and finds the house garnished.

In this way, then, after the notice of the woman, and after his statement of the reply which was made to the multitudes on the subject of the sign which they sought from heaven, he brings in the similitude of the prophet Jonas; and then, directly continuing the Lord's discourse, he next instances what was said concerning the Queen of the South and the Ninevites. Thus he has rather related something which Matthew has passed over in silence, than omitted any of the facts which that evangelist has narrated in this place. And furthermore, who can fail to perceive that the question as to the precise order in which these words were uttered by the Lord is a superfluous one? For this

lesson also we ought to learn, on the unimpeachable authority of the evangelists,-namely, that no offence against truth need be supposed on the part of a writer, although he may not reproduce the discourse of some speaker in the precise order in which the person from whose lips it proceeded might have given it; the fact being, that the mere item of the order, whether it be this or that, does not affect the subject-matter itself. And by his present version Luke indicates that this discourse of the Lord was of greater length than we might otherwise have supposed; and he records certain topics handled in it, which resemble those which are mentioned by Matthew in his recital of the sermon which was delivered on the mount.

So that we take these words to have been spoken twice over, to wit, on that previous occasion, and again on this one. But on the conclusion of this discourse Luke proceeds to another subject, as to which it is uncertain whether, in the account which he gives of it, he has kept by the order of actual occurrence. For he connects it in this way: "And as He spake, a certain Pharisee besought Him to dine with him. He does not say, however, "as He spake these words," but only "as He spake. For if he had said, "as He spake these words," the expression would of course have compelled us to suppose that the incidents referred to, besides being recorded by him in this order, also took place on the Lord's part in that same order. Chapter XL.-Of the Question as to Whether There is Any Discrepancy Between Matthew on the One Hand, and Mark and Luke on the Other, in Regard to the Order in Which the Notice is Given of the Occasion on Which His Mother and His Brethren Were Announced to Him.

87. Matthew then proceeds with his narrative in the following terms: "While He yet talked to the people, behold, His mother and His brethren stood without, desiring to speak to Him; and so on, down to the words, "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother. Without doubt, we ought to understand this to have occurred in immediate sequence on the preceding incidents. For he has prefaced his transition to this narrative by the words, "While He yet talked to the people; and what does this term "yet" refer to, but to the very matter of which He was speaking on that occasion? For the expression is not, "When He talked to the people, Behold, His mother and His brethren; but, "While He was yet speaking," etc. And that phraseology compels us to suppose that it was at the very time when He was still engaged in speaking of those

things which were mentioned immediately above. For Mark has also related what our Lord said after His declaration on the subject of the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. He gives it thus: "And there came His mother and His brethren," omitting certain matters which meet us in the context connected with that discourse of the Lord, and which Matthew has introduced there with greater fulness than Mark, and Luke, again, with greater fulness than Matthew.

On the other hand, Luke has not kept the historical order in the report which he offers of this incident, but has given it by anticipation, and has narrated it as he recalled it to memory, at a point antecedent to the date of its literal occurrence. But furthermore, he has brought it in in such a manner that it appears dissociated from any close connection either with what precedes it or with what follows it. For, after reporting certain of the Lord's parables, he has introduced his notice of what took place with His mother and His brethren in the following manner: "Then came to Him His mother and His brethren, and could not come at Him for the press. Thus he has not explained at what precise time it was that they came to Him. And again, when he passes off from this subject, he proceeds in these terms: "Now it came to pass on one of the days, that He went into a ship with His disciples. And certainly, when he employs this expression, "it came to pass on one of the days," he indicates clearly enough that we are under no necessity of supposing that the day meant was the very day on which this incident took place, or the one following in immediate succession.

Consequently, neither in the matter of the Lord's words, nor in that of the historical order of the occurrences related, does Matthew's account of the incident which occurred in connection with the mother and the brethren of the Lord, exhibit any want of harmony with the versions given of the same by the other two evangelists. Chapter XLI.-Of the Words Which Were Spoken Out of the Ship on the Subject of the Sower, Whose Seed, as He Sowed It, Fell Partly on the Wayside, Etc.; And Concerning the Man Who Had Tares Sowed Over and Above His Wheat; And Concerning the Grain of Mustard Seed and the Leaven; As Also of What He Said in the House Regarding the Treasure Hid in the Field, and the Pearl, and the Net Cast into the Sea, and the Man that Brings Out of His Treasure Things New and Old; And of the Method in Which Matthew's Harmony with Mark and Luke is Proved

Both with Respect to the Things Which They Have Reported in Common with Him, and in the Matter of the Order of Narration.

88. Matthew continues thus: "In that day went Jesus out of the house, and sat by the seaside: and great multitudes were gathered together unto Him, so that He went into a ship and sat, and the whole multitude stood on the shore. And He spake many things unto them in parables, saying; and so on, down to the words, "Therefore every scribe which is instructed in the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old. That the things narrated in this passage took place immediately after the incident touching the mother and the brethren of the Lord, and that Matthew has also retained that historical order in his version. of these events, is indicated by the circumstance that, in passing from the one subject to the other, he has expressed the connection by this mode of speech: "In that day went Jesus out of the house, and sat by the sea-side; and greatmultitudes were gathered together unto Him. For by adopting this phrase, "in that day" (unless perchance the word "day," in accordance with a use and wont of the Scriptures, may signify simply "time"), he intimates clearly enough either that the thing now related took place in immediate succession on what precedes, or that much at least could not have intervened. This inference is confirmed by the fact that Mark keeps by the same order.

Luke, on the other hand, after his account of what happened with the mother and the brethren of the Lord, passes to a different subject. But at the same time, in making that transition, he does not institute any such connection as bears the appearance of a want of consistency with this order. Consequently, in all those passages in which Mark and Luke have reported in common with Matthew the words which were spoken by the Lord, there is no questioning their harmony with one another. Moreover, the sections which are given by Matthew only are even much more beyond the range of controversy. And in the matter of the order of narration, although it is presented somewhat differently by the various evangelists, according as they have proceeded severally along the line of historical succession, or along that of the succession of recollection, I see as little reason for alleging any discrepancy of statement or any contradiction between any of the writers.

Chapter XLII.-Of His Coming into His Own Country, and of the Astonishment of the People at His Doctrine, as They Looked with Contempt

Upon His Lineage; Of Matthew's Harmony with Mark and Luke in This Section; And in Particular, of the Question Whether the Order of Narration Which is Presented by the First of These Evangelists Does Not Exhibit Some Want of Consistency with that of the Other Two. 89. Matthew thence proceeds as follows: "And it came to pass that, when Jesus had finished these parables, He departed thence: and when He was come into His own country, He taught them in their synagogues;" and so on, down to the words, "And He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief." Thus he passes from the above discourse containing the parables, on to this passage, in such a way as not to make it absolutely necessary for us to take the one to have followed in immediate historical succession upon the other. All the more may we suppose this to be the case, when we see how Mark passes on from these parables to a subject which is not identical with Matthew's directly succeeding theme, but quite different from that, and agreeing rather with what Luke introduces; and how he has constructed his narrative in such a manner as to make the balance of credibility rest on the side of the supposition, that what followed in immediate historical sequence was rather the occurrences which these two latter evangelists both insert in near connection [with the parables],-namely, the incidents of the ship in which Jesus was asleep, and the miracle performed in the expulsion of the devils in the country of the Gerasenes, -two events which Matthew has already recalled and introduced at an earlier stage of his record. At present, therefore, we have to consider whether [Matthew's report of] what the Lord spoke, and what was said to Him in His own country, is in concord with the accounts given by the other two, namely, Mark and Luke. For, in widely different and dissimilar sections of his history, John mentions words, either spoken to the Lord or spoken by Him, which resemble those recorded in this passage by the other three evangelists.

90. Now Mark, indeed, gives this passage in terms almost precisely identical with those which meet us in Matthew; with the one exception, that what he says the Lord was called by His fellow-townsmen is, "the carpenter, and the son of Mary," and not, as Matthew tells us, the "carpenter's son. Neither is there anything to marvel at in this, since He might quite fairly have have been designated by both these names. For in taking Him to be the son of a carpenter, they naturally also took Him to be a carpenter. Luke, on the other hand, sets forth the same incident on a wider scale, and records a

variety of other matters which took place in that connection. And this account he brings in at a point not long subsequent to His baptism and temptation, thus unquestionably introducing by anticipation what really happened only after the occurrence of a number of intervening circumstances. In this, therefore, every one may see an illustration of a principle of prime consequence in relation to this most weighty question concerning the harmony of the evangelists, which we have undertaken to solve by the help of God, -the principle, namely, that it is not by mere ignorance that these writers have been led to make certain omissions, and that it is as little through simple ignorance of the actual historical order of events that they have [at times] preferred to keep by the order in which these events were recalled to their own memory.

The correctness of this principle may be gathered most clearly from the fact that, at a point antecedent to any account given by him of anything done by the Lord at Capharnaum, Luke has anticipated the literal date, and has inserted this passage which we have at present under consideration, and in which we are told how His fellow-citizens at once were astonished at the might of the authority which was in Him, and expressed their contempt for the meanness of His family. For he tells us that He addressed them in these terms: "Ye will surely say unto me, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done in Capharnaum, do also here in thy country; while, so far as the narrative of this same Luke is concerned, we have not yet read of Him as having done anything at Capharnaum. Furthermore, as it will not take up much time, and as, besides, it is both a very simple and a highly needful matter to do so, we insert here the whole context, showing the subject from which and the method in which the writer has come to give the contents of this section. After his statement regarding the Lord's baptism and temptation, he proceeds in these terms: "And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from Him for a season. And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: and there went out a fame of Him through all the region round about. And He taught in their synagogues, and was magnified of all.

And He came to Nazareth, where He had been brought up: and, as his custom was, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto Him the book of the prophet Esaias: and when He had opened the book, He found the place where it was writ-

ten, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me. He hath sent me to preach the gospel to the poor, to proclaim deliverance to the captives, and sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the accepted year of the Lord, and the day of retribution. And when He had closed the book, He gave it again to the minister, and sat down: and the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on Him. And He began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears. And all bare Him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth. And they said, Is not this Joseph's son? And He said unto them, Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done in Capharnaum, do also here in thy country. And so he continues with the rest, until this entire section in his narrative is gone over.

What, therefore, can be more manifest, than that he has knowingly introduced this notice at a point antecedent to its historical date, seeing it admits of no question that he knows and refers to certain mighty deeds done by Him before this period in Capharnaum, which, at the same time, he is aware he has not as yet narrated in detail? For certainly he has not made such an advance with his history from his notice of the Lord's baptism, as that he should be supposed to have forgotten the fact that up to this point he has not mentioned any of the things which took place in Capharnaum; the truth being, that he has just begun here, after the baptism, to give us his narrative concerning the Lord personally. Chapter XLIII.-Of the Mutual Consistency of the Accounts Which are Given by Matthew, Mark, and Luke of What Was Said by Herod on Hearing About the Wonderful Works of the Lord, and of Their Concord in Regard to the Order of Narration.

91. Matthew continues: "At that time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus, and said unto his servants, This is John the Baptist: he is risen from the dead; and therefore mighty works do show forth themselves in him. Mark gives the same passage, and in the same manner, but not in the same order. For, after relating how the Lord sent forth the disciples with the charge to take nothing with them on the journey save a staff only, and after bringing to its close so much of the discourse which was then delivered as has been recorded by him, he has subjoined this section. He does not, however, connect it in such a way as to compel us to suppose that what it narrates took place actually in immediate sequence on what precedes it in the history. And

in this, indeed, Matthew is at one with him. For Matthew's expression is, "at that time," not "on that day," or "at that hour. Only there is this difference between them, that Mark refers not to Herod himself as the utterer of the words in question, but to the people, his statement being this: "They said that John the Baptist was risen from the dead; whereas Matthew makes Herod himself the speaker, the phrase being: "He said unto his servants.

Luke, again, keeping the same order of narration as Mark, and introducing it also indeed, like Mark, in no such way as to compel us to suppose that his order must have been the order of actual occurrence, presents his version of the same passage in the following terms: "Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done by Him: and he was perplexed, because that it was said of some, that John was risen from the dead; and of some, that Elias had appeared; and of others, that one of the old prophets was risen again. And Herod said, John have I beheaded: but who is this of whom I hear such things? And he desired to see Him. In these words Luke also attests Mark's statement, at least, so far as concerns the affirmation that it was not Herod himself, but other parties, who said that John was risen from the dead. But as regards his mentioning how Herod was perplexed, and his bringing in thereafter those words of the same prince: "John have I beheaded: but who is this of whom I hear such things? we must either understand that after the said perplexity he became persuaded in his own mind of the truth of what was asserted by others, when he spoke to his servants, in accordance with the version given by Matthew, which runs thus: "And he said to his servants, This is John the Baptist: he is risen from the dead; and therefore mighty works do show forth themselves in him;

or we must suppose that these words were uttered in a manner betraying that he was still in a state of perplexity. For had he said, "Can this be John the Baptist? or, "Can it chance that this is John the Baptist? there would have been no need of saying anything about a mode of utterance by which he might have revealed his dubiety and perplexity. But seeing that these forms of expression are not before us, his words may be taken to have been pronounced in either of two ways: so that we may either suppose him to have been convinced by what was said by others, and so to have spoken the words in question with a real belief [in John's reappearance]; or we may imagine him to have been still in that state of hesitancy of which mention is made by Luke. Our explanation is favoured by the fact that Mark, who had already

told us how it was by others that the statement was made as to John having risen from the dead, does not fail to let us know also that in the end Herod himself spoke to this effect: "It is John whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead. For these words may also be taken to have been pronounced in either of two ways, -namely, as the utterances either of one corroborating a fact, or of one in doubt.

Moreover, while Luke passes on to a new subject after the notice which he gives of this incident, those other two, Matthew and Mark, take occasion to tell us at this point in what way John was put to death by Herod.

CHAPTER XLIV.-OF THE ORDER IN WHICH THE ACCOUNTS OF JOHN'S IMPRISONMENT AND DEATH ARE GIVEN BY THESE THREE EVANGELISTS.

192. Matthew then proceeds with his narrative in the following terms: "For Herod laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother's wife; and so on, down to the words, "And his disciples came and took up the body, and buried it, and went and told Jesus. Mark gives this narrative in similar terms. Luke, on the other hand, does not relate it in the same succession, but introduces it in connection with his statement of the baptism wherewith the Lord was baptized. Hence we are to understand him to have acted by anticipation here, and to have taken the opportunity of recording at this point an event which took place actually a considerable period later. For he has first reported those words which John spake with regard to the Lord -namely, that "His fan is in His hand, and that He will thoroughly purge His floor, and will gather the wheat into His garner; but the chaff He will burn up with fire unquenchable; and immediately thereafter he has appended his statement of an incident which the evangelist John demonstrates not to have taken place in direct historical sequence. For this latter writer mentions that, after Jesus had been baptized, He went into Galilee at the period when He turned the water into wine; and that, after a sojourn of a few days in Capharnaum, He left that district and returned to the land of Judaea, and there baptized a multitude about the Jordan, previous to the time when John was imprisoned.

2 Now what reader, unless he were all the better versed in these writings, would not take it to be implied here that it was after the utterance of the words with regard to the fan and the purged floor that Herod became incensed against John, and cast him into prison? Yet, that the incident referred to here did not, as matter of fact, occur in the order in which it is here recor-

ded, we have already shown elsewhere; and, indeed, Luke himself puts the proof into our hands. For if [he had meant that] John's incarceration took place immediately after the utterance of those words, then what are we to make of the fact that in Luke's own narrative the baptism of Jesus is introduced subsequently to his notice of the imprisonment of John? Consequently it is manifest that, recalling the circumstance in connection with the present occasion, he has brought it in here by anticipation, and has thus inserted it in his history at a point antecedent to a number of incidents, of which it was his purpose to leave us some record, and which, in point of time, were antecedent to this mishap that befell John. But it is as little the case that the other two evangelists, Matthew and Mark, have placed the fact of John's imprisonment in that position in their narratives which, as is apparent also from their own writings, belonged to it in the actual order of events.

3 For they, too, have told us how it was on John's being cast into prison that the Lord went into Galilee; and then, after [relating] a number of things which He did in Galilee, they come to Herod's admonition or doubt as to the rising again from the dead of that John whom he beheaded; and in connection with this latter occasion, they give us the story of all that occurred in the matter of John's incarceration and death.

CHAPTER XLV.-OF THE ORDER AND THE METHOD IN WHICH ALL THE
FOUR EVANGELISTS COME TO THE NARRATION OF THE MIRACLE OF
THE FIVE LOAVES.

93. After stating how the report of John's death was brought to Christ, Matthew continues his account, and introduces it in the following connection: "When Jesus heard of it, He departed thence by ship into a desert place apart: and when the people had heard thereof, they followed Him on foot out of the cities. And He went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and He healed their sick. He mentions, therefore, that this took place immediately after John had suffered. Consequently it was after this that those things took place which have been previously recorded-namely, the circumstances which alarmed Herod, and induced him to say, "John have I beheaded. For it must surely I be understood that these incidents occurred subsequently which report carried to the ears of Herod, so that he became anxious, and was in perplexity as to who that person possibly could be of whom he heard things so remarkable, when he had himself put John to death. Mark, again, after relating how John suffered,

mentions that the disciples who had been sent forth returned to Jesus, and told Him all that they had done and taught; and that the Lord (a fact which he alone records) directed them to rest for a little while in a desert place, and that He went on board a vessel with them, and departed; and that the crowds of people, when they perceived that movement, went before them to that place; and that the Lord had compassion on them, and taught them many things;

and that, when the hour was now advancing, it came to pass that all who were present were made to eat of the five loaves and the two fishes. This miracle has been recorded by all the four evangelists. For in like manner, Luke, who has given an account of the death of John at a much earlier stage in his narrative, in connection with the occasion of which we have spoken, in the present context tells us first of Herod's perplexity as to who the Lord could be, and immediately thereafter appends statements to the same effect with those in Mark,-namely, that the apostles returned to Him, and reported to Him all that they had done; and that then He took them with Him and departed into a desert place, and that the multitudes followed Him thither, and that He spake to them concerning the kingdom of God, and restored those who stood in need of healing. Then, too, he mentions that, when the day was declining, the miracle of the five loaves was wrought.

94. But John, again, who differs greatly from those three in this respect, that he deals more with the discourses which the Lord delivered than with the works which He so marvellously wrought, after recording how He left Judaea and departed the second time into Galilee, which departure is understood to have taken place at the time to which the other evangelists also refer when they tell us that on John's imprisonment He went into Galilee,-after recording this, I say, John inserts in the immediate context of his narrative the considerable discourse which He spake as He was passing through Samaria, on the occasion of His meeting with the Samaritan woman whom He found at the well; and then he states that two days after this He departed thence and went into Galilee, and that thereupon He came to Cana of Galilee, where He had turned the water into wine, and that there He healed the son of a certain nobleman. But as to other things which the rest have told us He did and said in Galilee, John is silent. At the same time, however, he mentions something which the others have left unnoticed,-namely, the fact that He went up to Jerusalem on the day of the feast, and there wrought the

miracle on the man who had the infirmity of thirty-eight years standing, and who found no one by whose help he might be carried down to the pool in which people afflicted with various diseases were healed.

In connection with this, John also relates how He spake many things on that occasion. He tells us, further, that after these events He departed across the sea of Galilee, which is also the sea of Tiberias, and that a great multitude followed Him; that thereupon He went away to a mountain, and there sat with His disciples,—the passover, a feast of the Jews, being then nigh; that then, on lifting up His eyes and seeing a very great company, He fed them with the five loaves and the two fishes; which notice is given us also by the other evangelists. And this makes it certain that he has passed by those incidents which form the course along which these others have come to introduce the notice of this miracle into their narratives. Nevertheless, while different methods of narration, as it appears, are prosecuted, and while the first three evangelists have thus left unnoticed certain matters which the fourth has recorded, we see how those three, on the one hand, who have been keeping nearly the same course, have found a direct meeting-point with each other at this miracle of the five loaves;

and how this fourth writer, on the other hand, who is conversant above all with the profound teachings of the Lord's discourses, in relating some other matters on which the rest are silent, has sped round in a certain method upon their track, and, while about to soar off from their pathway after a brief space again into the region of loftier subjects, has found a meeting-point with them in the view of presenting this narrative of the miracle of the five loaves, which is common to them all.

CHAPTER XLVI.—OF THE QUESTION AS TO HOW THE FOUR EVANGELISTS
HARMONIZE WITH EACH OTHER ON THIS SAME SUBJECT OF THE
MIRACLE OF THE FIVE LOAVES.

95. Matthew then proceeds and carries on his narrative in due consecution to the said incident connected with the five loaves in the following manner: "And when it was evening, His disciples came to Him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past; send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves victuals. But Jesus said unto them, They need not depart; give ye them to eat; and so forth, down to where we read, "And the number of those who ate was five thousand men, besides women and children. This miracle, therefore, which all the four evangelists record,

and in which they are supposed to betray certain discrepancies with each other, must be examined and subjected to discussion, in order that we may also learn from this instance some rules which will be applicable to all other similar cases in the form of principles regulating modes of statement in which, however diverse they may be, the same sense is nevertheless retained, and the same veracity in the expression of matters of fact is preserved. And, indeed, this investigation ought to begin not with Matthew, although that would be in accordance with the order in which the evangelists stand, but rather with John, by whom the narrative in question is told with such particularity as to record even the names of the disciples with whom the Lord conversed on this subject. For he gives the history in the following terms:

"When Jesus then lifted up His eyes, and saw a very great company come unto Him, He saith unto Philip, Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat? And this He said to prove him; for He Himself knew what He would do. Philip answered Him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little. One of His disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto Him, There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two fishes; but what are they among so many? Jesus said therefore, Make the men sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand. Jesus then took the loaves; and when He had given thanks, He distributed to the disciples, and the disciples to them that were set down; and likewise of the fishes as much as they would. And when they were filled, He said unto His disciples, Gather up the fragments that remain, that they be not lost. Therefore they gathered them together, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above unto them that had eaten."

96. The inquiry which we have here to handle does not concern itself with a statement given by this evangelist, in which he specifies the kind of loaves; for he has not omitted to mention, what has been omitted by the others, that they were barley loaves. Neither does the question deal with what he has left unnoticed, -namely, the fact that, in addition to the five thousand men, there were also women and children, as Matthew tells us. And it ought now by all means to be a settled matter, and one kept regularly in view in all such investigations, that no one should find any difficulty in the there circumstance that something which is unrecorded by one writer is related by another. But the question here is as to how the several matters narrated by

these writers may be [shown to be] all true, so that the one of them, in giving his own peculiar version, does not put out of court the account offered by the other.

For if the Lord, according to the narrative of John, on seeing the multitudes before Him, asked Philip, with the view of proving him, whence bread might be got to be given to them, a difficulty may be raised as to the truth of the statement which is made by the others, -namely, that the disciples first said to the Lord that He should send the multitudes away, in order that they might go and purchase food for themselves in the neighbouring localities, and that He made this reply to them, according to Matthew: "They need not depart; give ye them to eat. With this last Mark and Luke also agree, only that they leave out the words, "They need not depart. We are to suppose, therefore, that after these words the Lord looked at the multitude, and spoke to Philip in the terms which John records, but which those others have omitted. Then the reply which, according to John, was made by Philip, is mentioned by Mark as having been given by the disciples, -the intention being, that we should understand Philip to have returned this answer as the mouthpiece of the rest; although they may also have put the plural number in place of the singular, according to very frequent usage. The words here actually ascribed to Philip -namely, "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little" -have their counterpart in this version by Mark, "Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat?"

The expression, again, which the same Mark relates to have been used by the Lord, namely, "How many loaves have ye?" has been passed by without notice by the rest. On the other hand, the statement occurring in John, to the effect that Andrew made the suggestion about the five loaves and the two fishes, appears in the others, who use here the plural number instead of the singular, as a notice referring the suggestion to the disciples generally. And, indeed, Luke has coupled Philip's reply together with Andrew's answer in one sentence. For when he says, "We have no more but five loaves and two fishes," he reports Andrew's response; but when he adds, "except we should go and buy meat for all this people," he seems to carry us back to Philip's reply, only that he has left unnoticed the "two hundred pennyworth. At the same time, that [sentence about the going and buying meat] may also be understood to be implied in Andrew's own words. For after saying, "There is a lad

here which hath five barley loaves and two fishes," he likewise subjoined, "But what are they among so many? And this last clause really means the same as the expression in question, namely, "except we should go and buy meat for all this people."

97. From all this variety of statement which is found in connection with a genuine harmony in regard to the matters of fact and the ideas conveyed, it becomes sufficiently clear that we have the wholesome lesson inculcated upon us, that what we have to look to in studying a person's words is nothing else than the intention of the speakers; in setting forth which intention all truthful narrators ought to take the utmost pains when they record anything, whether it may relate to man, or to angels, or to God. For the subjects' mind and intention admit of being expressed in words which should leave no appearance of any discrepancies as regards the matter of fact. 98. In this connection, it is true, we ought not to omit to direct the reader's attention to certain other matters which may turn out to be of a kindred nature with those already considered. One of these is found in the circumstance that Luke has stated that they were ordered to sit down by fifties, whereas Mark's version is that it was by hundreds and by fifties. This difference, however, creates no real difficulty. The truth is, that the one has reported simply a part, and the other has given the whole. For the evangelist who has introduced the notice of the hundreds as well as the fifties has just mentioned something which the other has left unmentioned. But there is no contradiction between them on that account. If, indeed, the one had noticed only the fifties, and the other only the hundreds, they might certainly have seemed to be in some antagonism with each other, and it might not have been easy to make it plain that both instructions were actually uttered, although only the one has been specified by the former writer, and the other by the latter. And yet, even in such a case, who will not acknowledge that when the matter was subjected to more careful consideration, the solution should have been discovered? This I have instanced now for this reason, that matters of that kind do often present themselves, which, while they really contain no discrepancies, appear to do so to persons who pay insufficient attention to them, and pronounce upon them inconsiderately.

Chapter XLVII.-Of His Walking Upon the Water, and of the Questions Regarding the Harmony of the Evangelists Who Have Narrated that Scene, and Regarding the Manner in Which They Pass Off from the Section Re-

cording the Occasion on Which He Fed the Multitudes with the Five Loaves, 99. Matthew goes on with his account in the following terms: "And when He had sent the multitudes away, He went up into a mountain apart to pray: and when the evening was come, He was there alone. But the ship was now in the midst of the sea, tossed with waves: for the wind was contrary. And in the fourth watch of the night He came unto them, walking on the sea. And when the disciples saw Him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and so on, down to the words, "They came and worshipped Him, saying, Of a truth Thou art the Son of God. In like manner, Mark, after narrating the miracle of the five loaves, gives his account of this same incident in the following terms: "And when it was late, the ship was in the midst of the sea, and He alone on the land. And He saw them toiling in rowing: for the wind was contrary to them," and so on. This is similar to Matthew's version, except that nothing is said as to Peter's walking upon the waters. But here we must see to it, that no difficulty be found in what Mark has stated regarding the Lord, namely, that, when He walked upon the waters, He would also have passed by them.

For in what way could they have understood this, were it not that He was really proceeding in a different direction from them, as if minded to pass those persons by like strangers, who were so far from recognizing Him that they took Him to be a spirit? Who, however, is so obtuse as not to perceive that this bears a mystical significance? At the same time, too, He came to the help of the men in their perturbation and outcry, and said to them, "Be of good cheer, it is I; be not afraid. What is the explanation, therefore, of His wish to pass by those persons whom nevertheless He thus encouraged when they were in terror, but that that intention to pass them by was made to serve the purpose of drawing forth those cries to which it was meet to bear succour? 100. Furthermore, John still tarries for a little space with these others. For, after his recital of the miracle of the five loaves, he also gives us some account of the vessel that laboured, and of the Lord's act in walking upon the sea. This notice he connects with his preceding narrative in the following manner: "When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take Him by force and make Him a king, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone. And when it became late, His disciples went down unto the sea; and when they had entered into a ship, they came over the sea to Capharnaum: and it was now dark, and Jesus was not come to them. And the

sea arose by reason of a great wind that blew," and so on. In this there cannot appear to be anything contrary to the records preserved in the other Gospels, unless it be the circumstance that Matthew tells us how, when the multitudes were sent away, He went up into a mountain, in order that there He might pray alone; while John states that He was on a mountain with those same multitudes whom He fed with the five loaves.

But seeing that John also informs us how He departed into a mountain after the said miracle, to preclude His being taken possession of by the multitudes, who wished to make Him a king, it is surely evident that they had come down from the mountain to more level ground when those loaves were provided for the crowds. And consequently there is no contradiction between the statements made by Matthew and John as to His going up again to the mountain. The only difference is, that Matthew uses the phrase "He went up," while John's term is "He departed. And there would be an antagonism between these two, only if in departing He had not gone up. Nor, again, is any want of harmony betrayed by the fact that Matthew's words are, "He went up into a mountain apart to pray; whereas John puts it thus: "When He perceived that they would come to make Him a king, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone. Surely the matter of the departure is in no way a thing antagonistic to the matter of prayer. For, indeed, the Lord, who in His own person transformed the body of our humiliation in order that He might make it like unto the body of His own glory, hereby taught us also the truth that the matter of departure should be to us in like manner grave matter for prayer.

Neither, again, is there any defect of consistency proved by the circumstance that Matthew has told us first how He commanded His disciples to embark in the little ship, and to go before Him unto the other side of the lake until He sent the multitudes away, and then informs us that, after the multitudes were sent away, He Himself went up into a mountain alone to pray; while John mentions first that He departed unto a mountain alone, and then proceeds thus: "And when it became late, His disciples came down unto the sea; and when they had entered into a ship," etc. For who will not perceive that, in recapitulating the facts, John has spoken of something as actually done at a later point by the disciples, which Jesus had already charged them to do before His own departure unto the mountain; just as it is a familiar procedure in discourse, to revert in some fashion or other to any

matter which otherwise would have been passed over But inasmuch as it may not be specifically noted that a reversion, especially when done briefly and instantaneously, is made to something omitted, the auditors are sometimes led to suppose that the occurrence which is mentioned at the later stage also took place literally at the later period.

In this way the evangelist's statement really is, that to those persons whom he had described as embarking in the ship and coming across the sea to Capharnaum, the Lord came, walking toward them upon the waters, as they were toiling in the deep; which approach of the Lord of course took place at the earlier point, during the said voyage in which they were making their way to Capharnaum. 101. On the other hand, Luke, after the record of the miracle of the five loaves, passes to another subject, and diverges from this order of narration. For he makes no mention of that little ship, and of the Lord's pathway over the waters. But after the statement conveyed in these words, "And they did all eat, and were filled, and there was taken up of fragments that remained to them twelve baskets," he has subjoined the following notice: "And it came to pass, as He was alone praying, His disciples were with Him; and He asked them, saying, Who say the people that I am? Thus he relates in this succession something new, which is not given by those three who have left us the account of the manner in which the Lord walked upon the waters, and came to the disciples when they were on the voyage. It ought not, however, on this account, to be supposed that it was on that same mountain to which Matthew has told us He went up in order to pray alone, that He said to His disciples, "Who say the people that I am? For Luke, too, seems to harmonize with Matthew in this, because his words are, "as He was alone praying; while Matthew's were, "He went up unto a mountain alone to pray.

But it must by all means be held to have been on a different occasion that He put this question, since [it is said here, both that] He prayed alone, and [that] the disciples were with Him. Thus Luke, indeed, has mentioned only the fact of His being alone, but has said nothing of His being without His disciples, as is the case with Matthew and John, since [according to these latter] they left Him in order to go before Him to the other side of the sea. For with unmistakeable plainness Luke has added the statement that "His disciples also were with Him. Consequently, in saying that He was alone, he meant his statement to refer to the multitudes, who did not abide with Him.

Chapter XLVIII.-Of the Absence of Any Discrepancy Between Matthew and Mark on the One Hand, and John on the Other, in the Accounts Which the Three Give Together of What Took Place After the Other Side of the Lake Was Reached.

102. Matthew proceeds as follows: "And when they were gone over, they came into the land of Genesar. And when the men of that place had knowledge of Him, they sent out unto all that country round about, and brought unto Him all that were diseased, and besought Him that they might only touch the hem of His garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole. Then came to Him scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem, saying, Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread," and so on, down to the words, "But to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man. This is also related by Mark, in a way which precludes the raising of any question about discrepancies. For anything expressed here by the one in a form differing from that used by the other, involves at least no departure from identity in sense. John, on the other hand, fixing his attention, as his wont is, upon the Lord's discourses, passes on from the notice of the ship, which the Lord reached by walking upon the waters, to what took place after they disembarked upon the land, and mentions that He took occasion from the eating of the bread to deliver many lessons, dealing pre-eminently with divine things. After this address, too, his narrative is again borne on to one subject after another, in a sublime strain.

At the same time, this transition which he thus makes to different themes does not involve any real want of harmony, although he exhibits certain divergencies from these others, with the order of events presented by the rest of the evangelists. For what is there to hinder us from supposing at once that those persons, whose story is given by Matthew and Mark, were healed by the Lord, and that He delivered this discourse which John recounts to the people who followed Him across the sea? Such a supposition is made all the more reasonable by the fact that Capharnaum, to which place they are said, according to John, to have crossed, is near the take of Genesar; and that, again, is the district into which they came, according to Matthew, on landing.

CHAPTER XLIX.-OF THE WOMAN OF CANAAN WHO SAID, "YET THE DOGS
EAT OF THE CRUMBS WHICH FALL FROM THEIR MASTERS' TABLES,"
AND OF THE HARMONY BETWEEN THE ACCOUNT GIVEN BY MATTHEW
AND THAT BY LUKE.

1103. Matthew, accordingly, proceeds with his narrative, after the notice of that discourse which the Lord delivered in the presence of the Pharisees on the subject of the unwashed hands. Preserving also the order of the succeeding events, as far as it is indicated by the transitions from the one to the other, he introduces this account into the context in the following manner: "And Jesus went thence, and departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto Him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, Thou son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. But He answered her not a word," and so on, down to the words, "O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour. This story of the woman of Canaan is recorded also by Mark, who keeps the same order of events, and gives no occasion to raise any question as to a want of harmony, unless it be found in the circumstance that he tells us how the Lord was in the house at the time when the said woman came to Him with the petition on behalf of her daughter. Now we might readily suppose that Matthew has simply omitted mention of the house, while nevertheless relating the same occurrence.

2 But inasmuch as he states that the disciples made the suggestion to Him in these terms, "Send her away, for she crieth after us," he seems to imply distinctly that the woman gave utterance to these cries of entreaty behind the Lord as He walked on. In what sense, then, could it have been "in the house," unless we are to take Mark to have intimated the fact, that she had gone into the place where Jesus then was, when he mentioned at the beginning of the narrative that He was in the house? But when Matthew says that "He answered her not a word," he has given us also to understand what neither of the two evangelists has related explicitly,-namely, the fact that during that silence which He maintained Jesus went out of the house. And in this manner all the other particulars are brought into a connection which from this point onwards presents no kind of appearance of discrepancy. For as to what Mark records with respect to the answer which the Lord gave her, to the effect that it was not meet to take the children's bread and cast it unto the

dogs, that, reply was returned only after the interposition of certain sayings which Matthew has not left unrecorded.

³ That is to say, [we are to suppose that] there came in first the request which the disciples addressed to Him in regard to the woman's case, and the answer He gave them, to the effect that He was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel; that next there was her own approach, or, in other words, her coming after Him, and worshipping Him, saying, "Lord, help me; and that then, after all these incidents, those words were spoken which have been recorded by both the evangelists.

CHAPTER L.-OF THE OCCASION ON WHICH HE FED THE MULTITUDES
WITH THE SEVEN LOAVES, AND OF THE QUESTION AS TO THE HARMONY
BETWEEN MATTHEW AND MARK IN THEIR ACCOUNTS OF THAT
MIRACLE.

104. Matthew proceeds with his narrative in the following terms: "And when Jesus had departed from thence, He came nigh unto the sea of Galilee; and went up into a mountain, and sat down there. And great multitudes came unto Him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet, and He healed them; in-somuch that the multitudes wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk, and the blind to see: and they glorified the God of Israel. Then Jesus called His disciples unto Him, and said, I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days, and have nothing to eat," and so on, down to the words, "And they that did eat were four thousand men, besides women and children." This other miracle of the seven loaves and the few little fishes is recorded also by Mark, and that too in almost the same order; the exception being that he inserts before it a narrative given by no other, -namely, that relating to the deaf man whose ears the Lord opened, when He spat and said, "Effeta," that is, Be opened.

105. In the case of this miracle of the seven loaves, it is certainly not a superfluous task to call attention to the fact that these two evangelists, Matthew and Mark, have thus introduced it into their narrative. For if one of them had recorded this miracle, who at the same time had taken no notice of the instance of the five loaves, he would have been judged to stand opposed to the rest. For in such circumstances, who would not have supposed that there was only the one miracle wrought in actual fact, and that an incom-

plete and unveracious version of it had been given by the writer referred to, or by the others, or by all of them together; so [that we must have imagined] either that the one evangelist, by a mistake on his own part, had been led to mention seven loaves instead of five; or that the other two, whether as having both presented an incorrect statement, or as having been misled through a slip of memory, had put the number five for the number seven. In like manner, it might have been supposed that there was a contradiction between the twelve baskets and the seven baskets, and again, between the five thousand and the four thousand, expressing the numbers of those who were fed.

But now, since those evangelists who have given us the account of the miracle of the seven loaves have also not failed to mention the other miracle of the five loaves, no difficulty can be felt by any one, and all can see that both works were really wrought. This, accordingly, we have instanced, in order that, if in any other passage we come upon some similar deed of the Lord's, which, as told by one evangelist, seems so utterly contrary to the version of it given by another that no method of solving the difficulty can possibly be found, we may understand the explanation to be simply this, that both incidents really took place, and that they were recorded separately by the two several writers. This is precisely what we have already recommended to attention in the matter of the seating of the multitudes by hundreds and by fifties. For were it not for the circumstance that both these numbers are found noted by the one historian, we might have supposed that the different writers had made contradictory statements.

Chapter LI.-Of Matthew's Declaration That, on Leaving These Parts, He Came into the Coasts of Magedan; And of the Question as to His Agreement with Mark in that Intimation, as Well as in the Notice of the Saying About Jonah, Which Was Returned Again as an Answer to Those Who Sought a Sign. 106. Matthew continues as follows: "And He sent away the multitude, and took ship, and came into the coasts of Magedan;" and so on, down to the words, "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it but the sign of the prophet Jonas." This has already been recorded in another connection by the same Matthew. Hence again and again we must hold by the position that the Lord spake the same words on repeated occasions; so that when any completely irreconcilable difference appears between statements of His utterances, we are to understand the words to have been spoken twice over. In this case, indeed, Mark also

keeps the same order; and after his account of the miracle of the seven loaves, subjoins the same intimation as is given us in Matthew, only with this difference, that Matthew's expression for the locality is not Dalmanutha, as is read in certain codices, but Magedan. There is no reason, however, for questioning the fact that it is the same place that is intended under both names. For most codices, even of Mark's Gospel, give no other reading than that of Magedan. Neither should any difficulty be felt in the fact that Mark does not say, as Matthew does, that in the answer which the Lord returned to those who sought after a sign, He referred to Jonah, but mentions simply that He replied in these terms: "There shall no sign be given unto it." For we are given to understand what kind of sign they asked-namely, one from heaven. And he has simply omitted to specify the words which Matthew has introduced regarding Jonas.

CHAPTER LII.-OF MATTHEW'S AGREEMENT WITH MARK IN THE
STATEMENT ABOUT THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES, AS REGARDS BOTH
THE SUBJECT ITSELF AND THE ORDER OF NARRATIVE.

107. Matthew proceeds: "And He left them, and departed. And when His disciples were come to the other side, they forgot to take bread. Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed, and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees;" and so forth, down to where we read, "Then understood they that He bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." These words are recorded also by Mark, and that likewise in the same order.

CHAPTER LIII.-OF THE OCCASION ON WHICH HE ASKED THE DISCIPLES
WHOM MEN SAID THAT HE WAS; AND OF THE QUESTION WHETHER, WITH
REGARD EITHER TO THE SUBJECT-MATTER OR THE ORDER, THERE
ARE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE.

108. Matthew continues thus: "And Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi; and He asked His disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am? And they said, Some say that Thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets;" and so on, down to the words, "And whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Mark relates this nearly in the same order. But he has brought in before it a narrative which is given by him alone, -namely, that regarding the giving of sight to that blind man who said to the Lord, "I see men as trees walking." Luke, again, also records this incident, inserting it after his

account of the miracle of the five loaves; and, as we have already shown above, the order of recollection which is followed in his case is not antagonistic to the order adopted by these others. Some difficulty, however, may be imagined in the circumstance that Luke's representation bears that the Lord put this question, as to whom men held Him to be, to His disciples at a time when He was alone praying, and when His disciples were also with Him; whereas Mark, on the other hand, tells us that the question was put by Him to the disciples when they were on the way. But this will be a difficulty only to the man who has never prayed on the way.

109. I recollect having already stated that no one should suppose that Peter received that name for the first time on the occasion when He said to Him, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." For the time at which he did obtain this name was that referred to by John, when he mentions that he was addressed in these terms: "Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, Peter." Hence, too, we are as little to think that Peter got this designation on the occasion to which Mark alludes, when he recounts the twelve apostles individually by name, and tells us how James and John were called the sons of thunder, merely on the ground that in that passage he has recorded the fact that He surnamed him Peter. For that circumstance is noticed there simply because it was suggested to the writer's recollection at that particular point, and not because it took place in actual fact at that specific time.

CHAPTER LIV.-OF THE OCCASION ON WHICH HE ANNOUNCED HIS
COMING PASSION TO THE DISCIPLES, AND OF THE MEASURE OF
CONCORD BETWEEN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE IN THE ACCOUNTS
WHICH THEY GIVE OF THE SAME.

110. Matthew proceeds in the following strain: "Then charged He His disciples that they should tell no man that He was Jesus the Christ. From that time forth began Jesus to show unto His disciples how that He must go into Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes;" and so on, down to where we read, "Thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." Mark and Luke add these passages in the same order. Only Luke says nothing about the opposition which Peter expressed to the passion of Christ.

CHAPTER LV.-OF THE HARMONY BETWEEN THE THREE EVANGELISTS IN
THE NOTICES WHICH THEY SUBJOIN OF THE MANNER IN WHICH THE
LORD CHARGED THE MAN TO FOLLOW HIM WHO WISHED TO COME
AFTER HIM.

111. Matthew continues thus: "Then said Jesus unto His disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me;" and so on, down to the words, "And then He shall reward every man according to his work." This is appended also by Mark, who keeps the same order. But he does not say of the Son of man, who was to come with His angels, that He is to reward every man according to his work. Nevertheless, he mentions at the same time that the Lord spoke to this effect: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed when He comes in the glory of His Father with the holy angels." And this may be taken to bear the same sense as is expressed by Matthew, when he says, that "He shall reward every man according to his work." Luke also adds the same statements in the same order, slightly varying the terms indeed in which they are conveyed, but still showing a complete parallel with the others in regard to the truthful reproduction of the self-same ideas.

Chapter LVI.-Of the Manifestation Which the Lord Made of Himself, in Company with Moses and Elias, to His Disciples on the Mountain; And of the Question Concerning the Harmony Between the First Three Evangelists with Regard to the Order and the Circumstances of that Event; And in Especial, the Number of the Days, in So Far as Matthew and Mark State that It Took Place After Six Days, While Luke Says that It Was After Eight Days.

112. Matthew proceeds thus: "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom. And after six days, Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and brought them up into an high mountain;" and so on, down to where we read, "Tell the vision to no man until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." This vision of the Lord upon the mount in the presence of the three disciples, Peter, James, and John, on which occasion also the testimony of the Father's voice was borne Him from heaven, is related by the three evangelists in the same order, and in a manner expressing the same sense completely. And as regards other matters, they may be seen by the readers to be in accordance with those modes of narration of which we have

given examples in many passages already, and in which there are diversities in expression without any consequent diversity in meaning.

113. But with respect to the circumstance that Mark, along with Matthew, tells us how the event took place after six days, while Luke states that it was after eight days, those who find a difficulty here do not deserve to be set aside with contempt, but should be enlightened by the offering of explanations. For when we announce a space of days in these terms, "after so many days," sometimes we do not include in the number the day on which we speak, or the day on which the thing itself which we intimate beforehand or promise is declared to take place, but reckon only the intervening days, on the real and full and final expiry of which the incident in question is to occur. This is what Matthew and Mark have done. Leaving out of their calculation the day on which Jesus spoke these words, and the day on which He exhibited that memorable spectacle on the mount, they have regarded simply the intermediate days, and thus have used the expression, "after six days." But Luke, reckoning in the extreme day at either end, that is to say, the first day and the last day, has made it "after eight days," in accordance with that mode of speech in which the part is put for the whole.

114. Moreover, the statement which Luke makes with regard to Moses and Elias in these terms, "And it came to pass, as they departed from Him, Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here," and so forth, ought not to be considered antagonistic to what Matthew and Mark have subjoined to the same effect, as if they made Peter offer this suggestion while Moses and Elias were still talking with the Lord. For they have not expressly said that it was at that time, but rather they have simply left unnoticed the fact which Luke has added,-namely, that it was as they went away that Peter made the suggestion to the Lord with respect to the making of three tabernacles. At the same time, Luke has appended the intimation that it was as they were entering the cloud that the voice came from heaven,-a circumstance which is not affirmed, but which is as little contradicted, by the others.

CHAPTER LVII.-OF THE HARMONY BETWEEN MATTHEW AND MARK IN
THE ACCOUNTS GIVEN OF THE OCCASION ON WHICH HE SPOKE TO THE
DISCIPLES CONCERNING THE COMING OF ELIAS.

115. Matthew goes on thus: "And His disciples asked Him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come and restore all things. But I say unto you,

that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that He spake unto them of John the Baptist." This same passage is given also by Mark, who keeps also the same order; and although he exhibits some diversity of expression, he makes no departure from a truthful representation of the same sense. He has not, however, added the statement, that the disciples understood that the Lord had referred to John the Baptist in saying that Elias was come already.

CHAPTER LVIII.-OF THE MAN WHO BROUGHT BEFORE HIM HIS SON,
WHOM THE DISCIPLES WERE UNABLE TO HEAL; AND OF THE QUESTION
CONCERNING THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THESE THREE EVANGELISTS
ALSO IN THE MATTER OF THE ORDER OF NARRATION HERE.

116. Matthew goes on in the following terms: "And when He was come to the multitude, there came to Him a certain man, kneeling down before Him, and saying, Lord, have mercy on my son; for he is lunatic, and sore vexed;" and so on, down to the words, "Howbeit this kind is not cast out but by prayer and fasting." Both Mark and Luke record this incident, and that, too, in the same order, without any suspicion of a want of harmony.

CHAPTER LIX.-OF THE OCCASION ON WHICH THE DISCIPLES WERE
EXCEEDING SORRY WHEN HE SPOKE TO THEM OF HIS PASSION, AS IT IS
RELATED IN THE SAME ORDER BY THE THREE EVANGELISTS.

117. Matthew continues thus: "And while they abode in Galilee, Jesus said unto them, The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men; and they shall kill Him, and the third day He shall rise again. And they were exceeding sorry." Mark and Luke record this passage in the same order.

CHAPTER LX.-OF HIS PAYING THE TRIBUTE MONEY OUT OF THE
MOUTH OF THE FISH, AN INCIDENT WHICH MATTHEW ALONE
MENTIONS.

118. Matthew continues in these terms: "And when they were come to Capharnaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said to him, Doth not your master pay tribute? He saith, Yes;" and so on, down to where we read: "Thou shall find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee." He is the only one who relates this occurrence, after the interposition of which he follows again the order which is pursued also by Mark and Luke in company with him. Chapter LXI.-Of the Little Child Whom He Set Before Them for Their Imitation, and of the Offences of the

World; Of the Members of the Body Causing Offences; Of the Angels of the Little Ones, Who Behold the Face of the Father; Of the One Sheep Out of the Hundred Sheep; Of the Reproving of a Brother in Private; Of the Loosing and the Binding of Sins; Of The, Agreement of Two, and the Gathering Together of Three; Of the Forgiving of Sins Even Unto Seventy Times Seven; Of the Servant Who Had His Own Large Debt Remitted, and Yet Refused to Remit the Small Debt Which His Fellow-Servant Owed to Him; And of the Question as to Matthew's Harmony with the Other Evangelists on All These Subjects.

119. The same Matthew then proceeds with his narrative in the following terms: "In that hour came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who, thinkest Thou, is the greater in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto Him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven; and so on, down to the words, "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses. Of this somewhat lengthened discourse which was spoken by the Lord, Mark, instead of giving the whole, has presented only certain portions, in dealing with which he follows meantime the same order. He has also introduced some matters which Matthew does not mention. Moreover, in this complete discourse, so far as we have taken it under consideration, the only interruption is that which is made by Peter, when he inquires how often a brother ought to be forgiven. The Lord, however, was speaking in a strain which makes it quite clear that even the question which Peter thus proposed, and the answer which was returned to him, belong really to the same address. Luke, again, records none of these things in the order here observed, with the exception of the incident with the little child whom He set before His disciples, for their imitation when they were thinking of their own greatness.

For if he has also narrated some other matters of a tenor resembling those which are inserted in this discourse, these are sayings which he has recalled for notice in other connections, and on occasions different from the present: just as John introduces the Lord's words on the subject of the forgiveness of sins, -namely, those to the effect that they should be remitted to him to whom the apostles remitted them, and that they should be retained to him to whom they retained them, as spoken by the Lord after His resurrection;

while Matthew mentions that in the discourse now under notice the Lord made this declaration, which, however, the self-same evangelist at the same time affirms to have been given on a previous occasion to Peter. Therefore, to preclude the necessity of having always to inculcate the same rule, we ought to bear in mind the fact that Jesus uttered the same word repeatedly, and in a number of different places,—a principle which we have pressed so often upon your attention already; and this consideration should save us from feeling any perplexity, even although the order of the sayings may be thought to create some difficulty.

Chapter LXII.—Of the Harmony Subsisting Between Matthew and Mark in the Accounts Which They Offer of the Time When He Was Asked Whether It Was Lawful to Put Away One's Wife, and Especially in Regard to the Specific Questions and Replies Which Passed Between the Lord and the Jews, and in Which the Evangelists Seem to Be, to Some Small Extent, at Variance. 120. Matthew continues giving his narrative in the following manner: "And it came to pass, that when Jesus had finished these sayings, He departed from Galilee, and came into the coasts of Judaea beyond Jordan; and great multitudes followed Him; and He healed them there. The Pharisees also came unto Him, tempting Him, and saying, Is it lawful top a man to put away his wife for every cause?" And so on, down to the words, "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." Mark also records this, and observes the same order. At the same time, we must certainly see to it that no appearance of contradiction be supposed to arise from the circumstance that the same Mark tells us how the Pharisees were asked by the Lord as to what Moses commanded them, and that on His questioning them to that effect they returned the answer regarding the bill of divorcement which Moses suffered them to write; whereas, according to Matthew's version, it was after the Lord had spoken those words in which He had shown them, out of the law, how God made male and female to be one flesh, and how, therefore, those [thus joined together of Him] ought not to be put asunder by man, that they gave the reply, "Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?" To this interrogation, also [as Matthew puts it], He says again in reply, "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." There is no difficulty, I repeat, in this; for it is not the case that Mark makes no kind of mention of the reply which was thus given by the Lord, but he brings it in after

the answer which was returned by them to His question relating to the bill of divorcement.

121. As far as the order or method of statement here adopted is concerned, we ought to understand that it in no way affects the truth of the subject itself, whether the question regarding the permission to write a bill of divorcement given by the said Moses, by whom also it is recorded that God made male and female to be one flesh, was addressed by these Pharisees to the Lord at the time when He was forbidding the separation of husband and wife, and confirming His declaration on that subject by the authority of the law; or whether the said question was conveyed in the reply which the same persons returned to the Lord, at the time when He asked them about what Moses had commanded them. For His intention was not to offer them any reason for the permission which Moses thus granted them until they had first mentioned the matter themselves; which intention on His part is what is indicated by the inquiry which Mark has introduced. On the other hand, their desire was to use the authority of Moses in commanding the giving of a bill of divorcement, for the purpose of stopping His mouth, so to speak, in the matter of forbidding, as they believed He undoubtedly would do, a man to put away his wife. For they had approached Him with the view of saying what would tempt Him.

And this desire of theirs is what is indicated by Matthew, when, instead of stating how they were interrogated first themselves, he represents them as having of their own accord put the question about the precept of Moses, in order that they might thereby, as it were, convict the Lord of doing what was wrong in prohibiting the putting away of wives. Wherefore, since the mind of the speakers, in the service of which the words ought to stand, has been exhibited by both evangelists, it is no matter how the modes of narration adopted by the two may differ, provided neither of them fails to give a correct representation of the subject itself. 122. Another view of the matter may also be taken, namely, that, in accordance with Mark's statement, when these persons began by questioning the Lord on the subject of the putting away of a wife, He questioned them in turn as to what Moses commanded them; and that, on their replying that Moses suffered them to write a bill of divorcement and put the wife away, He made His answer to them regarding the said law which was given by Moses, reminding them how God instituted the union of male and female, and addressing them in the words which are

inserted by Matthew, namely, "Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female?" and so on. On hearing these words, they repeated in the form of an inquiry what they had already given utterance to when replying to His first interrogation, namely the expression, "Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?" Then Jesus showed that the reason was the hardness of their heart; which explanation Mark brings in, with a view to brevity, at an earlier point, as if it had been given in reply to that former response of theirs, which Matthew has passed over. And this he does as judging that no injury could be done to the truth at whichever point the explanation might be introduced, seeing that the words, with a view to which it was returned, had been uttered twice in the same form; and seeing also that the Lord, in any case, had offered the said explanation in reply to such words.

Chapter LXIII.-Of the Little Children on Whom He Laid His Hands; Of the Rich Man to Whom He Said, "Sell All that Thou Hast;" Of the Vineyard in Which the Labourers Were Hired at Different Hours; And of the Question as to the Absence of Any Discrepancy Between Matthew and the Other Two Evangelists on These Subjects. 123. Matthew proceeds thus: "Then were there brought unto Him little children, that He should put His hands on them, and pray; and the disciples rebuked them; and so on, down to where we read, "For many are called, but few are chosen. Mark has followed the same order here as Matthew. But Matthew is the only one who introduces the section relating to the labourers who were hired for the vineyard. Luke, on the other hand, first mentions what He said to those who were asking each other who should be the greatest, and next subjoins at once the passage concerning the man whom they had seen casting out devils, although he did not follow Him; then he parts company with the other two at the point where he tells us how He stedfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem; and after the interposition of a number of subjects, he joins them again in giving the story of the rich man, to whom the word is addressed, "Sell all that thou hast," which individual's case is related here by the other two evangelists, but still in the succession which is followed by all the narratives alike. For in the passage referred to in Luke, that writer does not fail to bring in the story of the little children, just as the other two do immediately before the mention of the rich man.

With regard, then, to the accounts which are given us of this rich person, who asks what good thing he should do in order to obtain eternal life, there may appear to be some discrepancy between them, because the words were, according to Matthew, "Why askest thou me about the good? while according to the others they were, "Why callest thou me good? The sentence, "Why askest thou me about the good? may then be referred more particularly to what was expressed by the man when he put the question, "What good thing shall I do? For there we have both the name "good" applied to Christ, and the question put. But the address "Good Master" does not of itself convey the question. Accordingly, the best method of disposing of it is to understand both these sentences to have been uttered, "Why callest thou me good? and, "Why askest thou me about the good?"

Chapter LXIV.-Of the Occasions on Which He Foretold His Passion in Private to His Disciples; And of the Time When the Mother of Zebedee's Children Came with Her Sons, Requesting that One of Them Should Sit on His Right Hand, and the Other on His Left Hand; And of the Absence of Any Discrepancy Between Matthew and the Other Two Evangelists on These Subjects. 124. Matthew continues his narrative in the following terms: "And Jesus, going up to Jerusalem, took the twelve disciples apart, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn Him to death, and shall deliver Him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify Him; and the third day He shall rise again. Then came to Him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshipping Him, and desiring a certain thing of Him; and so on, down to the words, "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many. Here again Mark keeps the same order as Matthew, only he represents the sons of Zebedee to have made the request themselves; while Matthew has stated that it was preferred on their behalf not by their own personal application, but by their mother, as she had laid what was their wish before the Lord. Hence Mark has briefly intimated what was said on that occasion as spoken by them, rather than by her [in their name]. And to conclude with the matter, it is to them rather than to her, according to Matthew no less than according to Mark, that the Lord returned His reply.

Luke, on the other hand, after narrating in the same order our Lord's predictions to the twelve disciples on the subject of His passion and resurrec-

tion, leaves unnoticed what the other two evangelists immediately go on to record; and after the interposition of these passages, he is joined by his fellow-writers again [at the point where they report the incident] at Jericho. Moreover, as to what Matthew and Mark have stated with respect to the princes of the Gentiles exercising dominion over those who are subject to them,-namely, that it should not be so with them [the disciples], but that he who was greatest among them should even be a servant to the others,-Luke also gives us something of the same tenor, although not in that connection; and the order itself indicates that the same sentiment was expressed by the Lord on a second occasion.

CHAPTER LXV.-OF THE ABSENCE OF ANY ANTAGONISM BETWEEN
MATTHEW AND MARK, OR BETWEEN MATTHEW AND LUKE, IN THE
ACCOUNT OFFERED OF THE GIVING OF SIGHT TO THE BLIND MEN OF
JERICHO.

125. Matthew continues thus: "And as they departed from Jericho, a great multitude followed Him. And, behold, two blind men sitting by the wayside heard that Jesus passed by, and cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou Son of David;" and so on, down to the words, "And immediately their eyes received sight, and they followed Him." Mark also records this incident, but mentions only one blind man. This difficulty is solved in the way in which a former difficulty was explained which met us in the case of the two persons who were tormented by the legion of devils in the territory of the Gerasenes. For, that in this instance also of the two blind men whom he [Matthew] alone has introduced here, one of them was of pre-eminent note and repute in that city, is a fact made clear enough by the single consideration, that Mark has recorded both his own name and his father's; a circumstance which scarcely comes across us in all the many cases of healing which had been already performed by the Lord, unless that miracle be an exception, in the recital of which the evangelist has mentioned by name Jairus, the ruler of the synagogue, whose daughter Jesus restored to life. And in this latter instance this intention becomes the more apparent, from the fact that the said ruler of the synagogue was certainly a man of rank in the place. Consequently there can be little doubt that this Bartimaeus, the son of Timaeus, had fallen from some position of great prosperity, and was now regarded as an object of the most notorious and the most remarkable wretchedness, because, in addition to being blind, he had also to sit begging.

And this is also the reason, then, why Mark has chosen to mention only the one whose restoration to sight acquired for the miracle a fame as widespread as was the notoriety which the man's misfortune itself had gained.

126. But Luke, although he mentions an incident altogether of the same tenor, is nevertheless to be understood as really narrating only a similar miracle which was wrought in the case of another blind man, and as putting on record its similarity to the said miracle in the method of performance. For he states that it was performed when He was coming nigh unto Jericho; while the others say that it took place when He was departing from Jericho. Now the name of the city, and the resemblance in the deed, favour the supposition that there was but one such occurrence. But still, the idea that the evangelists really contradict each other here, in so far as the one says, "As He was come nigh unto Jericho," while the others put it thus, "As He came out of Jericho," is one which no one surely will be prevailed on to accept, unless those who would have it more readily credited that the gospel is unveracious, than that He wrought two miracles of a similar nature and in similar circumstances. But every faithful son of the gospel will most readily perceive which of these two alternatives is the more credible, and which the rather to be accepted as true; and, indeed, every gainsayer too, when he is advised concerning the real state of the case, will answer himself either by the silence which he will have to observe, or at least by the tenor of his reflections should he decline to be silent.

CHAPTER LXVI.-OF THE COLT OF THE ASS WHICH IS MENTIONED BY MATTHEW, AND OF THE CONSISTENCY OF HIS ACCOUNT WITH THAT OF THE OTHER EVANGELISTS, WHO SPEAK ONLY OF THE ASS.

127. Matthew goes on with his narrative in the following terms: "And when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem, and were come to Bethphage, unto the Mount of Olives, then sent Jesus two disciples, saying unto them, Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her; and so on, down to the words, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest. Mark also records this occurrence, and inserts it in the same order. Luke, on the other hand, carries a space by Jericho, recounting certain matters which these others have omitted,-namely, the story of Zacchaeus, the chief of the publicans, and some sayings which are couched in parabolic form. After instancing these things, however, this evangelist again joins company with the others in the narrative

relating to the ass on which Jesus sat. And let not the circumstance stagger us, that Matthew speaks both of an ass and of the colt of an ass, while the others say nothing of the ass. For here again we must bear in mind the rule which we have already introduced in dealing with the statements about the seating of the people by fifties and by hundreds on the occasion on which the multitudes were fed with the five loaves. Now, after this principle has been brought into application, the reader should not feel any serious difficulty in the present case.

Indeed, even had Matthew said nothing about the colt, just as his fellow-historians have taken no notice of the ass, the fact should not have created any such perplexity as to induce the idea of an insuperable contradiction between the two statements, when the one writer speaks only of the ass, and the others only of the colt of the ass. But how much less cause then for any disquietude ought there to be, when we see that the one writer has mentioned the ass to which the others have omitted to refer, in such a manner as at the same time not to leave unnoticed also the colt of which the rest have spoken! In fine, where it is possible to suppose both objects to have been included in the occurrence, there is no real antagonism, although the one writer may specify only the one thing, and another only the other. How much less need there be any contradiction, when the one writer particularizes the one object, and another instances both!

128. Again, although John tells us nothing as to the way in which the Lord despatched His disciples to fetch these animals to Him, nevertheless he inserts a brief allusion to this colt, and cites also the word of the prophet which Matthew makes use of. In the case also of this testimony from the prophet, the terms in which it is reproduced by the evangelists, although they exhibit certain differences, do not fail to express a sense identical in intention. Some difficulty, however, may be felt in the fact that Matthew adduces this passage in a forth which represents the prophet to have made mention of the ass; whereas this is not the case, either with the quotation as introduced by John, or with the version given in the ecclesiastical codices of the translation in common use. An explanation of this variation seems to me to be found in the fact that Matthew is understood to have written his Gospel in the Hebrew language. Moreover, it is manifest that the translation which bears the name of the Septuagint differs in some particulars from the

text which is found in the Hebrew by those who know that tongue, and by the several scholars who have given us renderings of the same Hebrew books.

And if an explanation is asked for this discrepancy, or for the circumstance that the weighty authority of the Septuagint translation diverges in many passages from the rendering of the truth which is discovered in the Hebrew codices, I am of opinion that no more probable account of the matter will suggest itself, than the supposition that the Seventy composed their version under the influence of the very Spirit by whose inspiration the things which they were engaged in translating had been originally spoken. This is an idea which receives confirmation also from the marvellous consent which is asserted to have characterized them. Consequently, when these translators, while not departing from the real mind of God from which these sayings proceeded, and to the expression of which the words ought to be subservient, gave a different form to some matters in their reproduction of the text, they had no intention of exemplifying anything else than the very thing which we now admiringly contemplate in that kind of harmonious diversity which marks the four evangelists, and in the light of which it is made clear that there is no failure from strict truth, although one historian may give an account of some theme in a manner different indeed from another, and yet not so different as to involve an actual departure from the sense intended by the person with whom he is bound to be in concord and agreement.

To understand this is of advantage to character, with a view at once to guard against what is false, and to pronounce correctly upon it; and it is of no less consequence to faith itself, in the way of precluding the supposition that, as it were with consecrated sounds, truth has a kind of defence provided for it which might imply God's handing over to us not only the thing itself, but likewise the very words which are required for its enunciation; whereas the fact rather is, that the theme itself which is to be expressed is so decidedly deemed of superior importance to the words in which it has to be expressed, that we would be under no obligation to ask about them at all, if it were possible for us to know the truth without the terms, as God knows it, and as His angels also know it in Him.

CHAPTER LXVII.-OF THE EXPULSION OF THE SELLERS AND BUYERS
FROM THE TEMPLE, AND OF THE QUESTION AS TO THE HARMONY
BETWEEN THE FIRST THREE EVANGELISTS AND JOHN, WHO RELATES
THE SAME INCIDENT IN A WIDELY DIFFERENT CONNECTION.

129. Matthew goes on with his narrative in the following terms: "And when He was come into Jerusalem, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this? And the multitude said, This is Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee. And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple." and so on, down to where we read, "But ye have made it a den of thieves." This account of the multitude of sellers who were cast out of the temple is given by all the evangelists; but John introduces it in a remarkably different order. For, after recording the testimony borne by John the Baptist to Jesus, and mentioning that He went into Galilee at the time when He turned the water into wine, and after he has also noticed the sojourn of a few days in Capharnaum, John proceeds to tell us that He went up to Jerusalem at the season of the Jews' passover, and when He had made a scourge of small cords, drove out of the temple those who were selling in it. This makes it evident that this act was performed by the Lord not on a single occasion, but twice over; but that only the first instance is put on record by John, and the last by the other three.

Chapter LXVIII.-Of the Withering of the Fig-Tree, and of the Question as to the Absence of Any Contradiction Between Matthew and the Other Evangelists in the Accounts Given of that Incident, as Well as the Other Matters Related in Connection with It; And Very Specially as to the Consistency Between Matthew and Mark in the Matter of the Order of Narration.

130. Matthew continues thus: "And the blind and the lame came to Him in the temple, and He healed them. And when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that He did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the Son of David, they were sore displeased, and said unto Him, Hearest thou what these say? And Jesus saith unto them, Yea; have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise? And He left them, and went out of the city into Bethany; and He lodged there. Now in the morning, as He returned into the city, He hungered. And when He saw a single fig-tree in the way, He came to it, and found nothing thereon but leaves only, and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever. And presently the fig-tree withered away.

And when the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, How soon is the fig-tree withered away! But Jesus answered and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do this which is done to the fig-tree; but also, if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, it shall be done. And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive."

131. Mark also records this occurrence in due succession. He does not, however, follow the same order in his narrative. For first of all, the fact which is related by Matthew, namely, that Jesus went into the temple, and cast out those who sold and bought there, is not mentioned at that point by Mark. On the other hand, Mark tells us that He looked round about upon all things, and, when the eventide was now come, went out into Bethany with the twelve. Next he informs us that on another day, when they were coming from Bethany, He was hungry, and cursed the fig-tree, as Matthew also intimates. Then the said Mark subjoins the statement that He came into Jerusalem, and that, on going into the temple, He cast out those who sold and bought there, as if that incident took place not on the first day specified, but on a different day. But inasmuch as Matthew puts the connection in these terms, "And He left them, and went out of the city into Bethany," and tells us that it was when returning in the morning into the city that He cursed the tree, it is more reasonable to suppose that he, rather than Mark, has preserved the strict order of time so far as regards the incident of the expulsion of the sellers and buyers from the temple.

For when he uses the phrase, "And He left them, and went out," who can be understood by those parties whom He is thus said to have left, but those with whom He was previously speaking, -namely, the persons who were so sore displeased because the children cried out, "Hosanna to the Son of David"? It follows, then, that Mark has omitted what took place on the first day, when He went into the temple; and in mentioning that He found nothing on the fig-tree but leaves, he has introduced what He called to mind only there, but what really occurred on the second day, as both evangelists testify. Then, further, his account bears that the astonishment which the disciples expressed at finding how the fig-tree had withered away, and the reply which the Lord made to them on the subject of faith, and the casting of the mountain into the sea, belonged not to this same second day on which He said to the tree, "No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever," but to a third day. For

in connection with the second day, the said Mark has recorded the incident of the casting of the sellers out of the temple, which he had omitted to notice as belonging to the first day.

Accordingly, it is in connection with this second day that he tells us how Jesus went out of the city, when even was come, and how, when they passed by in the morning, the disciples saw the fig-tree dried up from the roots, and how Peter, calling to remembrance, said unto Him, "Master, behold the fig-tree which Thou cursedst is withered away. Then, too, he informs us that He gave the answer relating to the power of faith. On the other hand, Matthew recounts these matters in a manner importing that they all took place on this second day; that is to say, both the word addressed to the tree, "Let no fruit grow on thee from henceforward for ever," and the withering that ensued so speedily in the tree, and the reply which He made on the subject of the power of faith to His disciples when they observed that withering and marvelled at it. From this we are to understand that Mark, on his side, has recorded in connection with the second day what he had omitted to notice as occurring really on the first,-namely, the incident of the expulsion of the sellers and buyers from the temple.

On the other hand, Matthew, after mentioning what was done on the second day,- namely, the cursing of the fig-tree as He was returning in the morning from Bethany into the city,-has omitted certain facts which Mark has inserted, namely, His coming into the city, and His going out of it in the evening, and the astonishment which the disciples expressed at finding the tree dried up as they passed by in the morning; and then to what had taken place on the second day, which was the day on which the tree was cursed, he has attached what really took place on the third day, -namely, the amazement of the disciples at seeing the tree's withered condition, and the declaration which they heard from the Lord on the subject of the power of faith. These several facts Matthew has connected together in such a manner that, were we not compelled to turn our attention to the matter by Mark's narrative, we should be unable to recognise either at what point or with regard to what circumstances the former writer has left anything unrecorded in his narrative. The case therefore stands thus: Matthew first presents the facts conveyed in these words, "And He left them, and went out of the city into Bethany; and He lodged there. Now in the morning, as He returned into the city, He hungered;

and when He saw a single fig-tree in the way, He came to it, and found nothing thereon but leaves only, and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever; and presently the fig-tree withered away. Then, omitting the other matters which belonged to that same day, he has immediately subjoined this statement, "And when the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, How soon is it withered away! although it was on another day that they saw this sight, and on another day that they thus marvelled. But it is understood that the tree did not wither at the precise time when they saw it, but presently when it was cursed. For what they saw was not the tree in the process of drying up, but the tree already dried completely up; and thus they learned that it had withered away immediately on the Lord's sentence.

CHAPTER LXIX.-OF THE HARMONY BETWEEN THE FIRST THREE
EVANGELISTS IN THEIR ACCOUNTS OF THE OCCASION ON WHICH THE
JEWS ASKED THE LORD BY WHAT AUTHORITY HE DID THESE THINGS.

132. Matthew continues his narrative in the following terms: "And when He was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto Him as He was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority? And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? and so on, down to the words, "Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things. The other two, Mark and Luke, have also set forth this whole passage, and that, too, in almost as many words. Neither does there appear to be any discrepancy between them in regard to the order, the only exception being found in the circumstance of which I have spoken above, -namely, that Matthew omits certain matters belonging to a different day, and has constructed his narrative with a connection which, were our attention not called [otherwise] to the fact, might lead to the supposition that he was still treating of the second day, where Mark deals with the third. Moreover, Luke has not appended his notice of this incident, as if he meant to go over the days in orderly succession;

but after recording the expulsion of the sellers and buyers from the temple, he has passed by without notice all that is contained in the statements above-His going out into Bethany, and His returning to the city, and what was done to the fig-tree, and the reply touching the power of faith which was made to the disciples when they marvelled. And then, after all

these omissions, he has introduced the next section of his narrative in these terms: "And He taught daily in the temple. But the chief priests, and the scribes, and the chief of the people sought to destroy Him; and could not find what they might do: for all the people were very attentive to hear Him. And it came to pass, that on one of these days, as He taught the people in the temple, and preached the gospel, the chief priests and the scribes came upon Him, with the elders, and spake unto Him, saying, Tell us, by what authority doest thou these things? and so on; all which the other two evangelists record in like manner. From this it is apparent that he is in no antagonism with the others, even with regard to the order; since what he states to have taken place "on one of those days," may be understood to belong to that particular day on which they also have reported it to have occurred.

Chapter LXX.-Of the Two Sons Who Were Commanded by Their Father to Go into His Vineyard, and of the Vineyard Which Was Let Out to Other Husbandmen; Of the Question Concerning the Consistency of Matthew's Version of These Passages with Those Given by the Other Two Evangelists, with Whom He Retains the Same Order; As Also, in Particular, Concerning the Harmony of His Version of the Parable, Which is Recorded by All the Three, Regarding the Vineyard that Was Let Out; And in Reference Specially to the Reply Made by the Persons to Whom that Parable Was Spoken, in Relating Which Matthew Seems to Differ Somewhat from the Others. 133. Matthew goes on thus: "But what think ye? A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to-day in my vineyard. But he answered and said, I will not; but afterward he repented, and went. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir; and went not;" and so on, down to the words, "And whosoever shall fall upon this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." Mark and Luke do not mention the parable of the two sons to whom the order was given to go and labour in the vineyard. But what is narrated by Matthew subsequently to that,-namely, the parable of the vineyard which was let out to the husbandmen, who persecuted the servants that were sent to them, and afterwards put to death the beloved son, and thrust him out of the vineyard,-is not left unrecorded also by those two. And in detailing it they likewise both retain the same order, that is to say, they bring it in after that declaration of their inability to tell which was made by the Jews when interrogated regarding the baptism of John, and after the reply which

He returned to them in these words: "Neither do I tell you by what authority I do these things."

134. Now no question implying any contradiction between these accounts rises here, unless it be raised by the circumstance that Matthew, after telling us how the Lord addressed to the Jews this interrogation, "When the lord, therefore, of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen?" adds, that they answered and said, "He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons." For Mark does not record these last words as if they constituted the reply returned by the men; but he introduces them as if they were really spoken by the Lord immediately after the question which was put by Him, so that in a certain way He answered Himself. For [in this Gospel] He speaks thus: "What shall therefore the lord of the vineyard do? he will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others." But it is quite easy for us to suppose, either that the men's words are subjoined herewithout the insertion of the explanatory clause "they said," or "they replied," that being left to be understood; or else that the said response is ascribed to the Lord Himself rather than to these men, because when they answered with such truth, He also, who is Himself the Truth, really gave the same reply in reference to the persons in question.

135. More serious difficulty, however, may be created by the fact that Luke not only does not speak of them as the parties who made that answer (for he, as well as Mark, attributes these words to the Lord), but even represents them to have given a contrary reply, and to have said, "God forbid. For his narrative proceeds in these terms: "What therefore shall the lord of the vineyard do unto them? He shall come and destroy these husbandmen, and shall give the vineyard to others. And when they heard it, they said, God forbid. And He beheld them, and said, What is this then that is written, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner? How then is it that, according to Matthew's version, the men to whom He spake these words said, "He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out this vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons; whereas, according to Luke, they gave a reply inconsistent with any terms like these, when they said, "God forbid"? And, in truth, what the Lord proceeds immediately to say regarding the stone which was rejected by the builders, and yet was made the head of the corner, is introduced in a manner

implying that by this testimony those were confuted who were gainsaying the real meaning of the parable.

For Matthew, no less than Luke, records that passage as if it were intended to meet the gainsayers, when he says, "Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner? For what is implied by this question, "Did ye never read," but that the answer which they had given was opposed to the real intention [of the parable]? This is also indicated by Mark, who gives these same words in the following manner: "And have ye not read this scripture, The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner? This sentence, therefore, appears to occupy in Luke, rather than the others, the place which is properly assignable to it as originally uttered. For it is brought in by him directly after the contradiction expressed by those men when they said, "God forbid. And the form in which it is cast by him, -namely, "What is this then that is written, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner? "-is equivalent insense to the other modes of statement. For the real meaning of the sentence is indicated equally well, whichever of the three phrases is used, "Did ye never read? or, "And have ye not read? or, "What is this, then, that is written?"

136. It remains, therefore, for us to understand that among the people who were listening on that occasion, there were some who replied in the terms related by Matthew, when he writes thus: "They say unto Him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen;" and that there were also some who answered in the way indicated by Luke, that is to say, with the words, "God forbid." Accordingly, those persons who had replied to the Lord to the former effect, were replied to by these other individuals in the crowd with the explanation, "God forbid." But the answer which was really given by the first of these two parties, to whom the second said in return, "God forbid," has been ascribed both by Mark and by Luke to the Lord Himself, on the ground that, as I have already intimated, the Truth Himself spake by these men, whether as by persons who knew not that they were wicked, in the same way that He spake also by Caiaphas, who when he was high priest prophesied without realizing what he said, or as by persons who did understand, and who had come by this time both to knowledge and to belief. For there was also present on this occasion that multitude of people at whose hand the prophecy had already received a

fulfilment, when they met Him in a mighty concourse on His approach, and hailed Him with the acclaim, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."

137. Neither should we stumble at the circumstance that the same Matthew has stated that the chief priests and the elders of the people came to the Lord, and asked Him by what authority He did these things, and who gave Him this authority, on the occasion when He to, in turn, interrogated them concerning the baptism of John, inquiring whence it was, whether from heaven or of men; to whom also, on their replying that they did not know, He said, "Neither do I tell you by what authority I do those things. For he has followed up this with the words introduced in the immediate context, "But what think ye? A certain man had two sons," and so forth. Thus this discourse is brought into a connection which is continued, uninterrupted by the interposition either of any thing or of any person, down to what is related regarding the vineyard which was let out to the husbandmen. It may, indeed, be supposed that He spake all these words to the chief priests and the elders of the people, by whom He had been interrogated with regard to His authority. But then, if these persons had indeed questioned Him with a view to tempt Him, and with a hostile intention, they could not be taken for men who had believed, and who cited the remarkable testimony in favour of the Lord which was taken from a prophet;

and surely it is only if they had the character of those who believed, and not of those who were ignorant, that they could have given a reply like this: "He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard to other husbandmen. This peculiarity [of Matthew's account], however, should not by any means so perplex us as to lead us to imagine that there were none who believed among the multitudes who listened at this time to the Lord's parables. For it is only for the sake of brevity that the same Matthew has passed over in silence what Luke does not fail to mention,-namely, the fact that the said parable was not spoken only to the parties who had interrogated Him on the subject of His authority, but to the people. For the latter evangelist puts it thus: "Then began He to speak to the people this parable; A certain man planted a vineyard," and so on. Accordingly, we may well understand that among the people then assembled there might also have been persons who could listen to Him as those did who before this had said, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord; and that either these, or some of

them, were the individuals who replied in the words, "He will miserably destroy these wicked men, and will let out his vineyard to other husbandmen.

The answer actually returned by these men, moreover, has been attributed to the Lord Himself by Mark and Luke, not only because their words were really His words, inasmuch as He is the Truth that oftentimes speaks even by the wicked and the ignorant, moving the mind of man by a certain hidden instinct, not in the merit of man's holiness, but by the right of His own proper power; but also because the men may have been of a character admitting of their being reckoned, not without reason, as already members in the true body of Christ, so that what was said by them might quite warrantably be ascribed to Him whose members they were. For by this time He had baptized more than John, and had multitudes of disciples, as the same evangelists repeatedly testify; and from among these followers He also drew those five hundred brethren, to whom the Apostle Paul tells us that He showed Himself after His resurrection. And this explanation of the matter is supported by the fact that the phrase which occurs in the version. by this same Matthew, -namely, "They say unto Him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men," -is not put in a form necessitating us to take the pronoun *illi* in the plural number, as if it was intended to mark out the words expressly as the reply made by the persons who had craftily questioned Him on the subject of His authority;

but the clause, "They say unto Him," is so expressed that the term *illi* should be taken for the singular pronoun, and not the plural, and should be held to signify "unto Him," that is to say, unto the Lord Himself, as is made clear in the Greek codices, without a single atom of ambiguity. 138. There is a certain discourse of the Lord which is given by the evangelist John, and which may help us more readily to understand the statement I thus make. It is to this effect: "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on Him, If ye continue in my word, then ye shall be my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. And they answered Him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be free? Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever; but the Son abideth for ever. If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. I know that ye are Abraham's seed; but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you. Now surely it is not to

be supposed that He spake these words, "Ye seek to kill me" to those persons who had already believed on Him, and to whom He had said, "If ye abide in my word, then shall ye be my disciples indeed.

But inasmuch as He had spoken in these latter terms to the men who had already believed on Him, and as, moreover, there was present on that occasion a multitude of people, among whom there were many who were hostile to Him, even although the evangelist does not tell us explicitly who those parties were who made the reply referred to, the very nature of the answer which they gave, and the tenor of the words which thereupon were rightly directed to them by Him, make it sufficiently clear what specific persons were then addressed, and what words were spoken to them in particular. Precisely, therefore, as in the multitude thus alluded to by John there were some who had already believed on Jesus, and also some who sought to kill Him, in that other concourse which we are discussing at present there were some who had craftily questioned the Lord on the subject of the authority by which He did these things; and there were also others who had hailed Him, not in deceit, but in faith, with the acclaim, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. And thus, too, there were persons present who could say, "He will destroy those men, and will give his vineyard to others. This saying, furthermore, may be rightly understood to have been the voice of the Lord Himself, either in virtue of that Truth which in His own Person He is Himself, or on the ground of the unity which subsists between the members of His body and the head.

There were also certain individuals present who, when these other parties gave that kind of answer, said to them, "God forbid," because they understood the parable to be directed against themselves.

CHAPTER LXXI.—OF THE MARRIAGE OF THE KING'S SON, TO WHICH THE MULTITUDES WERE INVITED; AND OF THE ORDER IN WHICH MATTHEW INTRODUCES THAT SECTION AS COMPARED WITH LUKE, WHO GIVES US A SOMEWHAT SIMILAR NARRATIVE IN ANOTHER CONNECTION.

139. Matthew goes on as follows: "And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard His parables, they perceived that He spake of them: and when they sought to lay hands on Him, they feared the multitude, because they took Him for a prophet. And Jesus answered and spake unto them again by parables, and said, The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king which made a marriage for his son, and sent forth his servants to call them that

were bidden to the wedding, and they would not come;" and so on, down to the words "For many are called, but few are chosen." This parable concerning the guests who were invited to the wedding is related only by Matthew. Luke also records something which resembles it. But that is really a different passage, as the order itself sufficiently indicates, although there is some similarity between the two. The matters introduced, however, by Matthew immediately after the parable concerning the vineyard, and the killing of the son of the head of the house,—namely, the Jews' perception that this whole discourse was directed against them, and their beginning to contrive treacherous schemes against Him,—are attested likewise by Mark and Luke, who also keep the same order in inserting them. But after this paragraph they proceed to another subject, and immediately subjoin a passage which Matthew has also indeed introduced in due order, but only subsequently to this parable of the marriage, which he alone has put on record here.

CHAPTER LXXII.—OF THE HARMONY CHARACTERIZING THE
NARRATIVES GIVEN BY THESE THREE EVANGELISTS REGARDING THE
DUTY OF RENDERING TO CAESAR THE COIN BEARING HIS IMAGE, AND
REGARDING THE WOMAN WHO HAD BEEN MARRIED TO THE SEVEN
BROTHERS.

140. Matthew then continues in these terms: "Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle Him in His talk. And they send out unto Him their disciples, with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any man; for thou regardest not the person of men: tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar, or not?" and so on, down to the words, "And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at His doctrine." Mark and Luke give a similar account of these two replies made by the Lord,—namely, the one on the subject of the coin, which was prompted by the question as to the duty of giving tribute to Caesar; and the other on the subject of the resurrection, which was suggested by the case of the woman who had married the seven brothers in succession. Neither do these two evangelists differ in the matter of the order. For after the parable which told of the men to whom the vineyard was let out, and which also dealt with the Jews (against whom it was directed), and the evil counsel they were devising (which sections are given by all three evangelists together), these two, Mark and Luke, pass over the parable of the guests who were invited to the wedding (which only Matthew has introduced), and thereafter

they join company again with the first evangelist, when they record these two passages which deal with Caesar's tribute, and the woman who was the wife of seven different husbands, inserting them in precisely the same order, with a consistency which admits of no question.

Chapter LXXIII.-Of the Person to Whom the Two Precepts Concerning the Love of God and the Love of Our Neighbour Were Commended; And of the Question as to the Order of Narration Which is Observed by Matthew and Mark, and the Absence of Any Discrepancy Between Them and Luke. 141. Matthew then proceeds with his narrative in the following terms: "But when the Pharisees had heard that He had put the Sadducees to silence, they were gathered together. And one of them, which was a lawyer, asked Him a question, tempting Him, and saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." This is recorded also by Mark, and that too in the same order. Neither should there be any difficulty in the statement made by Matthew, to the effect that the person by whom the question was put to the Lord tempted Him; whereas Mark says nothing about that, but tells us at the end of the paragraph how the Lord said to the man, as to one who answered discreetly, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." For it is quite possible that, although the man approached Him with the view of tempting Him, he may have been set right by the Lord's response. Or we need not at any rate take the tempting referred to in a bad sense, as if it were the device of one who sought to deceive an adversary; but we may rather suppose it to have been the result of caution, as if it were the act of one who wished to have further trial of a person who was unknown to him. For it is not without a good purpose that this sentence has been written, "He that is hasty to give credit is light-minded, and shall be impaired."

142. Luke, on the other hand, not indeed in this order, but in a widely different connection, introduces something which resembles this. But whether in that passage he is actually recording this same incident, or whether the person with whom the Lord [is represented to have] dealt in a similar manner there on the subject of those two commandments is quite another individual, is altogether uncertain. At the same time, it may appear

right to regard the person who is introduced by Luke as a different individual from the one before us here, not only on the ground of the remarkable divergence in the order of narration, but also because he is there reported to have replied to a question which was addressed to him by the Lord, and in that reply to have himself mentioned those two precepts. The same opinion is further confirmed by the fact that, after telling us how the Lord said to him, "This do, and thou shalt live,"-thus instructing him to do that great thing which, according to his own answer, was contained in the law,-the evangelist follows up what had passed with the statement, "But he, willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour? Thereupon, too [according to Luke], the Lord told the story of the man who was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among robbers. Consequently, considering that this individual is described at the outset as tempting Christ, and is represented to have repeated the two commandments in his reply;

and considering, further, that after the counsel which was given by the Lord in the words, "This do, and thou shalt live," he is not commended as good, but, on the contrary, has this said of him, "But he, willing to justify himself," etc., whereas the person who is mentioned in parallel order both by Mark and by Luke received a commendation so marked, that the Lord spake to him in these terms, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God,"-the more probable view is that which takes the person who appears on that occasion to be a different individual from the man who comes before us here.

Chapter LXXIV.-Of the Passage in Which the Jews are Asked to Say Whose Son They Suppose Christ to Be; And of the Question Whether There is Not a Discrepancy Between Matthew and the Other Two Evangelists, in So Far as He States the Inquiry to Have Been, "What Think Ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?" And Tells Us that to This They Replied, "The Son of David;"Whereas the Others Put It Thus, "How Say the Scribes that Christ is David's Son?"

143. Matthew goes on thus: "Now when the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? Whose son is He? They say unto Him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call Him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou on my right hand, till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool? If David then call Him Lord, how is He his son? And no man was able to answer Him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask Him any more questions. This is given also by Mark in due course, and in the same order. Luke,

again, only omits mention of the person who asked the Lord which was the first commandment in the law, and, after passing over that incident in silence, observes the same order once more as the others, narrating just as these, do this question which the Lord put to the Jews concerning Christ, as to how He was David's son. Neither is the sense at all affected by the circumstance that, as Matthew puts it, when Jesus had asked them what they thought of Christ, and whose son He was, they [the Pharisees] replied, "The son of David," and then He proposed the further query as to how David then called Him Lord; whereas, according to the version presented by the other two, Mark and Luke, we do not find either that these persons were directly interrogated, or that they made any answer.

For we ought to take this view of the matter, namely, that these two evangelists have introduced the sentiments which were expressed by the Lord Himself after the reply made by those parties, and have recorded the terms in which He spoke in the hearing of those whom He wished profitably to instruct in His authority, and to turn away from the teaching of the scribes, and whose knowledge of Christ amounted then only to this, that He was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, while they did not understand that He was God, and on that ground also the Lord even of David. It is in this way, therefore, that in the accounts given by these two evangelists, the Lord is mentioned in a manner which makes it appear as if He was discoursing on the subject of these erroneous teachers to men whom He desired to see delivered from the errors in which these scribes were involved. Thus, too, the question, which is presented by Matthew in the form, "What say ye?" is to be taken not as addressed directly to these [Pharisees], but rather as expressed only with reference to those parties, and directed really to the persons whom He was desirous of instructing.

Chapter LXXV.-Of the Pharisees Who Sit in the Seat of Moses, and Enjoin Things Which They Do Not, and of the Other Words Spoken by the Lord Against These Same Pharisees; Of the Question Whether Matthew's Narrative Agrees Here with Those Which are Given by the Other Two Evangelists, and in Particular with that of Luke, Who Introduces a Passage Resembling This One, Although It is Brought in Not in This Order, But in Another Connection. 144. Matthew proceeds with his account, observing the following order of narration: "Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to His disciples, saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all, there-

fore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not; and so on, down to the words, "Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. Luke also mentions a similar discourse which was spoken by the Lord in opposition to the Pharisees and the scribes and the doctors of the law, but reports it as delivered in the house of a certain Pharisee, who had invited Him to a feast. In order to relate that passage, he has made a digression from the order which is followed by Matthew, about the point at which they have both put on record the Lord's sayings respecting the sign of the three days and nights in the history of Jonas, and the queen of the south, and the unclean spirit that returns and finds the house swept. And that paragraph is followed up by Matthew with these words: "While He yet talked to the people, behold, His mother and His brethren stood without, desiring to speak with Him.

But in the version which the third Gospel presents of the discourse then spoken by the Lord, after the recital of certain sayings of the Lord which Matthew has omitted to notice, Luke turns off from the order which he had been observing in concert with Matthew, to that his immediately subsequent narrative runs thus: "And as He spake, a certain Pharisee besought Him to dine with him: and He went in, and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that He had not first washed before dinner. And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and platter. And after this, Luke reports other utterances which were directed against the said Pharisees and scribes and teachers of the law, which are of a similar tenor to those which Matthew also recounts in this passage which we have taken in hand at present to consider. Wherefore, although Matthew records these things in a manner which, while it is true indeed that the house of that Pharisee is not mentioned by name, yet does not specify as the scene where the words were spoken any place entirely inconsistent with the idea of His having been in the house referred to; still the facts that the Lord by this time [i.e.

according to Matthew's Gospel] had left Galilee and come into Jerusalem, and that the incidents alluded to above, on to the discourse which is now under review, are so arranged in the context after His arrival as to make it only reasonable to understand them to have taken place in Jerusalem, whereas Luke's narrative deals with what occurred at the time when the Lord as yet

was only journeying towards Jerusalem, are considerations which lead me to the conclusion that these are not the same, but only two similar discourses, of which the former evangelist has reported the one, and the latter the other. 145. This is also a matter which requires some consideration,-namely, the question how it is said here, "Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord," when, according to this same Matthew, they had already expressed themselves to this effect. Besides, Luke likewise tells us that a reply containing these very words had previously been returned by the Lord to the persons who had counselled Him to leave their locality, because Herod sought to kill Him. That evangelist represents these self-same terms, which Matthew records here, to have been employed by Him in the declaration which He directed on that occasion against Jerusalem itself. For Luke's narrative proceeds in the following manner: "The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto Him, Get thee out, and depart hence: for Herod will kill thee. And He said unto them, Go ye and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected. Nevertheless, I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following; for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house shall be left unto you desolate:

and I say unto you, that ye shall not see me until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. There does not seem, however, to be anything contradictory to the narration thus given by Luke in the circumstance that the multitudes said, when the Lord was approaching Jerusalem, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. For, according to the order which is followed by Luke, He had not yet come to the scene in question, and the words had not been uttered. But since he does not tell us that He did actually leave the place at that time, not to return to it until the period came when such words would be spoken by them (for He continues on His journey until he arrives at Jerusalem; and the saying, "Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected," is to be taken to have been uttered by Him in a mystical and figurative sense: for certainly He did not suffer at a time answering literally to the third day after the present occasion;

nay, He immediately goes on to say, "Nevertheless, I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following"), we are indeed constrained also to put a mystical interpretation upon the sentence, "Ye shall not see me henceforth, until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord," and to understand it to refer to that advent of His in which He is to come in His effulgent brightness; it being thereby also implied, that what He expressed in the declaration, "I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected," bears upon His body, which is the Church. For devils are cast out when the nations abandon their ancestral superstitions and believe on Him; and cures are wrought when men renounce the devil and this world, and live in accordance with His commandments, even unto the consummation of the resurrection, in which there shall, as it were, be realized that perfecting on the third day; that is to say, the Church shall be perfected up to the measure of the angelic fulness through the realized immortality of the body as well as the soul. Therefore the order followed by Matthew is by no means to be understood to involve a digression to another connection.

But we are rather to suppose, either that Luke has antedated the events which took place in Jerusalem, and has introduced them at this point simply as they were here suggested to his recollection, before his narrative really brings the Lord to Jerusalem; or that the Lord, when drawing near the same city on that occasion, did actually reply to the persons who counselled Him to be on His guard against Herod, in terms resembling those in which Matthew represents Him to have spoken also to the multitudes at a period when He had already arrived in Jerusalem, and when all these events had taken place which have been detailed above.

CHAPTER LXXVI.-OF THE HARMONY IN RESPECT OF THE ORDER OF
NARRATION SUBSISTING BETWEEN MATTHEW AND THE OTHER TWO
EVANGELISTS IN THE ACCOUNTS GIVEN OF THE OCCASION ON WHICH HE
FORETOLD THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE.

1146. Matthew proceeds with his history in the following terms: "And Jesus went out and departed from the temple; and His disciples came to Him for to show Him the buildings of the temple. And Jesus said unto them, See ye all these things? Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another which shall not be thrown down. This incident is related also by Mark, and nearly in the same order. But he brings it in after a digression

of some small extent, which is made with a view to mention the case of the widow who put the two mites into the treasury, which occurrence is recorded only by Mark and Luke. For [in proof that Mark's order is essentially the same as Matthew's, we need only notice that] in Mark's version also, after the account of the Lord's discussion with the Jews on the occasion when He asked them how they held Christ to be David's son, we have a narrative of what He said in warning them against the Pharisees and their hypocrisy,-a section which Matthew has presented on the amplest scale, introducing into it a larger number of the Lord's sayings on that occasion. Then after this paragraph, which has been handled briefly by Mark, and treated with great fulness by Matthew, Mark, as I have said, introduces the passage about the widow who was at once so extremely poor, and yet abounded so remarkably.

² And finally, without interpolating anything else, he subjoins a section in which he comes again into unison with Matthew,-namely, that relating to the destruction of the temple. In like manner, Luke first states the question which was propounded regarding Christ, as to how He was the son of David, and then mentions a few of the words which were spoken in cautioning them against the hypocrisy of the Pharisees. Thereafter he proceeds, as Mark does, to tell the story of the widow who cast the two mites into the treasury. And finally he appends the statement, which appears also in Matthew and Mark, on the subject of the destined overthrow of the temple.

CHAPTER LXXVII.-OF THE HARMONY SUBSISTING BETWEEN THE THREE
EVANGELISTS IN THEIR NARRATIVES OF THE DISCOURSE WHICH HE
DELIVERED ON THE MOUNT OF OLIVES, WHEN THE DISCIPLES ASKED
WHEN THE CONSUMMATION SHOULD HAPPEN.

147. Matthew continues in the following strain: "And as He sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto Him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the world? And Jesus answered, and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you: for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many;" and so on, down to where we read, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." We have now, therefore, to examine this lengthened discourse as it meets us in the three evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. For they all introduce it in their narratives, and that, too, in the same order. Here, as elsewhere, each of these writers gives some matters which are peculiar to him-

self, in which, nevertheless, we have not to apprehend any suspicion of inconsistency. But what we have to make sure of is the proof that, in those passages which are exact parallels, they are nowhere to be regarded as in antagonism with each other. For if anything bearing the appearance of a contradiction meets us here, the simple affirmation that it is something wholly distinct, and uttered by the Lord in similar terms indeed, but on a totally different occasion, cannot be deemed a legitimate mode of explanation in a case like this, where the narrative, as given by all the three evangelists, moves in the same connection at once of subjects and of dates. Moreover, the mere fact that the writers do not all observe the same order in the reports which they give of the same sentiments expressed by the Lord, certainly does not in any way affect either the understanding or the communication of the subject itself, provided the matters which are represented by them to have been spoken by Him are not inconsistent the one with the other.

148. Again, what Matthew states in this form, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come," is given also in the same connection by Mark in the following manner: "And the gospel must first be published among all nations." Mark has not added the words, "and then shall the end come;" but he indicates what they express, when he uses the phrase "first" in the sentence, "And the gospel must first be published among all nations." For they had asked Him about the end. And therefore, when He addresses them thus, "The gospel must first be published among all nations," the term "first" clearly suggests the idea of something to be done before the consummation should come. 149. In like manner, what Matthew states thus, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, whoso readeth let him understand," is put in the following form by Mark: "But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not, let him that readeth understand." But though the phrase is thus altered, the sense conveyed is the same. For the point of the clause "where it ought not," is that the abomination of desolation ought not to be in the holy place. Luke's method of putting it, again, is neither, "And when ye shall see the abomination of desolation stand in the holy place," nor "where it ought not," but, "And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with an army, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh." At that time, therefore, will the abomination of desolation be in the holy place.

150. Again, what is given by Matthew in the following terms: "Then let them which be in Judaea flee into the mountains; and let him which is on the house-top not come down to take anything out of his house; neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes," is reported also by Mark almost in so many words. On the other hand, Luke's version proceeds thus: "Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains. Thus far he agrees with the other two. But he presents what is subsequent to that in a different form. For he goes on to say, "And let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto: for these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. Now these statements seem to present differences enough between each other. For the one, as it occurs in the first two evangelists, runs thus: "Let him which is on the house-top not come down to take anything out of his house; whereas what is given by the third evangelist is to this effect: "And let them which are in the midst of it depart out.

The import, however, may be, that in the great agitation which will arise in the face of so mighty an impending peril, those shut up in the state of siege (which is expressed by the phrase, "they which are in the midst of it") will appear upon the housetop [or "wall"], amazed and anxious to see what terror hangs over them, or what method of escape may open. Still the question rises, How does this third evangelist say here, "let them depart out," when he has already used these terms: "And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with an army"? For what is brought in after this-namely, the sentence, "And let not them that are in the countries enter there-into "-appears to form part of one consistent admonition; and we can perceive how those who are outside the city are not to enter into it; but the difficulty is to see how those who are in the midst of it are to depart out, when the city is already compassed with an army.

Well, may not this expression, "in the midst of it," indicate a time when the danger will be so urgent as to leave no opportunity open, so far as temporal means are concerned, for the preservation of this present life in the body, and that the fact that this will be a time when the soul ought to be ready and free, and neither taken up with, nor burdened by, carnal desires, is imported by the phrase employed by the first two writers-namely, "on the house-top," or, "on the wall"? In this way the third evangelist's phraseology, "let them depart out" (which really means, let them no more be engrossed

with the desire of this life, but let them be prepared to pass into another life), is equivalent in sense to the terms used by the other two," let him not come down to take anything out of his house" (which really means, "let not his affections turn towards the flesh, as if it could yield him anything to his advantage then").

And in like manner the phrase adopted by the one, "And let not them that are in the countries enter thereunto" (which is to say, "Let not those who, with good purpose of heart, have already placed themselves outside it, indulge again in any carnal lust or longing after it"), denotes precisely what the other two evangelists embody in the sentence, "Neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes," which is much the same as to state that he should not again involve himself in cares of which he had been unburdened. 151. Moreover, Matthew proceeds thus: "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath-day. Part of this is given and part omitted by Mark, when he says, "And pray ye that your flight be not in the winter. Luke, on the other hand, leaves this out entirely, and instead of it introduces something which is peculiar to himself, and by which he appears to me to have cast light upon this very clause which has been set before us somewhat obscurely by these others. For his version runs thus: "And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass. This is to be understood to be the same flight as is mentioned by Matthew, which should not be taken in the winter or on the Sabbath-day. That "winter," moreover, refers to these "cares of this life" which Luke has specified directly; and the "Sabbath-day" refers in like manner to the "surfeiting and drunkenness. For sad cares are like a winter;

and surfeiting and drunkenness drown and bury the heart in carnal delights and luxury-an evil which is expressed under the term "Sabbath-day," because of old, as is the case with them still, the Jews had the very pernicious custom of rePelling in pleasure on that day, when they were ignorant of the spiritual Sabbath. Or, if something else is intended by the words which thus appear in Matthew and Mark, Luke's terms may also be taken to bear on something else, while no question implying any antagonism between them

need be raised for all that. At present, however, we have not undertaken the task of expounding the Gospels, but only that of defending them against groundless charges of falsehood and deceit. Furthermore, other matters which Matthew has inserted in this discourse, and which are common to him and Mark, present no difficulty. On the other hand, with respect to those sections which are common to him and Luke, [it is to be remarked that] these are not introduced into the present discourse by Luke, although in regard to the order of narration here they are at one. But he records sentences of like tenor in other connections, either reproducing them as they suggested themselves to his memory, and thus bringing them in by anticipation so as to relate at an earlier point words which, as spoken by the Lord, belong really to a later;

or else, giving us to understand that they were uttered twice over by the Lord, once on the occasion referred to by Matthew, and on a second occasion, with which Luke himself deals. Chapter LXXVIII.-Of the Question Whether There is Any Contradiction Between Matthew and Mark on the One Hand, and John on the Other, in So Far as the Former State that After Two Days Was to Be the Feast of the Passover, and Afterwards Tells Us that He Was in Bethany, While the Latter Gives a Parallel Narrative of What Took Place at Bethany, But Mentions that It Was Six Days Before the Passover. 152. Matthew continues thus: "And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these sayings, He said unto His disciples, Ye know that after two days will be the feast of the passover, and the Son of man shall be betrayed to be crucified." This is attested in like manner by the other two,-namely, Mark and Luke,-and that, too, with a thorough harmony on the subject of the order of narration. They do not, however, introduce the sentence as one spoken by the Lord Himself. They make no statement to that effect. At the same time, Mark, speaking in his own person, does tell us that "after two days was the feast of the passover and of unleavened bread." And Luke likewise gives this as his own affirmation: "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the passover;" that is to say, it "drew nigh" in this sense, that it was to take place after two days' space, as the other two are more apparently at one in expressing it. John, on the other hand, has mentioned in three several places the nearness of this same feast-day. In the two earlier instances the intimation is made when he is engaged in recording certain matters of another tenor. But on the third occasion his narrative appears clearly

to deal with those very times, in connection with which the other three evangelists also notice the subject,—that is to say, the times when the Lord's passion was actually imminent.

153. But to those who look into the matter without sufficient care, there may seem to be a contradiction involved in the fact that Matthew and Mark, after stating that the passover was to be after two days, have at once informed us how Jesus was in Bethany on that occasion, on which the account of the precious ointment comes before us; whereas John, when he is about to give us the same narrative concerning the ointment, begins by telling us that Jesus came to Bethany six days before the passover. Now, the question is, how the passover could be spoken of by those two evangelists as about to be celebrated two days after, seeing that we find them, immediately after they have made this statement, in company with John, giving us an account of the scene with the ointment in Bethany; while in that connection the last-named writer informs us, that the feast of the passover was to take place six days after. Nevertheless, those who are perplexed by this difficulty simply fail to perceive that Matthew and Mark have brought in their account of the scene which was enacted in Bethany really in the form of a recapitulation, not as if the time of its occurrence was actually subsequent to the [time indicated in the] announcement made by them on the subject of the two days' space, but as an event which had already taken place at a date when there was still a period of six days preceding the passover.

For neither of them has appended his account of what took place at Bethany to his statement regarding the celebration of the passover after two days' space in any such terms as these: "After these things, when He was in Bethany. But Matthew's phrase is this: "Now when Jesus was in Bethany. And Mark's version is simply this: "And being in Bethany," etc.; which is a method of expression that may certainly be taken to refer to a period antecedent to the utterance of what was said two days before the passover. The case, therefore, stands thus: As we gather from the narrative of John, Jesus came to Bethany six days before the passover; there the supper took place, in connection with which we get the account of the precious ointment; leaving this place, He came next to Jerusalem, sitting upon an ass; and thereafter happened those things which they relate to have occurred after this arrival of His in Jerusalem. Consequently, even although the evangelists do not mention the fact, we understand that between the day on which He came to

Bethany, and which witnessed the scene with the ointment, and the day to which all these deeds and words which are at present before us belonged, there elapsed a period of four days, so that at this point might come in the day which the two evangelists have defined by their statement as to the celebration of the passover two days after.

Further, when Luke says, "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh," he does not indeed make any express mention of a two days' space; but still, the nearness which he has instanced ought to be accepted as made good by this very space of two days. Again, when John makes the statement that "the Jews' passover was nigh at hand," he does not intend a two days' space to be understood thereby, but means that there was a period of six days before the passover. Thus it is that, on recording certain matters immediately after this affirmation, with the intention of specifying what measure of nearness he had in view when he spoke of the passover as nigh at hand, he next proceeds in the following strain: "Then Jesus, six days before the passover, came to Bethany, where Lazarus had died, whom Jesus raised from the dead; and there they made Him a supper. This is the incident which Matthew and Mark introduce in the form of a recapitulation, after the statement that after two days would be the passover. In their recapitulation they thus come back upon the day in Bethany, which was yet a six days' space off from the passover, and give us the account which John also gives of the supper and the ointment.

Subsequently to that scene, we are to suppose Him to come to Jerusalem, and then, after the occurrence of the other things recorded, to reach this day, which was still a two days' space from the passover, and from which these evangelists have made this digression, with the object of giving a recapitulatory notice of the incident with the ointment in Bethany. And after the completion of that narrative, they return once more to the point from which they made the digression; that is to say, they now proceed to record the words spoken by the Lord two days before the passover. For if we remove the notice of the incident at Bethany, which they have introduced as a digression from the literal order, and have given in the form of a recollection and recapitulation inserted at a point subsequent to its actual historical position, and if we then set the narrative in its regular connection, the recital will go on as follows;-according to Matthew, the Lord's words coming in thus: "Ye know that after two days shall be the feast of the passover, and the Son of man shall be betrayed to be crucified. Then assembled together the

chief priests and the elders of the people unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, and consulted that they might take Jesus by subtilty, and kill Him. But they said, Not on the feast-day, lest there be an uproar among the people. Then one of the twelve, called Judas Scarioth, went unto the chief priests," etc.

For between the place where it is said, "lest there be an uproar among the people," and the passage where we read, "then one of the disciples, called Judas, went," etc., that notice of the scene at Bethany intervenes, which they have introduced by way of recapitulation. Consequently, by leaving it out, we have established such a connection in the narrative as may make our conclusion satisfactory, that there is no contradiction here in the matter of the order of times. Again, if we deal with Mark's Gospel in like manner, and omit the account of the same supper at Bethany, which he also has brought in as a recapitulation, his narrative will proceed in the following order: "Now after two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take Him by craft, and put Him to death. For they said, Not on the feast-day, lest there be an uproar of the people. And Judas Scariothes, one of the twelve, went unto the chief priests, to betray Him. Here, again, the incident at Bethany which these evangelists have inserted, by way of recapitulation, is placed between the clause, "lest there be an uproar of the people," and the verse which we have attached immediately to that, namely, "And Judas Scariothes, one of the twelve. Luke, on the other hand, has simply omitted the said occurrence at Bethany.

This is the explanation which we give in reference to the six days before the passover, which is the space mentioned by John when narrating what took place at Bethany, and in reference to the two days before the passover, which is the period specified by Matthew and Mark when presenting their account, in direct sequence upon the statement thus made, of that same scene in Bethany which has been recorded also by John. Chapter LXXIX.-Of the Concord Between Matthew, Mark, and John in Their Notices of the Supper at Bethany, at Which the Woman Poured the Precious Ointment on the Lord, and of the Method in Which These Accounts are to Be Harmonized with that of Luke, When He Records an Incident of a Similar Nature at a Different Period. 154. Matthew, then, continuing his narrative from the point up to which we had concluded its examination, proceeds in the follow-

ing terms: "Then assembled together the chief priests and the elders of the people unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, and consulted that they might take Jesus by subtilty and kill Him: but they said, Not on the feast-day, lest there be an uproar among the people. Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, there came unto Him a woman having an alabaster box of precious ointment, and poured it on His head as He sat at meat; and so on down to the words, "there shall also this that this woman hath done be told for a memorial of her. The scene with the woman and the costly ointment at Bethany we have now to consider, as it is thus detailed.

For although Luke records an incident resembling this, and although the name which he assigns to the person in whose house the Lord was supping might also suggest an identity between the two narratives (for Luke likewise names the host "Simon"), still, since there is nothing either in nature or in the customs of men to make the case an incredible one, that as one man may have two names, two men may with all the greater likelihood have one and the same name, it is more reasonable to believe that the Simon in whose house [it is thus supposed, according to Luke's version, that] this scene at Bethany took place, was a different person from the Simon [named by Matthew]. For Luke, again, does not specify Bethany as the place where the incident which he records happened. And although it is true that he in no way particularizes the town or village in which that occurrence took place, still his narrative does not seem to deal with the same locality. Consequently, my opinion is, that there is but one interpretation to be put upon the matter.

That is not, however, to suppose that the woman who appears in Matthew was an entirely different person from the woman who approached the feet of Jesus on that occasion in the character of a sinner, and kissed them, and washed them with her tears, and wiped them with her hair, and anointed them with ointment, in reference to whose case Jesus also made use of the parable of the two debtors, and said that her sins, which were many, were forgiven her because she loved much. But my theory is, that it was the same Mary who did this deed on two separate occasions, the one being that which Luke has put on record, when she approached Him first of all in that remarkable humility, and with those tears, and obtained the forgiveness of her sins. For John, too, although he has not given the kind of recital which Luke has left us of the circumstances connected with that incident, has at least

mentioned the fact, in commending the same Mary to our notice, when he has just begun to tell the story of the raising of Lazarus, and before his narrative brings the Lord to Bethany itself. The history which he offers us of that transaction proceeds thus: "Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of Mary; and her sister Martha. It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped His feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick.

By this statement John attests what Luke has told us when he records a scene of this nature in the house of a certain Pharisee, whose name was Simon. Here, then, we see that Mary had acted in this way before that time. And what she did a second time in Bethany is a different matter, which does not belong to Luke's narrative, but is related by three of the evangelists in concert, namely, John, Matthew, and Mark. 155. Let us therefore notice how harmony is maintained here between these three evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and John, regarding whom there is no doubt that they record the self-same occurrence at Bethany, on occasion of which the disciples also, as all three mention, murmured against the woman, ostensibly on the ground of the waste of the very precious ointment. Now the further fact that Matthew and Mark tell us that it was the Lord's head on which the ointment was poured, while John says it was His feet, can be shown to involve no contradiction, if we apply the principle which we have already expounded in dealing with the scene of the feeding of the multitudes with the five loaves. For as there was one writer who, in giving his account of that incident, did not fail to specify that the people sat down at once by fifties and by hundreds, although another spoke only of the fifties, no contradiction could be supposed to emerge. There might indeed have seemed to be some difficulty, if the one evangelist had referred only to the hundreds, and the other only to the fifties; and yet, even in that case, the correct finding should have been to the effect that they were seated both by fifties and by hundreds.

And this example ought to have made it plain to us, as I pressed it upon my readers in discussing that section, that even where the several evangelists introduce only the one fact each, we should take the case to have been really, that both things were elements in the actual occurrence. In the same way, our conclusion with regard to the passage now before us should be, that the woman poured the ointment not only upon the Lord's head, but also on His feet. It is true that some person may possibly be found absurd and artful

enough to argue, that because Mark states that the ointment was poured out only after the alabaster vase was broken there could not have remained in the shattered vessel anything with which she could anoint His feet. But while a person of that character, in his endeavours to disprove the veracity of the Gospel, may contend that the vase was broken, in a manner making it impossible that any portion of the contents could have been left in it, how much better and more accordant with piety must the position of a very different individual appear, whose aim will be to uphold the truthfulness of the Gospel, and who may therefore contend that the vessel was not broken in a manner involving the total outpouring of the ointment!

Moreover, if that calumniator is so persistently blinded as to attempt to shatter the harmony of the evangelists on this subject of the shattering of the vase, he should rather accept the alternative, that the [Lord's] feet were anointed before the vessel itself was broken, and that it thus remained whole, and filled with ointment sufficient for the anointing also of the head, when, by the breakage referred to, the entire contents were discharged. For we allow that there is a due regard to the several parts of our nature when the act commences with the head, but [we may also say that] an equally natural order is preserved when we ascend from the feet to the head. 156. The other matters belonging to this incident do not seem to me to raise any question really involving a difficulty. There is the circumstance that the other evangelists mention how the disciples murmured about the [wasteful] outpouring of the precious ointment, whereas John states that Judas was the person who thus expressed himself, and tells us, in explanation of the fact, that "he was a thief." But I think it is evident that this same Judas was the person referred to under the [general] name of the disciples, the plural number being used here instead of the singular, in accordance with that mode of speech of which we have already introduced an explanation in the case of Philip and the miracle of the five loaves. It may also be understood in this way, that the other disciples either felt as Judas felt, or spoke as he did, or were brought over to that view of the matter by what Judas said, and that Matthew and Mark consequently have expressed in word what was really the mind of the whole company; but that Judas spoke as he did just because he was a thief, whereas what prompted the rest was their care for the poor; and further, that John has chosen to record the utterance of such sentiments only in the instance of

that one [among the disciples] whose habit of acting the thief he believed it right to bring out in connection with this occasion.

CHAPTER LXXX.-OF THE HARMONY CHARACTERIZING THE ACCOUNTS
WHICH ARE GIVEN BY MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE, OF THE OCCASION
ON WHICH HE SENT HIS DISCIPLES TO MAKE PREPARATIONS FOR HIS
EATING THE PASSOVER.

157. Matthew proceeds thus: "Then one of the twelve, who is called Judas [of] Scarioth, went unto the chief priests, and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver Him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver; and so on down to the words, "And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them, and they made ready the passover. Nothing in this section can be supposed to stand in any contradiction with the versions of Mark and Luke, who record this same passage in a similar manner. For as regards the statement given by Matthew in these terms, "Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand: I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples," it just indicates the person whom Mark and Luke name the "goodman of the house," or the "master of the house," in which the dining-room was shown them where they were to make ready the passover. And Matthew has expressed this by simply bringing in the phrase, "to such a man," as a brief explanation introduced by himself with the view of succinctly giving us to understand who the person referred to was. For if he had said that the Lord addressed them in words like these:

"Go into the city, and say unto him [or "it "], The Master saith, My time is at hand, I will keep the passover at thy house," it might have been supposed that the terms were intended to be directed to the city itself. For this reason, therefore, Matthew has inserted the statement, that the Lord bade them go "to such a man," not, however, as a statement made by the Lord, whose instructions he was recording, but simply as one volunteered by himself, with the view of avoiding the necessity of narrating the whole at length, when it seemed to him that this was all that required to be mentioned in order to bring out with sufficient accuracy what was really meant by the person who gave the order. For who can fail to see that no one naturally speaks to others in such an indefinite fashion as this, "Go ye to such a man"? If, again, the words had been, "Go ye to any one whatsoever," or "to any one you please," the mode of expression might have been correct enough, but the person to whom the disciples were sent would have been left uncertain: whereas Mark

and Luke present him as a certain definitely indicated individual, although they pass over his name in silence. The Lord Himself, we may be sure, knew to what person it was that He despatched them.

And in order that those also whom He was thus sending might be able to discover the individual meant, He gave them, before they set out, a particular sign which they were to follow,-namely, the appearance of a man bearing a pitcher or a vessel of water,-and told them, that if they went after him, they would reach the house which He intended. Hence, seeing that it was not competent here to employ the phraseology, "Go to any one you please," which is indeed legitimate enough, so far as the demands of linguistic propriety are concerned, but which an accurate statement of the matter dealt with here renders inadmissible in this passage, with how much less warrant could an expression like this have been used here (by the speaker Himself), "Go to such a man," which the usage of correct language can never admit at all? But it is manifest that the disciples were sent by the Lord, plainly, not to any man they pleased, but to "such a man," that is to say, to a certain definite individual. And that is a thing which the evangelist, speaking in his own person, could quite rightly have related to us, by putting it in this way: "He sent them to such a man, in order to say to him, I will keep the passover at thy house. He might also have expressed it thus: "He sent them to such a man, saying, Go, say to him, I will keep the passover at thy house.

And thus it is that, after giving us the words actually spoken by the Lord Himself, namely, "Go into the city," he has introduced this addition of his own, "to such a man," which he does, however, not as if the Lord had thus expressed Himself, but simply with the view of giving us to understand, although the name is left unrecorded, that there was a particular person in the city to whom the Lord's disciples were sent, in order to make ready the passover. Thus, too, after the two [or three] words brought in that manner as an explanation of his own, he takes up again the order of the words as they were uttered by the Lord Himself, namely, "And say unto him, The Master saith. And if you ask now "to whom" they were to say this, the correct reply is given [at once] in these terms, To that particular man to whom the evangelist has given us to understand that the Lord sent them, when, speaking in His own person, he introduced the clause, "to such a man. The clause thus inserted may indeed contain a rather unusual mode of expression, but still it is a perfectly legitimate phraseology when it is thus understood. Or it may be, that

in the Hebrew language, in which Matthew is reported to have written, there is some peculiar usage which might make it entirely accordant with the laws of correct expression, even were the whole taken to have been spoken by the Lord Himself.

Whether that is the case, those who understand that tongue may decide. Even in the Latin language itself, indeed, this kind of expression might also be used, in terms like these: "Go into the city to such a man as may be indicated by a person who shall meet you carrying a pitcher of water. If the instructions were conveyed in such words as these, they could be acted upon without any ambiguity. Or again, if the terms were anything like these, "Go into the city to such a man, who resides in this or the other place, in such and such a house," then the note thus given of the place and the designation of the house would make it quite possible to understand the commission delivered, and to execute it. But when these instructions, and all others of a similar order, are left entirely untold, the person who in such circumstances uses this kind of address, "Go to such a man, and say unto him," cannot possibly be listened to intelligently for this obvious reason, that when he employs the terms, "to such a man," he intends a certain particular individual to be understood by them, and yet offers us no hint by which he may be identified. But if we are to suppose that the clause referred to is one introduced as an explanation by the evangelist himself, [we may find that] the requirements of brevity will render the expression somewhat obscure, without, however, making it incorrect.

Moreover, as to the fact, that where Mark speaks of a pitcher of water, Luke mentions a vessel, the simple explanation is, that the one has used a word indicative of the kind of vessel, and the other a term indicative of its capacity, while both evangelists have nevertheless preserved the real meaning actually intended. 158. Matthew proceeds thus: "Now when the even was Come, He sat down with the twelve disciples; and as they did eat, He said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say, Lord, is it I?" and so on, down to where we read, "Then Judas, which betrayed Him, answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said." In what we have now presented for consideration here, the other three evangelists, who also record such matters, offer nothing calculated to raise any question of serious difficulty.

INTRODUCTION

¹This book contains a demonstration of the harmony of the evangelists from the accounts of the Supper on to the end of the Gospel, the narratives given by the several writers being collated, and the whole arranged in one orderly connection.

Prologue.

21. Inasmuch as we have now reached that point in the history at which all the four evangelists necessarily hold their course in company on to the conclusion, without presenting any serious divergence the one from the other, if it happens anywhere that one of them makes mention of something which another leaves unnoticed, it appears to me that we may demonstrate the consistency maintained by the various evangelists with greater expedition, if from this point onwards we now bring all the statements given by all the writers together into one connection, and arrange the whole in a single narration, and under one view. I consider that in this way the task which we have undertaken may be discharged with greater convenience and facility than otherwise might be the case. What we have now before us, therefore, is to attempt the construction of a single narrative, in which we shall include all the particulars, and for which we shall possess the attestation of those evangelists who, (each selecting for recital out of the whole number of facts those which he had either the ability or the desire to relate,) have prepared these records for us: this being done in such a manner, moreover, that all these statements, in regard to which we have to prove an entire freedom from contradictions, are taken as made by all the evangelists together.

CHAPTER I.—OF THE METHOD IN WHICH THE FOUR EVANGELISTS ARE SHOWN TO BE AT ONE IN THE ACCOUNTS GIVEN OF THE LORD'S SUPPER AND THE INDICATION OF HIS BETRAYER.

2. Let us commence here, accordingly, with the notice presented by Matthew, [which runs thus]: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to His disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. Both Mark and Luke also gave this section. It is true that Luke has made mention of the cup twice over: first before He gave the bread; and, secondly, after the bread has been given. But the fact is, that what is stated in that earlier connection has been introduced, according to this writer's habit, by anticipation, while the words which he has inserted here in their proper

order are left unrecorded in those previous verses, and the two passages when put together make up exactly what stands expressed by those other evangelists. John, on the other hand, has said nothing about the body and blood of the Lord in this context; but he plainly certifies that the Lord spake to that effect on another occasion, with much greater fulness than here. At present, however, after recording how the Lord rose from supper and washed the disciples' feet, and after telling us also the reason why the Lord dealt thus with them, in expressing which He had intimated, although still obscurely, and by the use of a testimony of Scripture, the fact that He was being betrayed by the man who was to eat of His bread, at this point John comes to the section in question, which the other three evangelists also unite in introducing.

He presents it thus: "When Jesus had thus said, He was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, That one of you shall betray me. Then the disciples looked (as the same John subjoins) one on another, doubting of whom He spake. "And (as Matthew and Mark tell us) they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto Him, Is it I? And He answered and said (as Matthew proceeds to state), He that dipeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. Matthew also goes on to make the following addition to the preceding: "The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of Him; but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man shall be betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born. Mark, too, is at one with him here as regards both the words themselves and the order of narration. Then Matthew continues thus: "Then Judas, which betrayed Him, answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said. Even these words did not say explicitly whether he was himself the man. For the sentence still admits of being understood as if its point was this, "I am not the person who has said so. All this, too, may quite easily have been uttered by Judas and answered by the Lord without its being noticed by all the others.

3. After this, Matthew proceeds to insert the mystery of His body and blood, as it was committed then by the Lord to the disciples. Here Mark and Luke act correspondingly. But after He had handed the cup to them, [we find that] He spoke again concerning His betrayer, in terms which Luke recounts, when he says, "But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. And truly the Son of man goeth as it was determined: but woe unto that man by whom He shall be betrayed." At this point we

must now suppose that to come in which is narrated by John while these others omit it, just as John has also passed by certain matters which they have detailed. In accordance with this, after the giving of the cup, and after the Lord's subsequent saying which has been brought in by Luke, -namely, "But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table," etc., -the statement made by John is [to be taken as immediately] subjoined. It is to the following effect: "Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of His disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him, and said unto him, Who is he of whom He speaketh? He then, when he had laid himself on Jesus' breast, saith unto Him, Lord, who is it? Jesus answered, He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when He had dipped the sop, He gave it to Judas, the son of Simon [of] Scarioth. And after the sop Satan then entered into him."

4. Here we must take care not to let John underlie the appearance not only of standing in antagonism to Luke, who had stated before this, that Satan entered into the heart of Judas at the time when he made his bargain with the Jews to betray Him on receipt of a sum of money, but also of contradicting himself. For, at an earlier point, and previous to [his notice of] the receiving of this sop, he had made use of these terms: "And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas to betray Him. And how does he enter into the heart, but by putting unrighteous persuasions into the thoughts of unrighteous men? The explanation, however, is this. We ought to suppose Judas to have been more fully taken possession of by the devil now, just as on the other hand, in the instance of the good, those who had already received the Holy Spirit on that occasion, subsequently to His resurrection, when He breathed upon them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," also obtained a fuller gift of that Spirit at a later time, namely, when He was sent down from above on the day of Pentecost. In like manner, Satan then entered into this man after the sop. And (as John himself mentions in the immediate context) "Jesus saith unto him, What thou doest, do quickly. Now no man at the table knew for what intent He spake this unto him;

for some of them thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of against the feast; or, that he should give something to the poor. He then, having received the sop, went immediately out; and it was night. Therefore, when he was gone out, Jesus saith, Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him: and if

God be glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him."

CHAPTER II.-OF THE PROOF OF THEIR FREEDOM FROM ANY
DISCREPANCIES IN THE NOTICES GIVEN OF THE PREDICTIONS OF
PETER'S DENIALS.

5. "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me: and, as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so now I say unto you. A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another. Simon Peter saith unto Him, Lord, whither goest thou? Jesus answered him, Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards. Peter saith unto Him, Lord, why cannot I follow Thee now? I will lay down my life for Thy sake. Jesus answered him, Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, until thou deniest me thrice. John, from whose Gospel I have taken the passage introduced above, is not the only evangelist who details this incident of the prophetic announcement of his own denial to Peter. The other three also record the same thing. They do not, however, take one and the same particular point in the discourses [of Christ] as their occasion for proceeding to this narration. For Matthew and Mark both introduce it in a completely parallel order, and at the same stage of their narrative, namely, after the Lord left the house in which they had eaten the passover;

while Luke and John, on the other hand, bring it in before He left that scene. Still we might easily suppose, either that it has been inserted in the way of a recapitulation by the one couple of evangelists, or that it has been inserted in the way of an anticipation by the other; only such a supposition may be made more doubtful by the circumstance that there is so remarkable a diversity, not only in the Lord's words, but even in those sentiments of His by which the incident in question is introduced, and by which Peter was moved to venture his presumptuous asseveration that he would die with the Lord or for the Lord. These considerations may constrain us rather to understand the narratives really to import that the man uttered his presumptuous declaration thrice over, as it was called forth by different occasions in the series of Christ's discourses, and that also three several times the answer was

returned him by the Lord, which intimated that before the cock crew he would deny Him thrice.

6. And surely there is nothing incredible in supposing that Peter was moved to such an act of presumption on several occasions, separated from each other by certain intervals of time, as he was actually instigated to deny Him repeatedly. Neither should it seem unreasonable to fancy that the Lord gave him a reply in similar terms at three successive periods, especially when [we see that] in immediate connection with each other, and without the interposition of anything else either in fact or word, Christ addressed the question to him three several times whether he loved Him, and that, when Peter returned the same answer thrice over, He also gave him thrice over the self-same charge to feed His sheep. That it is the more reasonable thing to suppose that Peter displayed his presumption on three different occasions, and that thrice over he received from the Lord a warning with respect to his triple denial, is further proved, as we may see, by the very terms employed by the evangelists, which record sayings uttered by the Lord in diverse form and of diverse import. Let us here call attention again to that passage which I introduced a little ago from the Gospel of John. There we certainly find that He had expressed Himself in this way "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me: and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so now I say to you.

A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another. Simon Peter saith unto Him, Lord, whither goest Thou? Now, surely it is evident here that what moved Peter to utter this question, "Lord, whither goest Thou? was the words which the Lord Himself had spoken. For he had heard Him say, "Whither I go, ye cannot come. Then Jesus made this reply to the said Peter: "Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now, but thou shall follow me afterwards. Thereupon Peter expressed himself thus: "Lord, why cannot I follow Thee now? I will lay down my life for Thy sake. And to this presumptuous declaration the Lord responded by predicting his denial. Luke, again, first mentions how the Lord said, "Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and, when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren: next he proceeds immediately to tell us how Peter replied to this effect: "Lord, I am ready to go with

Thee, both unto prison and to death; and then he continues thus: "And He said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me.

Now, who can fail to perceive that this is an occasion by itself, and that the incident in connection with which Peter was incited to make the presumptuous declaration already referred to is an entirely different one? But, once more, Matthew presents us with the following passage: "And when they had sung an hymn," he says, "they went out into the Mount of Olives. Then saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. But after I am risen again, I will go before you into Galilee. The same passage is given in precisely the same form by Mark. What similarity is there, however, in these words, or in the ideas expressed by them, either to the terms in which John represents Peter to have made his presumptuous declaration, or to those in which Luke exhibits him as uttering such an asseveration? And so we find that in Matthew's narrative the connection proceeds immediately thus: "Peter answered and said unto Him, Though all men shall be offended because of Thee, yet will I never be offended. Jesus saith unto him, Verily, I say unto thee, that this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. Peter saith unto him, Though I should die with Thee, yet will I not deny Thee. Likewise also said all His disciples."

7. All this is recorded almost in the same language also by Mark, only that he has not put in so general a form what the Lord said with regard to the manner in which the event [of Peter's failure] was to be brought about, but has given it a more particular turn. For his version is this: "Verily I say unto thee, That this day, even in this night, before the cock crow twice; thou shalt deny me thrice. Thus it appears that all of them tell us how the Lord foretold that Peter would deny Him before the cock crew, but that they do not all mention how often the cock was to crow, and that Mark is the only one who has presented a more explicit notice of this incident in the narrative. Hence some are of opinion that Mark's statement is not in harmony with those of the others. But this is simply because they do not give sufficient attention to the facts of the case, and, above all, because they approach the question under the cloud of a prejudiced mind, in consequence of their being possessed by a hostile disposition towards the gospel. The fact is, that Peter's denial, when taken as a whole, is a threefold denial. For he remained in the

same state of mental agitation, and harboured the same mendacious intention, until what had been foretold regarding him was brought to his mind, and healing came to him by bitter weeping and sorrow of heart.

It is evident, however, that if this complete denial-that is to say, the threefold denial-is taken to have commenced only after the first crowing of the cock, three of the evangelists will appear to have given an incorrect account of the matter. For Matthew's version is this: "Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice; and Luke puts it thus: "I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me; and John presents it in this form: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, the cock shall not crow till thou hast denied me thrice. And thus, in different terms and with words introduced in diverse successions, these three evangelists have expressed one and the same sense as conveyed by the words which the Lord spake-namely, the fact that, before the cock should crow, Peter was to deny Him thrice. On the other hand, if [we suppose that] he went through the whole triple denial before the cock began to crow at all, then Mark will be made to underlie the charge of having given a superfluous statement when he puts these words into the Lord's mouth: "Verily I say unto thee, That this day, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice.

For to what purpose would it be to say, "before the cock crow twice," when, on the supposition that this entire threefold denial was gone through previous to the first crowing of the cock, it is self-evident that a negation, which would thus be proved to have been completed before the first cock-crow, must also, as matter of course, be understood to have been fully uttered before the second cockcrow and before the third, and, in short, before all the cockcrowings which took place on that same night? But, inasmuch as this threefold denial was begun previous to the first crowing of the cock, those three evangelists concerned themselves with noticing, not the time at which Peter was to complete it, but the extent to which it was to be carried, and the period at which it was to commence; that is to say, their object was to bring out the facts that it was to be thrice repeated, and that it was to begin previous to the cockcrowing. At the same time, so far as the man's own mind is concerned, we might also quite well understand it to have been engaged in, as a whole, previous to the first cockcrow.

For although it is true that, so far as regards the actual utterance of the individual who was guilty of the denial, that threefold negation was only entered upon previous to the first cockcrow, and really finished before the second cockcrow, still it is equally true that, in so far as the disposition of mind and the apprehensions indulged by Peter were concerned, it was conceived, as a whole, before the first cockcrow. Neither is it a matter of any consequence of what duration those intervals of delay were which elapsed between the several utterances of that thrice-recurring voice, if it is the case that the denial completely possessed his heart even previous to the first cockcrow, -in consequence, indeed, of his having imbibed a spirit of terror so abject as to make him capable of denying the Lord when he was questioned regarding Him, not only once, but a second time, and even a third time.

Thus, a more correct and careful consideration of the matter might show us that, precisely as it is declared that the man who looketh on a woman to lust after her has committed adultery with her already in his heart, so, in the present instance, inasmuch as in the words which he spoke, Peter merely expressed the apprehension which he had already conceived with such intensity in his mind as to make it capable of enduring even on to a third repetition of his denial of the Lord, this threefold negation is to be assigned as a whole to that particular period at which the fear that sufficed thus to carry him on to a threefold denial took possession of him. In this way, too, it may be made apparent that, even if the words in which the denial was couched began to break forth from him only after the first cockcrow, when his heart was smitten by the inquiries addressed to him, it would involve neither any absurdity nor any untruthfulness, although it were said that before the cock crew he denied Him thrice, seeing that, in any case, previous to the crowing of the cock, his mind had been assailed by an apprehension violent enough to be able to draw him on even to a third denial.

All the less, therefore, ought we to feel any difficulty in the matter, if it appears that the threefold denial, as expressed also in the thrice-recurring utterances of the person who made the denial, was entered upon previous to the crowing of the cock, although it was not completed before the first cockcrow. We may take a parallel case, and suppose an intimation to be made to the following effect to a person: "This night, before the cock crow, you will write a letter to me, in which you will revile me thrice. Well, surely in this instance, if the man began to write the letter] before the cock had crowed at

all, and finished it after the cock had crowed for the first time, that would be no reason for alleging that the intimation previously made was false. The fact, therefore, is that, in putting these words into the Lord's lips, "Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice," Mark has given us a plainer indication of the intervals of time which separated the utterances themselves. And when we come to the said section of the evangelical narrative, we shall see that the circumstances are presented in a manner which exhibits, in that connection also, the harmony subsisting among the evangelists.

8. If, however, the demand is to get at the very words, literally and completely, which the Lord addressed to Peter, we answer that it is impossible to discover these; and further, that it is simply superfluous to ask them, inasmuch as the speaker's meaning-to intimate which was the object He had in view in uttering the words-admits of being understood with the utmost plainness, even under the diverse terms employed by the evangelists. And whether, then, it be the case that Peter, instigated at different occasions in the course of the Lord's sayings, made his presumptuous declaration three several times, and had his denial foretold him thrice over by the Lord, as is the more probable result to which our investigation points us; or whether it may appear that the accounts given by all the evangelists are capable of being reduced to a single statement, when a certain order of narration is adopted, so that it could be proved that it was only on one occasion that the Lord predicted to Peter, on the exhibition of his presumptuous spirit, the fact that he would deny Him;-in either case, any contradiction between the evangelists will fail to be detected, as nothing of that nature really exists.

Chapter III.-Of the Manner in Which It Can Be Shown that No Discrepancies Exist Between Them in the Accounts Which They Give of the Words Which Were Spoken by the Lord, on to the Time of His Leaving the House in Which They Had Supped. 9. At this point, therefore, we may now follow, as far as we can, the order of the narrative, as gathered from all the evangelists together. Thus, then, after the prediction in question had been made to Peter, according to John's version, the same John proceeds with his statement, and introduces in this connection the Lord's discourse, which was to the following effect: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions; and so forth. He narrates at length the sayings, so memorable and so pre-eminently sublime, of which He delivered Himself in the course of that address, until, in due

connection, he comes to the passage where the Lord speaks as follows: "O righteous Father, the world hath not known Thee: but I have known Thee, and these have known that Thou hast sent me. And I have declared unto them Thy name, and will declare it; that the love wherewith Thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them. Again we find, according to the narrative given by Luke, that there arose "a strife among them which of them should be accounted the greatest. And He said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.

For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth. And ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations: and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. The said Luke also immediately subjoins to these words the following passage: "And the Lord said to Simon: Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. And he said unto Him: Lord, I am ready to go with Thee, both into prison, and to death. And He said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shall thrice deny that thou knowest me. And He said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing. Then said He unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. For I say unto you, this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And He was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end.

And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And He said unto them, It is enough. Next comes the passage, given both by Matthew and by Mark: "And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives. Then saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. But after I am risen again, I will go before you into Galilee. Peter answered and said unto Him, Though all men shall be offended because of Thee, yet will I never be offended. Jesus saith unto

him, Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. Peter saith unto Him, Though I should die with Thee, yet will I not deny Thee. Likewise also said all the disciples. We have introduced the preceding section as it is presented by Matthew. But Mark also records it almost in so many and the same words, with the exception of the apparent discrepancy, which we have already cleared up above, on the subject of the crowing of the cock.

Chapter IV.-Of What Took Place in the Piece of Ground or Garden to Which They Came on Leaving the House After the Supper; And of the Method in Which, in John's Silence on the Subject, a Real Harmony Can Be Demonstrated Between the Other Three Evangelists-Namely, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. 10. Matthew then proceeds with his narrative in the same connection as follows: "Then cometh Jesus with them unto a place called Gethsemane. This is mentioned also by Mark. Luke, too, refers to it, although he does not notice the piece of ground by name. For he says: "And He came out, and went, as was His wont, to the Mount of Olives; and His disciples also followed Him. And when He was at the place, He said unto them, Pray that ye enter not into temptation. That is the place which the other two have instanced under the name of Gethsemane. There, we understand, was the garden which John brings into notice when he gives the following narration: "When Jesus had spoken these words, He went forth with His disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into the which He entered, and His disciples. Then taking Matthew's record, we get this statement next in order: "He said unto His disciples, Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder. And He took with Him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith He unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me. And He went a little farther, and fell on His face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt.

And He cometh unto the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto Peter, What! could ye not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak. He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me except I drink it, Thy will be done. And He came and found them asleep again: for their eyes were heavy. And

He left them, and went away again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words. Then cometh He to His disciples, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that shall betray me."

11. Mark also records these passages, introducing them quite in the same method and succession. Some of the sentences, however, are given with greater brevity by him, and others are somewhat more fully explained. These sayings of our Lord, indeed, may seem in one portion to stand in some manner of contradiction to each other as they are presented in Matthew's version. I refer to the fact that [it is stated there that] He came to His disciples after His third prayer, and said to them, "Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that shall betray me. For what are we to make of the direction thus given above, "Sleep on now, and take your rest," when there is immediately subjoined this other declaration, "Behold, the hour is at hand," and thereafter also the instruction, "Arise, let us be going"? Those readers who perceive something like a contradiction here, seek to pronounce these words, "Sleep on now, and take your rest," in a way betokening that they were spoken in reproach, and not in permission. And this is an expedient which might quite fairly be adopted were there any necessity for it.

Mark, however, has reproduced these sayings in a manner which implies that after He had expressed himself in the terms, "Sleep on now, and take your rest," He added the words, "It is enough," and then appended to these the further statement, "The hour is come; behold, the Son of man shall be betrayed. Hence we may conclude that the case really stood thus: namely, that after addressing these words to them, "Sleep on now, and take your rest," the Lord was silent for a space, so that what He had thus given them permission to do might be [seen to be] really acted upon; and that thereafter He made the other declaration "Behold the hour is come" Thus it is that in Mark's Gospel we find those words [regarding the sleeping] followed immediately by the phrase, "It is enough; that is to say," the rest which you have had is enough now. But as no distinct notice is introduced of this silence on the Lord's part which intervened then, the passage comes to be understood

in a forced manner, and it is supposed that a peculiar pronunciation must be given to these words.

12. Luke, on the other hand, has omitted to mention the number of times that He prayed. He has told us, however, a fact which is not recorded by the others-namely, that when He prayed He was strengthened by an angel, and that, as He prayed more earnestly, He had a bloody sweat, with drops falling down to the ground. Thus it appears that when he makes the statement, "And when He rose up from prayer, and was come to His disciples," he does not indicate how often He had prayed by that time. But still, in so doing, he does not stand in any kind of antagonism to the other two. Moreover, John does indeed mention how He entered into the garden along with His disciples. But he does not relate how He was occupied there up to the period when His betrayer came in along with the Jews to apprehend Him.

13. These three evangelists, therefore, have in this manner narrated the same incident, just as, on the other hand, one man might give three several accounts of a single occurrence, with a certain measure of diversity in his statements, and yet without any real contradiction. Luke, for example, has specified the distance to which He went forward from the disciples-that is to say, when He withdrew from them in order to pray-more definitely than the others. For he tells us that it was "about a stone's cast. Mark, again, states first of all in his own words how the Lord prayed that, "If it were possible, the hour might pass from Him," referring to the hour of His Passion, which he also expresses presently by the term "cup. He then reproduces the Lord's own words, in the following manner: "Abba, Father, all things are possible to Thee: take away this cup from me. And if we connect with these terms the clause which is given by the other two evangelists, and for which Mark himself has also already introduced a clear parallel, presented as a statement made in his own person instead of the Lord's, the whole sentence will be exhibited in this form: "Father, if it be possible, (for) all things are possible unto Thee, take away this cup from me. And it will be so put just to prevent any one from supposing that He made the Father's power less than it is when He said, "If it be possible.

For thus His words were not "If Thou canst do it" but "If it be possible. And anything is possible which He wills. Therefore, the expression, "If it be possible," has here just the same force as, "If Thou wilt. For Mark has made the sense in which the phrase, "If it be possible," is to be taken quite plain,

when he says, "All things are possible unto Thee. And further, the fact that these writers have recorded how He said, "Nevertheless, not what I will, but what Thou wilt" (an expression which means precisely the same as this other form, "Nevertheless, not my will but Thine be done"), shows us clearly enough that it was with reference not to any absolute impossibility on the Father's side, but only to His will, that these words, "If it be possible," were spoken. This is made the more apparent by the plainer statement which Luke has presented to the same effect. For his version is not, "If it be possible," but, "If Thou be willing. And to this clearer declaration of what was really meant we may add, with the effect of still greater clearness, the clause which Mark has inserted, so that the whole will proceed thus: "If Thou be willing, (for) all things are possible unto Thee, take away this cup from me."

14. Again, as to Mark's mentioning that the Lord said not only "Father," but "Abba, Father," the explanation simply is, that "Abba" is in Hebrew exactly what "Pater" is in Latin. And perhaps the Lord may have used both words with some kind of symbolical significance, intending to indicate thereby, that in sustaining this sorrow He bore the part of His body, which is the Church, of which He has been made the corner-stone, and which comes to Him [in the person of disciples gathered] partly out of the Hebrews, to whom He refers when He says "Abba," and partly out of the Gentiles, to whom He refers when He says "Pater" [Father]. The Apostle Paul also makes use of the same significant expression. For he says, "In whom we cry, Abba, Father; and, in another passage, "God sent His Spirit into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. For it was meet that the good Master and true Saviour, by sharing in the sufferings of the more infirm, should in His own person illustrate the truth that His witnesses ought not to despair, although it might perchance happen that, through human frailty, sorrow might steal in upon their hearts at the time of suffering; seeing that they would overcome it if, mindful that God knows what is best for those whose well-being He regards, they gave His will the preference over their own. On this subject, however, as a whole, the present is not the time for entering on any more detailed discussion.

For we have to deal simply with the question concerning the harmony of the evangelists, from whose varied modes of narration we gather the wholesome lesson that, in order to get at the truth, the one essential thing to aim at in dealing with the terms is simply the intention which the speaker had in

view in using them. For the word "Father" means just the same as the phrase "Abba, Father. But with a view to bring out the mystic significance, the expression, "Abba, Father," is the clearer form; while, for indicating the unity, the word "Father" is sufficient. And that the Lord did indeed employ this method of address, "Abba, Father," must be accepted as matter of fact. But still His intention would not appear very obvious were there not the means (since others use simply the term "Father") to show that under such a form of expression those two Churches, which are constituted, the one out of the Jews, and the other out of the Gentiles, are presented as also really one. In this way, then, [we may suppose that] the phrase, "Abba, Father," was adopted in order to convey the same idea as was indicated by the Lord on another occasion, when He said, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold. In these words He certainly referred to the Gentiles, since He had sheep also among the people of Israel.

But in that passage He goes on immediately to add the declaration, "Them also I must bring, that there may be one fold and one Shepherd. And so we may say that, just as the phrase, "Abba, Father," contains the idea of [the two races,] the Israelites and the Gentiles, the word "Father," used alone, points to the one flock which these two constitute.

CHAPTER V.-OF THE ACCOUNTS WHICH ARE GIVEN BY ALL THE FOUR
EVANGELISTS IN REGARD TO WHAT WAS DONE AND SAID ON THE
OCCASION OF HIS APPREHENSION; AND OF THE PROOF THAT THESE
DIFFERENT NARRATIVES EXHIBIT NO REAL DISCREPANCIES.

15. When we follow the versions presented by Matthew and Mark, we find that the history now proceeds thus: "And while He yet spake, lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came, and with him a great multitude, with swords and staves, from the chief priests and elders of the people. Now he that betrayed Him, gave them a sign, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is He; hold Him fast. And forthwith he came to Jesus, and said, Hail, Master; and kissed Him." First of all, however, as we gather from Luke's statement, He said to the traitor, "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?" Next, as we learn from Matthew, He spoke thus: "Friend, wherefore art thou come?" Thereafter He added certain words which are found in John's narrative, which runs in the following strain: "Whom seek ye? They answered Him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am He. And Judas also, which betrayed Him, stood with them. As soon then as He had said unto them, I am

He, they went backward, and fell to the ground. Then asked He them again, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus answered, I have told you that I am He: if therefore ye seek me, let these go their way; that the saying might be fulfilled which He spake, Of them which thou gavest me have I lost none."

16. Next comes in a passage, which is given by Luke as follows: "When they which were about Him saw what would follow, they said unto Him, Lord, shall we smite with the sword? And one of them smote the servant of the high priest," as is noticed by all the four historians, "and cut off his ear," which, as we are informed by Luke and John, was his "right ear." Moreover, we gather also from John that the person who smote the servant was Peter, and that the name of the man whom he thus struck was Malchus. Next we take what Luke mentions, namely, "Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far;" with which we must connect the words appended by Matthew, namely, "Put up thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" Along with these words we may also place the question to which John tells us He gave utterance on the same occasion, namely, "The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" And then, as is recorded by Luke, He touched the ear of the person who had been struck, and healed him.

17. Neither should we let the idea disturb us, that some contradiction may be found in the circumstance that Luke tells us how, when the disciples asked Him whether they should smite with the sword, the Lord replied in these words, "Suffer ye thus far," in a manner which might seem to imply that He thus expressed Himself, after the blow had been struck, in terms bearing that He was satisfied with what had been done so far, but desired nothing further to be done; whereas the language which is employed by Matthew might give us rather to understand that this whole incident of the use which Peter made of the sword was displeasing to the Lord. For it is more correct to suppose that when they put the question to Him, "Lord, shall we smite with the sword? He replied then, "Suffer ye thus far; His meaning being this: "Let not what is about to take place agitate you. These men are to be suffered to go thus far; that is to say, so far as to apprehend me, and thus to effect the fulfilment of those things which are written of me. We have fur-

ther to suppose, however, that during the time which passed in the interchange of the question addressed by them to the Lord, and the reply returned by Him to them, Peter was borne on by his intense desire to appear as defender, and by his stronger excitement in the Lord's behalf, to deal the blow.

But while these two things might easily have happened at the same time, two different statements could not have been uttered by the same person in one breath. For the writer would not have used the expression, "And Jesus answered and said," unless the words were a reply to the question which had been addressed by those who were about Him, and not a statement directed to Peter's act. For Matthew is the only one who has recorded the judgment passed by Jesus on Peter's act. And in that passage the phrase which Matthew has employed is also not in the form, "Jesus answered Peter thus, Put up thy sword; but it runs in these terms: "Then said Jesus unto him, Put up thy sword; from which it appears that it was after the deed that Jesus thus declared Himself. What is contained, again, in the phraseology used by Luke, namely, "And Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far," must be taken to have been the reply which was returned to the parties who had put the question to Him. But inasmuch as, according to our previous explanation, the single blow with which the servant was struck was delivered just during the time when the terms of the said question and answer were passing between these persons and the Lord, the writer has considered it right to record that act in the same particular order, so that it stands inserted between the words of the interrogation and those in which the response was couched.

Consequently, there is nothing here in antagonism to the statement introduced by Matthew, namely, "For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword,"-that is to say, those who may have used the sword. But there might appear to be some inconsistency here if the Lord's answer were taken in a sense which would show Him to have expressed approval on this occasion of the voluntary use of the sword, even although it was only to the effect of a single wound, and that, too, not a fatal one. The words, however, which were addressed to Peter may be understood, as a whole, in an application quite in harmony with the rest; so that, bringing in also what Luke and Matthew have reported, as I have stated above, we obtain the following connection: "Suffer ye thus far. Put up thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword," etc. In what way, moreover, this

sentence, "Suffer ye thus far," is to be understood, I have explained already. And if there is any better method of interpreting it, be it so. Only let the veracity of the evangelists be maintained in any case.

18. After this, Matthew continues the narrative, and mentions that in that hour He addressed the multitude as follows: "Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and staves for to take me? I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me." Then He added also certain words, which Luke introduces thus: "But this is your hour, and the power of darkness." Next comes the sentence given by Matthew: "But all this was done that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook Him and fled." This last fact is recorded also by Mark. The same evangelist makes also the following addition: "And there followed Him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and when they laid hold on him, he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked."

Chapter VI.-Of the Harmony Characterizing the Accounts Which These Evangelists Give of What Happened When the Lord Was Led Away to the House of the High Priest, as Also of the Occurrences Which Took Place Within the Said House After He Was Conducted There in the Nighttime, and in Particular of the Incident of Peter's Denial. 19. In the line of Matthew's narrative we come next upon this statement: "And they that laid hold on Jesus led Him away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the elders were assembled." We learn, however, from John that He was conducted first to Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas. On the other hand, Mark and Luke omit all mention of the name of the high priest. Moreover [we find that] He was led away bound. For, as John informs us, there were at hand there, in the multitude, a tribune and a cohort, and the servants of the Jews. Then in Matthew we have these words: "But Peter followed Him afar off unto the high priest's palace, and went in and sat with the servants to see the end." To this passage in the narrative Mark makes this addition: "And he warmed himself at the fire." Luke also makes a statement which amounts to the same, thus: "Peter followed afar off: and when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall, and were sat down together, Peter sat down among them." And John proceeds in these terms: "And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple. That disciple (namely, that other) was known unto the high priest, and went in (as John also tells us) with Jesus into the palace of the high priest. But Peter (as the same John adds) stood at the door

without. Then went out that other disciple, which was known unto the high priest, and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter." For , the last fact we are thus indebted to John's narrative. And in this way we see how it came about that Peter also got inside, and was within the hall, as the other evangelists mention.

20. Then Matthew's report goes on thus: "Now the chief priests and elders and all the council sought false witness against Jesus, to put Him to death, but found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. Mark comes in here with the explanation, that "their witness agreed not together. But, as Matthew continues, "At the last came two false witnesses, and said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days. Mark states that there were also others who said, "We have heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands. And therefore (as Mark also observes in the same passage) their witness did not agree together. Then Matthew gives us the following relation: "And the high priest arose and said unto Him, Answerest thou nothing? What is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held His peace. And the high priest answered and said unto Him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said. Mark reports the same passage in different terms, only he omits to mention the fact that the high priest adjured Him. He makes it plain, however, that the two expressions ascribed to Jesus as the reply to the high priest, -namely, "Thou hast said," and, "I am," -really amount to the same.

For, as the said Mark puts it, the narrative goes on thus: "And Jesus said, I am; and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven. This is just as Matthew also presents the passage, with the solitary exception that he does not say that Jesus replied in the phrase "I am. Again, Matthew goes on further in this strain: "Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? Behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? And they answered and said, He is guilty of death. Mark's version of this is entirely to the same effect. So Matthew continues, "Then did they spit in His face, and buffeted Him, and others smote Him with the palms of their hands, saying, Prophecy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee? Mark reports these things in like manner. He also mentions a further

fact, namely, that they covered His face. On these incidents we have likewise the testimony of Luke.

21. These things the Lord is understood to have passed through on to the early morning in the high priest's house, to which He was first conducted, and in which Peter was also tempted. With respect, however, to this temptation of Peter, which took place during the time that the Lord was enduring these injuries, the several evangelists do not present the same order in the recital of the circumstances. For Matthew and Mark first narrate the injuries offered to the Lord, and then this temptation of Peter. Luke, again, first describes Peter's temptation, and only after that the reproaches borne by the Lord; while John, on the other hand, first recounts part of Peter's temptation, then introduces some verses recording what the Lord had to bear, next appends a statement to the effect that the Lord was sent away thence (i.e. from Annas) to Caiaphas the high priest, and then at this point resumes and sums up the relation which he had commenced of Peter's temptation in the house to which he was first conducted, giving a full account of that incident, thereafter reverting to the succession of things befalling the Lord, and telling us how He was brought to Caiaphas.

22. Accordingly, Matthew proceeds as follows: "Now Peter sat without in the palace; and a damsel came unto him, saying, Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee. But he denied before them all, saying, I know not what thou sayest. And as he went out into the porch, another maid saw him, and said unto them that were there, This fellow was also with Jesus of Nazareth. And again he denied with an oath, I do not know the man. And after a while came unto him they that stood by, and said to Peter, Surely thou also art one of them, for thy speech bewrayeth thee. Then began he to curse and to swear, saying that he knew not the man. And immediately the cock crew." Such is Matthew's version. But we are also given to understand that after he had gone outside, and when he had now denied the Lord once, the first cock crew, - a fact which Matthew does not specify, but which is intimated by Mark.

23. But it was not when he was outside at the gate that he denied the Lord the second time. That took place after he had come back to the fire-place. There was no need, however, to mention the precise time at which he did thus return. Consequently Mark goes on with his narrative of the incident in these terms: "And he went out into the porch, and the cock crew. And a maid saw him again, and began to say to them that stood by, This is one of

them. And he denied it again. This is not the same maid, however, as the former one, but another, as Matthew tells us. Nay, we gather further that on the occasion of the second denial he was addressed by two parties, namely, by the maid who is mentioned by Matthew and Mark, and also by another person who is noticed by Luke. For Luke's account runs in this style: "And Peter followed afar off. And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall, and were sat down together, Peter sat down among them. But a certain maid beheld him as he sat by the fire, and earnestly looked upon him, and said, This man was also with him. And he denied Him, saying, Woman, I know Him not. And after a little while, another saw him, and said, "Thou art also of them.

Now the clause, "And after a little while," which Luke introduces, covers the period during which [we may suppose that] Peter went out and the first cock crew. By this time, however, he had come in again; and thus we can understand the consistency of John's narrative, which informs us that he denied the Lord the second time as he stood by the fire. For in his version of Peter's first denial, John not only says nothing about the first crowing of the cock (which holds good of the other evangelists, too, with the exception of Mark), but also leaves unnoticed the fact that it was as he sat by the fire that the maid recognised him. For all that John says there is this, "Then saith the damsel that kept the door unto Peter, Art not thou also one of this man's disciples? He saith, I am not. Then he brings in the statement which he deemed it right to make on the subject of what took place with Jesus in that same house. His record of this is to the following effect: "And the servants and officers stood there, who had made a fire of coals, for it was cold. And they warmed themselves; and Peter stood with them, and warmed himself. Here, therefore, we may suppose Peter to have gone out, and by this time to have come in again. For at first he was sitting by the fire; and after a space, as we gather, he had returned, and commenced to stand [by the hearth].

24. It may be, however, that some one will say to us: Peter had not actually gone out as yet, but had only risen with the purpose of going out. This may be the allegation of one who is of opinion that the second interrogation and denial took place when Peter was outside at the door. Let us therefore look at what follows in John's narrative. It is to this effect: "The high priest then asked Jesus of His disciples, and of His doctrine. Jesus answered him, I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple,

whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? ask them which heard me what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said. And when He had thus spoken, one of the officers which stood by struck Jesus with the palm of his hand, saying, Answerest thou the high priest so? Jesus answered him, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me? And Annas sent Him bound to Caiaphas the high priest. This certainly shows us that Annas was high priest. For Jesus had not been sent to Caiaphas as yet, when the question was thus put to Him, "Answerest thou the high priest so? Mention is also made of Annas and Caiaphas as high priests by Luke at the beginning of his Gospel.

After these statements, John reverts to the account which he had previously begun of Peter's denial. Thus he brings us back to the house in which the incidents took place which he has recorded, and from which Jesus was sent away to Caiaphas, to whom He was being conducted at the commencement of this scene, as Matthew has informed us. Moreover, it is in the way of a recapitulation that John records the matters regarding Peter which he has introduced at this point. Falling back upon his narration of that incident with the view of making up a complete account of the threefold denial, he proceeds thus: "And Simon stood and warmed himself. They said therefore unto him, Art not thou also one of his disciples? He denied it, and said, I am not. Here, therefore, we find that Peter's second denial occurred, not when he was at the door, but as he was standing by the fire. This, however, could not have been the case, had he not returned by this time after having gone outside. For it is not that by this second occasion he had actually gone out, and that the other maid who is referred to saw him there outside; but the matter is put as if it was on his going out that she saw him;

or, in other words, it was when he rose to go out that she observed him, and said to those who were there, -that is, to those who were gathered by the fire inside, within the court, - "This fellow was also with Jesus of Nazareth. Then we are to suppose that the man who had thus gone outside, on hearing this assertion, came in again, and swore to those who were now inimically disposed, "I do not know the man. In like manner, Mark also says of this same maid, that "she began to say to them that stood by, This is one of them. For this damsel was speaking not to Peter, but to those who had remained there when he went out. At the same time, she spoke in such a manner that

he heard her words; whereupon he came back and stood again by the fire, and met their words with a negative. Then we have the statement made by John in these terms: "They said, Art not thou also one of his disciples? We understand this question to have been addressed to him on his return as he stood there; and we also recognise the harmony in which this stands with the position that on this occasion Peter had to do not only with that other maid who is mentioned by Matthew and Mark in connection with this second denial, but also with that other person who is introduced by Luke. This is the reason why John uses the plural, "They said.

The explanation then may be, that when the maid said to those who were with her in the court as he went out, "This is one of them," he heard her words and returned with the purpose of clearing himself, as it were, by a denial. Or, in accordance with the more probable theory, we may suppose that he did not catch what was said about him as he went out, and that on his return the maid and the other person who is introduced by Luke addressed him thus, "Art not thou also one of his disciples? that he met them with a denial, "and said, I am not; and further, that when this other person of whom Luke speaks insisted more pertinaciously, and said, "Surely thou art one of them," Peter answered thus, "Man, I am not. Still, when we compare together all the statements made by the several evangelists on this subject, we come clearly to the conclusion, that Peter's second denial took place, not when he was at the door, but when he was within, by the fire in the court. It becomes evident, therefore, that Matthew and Mark, who have told us how he went without, have left the fact of his return unnoticed simply with a view to brevity.

25. Accordingly, let us next examine into the consistency of the evangelists so far as the third denial is concerned, which we have previously instanced in the statement given by Matthew only. Mark then goes on with his version in these terms: "And a little after, they that stood by said again to Peter, Surely thou art one of them; for thou art a Galilaean. But he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not this man of whom ye speak. And immediately the second time the cock crew. Luke, again, continues his narrative, relating the same incident in this fashion: "And about the space of one hour after, another confidently affirmed, Of a truth this fellow also was with him; for he is a Galilaean. And Peter said, Man, I know not what thou sayest. And immediately while he yet spake the cock crew. John follows with his ac-

count of Peter's third denial, which is thus given: "One of the servants of the high priest, being his kinsman whose ear Peter cut off, saith, Did not I see thee in the garden with him? Peter then denied again; and immediately the cock crew. Now what precise period of time is meant under the phrase, "a little after," which is employed by Matthew and Mark, is made clear by Luke, when he says, "And about the space of one hour after. John, however, conveys no intimation of this space of time.

Again, with respect to the circumstance that Matthew and Mark use the plural number instead of the singular, and speak of the persons who were engaged with Peter, while Luke mentions only a single individual, and John, too, specifies but one, particularizing him further as kinsman to him whose ear Peter cut off; we may easily explain it either by understanding Matthew and Mark to have adopted a familiar method of speech here in employing the plural number simply instead of the singular, or by supposing that one of the persons present—one who knew Peter and had seen him—took the lead in making the declaration, and that the rest, imitating his confidence, joined him in pressing the assertion upon Peter. If this is the case, then two of the evangelists have given the general statement, using simply the plural number; while the other two have preferred to particularize only the one special individual who played the chief part in the transaction. But, once more, Matthew affirms that the words, "Surely thou also art one of them, for thy speech bewrayeth thee," were spoken to Peter himself. In like manner, John tells us that the question, "Did not I see thee in the garden with him? was addressed directly to Peter. But Mark, on the other hand, gives us to understand that the sentence, "Surely he is one of them, for he is also a Galilaean," was what those who stood by said to each other about Peter.

And, in the same way, Luke indicates that the declaration uttered by the other person, who said, "Of a truth, this fellow also was with him, for he is a Galilaean," was not addressed to Peter, but was made regarding Peter. These variations, however, may be explained either by understanding the evangelists, who speak of Peter as the person directly addressed, to have fairly reproduced the general sense, inasmuch as what was spoken about the man in his own presence was much the same as if it had been spoken immediately to him; or by supposing that both these methods of address were actually practised, and that the one has been noticed by the former evangelists, and the other by the latter. Moreover, we take the second cockcrowing to have oc-

curred after the third denial, as Mark has expressly informed us. 26. Matthew then proceeds with his narrative in these terms: "And Peter remembered the word of Jesus which He had said unto him, Before the cock crow thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out and wept bitterly. Mark, again, gives it thus: "And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus had said unto him, Before the cock crow twice thou shalt deny me thrice. And he began to weep. Luke's version is as follows: "And the Lord turned and looked upon Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how He had said unto him, Before the cock crow thou shalt deny me thrice. And Peter went out and wept bitterly. John says nothing about Peter's recollection and weeping. Now, the statement made here by Luke, to the effect that "the Lord turned and looked upon Peter," is one which requires more careful consideration, with a view to its correct acceptance. For although there are also inner halls (or courts), so named, it was in the outer court (or hall) that Peter appeared on this occasion among the servants, who were warming themselves along with him at the fire. And it is not a credible supposition that Jesus was heard by the Jews in this place, so that we might also understand the look referred to have been a look with the bodily eye. For Matthew presents us first with this narrative: "Then did they spit in His face and buffeted Him;

and others smote Him with the palms of their hands, saying, Prophecy unto us, thou Christ, who is he that smote thee? And then he follows this up immediately with the paragraph about Peter: "Now Peter sat without in the palace. He would not, however, have used this latter expression, had it not been the case that the things previously alluded to were done to the Lord inside the house. And, indeed, as we gather from Mark's version, these things took place not simply in the interior, but also in the upper parts of the house. For, after recording the said circumstances, Mark goes on thus: "And as Peter was beneath in the palace. Thus, as Matthew's words, "Now Peter sat without in the palace," show us that the things previously mentioned took place inside the house, so Mark's words, "And as Peter was beneath in the palace," indicate that they were done not only in the interior, but in the upper parts of the house. But if this is the case, how could the Lord have looked on Peter with the actual glance of the bodily eye?

These considerations bring me to the conclusion, that the look in question was one cast upon Peter from Heaven, the effect of which was to bring up before his mind the number of times he had now denied [his Master], and

the declaration which the Lord had made to him prophetically, and in this way (the Lord thus looking mercifully upon him), to lead him to repent, and to weep salutary tears. The expression, therefore, will be a parallel to other modes of speech which we employ daily, as when we thus pray, "Lord, look upon me; or as when, in reference to one who has been delivered by the divine mercy from some danger or trouble, we say that the "Lord looked upon him. In the Scriptures, also, we find such words as these: "Look upon me and hear me; and "Return, O Lord, and deliver my soul. And, according to my judgment, a similar view is to be taken of the expression adopted here, when it is said that "the Lord turned and looked upon Peter; and Peter remembered the word of the Lord. Finally, we have to notice how, while it is the more usual practice with the evangelists to employ the name "Jesus" in preference to the word "Lord" in their narratives, Luke has used the latter term exclusively in the said sentence, saying expressly, "The 'Lord' turned and looked upon Peter;

and Peter remembered the word of the 'Lord:'" whereas Matthew and Mark have passed over this "look" in silence, and consequently have said that Peter remembered not the word of the "Lord," but the word of "Jesus. From this, therefore, we may gather that the "look" thus proceeding from Jesus was not one with the eyes of the human body, but a look cast from Heaven.

Chapter VII.-Of the Thorough Harmony of the Evangelists in the Different Accounts of What Took Place in the Early Morning, Previous to the Delivery of Jesus to Pilate; And of the Question Touching the Passage Which is Quoted on the Subject of the Price Set Upon the Lord, and Which is Ascribed to Jeremiah by Matthew, Although No Such Paragraph is Found in the Writings of that Prophet. 27. Matthew next proceeds as follows: "When the morning was come, all the chief priests and elders of the people took counsel against Jesus, to put Him to death; and when they had bound Him, they led Him away, and delivered Him to Pontius Pilate the governor. Mark's version is to the like effect: "And straightway in the morning, the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes, and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried Him away, and delivered Him to Pilate. Luke, again, after completing his account of Peter's denial, recapitulates what Jesus had to endure when it was now about daybreak, as it appears, and continues his narrative in the following connection: "And the men that held Jesus mocked Him, and smote Him; and when they had blindfolded Him,

they struck Him on the face, and asked Him, saying, Prophecy, who is it that smote thee? And many other things blasphemously spake they against Him. And as soon as it was day, the elders of the people, and the chief priests, and the scribes came together, and led Him into their council, saying, Art thou the Christ? tell us. And He said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe; and if I also ask you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God. Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And He said unto them, Ye say that I am.

And they said, What need we further witness? For we ourselves have heard of His own mouth. And the whole multitude of them arose, and led Him unto Pilate. Luke has thus recorded all these things. His statement contains certain facts which are also related by Matthew and Mark; namely, that the Lord was asked whether He was the Son of God, and that He made this reply, "I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. And we gather that these things took place when the day was now breaking, because Luke's expression is, "And as soon as it was day. Thus Luke's narrative is similar to those of the others, although he also introduces something which these others have left unnoticed. We gather further, that when it was yet night, the Lord faced the ordeal of the false witnesses,-a fact which is recorded briefly by Matthew and Mark, and which is passed over in silence by Luke, who, however, has told the story of what was done when the dawn was coming in. The former two-namely, Matthew and Mark-have given connected narratives of all that the Lord passed through until early morning. After that, however, they have reverted to the story of Peter's denial;

on the conclusion of which they have come back upon the events of the early morning, and have introduced the other circumstances which remained for recital with a view to the completion of their account of what befell the Lord. But up to this point they have given no account of the occurrences belonging specifically to the morning. In like manner John, after recording what was done with the Lord as fully as he deemed requisite, and after telling also the whole story of Peter's denial, continues his narrative in these terms: "Then lead they Jesus to Caiaphas, unto the hall of judgment. And it was early. Here we might suppose either that there had been something imperatively requiring Caiaphas' presence in the hall of judgment, and that he was absent on the occasion when the other chief priests held an in-

quiry on the Lord; or else that the hall of judgment was in his house; and that yet from the beginning of this scene they had thus only been leading Jesus away to the personage in whose presence He was at last actually conducted. But as they brought the accused person in the character of one already convicted, and as it had previously approved itself to Caiaphas' judgment that Jesus should die, there was no further delay in delivering Him over to Pilate, with a view to His being put to death. And thus it is that Matthew here relates what took place between Pilate and the Lord.

28. First, however, he makes a digression with the purpose of telling the story of Judas' end, which is related only by him. His account is in these terms: "Then Judas, which had betrayed Him, when he saw that He was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? See thou to that. And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself. And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood. And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in. Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of Him that was valued, whom the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me."

29. Now, if any one finds a difficulty in the circumstance that this passage is not found in the writings of the prophet Jeremiah, and thinks that damage is thus done to the veracity of the evangelist, let him first take notice of the fact that this ascription of the passage to Jeremiah is not contained in all the codices of the Gospels, and that some of them state simply that it was spoken "by the prophet." It is possible, therefore, to affirm that those codices deserve rather to be followed which do not contain the name of Jeremiah. For these words were certainly spoken by a prophet, only that prophet was Zechariah. In this way the supposition is, that those codices are faulty which contain the name of Jeremiah, because they ought either to have given the name of Zechariah or to have mentioned no name at all, as is the case with a certain copy, merely stating that it was spoken "by the prophet, saying," which prophet would assuredly be understood to be Zechariah. However, let

others adopt this method of defence, if they are so minded. For my part, I am not satisfied with it; and the reason is, that a majority of codices contain the name of Jeremiah, and that those critics who have studied the Gospel with more than usual care in the Greek copies, report that they have found it stand so in the more ancient Greek exemplars. I look also to this further consideration, namely, that there was no reason why this name should have been added [subsequently to the true text], and a corruption thus created; whereas there was certainly an intelligible reason for erasing the name from so many of the codices. For venturesome inexperience might readily have done that, when perplexed with the problem presented by the fact that this passage could not be found in Jeremiah.

30. How, then, is the matter to be explained, but by supposing that this has been done in accordance with the more secret counsel of that providence of God by which the minds of the evangelists were governed? For it may have been the case, that when Matthew was engaged in composing his Gospel, the word Jeremiah occurred to his mind, in accordance with a familiar experience, instead of Zechariah. Such an inaccuracy, however, he would most undoubtedly have corrected (having his attention called to it, as surely would have been the case, by some who might have read it while he was still alive in the flesh), had he not reflected that [perhaps] it was not without a purpose that the name of the one prophet had been suggested instead of the other in the process of recalling the circumstances (which process of recollection was also directed by the Holy Spirit), and that this might not have occurred to him had it not been the Lord's purpose to have it so written.

If it is asked, however, why the Lord should have so determined it, there is this first and most serviceable reason, which deserves our most immediate consideration, namely, that some idea was thus conveyed of the marvellous manner in which all the holy prophets, speaking in one spirit, continued in perfect unison with each other in their utterances,-a circumstance certainly much more calculated to impress the mind than would have been the case had all the words of all these prophets been spoken by the mouth of a single individual. The same consideration might also fitly suggest the duty of accepting unhesitatingly whatever the Holy Spirit has given expression to through the agency of these prophets, and of looking upon their individual communications as also those of the whole body, and on their collective communications as also those of each separately. If, then, it is the case that

words spoken by Jeremiah are really as much Zechariah's as Jeremiah's, and, on the other hand, that words spoken by Zechariah are really as much Jeremiah's as they are Zechariah's, what necessity was there for Matthew to correct his text when he read over what he had written, and found that the one name had occurred to him instead of the other?

Was it not rather the proper course for him to bow to the authority of the Holy Spirit, under whose guidance he certainly felt his mind to be placed in a more decided sense than is the case with us, and consequently to leave untouched what he had thus written, in accordance with the Lord's counsel and appointment, with the intent to give us to understand that the prophets maintain so complete a harmony with each other in the matter of their utterances that it becomes nothing absurd, but, in fact, a most consistent thing for us to credit Jeremiah with a sentence originally spoken by Zechariah? For if, in these days of ours, a person, desiring to bring under our notice the words of a certain individual, happens to mention the name of another by whom the words were not actually uttered, but who at the same time is the most intimate friend and associate of the man by whom they were really spoken; and if forthwith recollecting that he has given the one name instead of the other, he recovers himself and corrects the mistake, but does it nevertheless in some such way as this, "After all, what I said was not amiss;

what would we take to be meant by this, but just that there subsists so perfect a unison of sentiment between the two parties—that is to say, the man whose words the individual in question intended to repeat, and the second person whose name occurred to him at the time instead of that of the other—that it comes much to the same thing to represent the words to have been spoken by the former as to say that they were uttered by the latter? How much more, then, is this a usage which might well be understood and most particularly commended to our attention in the case of the holy prophets, so that we might accept the books composed by the whole series of them, as if they formed but a single book written by one author, in which no discrepancy with regard to the subjects dealt with should be supposed to exist, as none would be found, and in which there would be a more remarkable example of consistency and veracity than would have been the case had a single individual, even the most learned, been the enunciator of all these sayings? Therefore, while there are those, whether unbelievers or merely ignorant men, who endeavour to find an argument here to help them in demonstrat-

ing a want of harmony between the holy evangelists, men of faith and learning, on the other hand, ought rather to bring this into the service of proving the unity which characterizes the holy prophets.

31. I have also another reason (the fuller discussion of which must be reserved, I think, for another opportunity, in order to prevent the present discourse from extending to larger limits than may be allowed by the necessity which rests upon us to bring this work to a conclusion) to offer in explanation of the fact that the name of Jeremiah has been permitted, or rather directed, by the authority of the Holy Spirit, to stand in this passage instead of that of Zechariah. It is stated in Jeremiah that he bought a field from the son of his brother, and paid him money for it. That sum of money is not given, indeed, under the name of the particular price which is found in Zechariah, namely, thirty pieces of silver; but, on the other hand, there is no mention of the buying of the field in Zechariah. Now, it is evident that the evangelist has interpreted the prophecy which speaks of the thirty pieces of silver as something which has received its fulfilment only in the Lord's case, so that it is made to stand for the price set upon Him.

But again, that the words which were uttered by Jeremiah on the subject of the purchase of the field have also a bearing upon the same matter, may have been mystically signified by the selection thus made in introducing [into the evangelical narrative] the name of Jeremiah, who spoke of the purchase of the field, instead of that of Zechariah, to whom we are indebted for the notice of the thirty pieces of silver. In this way, on perusing first the Gospel, and finding the name of Jeremiah there, and then, again, on perusing Jeremiah, and failing there to discover the passage about the thirty pieces of silver, but seeing at the same time the section about the purchase of the field, the reader would be taught to compare the two paragraphs together, and get at the real meaning of the prophecy, and learn how it also stands in relation to this fulfilment of prophecy which was exhibited in the instance of our Lord. For [it is also to be remarked that] Matthew makes the following addition to the passage cited, namely, "Whom the children of Israel did value; and gave them the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me. Now, these words are not to be found either in Zechariah or in Jeremiah.

Hence we must rather take them to have been inserted with a nice and mystical meaning by the evangelist, on his own responsibility,—the Lord having given him to understand, by revelation, that a prophecy of the said

tenor had a real reference to this occurrence, which took place in connection with the price set upon Christ. Moreover, in Jeremiah, the evidence of the purchase of the field is ordered to be cast into an earthen vessel. Inlike manner, we find in the Gospel that the money paid for the Lord was used for the purchase of a potter's field, which field also was to be employed as a burying-place for strangers. And it may be that all this was significant of the permanence of the repose of those who sojourn like strangers in this present world, and are buried with Christ by baptism. For the Lord also declared to Jeremiah, that the said purchase of the field was expressive of the fact that in that land [of Judaea] there would be a remnant of the people delivered from their captivity. I judged it proper to give some sort of sketch of these things, as I was calling attention to the kind of significance which a really careful and painstaking study should look for in these testimonies of the prophets, when they are reduced to a unity and compared with the evangelical narrative. These, then, are the statements which Matthew has introduced with reference to the traitor Judas.

CHAPTER VIII.-OF THE ABSENCE OF ANY DISCREPANCIES IN THE
ACCOUNTS WHICH THE EVANGELISTS GIVE OF WHAT TOOK PLACE IN
PILATE'S PRESENCE.

32. He next proceeds as follows: "And Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked Him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? Jesus saith unto him, Thou sayest. And when He was accused of the chief priests and elders, He answered nothing. Then saith Pilate unto Him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee? And He answered him to never a word; insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly. Now at that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would. And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas. Therefore when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ? For he knew that for envy they had delivered Him. But when he was set down on the judgment-seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him. But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus. But the governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? And they said, Barabbas. Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ? They all

say, Let him be crucified. The governor said to them, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified.

When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye to it. Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and on our children. Then released he Barabbas unto them; and when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered Him to them to be crucified. These are the things which Matthew has reported to have been done to the Lord by Pilate. 33. Mark also presents an almost entire identity with the above, both in language and in subject. The words, however, in which Pilate replied to the people when they asked him to release one prisoner according to the custom of the feast, are reported by this evangelist as follows: "But Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews? On the other hand, Matthew gives them thus: "Therefore when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ? There need be no difficulty in the circumstance that Matthew says nothing about the people having requested that one should be released unto them. But it may fairly be asked, what were the words which Pilate actually uttered, whether these reported by Matthew, or those recited by Mark. For there seems to be some difference between these two forms of expression, namely, "Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ? and, "Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews? Nevertheless, as they were in the habit of calling their kings "anointed ones," and one might use the one term or the other, it is evident that what Pilate asked them was whether they would have the King of the Jews, that is, the Christ, released unto them.

And it matters nothing to the real identity in meaning that Mark, desiring simply to relate what concerned the Lord Himself, has not mentioned Barabbas here. For, in the report which he gives of their reply, he indicates with sufficient clearness who the person was whom they asked to have released unto them. His version is this: "But the chief priests moved the people, that he should rather release Barabbas unto them. Then he proceeds to add the sentence, "And Pilate answered and said again unto them, What will ye then that I should do unto him whom ye call the King of the Jews? This makes it plain enough now, that in speaking of the King of the Jews, Mark

meant to express the very sense which Matthew intended to convey by using the term "Christ. For kings were not called "anointed ones" except among the Jews; and the form which Matthew gives to the words in question is this, "Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ? So Mark continues, "And they cried out again, Crucify him: which appears thus in Matthew, "They all say unto him, Let him be crucified. Again Mark goes on, "Then Pilate said unto them Why, what evil hath he done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him. Matthew has not recorded this passage;

but he has introduced the statement, "When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made," and has also informed us how he washed his hands before the people with the view of declaring himself innocent of the blood of that just person (a circumstance not reported by Mark and the others). And thus he has also shown us with all due plainness how the governor dealt with the people with the intention of securing His release. This has been briefly referred to by Mark, when he tells us that Pilate said, "Why, what evil hath he done? And thereupon Mark also concludes his account of what took place between Pilate and the Lord in these terms: "And so Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged Him, to be crucified. The above is Mark's recital of what occurred in presence of the governor.

34. Luke gives the following version of what took place in presence of Pilate: "And they began to accuse Him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king. The previous two evangelists have not recorded these words, although they do mention the fact that these parties accused Him. Luke is thus the one who has specified the terms of the false accusations which were brought against Him. On the other hand, he does not state that Pilate said to Him, "Answerest thou nothing? behold, how many things they witness against thee. Instead of introducing these sentences, Luke goes on to relate other matters which are also reported by these two. Thus he continues: "And Pilate asked Him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And He answered him and said, Thou sayest. Matthew and Mark have likewise inserted this fact, previous to the statement that Jesus was taken to task for not answering His accusers. The truth, however, is not at all affected by the order in which Luke has narrated these things; and as little is it affected by the

mere circumstance that one writer passes over some incident without notice, which another expressly specifies. We have an instance in what follows; namely, "Then said Pilate to the chief priests and to the people, I find no fault in this man.

And they were the more fierce, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to this place. But when Pilate heard of Galilee, he asked whether the man were a Galilean. And as soon as he knew that He belonged unto Herod's jurisdiction, he sent Him to Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem at that time. And when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad; for he was desirous to see Him of a long season, because he had heard many things of Him, and he hoped to see some miracle done by Him. Then he questioned with Him in many words; but He answered him nothing. And the chief priests and scribes stood and vehemently accused Him. And Herod with his men of war set Him at nought, and mocked Him, and arrayed Him in a gorgeous robe, and sent Him again to Pilate. And the same day Herod and Pilate were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves. All these things are related by Luke alone, namely, the fact that the Lord was sent by Pilate to Herod, and the account of what took place on that occasion. At the same time, among the statements which he makes in this passage, there are some bearing a resemblance to matters which may be found reported by the other evangelists in connection with different portions of their narrations.

But the immediate object of these others, however, was to recount simply the various things which were done in Pilate's presence on to the time when the Lord was delivered over to be crucified. In accordance with his own plan, however, Luke makes the above digression with the view of telling what occurred with Herod; and after that he reverts to the history of what took place in the governor's presence. Thus he now continues as follows: "And Pilate, when he had called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people, said unto them, Ye have brought this man unto me as one that perverteth the people: and, behold, I having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him. Here we notice that he has omitted to mention how Pilate asked the Lord what answer He had to make to His accusers. Thereafter he proceeds in these terms: "No, nor yet Herod: for I sent you to him: and, lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto him. I will therefore chastise him and release him. For of necessity

he must release one unto them at the feast. And they cried out all at once, saying, Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas; who for a certain sedition made in the city, and for murder, was cast into prison. Pilate, therefore, willing to release Jesus, spake again to them. But they cried, saying, Crucify him, crucify him.

And he said unto them the third time, Why, what evil hath he done? I have found no cause of death in him: I will therefore chastise him and let him go. And they were instant with loud voices, requiring that He might be crucified; and the voices of them prevailed. The repeated effort which Pilate, in his desire to accomplish the release of Jesus, thus made to gain the people's consent, is satisfactorily attested by Matthew, although in a very few words, when he says, "But when Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made. For he would not have made such a statement at all, had not Pilate exerted himself earnestly in that direction, although at the same time he has not told us how often he made such attempts to rescue Jesus from their fury. Accordingly, Luke concludes his report of what took place in the governor's presence in this fashion: "And Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they required. And he released unto them him that for sedition and murder was cast into prison, whom they desired; but he delivered Jesus to their will."

35. Let us next take the account of these same incidents-that is to say, those in which Pilate was engaged-as it is presented by John. He proceeds thus: "And they themselves went not into the judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover. Pilate then went out unto them, and said, What accusation bring ye against this man? They answered and said unto him, If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee. We must look into this passage in order to show that it contains nothing inconsistent with Luke's version, which states that certain charges were brought against Him, and also specifies their terms. For Luke's words are these: "And they began to accuse Him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, saying that he himself is Christ a king. On the other hand, according to the paragraph which I have now cited from John, the Jews seem to have been unwilling to state any specific accusations, when Pilate asked them, "What accusation bring ye against this man? For their reply was, "If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee; the purport of

which was, that he should accept their authority, cease to inquire what fault was alleged against Him, and believe Him guilty for the simple reason that He had been [reckoned] worthy of being delivered up by them to him.

This being the case, then, we ought to suppose that both these versions report words which were actually said, both the one before us at present, and the one given by Luke. For among the multitude of sayings and replies which passed between the parties, these writers have made their own selections as far as their judgment allowed them to go, and each of them has introduced into his narrative just what he considered sufficient. It is also true that John himself mentions certain charges which were alleged against Him, and which we shall find in their proper connections. Here, then, he proceeds thus: "Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law. The Jews, therefore, said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death; that the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, which He spake, signifying what death He should die. Then Pilate entered into the judgment-hall again, and called Jesus, and said unto Him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus answered, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me? This again may seem not to harmonize with what is recorded by the others,-namely, "Jesus answered, Thou sayest,"-unless it is made clear in what follows that the one thing was said as well as the other.

Hence he gives us to understand that the matters which he records next are [not to be regarded as] things never actually uttered by the Lord, but are rather to be considered things which have been passed over in silence by the other evangelists. Mark, therefore, what remains of his narrative. It proceeds thus: "Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation, and the chief priests, have delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done? Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence. Pilate therefore said unto Him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. Behold, here is the point at which he comes to that which the other evangelists have reported. And then he goes on, the Lord being still the speaker, to recite other matters which the rest have not recorded. His terms are these: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice. Pilate saith unto him, What is truth? And when he had said this, he went out again unto the Jews,

and saith unto them, I find no fault in him. But ye have a custom, that I should release unto you one at the passover:

will ye, therefore, that I release unto you the King of the Jews? Then cried they all again, Not this man, but Barabbas. Now Barabbas was a robber. Then Pilate, therefore, took Jesus, and scourged Him. And the soldiers platted a crown of thorns, and put it on His head, and they put on Him a purple robe; and they came to Him and said, Hail, King of the Jews! and they smote Him with their hands. Pilate went forth again, and saith unto them, Behold, I bring him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in him. Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe. And Pilate saith unto them, Behold the man! When the chief priests therefore and officers saw Him, they cried out, saying, Crucify him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Take ye him, and crucify him; for I find no fault in him. The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God. This may fit in with what Luke reports to have been stated in the accusation brought by the Jews,-namely, "We found this fellow perverting our nation,"-so that we might append here the reason given for it, "Because he made himself the Son of God. John then goes on in the following strain: "When Pilate, therefore, heard that saying, he was the more afraid, and went again into the judgment-hall, and saith unto Jesus, Whence art thou?

But Jesus gave him no answer. Then saith Pilate unto Him, Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee? Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin. From thenceforth Pilate sought to release Him: but the Jews cried out, saying, If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Caesar. This may very well agree with what Luke records in connection with the said accusation brought by the Jews. For after the words, "We found this fellow perverting our nation," he has added the clause, "And forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king. This will also offer a solution for the difficulty previously referred to, namely, the occasion which might seem to be given for supposing John to have indicated that no specific charge was laid by the Jews against the Lord, when they answered and said unto him, "If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered

him up unto thee. John then continues in the following strain: "When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the judgment-seat, in a place that is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha. And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour;

and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King? But they cried out, Away with him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your king? The chief priests answered, We have no king but Caesar. Then delivered he Him therefore unto them to be crucified. The above is John's version of what was done by Pilate.

CHAPTER IX.-OF THE MOCKERY WHICH HE SUSTAINED AT THE HANDS OF PILATE'S COHORT, AND OF THE HARMONY SUBSISTING AMONG THE THREE EVANGELISTS WHO REPORT THAT SCENE, NAMELY, MATTHEW, MARK, AND JOHN.

136. We have now reached the point at which we may study the Lord's passion, strictly so called, as it is presented in the narrative of these four evangelists. Matthew commences his account as follows: "Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall, and gathered unto Him the whole band of soldiers. And they stripped Him, and put on Him a scarlet robe. And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon His head, and a reed in His right hand: and they bowed the knee before Him, and mocked Him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! At the same stage in the narrative, Mark delivers himself thus: "And the soldiers led Him away into the hall called Praetorium; and they called together the whole band. And they clothed Him with purple, and platted a crown of thorns, and put it on His head, and began to salute Him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! And they smote Him on the head with a reed, and did spit upon Him, and, bowing their knees, worshipped Him. Here, therefore, we perceive that while Matthew tells us how they "put on Him a scarlet robe," Mark speaks of purple, with which He was clothed. The explanation may be that the said scarlet robe was employed instead of the royal purple by these scoffers. There is also a certain red-coloured purple which resembles scarlet very closely.

2 And it may also be the case that Mark has noticed the purple which the robe contained, although it was properly scarlet. Luke has left this without mention. On the other hand, previous to stating how Pilate delivered Him up to be crucified, John has introduced the following passage: "Then Pilate

therefore took Jesus, and scourged Him. And the soldiers platted a crown of thorns, and put it on His head, and they put on Him a purple robe, and said, Hail, King of the Jews! And they smote Him with their hands. This makes it evident that Matthew and Mark have reported this incident in the way of a recapitulation, and that it did not actually take place after Pilate had delivered Him up to be crucified. For John informs us distinctly enough that these things took place when He yet was with Pilate. Hence we conclude that the other evangelists have introduced the occurrence at that particular point, just because, having previously passed it by, they recollected it there. This is also borne out by what Matthew proceeds next to relate. He continues thus: "And they spit upon Him, and took the reed, and smote Him on the head. And after that they had mocked Him, they took the robe off from Him, and put His own raiment on Him, and led Him away to crucify Him.

³ Here we are given to understand that the taking the robe off Him and the clothing Him with His own raiment were done at the close, when He was being led away. This is given by Mark, as follows: "And when they had mocked Him. they took off the purple from Him, and put His own clothes on Him." ⁴ Chapter X.-Of the Method in Which We Can Reconcile the Statement Which is Made by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, to the Effect that Another Person Was Pressed into the Service of Carrying the Cross of Jesus, with that Given by John, Who Says that Jesus Bore It Himself. 37. Matthew, accordingly, goes on with his narrative in these terms: "And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him they compelled to bear His cross." In like manner, Mark says: "And they led Him out to be crucified. And they compelled one Simon, a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to bear His cross." Luke's version is also to this effect: "And as they led Him away, they laid hold upon one Simon a Cyrenian, coming out of the country; and on him they laid the cross, that he might bear it after Jesus." On the other hand, John records the matter as follows: "And they took Jesus, and led Him away. And He bearing His cross went forth into a place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew, Golgotha; where they crucified Him." From all this we understand that Jesus was carrying the cross Himself as He went forth into the place mentioned. But on the way the said Simon, who is named by the other three evangelists, was pressed into the service, and got the cross to carry for the rest of the course until the spot was reached. Thus we find that both

circumstances really took place; namely, first the one noticed by John, and thereafter the one instanced by the other three.

CHAPTER XI.-OF THE CONSISTENCY OF MATTHEW'S VERSION WITH
THAT OF MARK IN THE ACCOUNT OF THE POTION OFFERED HIM TO
DRINK, WHICH IS INTRODUCED BEFORE THE NARRATIVE OF HIS
CRUCIFIXION.

38. Matthew then proceeds in these terms: "And they came unto a place called Golgotha; that is to say, a place of a skull." So far as the place is concerned, they are most unmistakeably at one. The same Matthew next adds, "and they gave Him wine to drink, mingled with gall; and when He had tasted thereof, He would not drink." This is given by Mark as follows: "And they gave Him to drink wine mingled with myrrh; and He received it not." Here we may understand Matthew to have conveyed the same sense as Mark, when he speaks of the wine being "mingled with gall." For the gall is mentioned with a view to express the bitterness of the potion. And wine mingled with myrrh is remarkable for its bitterness. The fact may also be that gall and myrrh together made the wine exceedingly bitter. Again, when Mark says that "He received it not," we understand the phrase to denote that He did not receive it so as actually to drink it. He did taste it, however, as Matthew certifies. Thus Mark's words, "He received it not," convey the same meaning as Matthew's version, "He would not drink." The former, however, has said nothing about His tasting the potion.

CHAPTER XII.-OF THE CONCORD PRESERVED AMONG ALL THE FOUR
EVANGELISTS ON THE SUBJECT OF THE PARTING OF HIS RAIMENT.

39. Matthew goes on thus: "And after they crucified Him, they parted His garments, casting lots: and sitting down, they watched Him." Mark reports the same incident, as follows: "And crucifying Him, they parted His garments, casting lots upon them, what every man should take." In like manner Luke says: "And they parted His raiment, and cast lots. And the people stood beholding." The occurrence is thus recorded briefly by the first three. But John gives us a more detailed narrative of the method in which the act was gone about. His version runs thus: "Then the soldiers, when they had crucified Jesus, took His garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and also His coat: now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout. They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but

cast lots for it, whose it shall be: that the Scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, They parted my garments, and for my vesture they did cast lots."

CHAPTER XIII.-OF THE HOUR OF THE LORD'S PASSION, AND OF THE QUESTION CONCERNING THE ABSENCE OF ANY DISCREPANCY BETWEEN MARK AND JOHN IN THE ARTICLE OF THE "THIRD" HOUR AND THE "SIXTH."

40. Matthew continues thus: "And they set up over His head His accusation written, 'This is Jesus the King of the Jews.'" Mark, on the other hand, before making any such statement, inserts these words: "And it was the third hour, and they crucified Him." For he subjoins these terms immediately after he has told us about the parting of the garments. This, then, is a matter which we must consider with special care, lest any serious error emerge. For there are some who entertain the idea that the Lord was certainly crucified at the third hour; and that thereafter, from the sixth hour on to the ninth, the darkness covered the land. According to this theory, we should have to understand three hours to have passed between the time when He was crucified and the time when the darkness occurred. And this view might certainly be held with all due warrant, were it not that John has stated that it was about the sixth hour when Pilate sat down on the judgment-seat, in a place that is called the Pavement, but in Hebrew, Gabbatha. For his version goes on in this manner: "And as it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King! But they cried out, Away with him, away with him! crucify him! Pilate said unto them, Shall I crucify your king? The chief priests answered, We have no king but Caesar. Then delivered he Him therefore unto them to be crucified." If Jesus, therefore, was delivered up to the Jews to be crucified when it was about the sixth hour, and when Pilate was then sitting upon the judgment-seat, how could He have been crucified at the third hour, as some have been led to suppose, in consequence of a misinterpretation of the words of Mark?

41. First, then, let us consider what the hour really is at which He can have been crucified; and then we shall see how it happens that Mark has reported Him to have been crucified at the third hour. Now it was about the sixth hour when Pilate, who was sitting, as has been stated, at the time upon the judgment-seat, delivered Him up to be crucified. The expression is not that it was the sixth hour fully, but only that it was about the sixth hour; that is to say, the fifth hour was entirely gone, and so much of the sixth hour

had also been entered upon. These writers, however, could not naturally use such phraseologies as the fifth hour and a quarter, or the fifth hour and a third, or the fifth hour and a half or anything of that kind. For the Scriptures have the well-known habit of dealing simply with the round numbers, without mention of fractions, especially in matters of time. We have an example of this in the case of the "eight days," after which, as they tell us, He went up into a mountain, -a space which is given by Matthew and Mark as "six days after," because they look simply at the days between the one from which the reckoning commences and the one with which it closes. This is particularly to be kept in view when we notice how measured the terms are which John employs here. For he says not "the sixth hour," but "about the sixth hour.

And yet, even had he not expressed himself in that way, but had stated merely that it was the sixth hour, it would still be competent for us to interpret the phrase in accordance with the method of speech with which we are, as I said, familiar in Scripture, namely, the use of the round numbers. And thus we could still take the sense quite fairly to be that, on the completion of the fifth hour and the commencement of the sixth, those matters were going on which are recorded in connection with the Lord's crucifixion, until, on the close of the sixth hour, and when He was hanging on the cross, the darkness occurred which is attested by three of the evangelists, namely, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. 42. In due order, let us now inquire how it is that Mark, after telling us that they parted His garments when they were crucifying Him, casting lots upon them what every man should take, has appended this statement, "And it was the third hour, and they crucified Him. Now here he had already made the declaration, "And crucifying Him, they parted His garments; and the other evangelists also certify that, when He was crucified, they parted His garments. If, therefore, it was Mark's design to specify the time at which the incident took place, it would have been enough for him to say simply, "And it was the third hour. What reason, then, can be assigned for his having added these words, "And they crucified Him," but that, under the summary statement thus inserted, he intended significantly to suggest something which might be found a subject for consideration, when the Scripture in question was read in times in which the whole Church knew perfectly well what hour it was at which the Lord was hanged upon the tree,

and the means were possessed for either correcting the writer's error or confuting his want of truth?

But, inasmuch as he was quite aware of the fact that the Lord was suspended on the cross] by the soldiers, and not by the Jews, as John most plainly affirms, his hidden object [in bringing in the said clause] was to convey the idea that those parties who cried out that He should be crucified were the Lord's real crucifiers, rather than the men who simply discharged their service to their chief in accordance with their duty. We understand, accordingly, that it was the third hour when the Jews cried out that the Lord should be crucified. And thus it is intimated most truly that these persons did really crucify Christ at the time when they cried out. All the more, too, did this merit notice, because they were unwilling to have the appearance of having done the deed themselves, and with that view delivered Him up unto Pilate, as their words indicate clearly enough in the report given by John. For, after stating how Pilate said to them, "What accusation bring ye against this man? his version proceeds thus: "They answered and said unto him, If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee. Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law. The Jews therefore said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death. Consequently, what they were especially unwilling to have the appearance of doing, that Mark here shows that they actually did do at the third hour.

For he judged most truly that the Lord's murderer was rather the tongue of the Jews than the hand of the soldiers. 43. Moreover, if any one alleges that it was not the third hour when the Jews cried out for the first time in the terms referred to, he simply displays himself most insanely to be an enemy to the Gospel; unless perchance he can prove himself able to produce some new solution of the problem. For he cannot possibly establish the position that it was not the third hour at the period alluded to. And, consequently, we surely ought rather to credit a veracious evangelist than the contentious suspicions of men. But you may ask, How can you prove that it was the third hour? I answer, Because I believe the evangelists; and if you also believe them, show me how the Lord can have been crucified both at the sixth hour and at the third. For, to make a frank acknowledgment, we cannot get over the statement of the sixth hour in John's narrative; and Mark records the third hour: and, therefore, if both of us accept the testimony of these writers, show me any other way in which both these notes of time can

be taken as literally correct. If you can do so, I shall most cheerfully acquiesce. For what I prize is not my own opinion, but the truth of the Gospel. And I could wish, indeed, that more methods of clearing up this problem might be discovered by others. Until that be done, however, join me, if it please you, in taking advantage of the solution which I have propounded. For if no explanation can be found, this one will suffice of itself. But if another can be devised, when it is unfolded, we shall make our choice. Only don't consider it an inevitable conclusion that any one of all the four evangelists has stated what is false, or has fallen into error in a position of authority at once so elevated and so holy.

44. Again, if any one affirms his ability to prove it not to have been the third hour when the Jews cried out in the terms in question, because, after Mark's statement to this effect, "And Pilate answered, and said again unto them, What will ye then that I shall do unto him whom ye call the King of the Jews? And they cried out again, Crucify him," we find no further details introduced into the narrative of the same evangelist, but are led on at once to the statement, that the Lord was delivered up by Pilate to be crucified-an act which John mentions to have taken place about the sixth hour;-I repeat, if any one adduces such an argument, let him understand that many things have been passed by without record here, which occurred in the interval when Pilate was engaged in looking out for some means by which he could rescue Jesus from the Jews, and was exerting himself most strenuously by every means in his power to withstand their maddened desires. For Matthew says, "Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do, then, with Jesus, which is called Christ? They all say, Let him be crucified. Then we affirm it to have been the third hour.

And when the same Matthew goes on to add the sentence, "But when Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made," we understand that a period of two hours had passed, during the attempts made by Pilate to effect the release of Jesus, and the tumults raised by the Jews in their efforts to defeat him, and that the sixth hour had then commenced, previous to the close of which those things took place which are related as happening between the time when Pilate delivered up the Lord and the on-coming of the darkness. Once more, as regards what Matthew records above,-namely, "And when he was set down on the judgment-seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man; for I

have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him," -we remark, that Pilate really took his seat upon the tribunal at a later point, but that, among the earlier incidents which Matthew was recounting, the account given of Pilate's wife came into his mind, and he decided on inserting it in this particular connection, with the view of preparing us for understanding how Pilate had an especially urgent reason for wishing, even on to the last, not to deliver Him up to the Jews.

45. Luke, again, after mentioning how Pilate said, "I will therefore chastise him and let him go," tells us that the whole multitude then cried out, "Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas." But perhaps they had not yet exclaimed, "Crucify him!" For Luke next proceeds thus: "Pilate therefore, willing to release Jesus, spake again to them. But they cried, saying, Crucify him, crucify him!" This is understood to have been at the third hour. Luke then continues in these terms: "And he said unto them the third time, Why, what evil hath he done? I have found no cause of death in him: I will therefore chastise him and let him go. And they were instant With loud voices requiring that He might be crucified. And the voices of them prevailed." Here, then, this evangelist also makes it quite evident that there was a great tumult. With sufficient accuracy for the purposes of my inquiry into the truth, we can further gather how long the interval was after which he spoke to them in these terms, "Why, what evil hath he done?" And when he adds thereafter, "They were instant with loud voices, requiring that He might be crucified, and the voices of them prevailed," who can fail to perceive that this clamour was made just because they saw that Pilate was unwilling to deliver the Lord up to them? And, inasmuch as he was exceedingly reluctant to give Him up, he did not certainly yield at present in a moment, but in reality two hours and something more were passed by him in that state of hesitancy.

46. Interrogate John in like manner, and see how strong this hesitancy was on Pilate's part, and how he shrank from so shameful a service. For this evangelist records these incidents much more fully, although even he certainly does not mention all the occurrences which took up these two hours and part of the sixth hour. After telling us how Pilate scourged Jesus, and allowed the robe to be put on Him in derision by the soldiers, and suffered Him to be subjected to ill-treatment and many acts of mockery (all of which was permitted by Pilate, as I believe, really with the view of mitigating their fury and keeping them from persevering in their maddened desire for His

death), John continues his account in the following manner: "Pilate went forth again, and saith unto them, Behold, I bring him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in him. Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And Pilate saith unto them, Behold the man! The object of this was, that they might gaze upon that spectacle of ignominy and be appeased. But the evangelist proceeds again: "When the chief priests therefore and officers saw Him, they cried out, saying, Crucify him, crucify him! It was then the third hour, as we maintain. Mark also what follows: "Pilate saith unto them, Take ye him, and crucify him; for I find no fault in him.

The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God. When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he was the more afraid; and went again into the judgment-hall, and saith unto Jesus, Whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no answer. Then saith Pilate unto Him, Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee? Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin. From thenceforth Pilate sought to release Him. Now, when it is said here that "Pilate sought to release Him," how long a space of time may we suppose to have been spent in that effort, and how many things may have been omitted here among the sayings which were uttered by Pilate, or the contradictions which were raised by the Jews, until these Jews gave expression to the words which moved him, and made him yield? For the writer goes on thus: "But the Jews cried out, saying, If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar. When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the judgment-seat, in a place that is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha. And it was the preparation of the passover, about the sixth hour.

Thus, then, between that exclamation of the Jews when they first cried out, "Crucify him," at which period it was the third hour, and this moment when he sat down on the judgment-seat, two hours had passed, which had been taken up with Pilate's attempts to delay matters and the tumults raised by the Jews; and by this time the fifth hour was quite spent, and so much of the sixth hour had been entered. Then the narrative goes on thus: "He saith unto the Jews, Behold your King! But they cried out, Away with him, away

with him! crucify him! But not even now was Pilate so overcome by the apprehension of their bringing a charge against himself as to be very ready to yield. For his wife had sent to him when he was sitting at this time upon the judgment-seat, an incident which Matthew, who is the only one that records it, has given by anticipation, introducing it before he comes to its proper place (according to the order of time) in his narrative, and bringing it in at another point which he judged opportune. In this way, Pilate, still continuing his efforts to prevent further advances, said then to them, "Shall I crucify your king? Thereupon "the chief priests answered, We have no king but Caesar. Then delivered he Him therefore unto them to be crucified.

And in the time that passed when He was on the way, and when He was crucified along with the two robbers, and when His garments were parted and the possession of His coat was decided by lot, and the various deeds of contumely were done to Him (for, while these different things were going on, gibes were also cast at Him), the sixth hour was fully spent, and the darkness came on, which is mentioned by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. 47. Let such impious pertinacity therefore perish, and let it be believed that the Lord Jesus Christ was crucified at once at the third hour by the voice of the Jews, and at the sixth by the hands of the soldiers. For during these tumults on the part of the Jews, and these agitations on the side of Pilate, upwards of two hours elapsed from the time when they burst out with the cry, "Crucify Him. But again, even Mark, who studies brevity above all the other evangelists, has been pleased to give a concise indication of Pilate's desire and of his efforts to save the Lord's life. For, after giving us this statement, "And they cried again, Crucify him" (in which he gives us to understand that they had cried out before this, when they asked that Barabbas might be released to them), he has appended these words: "Then Pilate continued to say unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? Thus by one short sentence he has given us an idea of matters which took a long time for their transaction. At the same time, however, keeping in view the correct apprehension of his meaning, he does not say, "Then Pilate said unto them," but expresses himself thus: "Then Pilate continued to say unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? For, if his phrase had been "said," we might have understood him to mean that such words were uttered only once.

But, by adopting the terms, "continued to say," he has made it clear enough to the intelligent that Pilate spoke repeatedly, and in a number of

ways. Let us therefore consider how briefly Mark has expressed this as compared with Matthew, how briefly Matthew as compared with Luke, how briefly Luke as compared with John, while at the same time each of these writers has introduced now one thing and now another peculiar to himself. In fine, let us also consider how brief is even the narrative given by John himself, as compared with the number of things which took place, and the space of time occupied by their occurrence. And let us give up the madness of opposition, and believe that two hours, and something more, may quite well have passed in the interval referred to. 48. If any one, however, asserts that if this was the real state of the case, Mark might have mentioned the third hour explicitly at the point at which it really was the third hour, namely, when the voices of the Jews were lifted up demanding that the Lord should be crucified; and, further, that he might have told us plainly there that those vociferators did really crucify Him at that time,—such a reasoner is simply imposing laws upon the historians of truth in his own overweening pride. For he might as well maintain that if he were himself to be a narrator of these occurrences, they ought all to be recorded just in the same way and the same order by all other writers as they have been recorded by himself. Let him therefore be content to reckon his own notion inferior to that of Mark the evangelist, who has judged it right to insert the statement just at the point at which it was suggested to him by divine inspiration. For the recollections of those historians have been ruled by the hand of Him who rules the waters, as it is written, according to His own good pleasure. For the human memory moves through a variety of thoughts, and it is not in any man's power to regulate either the subject which comes into his mind or the time of its suggestion.

Seeing, then, that those holy and truthful men, in this matter of the order of their narrations, committed the casualties of their recollections (if such a phrase may be used) to the direction of the hidden power of God, to whom nothing is casual, it does not become any mere man, in his low estate, removed far from the vision of God, and sojourning distantly from Him, to say, "This ought to have been introduced here; for he is utterly ignorant of the reason which led God to will its being inserted in the place it occupies. The word of an apostle is to this effect: "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost. And again he says: "To the one indeed we are the savour of life unto life; to the other, the savour of death unto death; and adds immedi-

ately, "And who is sufficient for these things?" -that is to say, who is sufficient to comprehend how righteously that is done? The Lord Himself expresses the same when He says, "I am come that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind. For it is in the depth of the riches of the knowledge and wisdom of God that it comes to pass that of the same lump one vessel is made unto honour, and another unto dishonour. And to flesh and blood it is said, "O man, who art thou that repliest against God?

Who, then, knows the mind of the Lord in the matter now under consideration? or who hath been His counsellor, where He has in such wise ruled the hearts of these evangelists in their recollections, and has raised them to so commanding a position of authority in the sublime edifice of His Church, that those very things which are capable of presenting the appearance of contradictions in them become the means by which many are made blind, deservedly given over to the lusts of their own heart, and to a reprobate mind; and by which also many are exercised in the thorough cultivation of a pious understanding, in accordance with the hidden righteousness of the Almighty? For the language of a prophet in speaking to the Lord is this: "Thy thoughts are exceeding deep. An inconsiderate man will not know, and a foolish man will not understand these things." 49. Moreover, I request and admonish those who read the statement which, with the help of the Lord, has thus been elaborated by us, to bear in mind this discourse, which I have thought it needful to introduce in the present connection, in every similar difficulty which may be raised in such inquiries, so that there may be no necessity for repeating the same thing over and over again. Besides, any one who is willing to clear himself of the hardness of impiety, and to give his attention to the subject, will easily perceive how opportune the place is in which Mark has inserted this notice of the third hour, so that every one may there be led to bethink himself of an hour at which the Jews really crucified the Lord, although they sought to transfer the burden of the crime to the Romans, whether to the leaders among them or to the soldiers,[as we see] when we come here upon the record of what was done by the soldiers in the discharge of their duty. For this writer says here, "And crucifying Him, they parted His garments, casting lots upon them, what every man should take." And to whom can this refer but to the soldiers, as is made manifest in John's narrative? Thus, lest any one should leave the Jews out of account, and make the conception of so great a crime lie against those soldiers, Mark gives us

here the statement, "And it was the third hour, and they crucified Him,"-his object being to have those Jews rather discovered to be the real crucifiers, who will be found by the careful investigator in a position making it quite possible for them to have cried out for the Lord's crucifixion at the third hour, while he observes that what was done by the soldiers took place at the sixth hour.

50. At the same time, however, there are not wanting persons who would have the time of the preparation-which is referred to by John, when he says, "And it was the preparation of the passover, about the sixth hour"-understood under this third hour of the day, which was also the period at which Pilate sat down upon the judgment-seat. In this way the completion of the said third hour would appear to be the time when He was crucified, and when He was now hanging on the tree. Other three hours must then be supposed to have passed, at the end of which He gave up the ghost. According to this idea, too, the darkness would have commenced with the hour at which He died-that is to say, the sixth hour of the day-and have lasted until the ninth. For these persons affirm that the preparation of the passover of the Jews was indeed on the day which was followed by the day of the Sabbath, because the days of unleavened bread began with the said Sabbath; but that, nevertheless, the true passover, which was being realized in the Lord's passion, the passover not of the Jews, but of the Christians, began to be prepared-that is, to have its parasceue-from the ninth hour of the night onwards, inasmuch as the Lord was then being prepared for being put to death by the Jews. For the term parasceue means by interpretation "preparation.

Between the said ninth hour of the night, therefore, and His crucifixion, the period occurs which is called by John the sixth hour of the parasceue, and by Mark the third hour of the day; so that, according to this view, Mark has not introduced by way of recapitulation into his record the hour at which the Jews cried out, "Crucify him, crucify him," but has expressly mentioned the third hour as the hour at which the Lord was nailed to the tree. What believer would not receive this solution of the problem with favour, were it only possible to find some point [in the narrative of incidents] in connection with the said ninth hour, at which we could suppose, in due consistency with other circumstances, the parasceue of our passover-that is to say, the preparation of the death of Christ-to have commenced. For, if we say that it began at the time when the Lord was apprehended by the Jews, it was still but the

first parts of the night. If we hold that it was at the time when He was conducted to the house of Caiaphas' father-in-law, where He was also heard by the chief priests, the cock had not crowed at all as yet, as we gather from Peter's denial, which took place only when the cock was heard. Again, if we suppose it was at the time when He was delivered up to Pilate, we have in the plainest terms the statement of Scripture, to the effect that by this time it was morning.

Consequently, it only remains for us to understand that this parasceue of the passover—that is to say, the preparation for the death of the Lord—commenced at the period when all the chief priests, in whose presence He was first heard, answered and said, "He is guilty of death," an utterance which we find reported both by Matthew and by Mark; so that they are taken to have introduced, in the form of a recapitulation, at a later stage, facts relating to the denial of Peter, which in point of historical order had taken place at an earlier point. And it is nothing unreasonable to conjecture, that the time at which, as I have said, they pronounced Him guilty of death, may very well have been the ninth hour of the night, between which time and the hour at which Pilate sat down on the judgment-seat there came in this sixth hour, as it is called—not, however, the sixth hour of the day, but that of the parasceue—that is to say, the preparation for the sacrifice of the Lord, which is the true passover. And, on this theory, the Lord was suspended on the tree when the sixth hour of the same parasceue was completed, which occurred at the completion of the third hour of the day.

We may make our choice, therefore, between this view and the other, which supposes Mark to have introduced the third hour by way of reminiscence, and to have had it especially in view, in mentioning the hour there, to suggest the fact of the condemnation brought upon the Jews in the matter of the Lord's crucifixion, in so far as they are understood to have been in a position to raise the clamour for His crucifixion to such an effect that we may hold them to have been the persons who actually crucified Him, rather than the men by whose hands He was suspended on the tree; just as the centurion, already referred to, approached the Lord in a more genuine sense than could be said of those friends whom He sent [on the matter-of-fact mission]. But whichever of these two views we adopt, unquestionably a solution is found for this problem on the subject of the hour of the Lord's passion, which is

most remarkably apt at once to excite the impudence of the contentious and I to agitate the inexperience of the weak.

CHAPTER XIV.-OF THE HARMONY PRESERVED AMONG ALL THE
EVANGELISTS ON THE SUBJECT OF THE TWO ROBBERS WHO WERE
CRUCIFIED ALONG WITH HIM.

51. Matthew continues his narrative in the following terms: "Then were there two robbers crucified with Him, one on the right hand, and another on the left." Mark and Luke give it also in a similar form. Neither does John raise any question of difficulty, although he has made no mention of those robbers. For he says, "And two other with Him, on either side one, and Jesus in the midst." But there would have been a contradiction if John had spoken of these others as innocent, while the former evangelists called them robbers.

CHAPTER XV.-OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE ACCOUNTS GIVEN BY
MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE ON THE SUBJECT OF THE PARTIES WHO
INSULTED THE LORD.

52. Matthew goes on in the following strain: "And they that passed by reviled Him, wagging their heads, and saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself: if thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross." Mark's statement agrees with this almost to the letter. Then Matthew continues thus: "Likewise also the chief priests, mocking Him, with the scribes and elders, said, He saved others; himself he cannot save: if he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God; let Him deliver him now, if He will: for he said, I am the Son of God." Mark and Luke, although they report the words differently, nevertheless agree in conveying the same meaning, although the one passes without notice something which the other mentions. For they are both really at one on the subject of the chief priests, giving us to understand that they insulted the Lord when He was crucified. The only difference is, that Mark does not specify the elders, while Luke, who has instanced the rulers, has not added the designation "of the priests," and thus has rather comprehended the whole body of the leading men under the general designation; so that we may fairly take both the scribes and the elders to be included in his description.

Chapter XVI.-Of the Derision Ascribed to the Robbers, and of the Question Regarding the Absence of Any Discrepancy Between Matthew and Mark on the One Hand, and Luke on the Other, When the Last-Named Evangel-

ist States that One of the Two Mocked Him, and that the Other Believed on Him. 53. Matthew continues his narrative in these terms: "The robbers also, which were crucified with Him, cast the same in His teeth. Mark is quite in harmony with Matthew here, giving the same statement in different words. On the other hand, Luke may be thought to contradict this, unless we be careful not to forget a certain mode of speech which is sufficiently familiar. For Luke's narrative runs thus: "And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on Him, saying, If thou be Christ, save thyself and us. And then the same writer proceeds to introduce into the same context the following recital: "But the other answering, rebuked him, saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss. And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily, I say unto thee, To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise. The question then is, how we can reconcile either Matthew's report, "The robbers also, which were crucified with Him, cast the same in His teeth," or Mark's, namely, "And they that were crucified with Him reviled Him," with Luke's testimony, which is to the effect that one of them reviled Christ, but that the other arrested him and believed on the Lord.

The explanation will be, that Matthew and Mark, presenting a concise version of the passage under review, have employed the plural number instead of the singular; as is the case in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where we find the statement given in the plural form, that "they stopped the mouths of lions," while Daniel alone is understood to be referred to. Again, the plural number is adopted where it is said that they "were sawn asunder," while that manner of death is reported only of Isaiah. In the same way, when it is said in the Psalm, "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers took counsel together," etc., the plural number is employed instead of the singular, according to the exposition given of the passage in the Acts of the Apostles. For those who have made use of the testimony of the said Psalm in that book take the kings to refer to Herod, and the princes to Pilate. But further, inasmuch as the pagans are in the habit of bringing such slanderous charges against the Gospel, I would ask them to consider how their own writers have spoken of Phaedras and Medeas and Clytemnestras, when there really was but a single individual reputed trader each of these names. And

what is more common, for example, than for a person to say, "The rustics also behave insolently to me," even although it should only be one that acted rudely?

In short, no real discrepancy would be created by the restriction of Luke's report to one of the two robbers, unless the other evangelists had declared expressly that "both" the malefactors reviled the Lord; for in that case it would not be possible for us to suppose only one individual intended under the plural number. Seeing, however, that the phrase employed is "the robbers," or "those who were crucified with Him," and the term "both" is not added, the expression is one which might have been used if both these men had been engaged in the thing, but which might equally well be adopted if one of the two had been implicated in it,—that fact being then conveyed by the use of the plural number, according to a familiar method of speech.

CHAPTER XVII.—OF THE HARMONY OF THE FOUR EVANGELISTS IN
THEIR NOTICES OF THE DRAUGHT OF VINEGAR.

54. Matthew proceeds in the following terms: "Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour. The same fact is attested by two others of the evangelists. Luke adds, however, a statement of the cause of the darkness, namely, that "the sun was darkened. Again, Matthew continues thus: "And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani! that is to say, My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me? And some of them that stood there, when they heard that, said, This man calleth for Elias. Mark's agreement with this is almost complete, so far as regards the words, and not only almost, but altogether complete, so far as the sense is concerned. Matthew next makes this statement: "And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave Him to drink. Mark presents it in a similar form: "And one ran, and filled a sponge full of vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave Him to drink, saying, Let alone; let us see whether Elias will come to take Him down. Matthew, however, has represented these words about Elias to have been spoken, not by the person who offered the sponge with the vinegar, but by the rest. For his version runs thus: "But the rest said, Let be;

let us see whether Elias will come to save Him;" —from which, therefore, we infer that both the man specially referred to and the others who were there expressed themselves in these terms. Luke, again, has introduced this

notice of the vinegar previous to his report of the robber's insolence. He gives it thus: "And the soldiers also mocked Him, coming to Him, and offering Him vinegar, and saying, If thou be the King of the Jews, save thyself. It has been Luke's purpose to embrace in one statement what was done and what was said by the soldiers. And we ought to feel no difficulty in the circumstance that he has not said explicitly that it was "one" of them who offered the vinegar. For, adopting a method of expression which we have discussed above, he has simply put the plural number for the singular. Moreover, John has also given us an account of the vinegar, where he says: "After this, Jesus, knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, said, I thirst. Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar: and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to His mouth. But although the said John thus informs us that Jesus said "I thirst," and also mentions that there was a vessel full of vinegar there, while the other evangelists leave these things unspecified, there is nothing to marvel at in this.

Chapter XVIII.-Of the Lord's Successive Utterances When He Was About to Die; And of the Question Whether Matthew and Mark are in Harmony with Luke in Their Reports of These Sayings, and Also Whether These Three Evangelists are in Harmony with John. 55. Matthew proceeds as follows: "And Jesus, crying again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. In like manner, Mark says, "And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost. Luke, again, has told us what He said when that loud voice was uttered. For his version is thus: "And Jesus, crying with a loud voice, said, Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit: and saying this, He gave up the ghost. John, on the other hand, as he has left unnoticed the first voice, which Matthew and Mark have reported-namely, "Eli, Eli"-has also passed over in silence the one which has been recited only by Luke, while the other two have referred to it under the designation of the "loud voice. I allude to the cry, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit. Luke has also attested the fact that this exclamation was uttered with a loud voice; and hence we may understand this particular cry to be identified with the loud voice which Matthew and Mark have specified. But John has stated a fact which is noticed by none of the other three, namely, that He said "It is finished," after He had received the vinegar. This cry we take to have been uttered previous to the loud voice referred to. For these are John's words: "When Jesus, therefore, had received

the vinegar, He said, It is finished; and He bowed His head, and gave up the ghost.

In the interval elapsing between this cry, "It is finished," and what is referred to in the subsequent sentence, "and He bowed His head and gave up the ghost," the voice was uttered which John himself has passed over without record, but which the other three have noticed. For the precise succession appears to be this, namely, that He said first "It is finished," when what had been prophesied regarding Him was fulfilled in Him, and that thereafter-as if He had been waiting for this, like one, indeed, who died when He willed it to be so-He commended His spirit [to His Father], and resigned it. But, whatever the order may be in which a person may consider it likely that these words were spoken, he ought above all things to guard against entertaining the notion that any one of the evangelists is in antagonism with another, when one leaves unmentioned something which another has repeated, or particularizes something which another has passed by in silence.

CHAPTER XIX.-OF THE RENDING OF THE VEIL OF THE TEMPLE, AND OF
THE QUESTION WHETHER MATTHEW AND MARK REALLY HARMONIZE
WITH LUKE WITH RESPECT TO THE ORDER IN WHICH THAT INCIDENT
TOOK PLACE.

56. Matthew proceeds thus: "And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom." Mark's version is also as follows: "And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom." Luke likewise gives a statement in similar terms: "And the veil of the temple was rent in the midst." He does not introduce it, however, in the same order. For, with the intention of attaching miracle to miracle, he has told us first how "the sun was darkened," and then has deemed it right to subjoin the said sentence in immediate succession, namely, "And the veil of the temple was rent in the midst." Thus it would appear that he has introduced at an earlier point this incident, which really took place when the Lord expired, so as to give us there a summary description of the circumstances relating to the drinking of the vinegar, and the loud voice, and the death itself, which are understood to have taken place previous to the rending of the veil, and after the darkness had come in. For Matthew has inserted this sentence, "And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent," in immediate succession to the statement, "And Jesus, crying again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost;" and has thus given us clearly to understand that the time when the veil was rent was after Jesus

had given up His spirit. If, however, he had not added the words, "And behold," but had said simply, "And the veil of the temple was rent," it would have been uncertain whether Mark and he had narrated the incident in the form of a recapitulation, while Luke had kept the exact order, or whether Luke had given the summary account of what these others had introduced in the correct historical succession.

CHAPTER XX.-OF THE QUESTION AS TO THE CONSISTENCY OF THE
SEVERAL NOTICES GIVEN BY MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE, ON THE
SUBJECT OF THE ASTONISHMENT FELT BY THE CENTURION AND THOSE
WHO WERE WITH HIM.

57. Matthew proceeds thus: "And the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after the resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many. There is no reason to fear that these facts, which have been related only by Matthew, may appear to be inconsistent with the narratives presented by any one of the rest. The same evangelist then continues as follows: "Now when the centurion, and they that were with him watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God. Mark offers this version: "And when the centurion which stood over against Him saw that He so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this was the Son of God. Luke's report runs thus: "Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man. Here Matthew says that it was when they saw the earthquake that the centurion and those who were with him were thus astonished, whereas Luke represents the man's amazement to have been drawn forth by the fact that Jesus uttered such a cry, and then gave up the ghost; thus making it clear how He had it in His own power to determine the time for His dying. But this involves no discrepancy.

For as the said Matthew not only tells us how the centurion "saw the earthquake," but also appends the words, "and those things that were done," he has indicated that there was room enough for Luke to represent the Lord's death as itself the thing which called forth the centurion's wonder. For that event is also one of the things which were done in so marvellous a manner then. At the same time, even although Matthew had not added any such statement, it would still have been perfectly legitimate to suppose, that

as many astonishing things did take place at that time, and as the centurion and those who were with him may well have looked upon them all with amazement, the historians were at liberty to select for narration any particular incident which they were severally disposed to instance as the subject of the man's wonder. And it would not be fair to impeach them with inconsistency, simply because one of them may have specified one occurrence as the immediate cause of the centurion's amazement, while another introduces a different incident. For all these events together had really been matters for the man's astonishment. Again, the mere fact that one evangelist tells us that the centurion said, "Truly this was the Son of God," while another informs us that the words were, "Truly this man was the Son of God," will create no difficulty to any one who has retained some recollection of the numerous statements and discussions bearing upon similar cases, which have already been given above.

For these different versions of the words both convey precisely the same sense and although one writer introduces the word "man" while another does not, that implies no kind of contradiction. A greater appearance of discrepancy may be supposed to be created by the circumstance, that the words which Luke reports the centurion to have uttered are not "This was the Son of God," but "This was a righteous man. But we ought to suppose either that both things were actually said by the centurion, and that two of the evangelists have recorded the one expression, and the third the other; or else perhaps that it was Luke's intention to bring out the exact idea which the centurion had in view when he said that Jesus was the Son of God. For it may be the case that the centurion did not really understand Him to be the Only-begotten, equal with the Father; but that he called Him the Son of God simply because he believed Him to be a righteous man, as many righteous men have been named sons of God. Moreover, when Luke says, "Now when the centurion saw what was done," he has really used terms which cover all the marvelous things which occurred on that occasion, commemorating a single deed of wonder, so to speak, of which all those miraculous incidents were, as we may say, members and parts.

But, once more, as regards the circumstance that Matthew has also referred to those who were with the centurion, while the others have left these parties unnoticed, to whom will this not explain itself on the well-understood principle that there is no contradiction necessarily involved in the

mere fact that one writer records what another passes by without mention? And, finally, as to Matthew's having told us that "they feared greatly," while Luke has said nothing about the man being afraid, but has informed us that "he glorified God," who can fail to understand that he glorified [God] just by the fear which he exhibited? Chapter XXI.-Of the Women Who Were Standing There, and of the Question Whether Matthew, Mark, and Luke, Who Have Stated that They Stood Afar Off, are in Antagonism with John, Who Has Mentioned that One of Them Stood by the Cross. 58. Matthew proceeds thus: "And many women were there beholding afar off, which followed Jesus from Galilee: among which was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of Zebedee's children. Mark gives it in this form: "There were also women looking on afar off: among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the Less and of Joseph, and Salome (who also, when He was in Galilee, followed Him, and ministered unto Him); and many other women which came up with Him unto Jerusalem. I see nothing which can be supposed to constitute a discrepancy between these writers here. For in what way can the truth be affected by the fact that some of these women are named in both lists, while others are referred to only in the one? Luke has likewise connected his narrations as follows: "And all the people that came together to that sight, beholding the things which were done, smote their breasts, and returned. And all His acquaintance and the women that followed Him from Galilee stood afar off beholding these things. Here we perceive that he is quite in harmony with the former two as far as regards the presence of the women, although he does not mention any of them by name.

On the subject of the multitude of people who were also present, and who, as they beheld the things which were done, smote their breasts and returned, he is in like manner at one with Matthew, although that evangelist has introduced into the context this distinct statement: "Now the centurion and they that were with him. Thus it simply appears that Luke is the only one who has spoken expressly of His "acquaintance" who stood afar off. For John has also noticed the presence of the women before the Lord gave up the ghost. His narrative runs thus: "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus His mother, and His mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw His mother, and the disciple standing by whom He loved, He saith unto His mother, Woman, behold thy son! Then

saith He to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home. Now, as regards this statement, had not Matthew and Mark at the same time mentioned Mary Magdalene most explicitly by name, it might have been possible for us to say that there was one company of women afar off, and another near the cross. For none of these writers has mentioned the Lord's mother here but John himself.

The question, therefore, which rises now is this, How can we understand the same Mary Magdalene both to have stood afar off along with other women, as the accounts of Matthew and Mark bear, and to have been by the cross, as John tells us, unless it be the case that these women were at such a distance as made it quite legitimate to say at once that they were near, because they were at hand there in the sight of Him, and also afar off in comparison with the crowd of people who were standing round about in closer vicinity along with the centurion and the soldiers? It is open for us, then, to suppose that those women who were present at the scene along with the Lord's mother, after He commended her to the disciple, began then to retire with the view of extricating themselves from the dense mass of people, and of looking on at what remained to be done from a greater distance. And in this way the rest of the evangelists, who have introduced their notices of these women only after the Lord's death, have properly reported them to be standing by that time afar off.

CHAPTER XXII.—OF THE QUESTION WHETHER THE EVANGELISTS ARE
ALL AT ONE ON THE SUBJECT OF THE NARRATIVE REGARDING JOSEPH,
WHO BEGGED THE LORD'S BODY FROM PILATE, AND WHETHER JOHN'S
VERSION CONTAINS ANY STATEMENTS AT VARIANCE WITH EACH
OTHER.

159. Matthew proceeds as follows: "Now when the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple: he went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered. Mark presents it in this form: "And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath, Joseph of Arimathea, an honourable councillor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus. And Pilate marvelled if He were already dead: and, calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether He had been any while dead. And when he knew it of the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph. Luke's report runs in these terms: "And, behold, there was a man named Joseph, a council-

lor; and he was a good man, and a just (the same had not consented to the counsel and deed of them): he was of Arimathea, a city of the Jews: who also himself waited for the kingdom of God. This man went unto Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. John, on the other hand, first narrates the breaking of the legs of those who had been crucified with the Lord, and the piercing of the Lord's side with the lance (which whole passage has been recorded by him alone), and then subjoins a statement which is of the same tenor with what is given by the other evangelists.

2 It proceeds in these terms: "And after this, Joseph of Arimathea, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews, besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus: and Pilate gave him leave. He came therefore, and took the body of Jesus. There is nothing here to give any one of them the appearance of being in antagonism with another. But some one may perhaps ask whether John is not inconsistent with himself, when he at once unites with the rest in telling us how Joseph begged the body of Jesus, and comes forward as the only one who states here that Joseph had been a disciple of Jesus secretly for fear of the Jews. For the question may reasonably be raised as to how it happened that the man who had been a disciple secretly for fear had the courage to beg His body—a thing which not one of those who were His open followers was bold enough to do. We must understand, however, that this man did so in the confidence which his dignified position gave him, the possession of which rendered it possible for him to make his way on familiar terms into Pilate's presence. And we must suppose, further, that in the performance of that last service relating to the interment, he cared less for the Jews, however he tried in ordinary circumstances, when hearing the Lord, to avoid exposing himself to their enmity.

CHAPTER XXIII.—OF THE QUESTION WHETHER THE FIRST THREE
EVANGELISTS ARE QUITE IN HARMONY WITH JOHN IN THE ACCOUNTS
GIVEN OF HIS BURIAL.

160. Matthew proceeds thus: "And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed. Mark's version is as follows: "And he bought fine linen, and took Him down, and wrapped Him in the linen, and laid Him in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre. Luke reports it in those terms: "And he took it down, and wrapped

it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid. So far as these three narratives are concerned, no allegation of a want of harmony can possibly be raised. John, however, tells us that the burial of the Lord was attended to not only by Joseph, but also by Nicodemus. For he begins with Nicodemus in due connection with what precedes, and goes on with his narrative as follows: "And there came also Nicodemus (which at the first came to Jesus by night), and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then, introducing Joseph again at this point, he continues in these terms: "Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now in the place where He was crucified there was a garden;

²and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus, therefore, because of the Jews' preparation day; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand. But there is really as little ground for supposing any discrepancy here as there was in the former case, if we take a correct view of the statement. For those evangelists who have left Nicodemus unnoticed have not affirmed that the Lord was buried by Joseph alone, although he is the only one introduced into their records. Neither does the fact, that these three are all at one in informing us how the Lord was wrapped in the linen cloth by Joseph, preclude us from entertaining the idea that other linen stuffs may have been brought by Nicodemus, and added to what was given by Joseph, so that John may be perfectly correct in his narrative, especially as what he tells us is that the Lord was wrapped not in a linen cloth, but in linen clothes. At the same time, when we take into account the handkerchief which was used for the head, and the bandages with which the whole body was swathed, and consider that all these were made of linen, we can see how, even although there was really but a single linen cloth [of the kind referred to by the first three evangelists] there, it could still have been stated with the most perfect truth that "they wound Him in linen clothes.

³For the phrase, linen clothes, is one applied generally to all textures made of flax.

CHAPTER XXIV.-OF THE ABSENCE OF ALL DISCREPANCIES IN THE
NARRATIVES CONSTRUCTED BY THE FOUR EVANGELISTS ON THE
SUBJECT OF THE EVENTS WHICH TOOK PLACE ABOUT THE TIME OF THE
LORD'S RESURRECTION.

61. Matthew proceeds thus: "And there was there Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, sitting over against the sepulchre." This is given by Mark as follows: "And Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Joseph, beheld where He was laid." So far it is evident that there is no kind of inconsistency between the accounts. 62. Matthew continues in these terms: "Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate. saying, Sir, we have remembered that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch; go your way, make it as sure as ye can. So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch." This narrative is given only by Matthew. Nothing, however, is stated by any of the others which can have the appearance of contrariety.

63. Again, the same Matthew carries on his recital as follows: "Now, in the evening of the Sabbath, when it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre. And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. And his countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men. And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here; for He is risen, as He said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay: And go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead; and, behold, He goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see Him: lo, I have told you. Mark is in harmony with this. It is possible, however, that some difficulty may be felt in the circumstance that, according to Matthew's version, the stone was already rolled away from the sepulchre, and the angel was sitting upon it. For Mark tells us that the women entered into the sepulchre, and there saw a young man sit-

ting on the right side, covered with a long white garment, and that they were affrighted.

But the explanation may be, that Matthew has simply said nothing about the angel whom they saw when they entered into the sepulchre, and that Mark has said nothing about the one whom they saw sitting outside upon the stone. In this way they would have seen two angels, and have got two separate angelic reports relating to Jesus,-namely, first one from the angel whom they saw sitting outside upon the stone, and then another from the angel whom they saw sitting on the right side when they entered into the sepulchre. Thus, too, the injunction given them by the angel who was sitting outside, and which was conveyed in the words, "Come, and see the place where the Lord lay," would have served to encourage them to go within the tomb; on coming to which, as has been said, and venturing within it, we may suppose then, to have seen the angel concerning whom Matthew tells us nothing, but of whom Mark discourses, sitting on the right side, from whom also they heard things of like tenor to those they had previously listened to. Or if this explanation is not satisfactory, we ought certainly to accept the theory that, as they entered into the sepulchre, they came within a section of the ground where, it is reasonable to suppose, a certain space had been by that time securely enclosed, extending a little distance in front of the rock which had been cut out in order to construct the place of sepulture; so that, according to this view, what they.

really beheld was the one angel sitting on the right side, in the space thus referred to, which same angel Matthew also represents to have been sitting upon the stone which he had rolled away from the mouth of the tomb when the earthquake took place, that is to say, from the place which had been dug out in the rock for a sepulchre. 64. It may also be asked how it is that Mark says: "And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they anything to any man; for they were afraid;" whereas Matthew's statement is in these terms: "And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy, and did run to bring His disciples word. The explanation, however, may be that the women did not venture to tell either of the angels themselves,-that is, they had not courage enough to say anything in reply to what they had heard from the angels. Or, indeed, it may be that they were not bold enough to speak to the guards whom they saw lying there; for the joy which Matthew mentions is

not inconsistent with the fear of which Mark takes notice. Indeed, we ought to have supposed that both feelings had possession of their minds, even although Matthew himself had said nothing about the fear. But now, when this evangelist also particularizes it, saying, "They departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy," he allows nothing to remain which can occasion any question of difficulty on this subject.

65. At the same time, a question, which is not to be dealt with lightly, does arise here with respect to the exact hour at which the women came to the sepulchre. For when Matthew says, "Now, on the evening of the Sabbath, when it was dawning toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre," what are we to make of Mark's statement, which runs thus: "And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun"? It is to be observed that in this Mark states nothing inconsistent with the reports given by other two of the evangelists, namely, Luke and John. For when Luke says, "Very early in the morning," and when John puts it thus, "Early, when it was yet dark," they convey the same sense which Mark is understood to express when he says, "Very early, at the rising of the sun; that is to say, they all refer to the period when the heavens were now beginning to brighten in the east, which, of course, does not take place but when the sunrise is at hand. For it is the brightness which is diffused by the rising sun that is familiarly designated by the name of the dawn. Consequently, Mark does not contradict the other evangelist who uses the phrase, "When it was yet dark;

for as the day breaks, what remains of the darkness [of the night] passes away just in proportion as the sun continues to rise. And this phrase, "Very early in the morning," need not be taken to mean that the sun itself was actually seen by this time [blazing] over the lands; but it is rather to be taken as like the kind of expression which we are in the habit of employing when speaking to people to whom we wish to intimate that something should be done more betimes than usual. For when we have used the term, "Early in the morning," if we wish to keep the persons addressed from supposing that we refer directly to the time when the sun is already conspicuously visible over earth, we usually add the word "very," and say, "very early in the morning," in order that they may clearly understand that we allude to the time which is also called the daybreak. At the same time, it is also customary for men, after the cockcrow has been repeatedly heard, and when they begin to

surmise that the day is now approaching, to say, "It is now early in the morning; and when after this they weigh their words and observe that, as the sun now rises,-that is to say, as it now makes its immediate advent into these parts,-the sky is just beginning to redden, or to brighten, those who said, "It is early in the morning," then amplify their expression and say, "It is very early in the morning.

But what does it matter, provided only that, whichever method of explanation be preferred, we understand that what is meant by Mark, when he uses the terms "early in the morning," is just the same as is intended by Luke when he adopts the phrase, "in the morning; and that the whole expression employed by the former-namely, "very early in the morning" -amounts to the same as that which we find in Luke-namely, "very early in the dawn," - and as that which is chosen by John when he says, "early, when it was yet dark"? Moreover, when Mark speaks of the "rising of the sun," he just means that by its rising the sun was now beginning to bring the light in upon the sky. But the question now is this: how can Matthew be in harmony with these three when he says neither "in the early morning" nor "early in the morning," but "in the evening of the Sabbath, when it was beginning to dawn toward the first day of the week"? This is a matter which must be carefully investigated. Now, under that first part of the night, which is [here called] the evening, Matthew intended to refer to this particular night, at the close of which the women came to the sepulchre. And we understand his reason for so referring to the said night to have been this: that by the time of the evening it was lawful for them to bring the spices, because the Sabbath was then indeed over.

Consequently, as they were hindered by the Sabbath from doing so previously, he has given a designation of the night, taken from the time at which it began to be a lawful thing for them to do what they did at any period of the same night which pleased them. Thus, therefore, the phrase "in the evening of the Sabbath" is used, as if what was said had been "in the night of the Sabbath," or in other words, in the night which follows the day of the Sabbath. The express words which he employs thus indicate this with sufficient clearness. For his terms are these: "Now, in the evening of the Sabbath, when it began to dawn toward the first day of the week; and that could not be the case if what we had to understand to be denoted by the mention of the "evening" was simply the first short space of the night, or in other words,

only the beginning of the night. For what can be said "to begin to dawn toward the first day of the week" is not explicitly the beginning [of the night], but the night itself, as it commences to be brought to its close by the advance of the light. For the terminus of the first part of the night is just the beginning of the second part, but the terminus of the whole night is the light.

Hence we could not speak of the evening as dawning toward the first day of the week unless under the term "evening" we should understand the night itself to be meant, which, as a whole, is brought to its close by the light. It is also a familiar method of speech in divine Scripture to express the whole under the part; and thus, under the word "evening" here, the evangelist has denoted the whole night, which finds its extreme point in the dawn. For it was in the dawn that those women came to the sepulchre; and in this way they really came on the night, which is here indicated by the term "evening. For, as I have said, the night as a whole is denoted by that word; consequently, at whatever period of that night they might have come, they certainly did come in the said night. And, accordingly, if they came at the latest point in that night, it is still unquestionably the case that they did come in the said night. But it could not be said to be on "the evening, when it began to dawn toward the first day of the week," unless the night as a whole can be understood under that expression. Accordingly, the women who came in the night referred to, came in the evening specified. And if they came at any period, even the latest during that night, they surely came in the night itself.

66. For the space of three days, which elapsed between the Lord's death and resurrection, cannot be correctly understood except in the light of that form of expression according to which the part is dealt with as the whole. For He said Himself, "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. Now, in whichever way we reckon the times, whether from the point when He yielded up the ghost, or from the date of his burial, the sum does not come out clearly, unless we take the intermediate day, that is to say, the Sabbath, as a complete day-in other words, a full day along with its night,-and, on the other hand, understand those days between which that one intervenes-that is to say, the day of the preparation and the first day of the week, which we designate the Lord's day-to be dealt with on the principle of the part standing for the whole.

For of what avail is it that some, hard pressed by these difficulties, and not knowing the very large part which the mode of expression referred to—namely, that which takes the part as the whole—plays in the matter of solving the problems presented in the Holy Scriptures, have struck out the idea of reckoning as a distinct night those three hours, namely, from the sixth hour to the ninth, during which the sun was darkened, and as a distinct day the other three hours, during which the sun was restored again to the lands, that is to say, from the ninth hour on to its setting? For the night connected with the coming Sabbath follows, and if we compute it along with its day, there will then be two days and two nights. But, further, after the Sabbath there comes in the night connected with the first day of the week, that is to say, with the dawning of the Lord's day, which was the time when the Lord arose. Consequently, the result to which this mode of calculation leads us will be just two days and two nights, and one night, even supposing it possible to take the last as a complete night, and taking it for granted that we were not to show that the said dawn was in reality the ultimate portion of the same.

Thus it would appear that, even although we were to compute these six hours in that fashion, during three of which the sun was darkened, and during the other three of which it shone forth again, we would not establish a satisfactory reckoning of three days and three nights. In accordance, therefore, with the usage which meets us so frequently in the language of the Scriptures, and which deals with the part as the whole, it remains for us to hold the time of the preparation to constitute the day at the one extremity, on which the Lord was crucified and buried, and, from that limit, to find one whole day along with its night which was fully spent. In this way, too, we must take the intermediate member, that is to say the day of the Sabbath, not as calculated simply from the part, but as a really complete day. The third day, again, must be computed from its first part; that is to say, calculating from the night, we must look upon it as making up a whole day when its day-portion is connected with it. Thus we shall get a space of three days, on the analogy of a case already considered, namely, those eight days after which the Lord went up into a mountain; with respect to which period we find that Matthew and Mark, fixing their attention simply on the complete days intervening, have put it thus, "After six days," whereas Luke's representation of the same is this, "An eight days after."

67. Let us now proceed, therefore, to look into the rest of this passage, and see how in other respects these statements are quite consistent with what is given by Matthew. For Luke tells us, with the utmost plainness, that two angels were seen by those women who came to the sepulchre. One of these angels we have understood to be referred to by each of the first two evangelists; that is to say, one of them is noticed by Matthew, namely, the one who was sitting outside upon the stone, and a second by Mark, namely, the one who was sitting within the sepulchre on the right side. But Luke's version of the scene is to the following effect: "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women which had come with Him from Galilee beheld the sepulchre, and how His body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in shining garments; and as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead?

He is not here, but is risen: remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered His words. And they returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest. The question, therefore, is this, how can these angels have been seen sitting each one separately, - namely, one outside upon the stone, according to Matthew, and another within upon the right side, according to Mark, - if Luke's report of the same bears that the two stood beside those women, although the words ascribed to them are similar? Well, it is still possible for us to suppose that one angel was seen by the women in the position assigned by Matthew, and in the circumstances indicated by Mark, as we have already explained. In this way, we may understand the said women to have entered into the sepulchre, that is to say, into a certain space which had been fenced off within a kind of enclosure, in such a manner that an entrance might be said to be made when they came in front of the rocky place in which the sepulchre was constructed; and there we

may take them to have beheld the angel sitting upon the stone which had been rolled away from the tomb, as Matthew tells us, or in other words, the angel sitting on the right side, as Mark expresses it.

And then we may further surmise that the said women, after they had gone within, and when they were looking at the place where the body of the Lord lay, saw other two angels standing, as Luke informs us, by whom they were addressed in similar terms, with a view to animate their minds and edify their faith. 68. But let us also examine John's version, and see whether or in what manner its consistency with these others is apparent. John, then, narrates these incidents as follows: "Now the first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and saw the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciples whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid Him. Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and they came to the sepulchre. So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And he, stooping down, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie, and the napkin, that was about His head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw, and believed. For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that He must rise again from the dead. Then the disciples went away again unto their own home. But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping:

and, as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre, and seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. They say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him. And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing Him to be the gardener, saith unto Him, Sir, if thou have borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him away. Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto Him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master. Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet

ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God. Mary Magdalene came and told, the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and, that He had spoken these things unto her. In the narrative thus given by John, the statement of the day or time when the sepulchre was come to agrees with the accounts presented by the rest. Again, in the report of two angels who were seen, he is also at one with Luke.

But when we observe how the one evangelist tells us that these angels were seen standing, while the other says that they were sitting; when we notice, also, that there are certain other things which are left unrecorded by these two writers; and, further, when we consider how questions are thus raised regarding the possibility of proving the consistency of the one set of historians with the other on these subjects, and of fixing the order in which those said things took place, we see that, unless we submit the whole to a careful examination, there may easily appear to be contradictions here between the several narratives. 69. This being the case, therefore, let us, so far as the Lord may help us, take all these incidents, which took place about the time of the Lord's resurrection, as they are brought before us in the statements of all the evangelists together, and let us arrange them in one connected narrative, which will exhibit them, precisely as they may have actually occurred. It was in the early morning of the first day of the week, as all the evangelists are at one in attesting, that the women came to the sepulchre. By that time, all that is recorded by Matthew alone had already taken place; that is to say, in regard to the quaking of the earth, and the rolling away of the stone, and the terror of the guards, with which they were so stricken, that in some part they lay like dead men. Then, as John informs us, came Mary Magdalene, who unquestionably was surpassingly more ardent in her love than these other women who had ministered to the Lord; so that it was not unreasonable in John to make mention of her alone, leaving those others unnamed, who, however, were along with her, as we gather from the reports given by others of the evangelists. She came accordingly;

and when she saw the stone taken away from the sepulchre, without pausing to make any more minute investigation, and never doubting but that the body of Jesus had been removed from the tomb, she ran, as the same John states, and told the state of matters to Peter and to John himself. For John is himself that disciple whom Jesus loved. They then set out running to

the sepulchre; and John, reaching the spot first, stooped down and saw the linen clothes lying, but he did not go within. But Peter followed up, and went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lie, and the napkin, which had been about His head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. Then John entered also, and saw in like manner, and believed what Mary had told him, namely, that the Lord had been taken away from the sepulchre. "For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that He must rise again from the dead. Then the disciples went away again unto their own home. But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping," -that is to say, before the place in the rock in which the sepulchre was constructed, but at the same time within that space into which they had now entered; for there was a garden there, as the same John mentions. Then they saw the angel sitting on the right side, upon the stone which was rolled away from the sepulchre; of which angel both Matthew and Mark discourse.

"Then he said unto them, Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here; for He is risen, as He said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay: and go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead; and, behold, He goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see Him: lo, I have told you. In Mark we also find a passage similar in tenor to the above. At these words, Mary, still weeping, bent down and looked forwards into the sepulchre, and beheld the two angels, who are introduced to us in John's narrative, sitting in white raiment, one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had been deposited. "They say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him. Here we are to suppose the angels to have risen up, so that they could be seen standing, as Luke states that they were seen, and then, according to the narrative of the same Luke, to have addressed the women, as they were afraid and bowed down their faces to the earth. The terms were these: "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen:

remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise. And they remembered His words. It was after this that, as we learn from John, "Mary turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing Him to be the gardener,

saith unto Him, Sir, if thou have borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him away. Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto Him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master. Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God. Then she departed from the sepulchre, that is to say, from the ground where there was space for the garden in front of the stone which had been dug out. Along with her there were also those other women, who, as Mark tells us, were surprised with fear and trembling. And they told nothing to any one. At this point we next take up what Matthew has recorded in the following passage: "Behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail! And they came and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him.

For thus we gather that, on coming to the sepulchre, they were twice addressed by the angels; and, again, that they were also twice addressed by the Lord Himself, namely, at the point at which Mary took Him to be the gardener, and a second time at present, when He meets them on the way, with a view to strengthen them by such a repetition, and to bring them out of their state of fear. "Then, accordingly, said He unto them, Be not afraid: go, tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me. "Then came Mary Magdalene, and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that He had spoken these things unto her;" -not herself alone, however, but with her also those other women to whom Luke alludes when he says, "Which told these things unto the eleven disciples, and all the rest. And their words seemed to them like madness, and they believed them not. Mark also attests these facts; for, after telling us how the women went out from the sepulchre, trembling and amazed, and said nothing to any man, he subjoins the statement, that the Lord rose early the first day of the week, and appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom He had cast seven devils, and that she went and told them who had been with Him, as they mourned and wept, and that they, when they heard that He was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.

It is further to be observed, that Matthew has also introduced a notice to the effect that, as the women who had seen and heard all these things were going away, there came likewise into the city some of the guards who had been lying like dead men, and that these persons reported to the chief priests all the things that were done, that is to say, those of them which they were

themselves also in a position to observe. He tells us, moreover, that when they were assembled with the elders and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers, and bade them say that His disciples came and stole Him away while they slept, promising at the same time to secure them against the governor, who had given those guards. Finally, he adds that they took the money, and did as they had been taught, and that this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day.

Chapter XXV.-Of Christ's Subsequent Manifestations of Himself to the Disciples, and of the Question Whether a Thorough Harmony Can Be Established Between the Different Narratives When the Notices Given by the Four Several Evangelists, as Well as Those Presented by the Apostle Paul and in the Acts of the Apostles, are Compared Together. 70. We must take up the consideration of the manner in which the Lord showed Himself to the disciples after His resurrection, and that with the view not only of bringing out clearly the consistency of the four evangelists with each other on these subjects, but also of exhibiting their agreement with the Apostle Paul, who discourses of the theme in his First Epistle to the Corinthians. The statement by the latter runs in the following terms: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this day, but some are fallen asleep. After that, He was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time. Now this succession of the appearances is one which has been given by none of the evangelists. Hence we must examine whether the order which they have put on record does not stand in antagonism to this. For neither has Paul related all, nor have the evangelists included everything in their reports.

And the real subject for our investigation, therefore, is the question, whether, among the incidents which do come under our notice in these various narratives, there is anything fitted to establish a discrepancy between the writers. Now Luke is the only one among the four evangelists who omits to tell us how the Lord was seen by the women, and confines his statement to the appearance of the angels. Matthew, again, informs us that He met them as they were returning from the sepulchre. Mark likewise mentions that He

appeared first to Mary Magdalene; as also does John. Only Mark does not state how He manifested Himself to her, while John does give us an explanation of that. Moreover, Luke not only passes by in silence the fact that He showed Himself to the women, as I have already remarked, but also reports that two disciples, one of whom was Cleophas, talked with Him, before they recognised Him, in a strain which seems to imply that the women had related no other appearance seen by them than that of the angels who told them that He was alive. For Luke's narrative proceeds thus: "And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs. And they talked together of all these things which had happened. And it came to pass that, while they communed together and reasoned, Jesus Himself drew near, and went with them. But their eyes were holden, that they should not know Him.

And He said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad? And the one of them, whose name was Cleophas, answering, said unto Him, Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days? And He said unto them, What things? And they said unto Him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people; and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered Him to be condemned to death, and have crucified Him. But we trusted that it had been He that should have redeemed Israel: and besides all this, to-day is the third day since these things were done. Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre; and when they found not His body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that He was alive. And certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women said; but Him they saw not. All these things they relate, according to Luke's narrative, just as they were able to command their recollections and bethink themselves of what had been reported to them by the women, or by the disciples who had run to the sepulchre when the intelligence was conveyed to them that His body had been removed from the place.

It is at the same time true that Luke himself reports only Peter to have run to the tomb, and there to have stooped down and seen the linen clothes laid by themselves, and then to have departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass. This notice about Peter, moreover, is introduced

previous to the narrative of these two disciples whom He found on the way, and subsequently to the story of the women who had seen the angels, and who had heard from them that Jesus had risen again; so that this position might seem to mark the period at which Peter ran to the sepulchre. But still we must suppose that Luke has inserted the passage about Peter here in the form of a recapitulation. For the time when Peter ran to the sepulchre was also the time when John ran to it; and at that point all that they had heard was simply the statement conveyed to them by the women, and in particular by Mary Magdalene, to the effect that the body had been carried away. Furthermore, the period at which the said woman brought such tidings was just the occasion when she saw the stone rolled away from the sepulchre.

And it was at a later point that these other things occurred, connected with the vision of the angels, and the appearance of the Lord Himself, who showed Himself twice over to the women, namely, once at the sepulchre, and a second time when He met them as they were returning from the tomb. This, however, took place previous to His being seen by those two upon the journey, one of whom was Cleophas. For, when this Cleophas was talking with the Lord, before he recognized who He was, he did not say expressly that Peter had gone to the sepulchre. But his words were these: "Certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women said; which last statement is also to be understood as introduced in the form of a recapitulation. For the reference is to the report brought first of all by the women to Peter and John about the removal of the body. And thus, when Luke here informs us that Peter ran to the sepulchre, and also states how Cleophas mentioned that some of those who were with them went to the tomb, he is to be taken as attesting John's account, which bears that two persons proceeded to the sepulchre. But Luke has specified Peter alone in the first instance, just because it was to him that Mary had brought the earliest tidings.

A difficulty, however, may also be felt in the circumstance that the same Luke does not say that Peter entered, but only that he stooped down and saw the linen clothes hid by themselves, and that thereupon he departed, wondering in himself; whereas John intimates that it was rather himself (for he is the disciple whom Jesus loved) that looked at the scene in this fashion, not going within the sepulchre, which he was the first to reach, but simply bending down and beholding the linen clothes laid in their place; although he

also adds that he did enter the tomb afterwards. The explanation, therefore, is simply this, that Peter at first did stoop down and look in after the fashion which Luke specifies, but to which John makes no allusion; and that he went actually in somewhat later, but still before John entered. And in this way we shall find that all these writers have given a true account of what occurred in terms which betray no discrepancies.

71. Taking, then, not only the reports presented by the four evangelists, but also the statement given by the Apostle Paul, we shall endeavour to bring the whole into a single connected narrative, and exhibit the order in which all these incidents may have taken place, comprehending all the Lord's appearances to the male disciples, and leaving out His earlier declarations to the women. Now, in the entire number of the men, Peter is understood to be the one to whom Christ showed Himself first. At least, this holds good so far as regards all the individuals who are actually mentioned by the four evangelists, and by the Apostle Paul. But, at the same time, who would be bold enough either to affirm or to deny that He may have appeared to some one among them before He showed Himself to Peter, although all these writers pass the matter over in silence? For the statement which Paul also gives is not in the form, "He was seen first of Cephas. But it runs thus: "He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once. And thus it is not made clear who these twelve were, just as we are not informed who these five hundred were. It is quite possible, indeed, that the twelve here instanced were some unknown twelve belonging to the multitude of the disciples. For now the apostle might speak of those whom the Lord designated apostles, not as the twelve, but as the eleven.

Some codices, indeed, contain this very reading. I take that, however, to be an emendation introduced by men who were perplexed by the text, supposing it to refer to those twelve apostles who, by the time when Judas disappeared, were really only eleven. It may be the case, then, that those are the more correct codices which contain the reading "eleven; or it may be that Paul intended some other twelve disciples to be understood by that phrase; or, once more, the fact may be that he meant that consecrated number to remain as before, although the circle had been reduced to eleven: for this number twelve, as it was used of the apostles, had so mystical an importance, that, in order to keep the spiritual symbol of the same number, there could be but a single individual, namely, Matthias, elected to fill the place of Judas

But whichever of these several views may be adopted, nothing necessarily results which can appear to be inconsistent with truth, or at variance with any one most trustworthy historian among them. Still, it remains the probable supposition, that, after He was seen of Peter, He appeared next to those two, of whom Cleophas was one, and regarding whom Luke presents us with a complete narrative, while Mark gives us only a very brief notice. The latter evangelist reports the same incident in these concise terms: "And after that He appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked and went to a country-seat.

For it is not unreasonable for us to suppose that the place of residence referred to may also have been styled a country-seat; just as Bethlehem itself, which formerly was called a city, is even at the present time also named a village, although its honour has now been made so much the greater since the name of this Lord, who was born in it, has been proclaimed so extensively throughout the Churches of all nations. In the Greek codices, indeed, the reading which we discover is rather "estate" than "country-seat. But that term was employed not only of residences, but also of free towns and colonies beyond the city, which is the head and mother of the rest, and is therefore called the metropolis. 72. Again, if Mark tells us that the Lord appeared to these persons in another form, Luke refers to the same when he says that their eyes, were holden, that they should not know Him. For something had come upon their eyes which was suffered to remain until the breaking of the bread, in reference to a well-known mystery, so that only then was the different form in Him made visible to them, and they did not recognise Him, as is shown by Luke's narrative, until the breaking of the bread took place. And thus, in apt accordance with the state of their minds, which were still ignorant of the truth, that it behoved Christ to die and rise again, their eyes sustained something of a similar order; not, indeed, that the truth itself proved misleading, but that they were themselves incompetent to perceive the truth, and thought of the matter as something else than it was. The deeper significance of all which is this, that no one should consider himself to have attained the knowledge of Christ, if he is not a member in His body-that is to say, in His Church-the unity of which is commended to our notice under the sacramental symbol of the bread by an apostle, when he says: "We being many are one bread and one body.

So was it that, when He handed to them the bread which He had blessed, their eyes were opened, and they recognised Him, that is to say, their eyes were opened for such knowledge of Him, in so far as the impediment was now removed which had prevented them from recognising Him. For certainly they were not walking with closed eyes. But there was something in them which debarred them from seeing correctly what was in their view,—a state of matters, indeed, which is the familiar result of darkness, or of a certain kind of humour. It is not meant by this, however, that the Lord could not alter the form of His flesh, so that His figure might be literally and actually different, and not the one which they were in the habit of beholding. For, indeed, even before His passion, He was transfigured on the mount so that His countenance "did shine as the sun. And He who made genuine wine out of genuine water can also transform any body whatsoever in all unquestionable reality into any other kind of body which may please Him. But what is meant is, that He had not acted so when He appeared in another form unto those two individuals. For He did not appear to be what He was, to these men, because their eyes were holden, so that they should not know Him. Moreover, not unsuitably may we suppose that this impediment in their eyes came from Satan, with the view of precluding their recognition of Jesus.

But, nevertheless, permission that it should be so was given by Christ on to the point at which the mystery of the bread was taken up. And thus the lesson might be, that it is when we become participants in the unity of His body, that we are to understand the impediment of the adversary to be removed, and liberty to be given us to know Christ. 73. Besides, it is necessary to believe that these were the same persons to whom Mark also refers. For he informs us, that they went and told these things to the rest: just as Luke states, that the persons in question rose up the same hour and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And then he adds that these two also told what things were done on the way, and how He was known of them in breaking of bread. By this time, therefore, a report of the resurrection of Jesus had been conveyed by those women, and also by Simon Peter, to whom He had already shown Himself. For these two disciples found those to whom they came in Jerusalem talking of that very subject. Consequently, it may be the case that fear made them decline men-

tioning formerly, when they were on the way, that they had heard that He had risen again, so that they confined themselves to stating how the angels had been seen by the women. For, not knowing with whom they were conversing, they might reasonably be anxious not to let any word drop from them on the subject of Christ's resurrection, lest they should fall into the hands of the Jews. But again, we must remark that Mark states that "they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them:

whereas Luke tells us that these others were already saying that the Lord was risen indeed, and had appeared unto Simon. Is not the explanation, however, simply this, that there were some of them there who refused to credit what was related? Moreover, to whom can it fail to be clear that Mark has just omitted certain matters which are fully set forth in Luke's narrative, - that is to say, the subjects of the conversation which Jesus had with them before He recognised them, and the manner in which they came to know Him in the breaking of the bread? For, after recording how He appeared to them in another form, as they went towards a country-seat, Mark has immediately appended the sentence, "And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them; as if men could tell of a person whom they had not recognised, or as if those to whom He had appeared only in another form could know Him! Without doubt, therefore, Mark has simply given us no explanation of the way in which they came to know Him, so as to be able to report the same to others.

And this, then, is a thing which deserves to be imprinted on our memory, in order that we may accustom ourselves to keep in view the habit which these evangelists have of passing over those matters which they do not put on record, and of connecting the facts which they do relate in such a manner that, among those who fail to give due consideration to the usage referred to, nothing proves itself a more fruitful source of misapprehension than this, leading them to imagine the existence of discrepancies in the sacred writers. 74. Luke next proceeds with his narrative in the following terms: "And as they thus spake, Jesus Himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you: it is I; be not afraid. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And He said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when He had thus spoken, He

showed them His hands and His feet. It is to this act, by which the Lord showed Himself after His resurrection, that John is also understood to refer when he discourses as follows: "Then, when it was late on the first day of the week, and when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when He had so said, He showed unto them His hands and His side. Thus, too, we may connect with these words of John certain matters which Luke reports, but which John Himself omits. For Luke continues in these terms: "And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, He said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb.

And when He had eaten before them, He took what remained, and gave it unto them. Again, a passage which Luke omits, but which John presents, may next be connected with these words. It is to the following effect: "Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained. Once more, we may attach to the above section another which John has left out, but which Luke inserts. It runs thus: "And He said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be endued with power from on high.

Observe, then, how Luke has here referred to that promise of the Holy Spirit which we do not elsewhere find made by the Lord, save in John's Gospel. And this deserves something more than a passing notice, in order that we may bear in mind how the evangelists attest each other's truth, even on subjects which some of them may not themselves record, but which they nevertheless know to have been reported. After these matters, Luke passes

over in silence all else that happened, and introduces nothing into his narrative beyond the occasion when Jesus ascended into heaven. And at the same time he appends this [statement of the ascension], just as if it followed immediately upon these words which the Lord spake, at the same time with those other transactions on the first day of the week, that is to say, on the day on which the Lord rose again; whereas, in the Acts of the Apostles, the self-same Luke tells us that the event really took place on the fortieth day after His resurrection. Finally, as regards the fact that John states that the Apostle Thomas was not present with these others on the occasion under review, whereas, according to Luke, the two disciples, of whom Cleophas was one, returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven assembled and those who were with them, it admits of little doubt that we must suppose Thomas simply to have left the company before the Lord showed Himself to the brethren when they were talking in the terms noticed above.

75. This being the case, John now records a second manifestation of Himself, which was vouchsafed by the Lord to the disciples eight days after, on which occasion Thomas also was present, who had not seen Him up to that time. The narrative proceeds thus: "And after eight days again His disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith He to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. Thomas answered and said unto Him, My Lord and my God. Jesus saith unto Him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed. This second appearance of the Lord among the disciples-that is to say, the appearance which John records in the second instance-we might also recognise as alluded to by Mark in a section concisely disposing of it, according to that evangelist's habit. A difficulty, however, is created by the circumstance that his terms are these: "Lastly, He appeared unto those eleven as they sat at meat. The difficulty does not lie in the mere fact that John says nothing about their sitting at meat, for he might well have omitted that;

but it does rest in the use of the word "lastly," for that makes it seem as if He did not show Himself to them after that occasion, whereas John still proceeds to record a third appearance of the Lord by the sea of Tiberias. And then we have to keep in view the fact that the same Mark tells us how Jesus

"upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen Him after He was risen. In these words he refers to the two disciples to whom He appeared after He was risen, as they went toward a country-seat, and to Peter, to whom the examination of Luke's narrative has shown us that He manifested Himself first of all [among the apostles],-perhaps also to Mary Magdalene, and those other women who were along with her on the occasion when He was seen by them at the sepulchre, and again when He met them as they were returning on the way. For the said Mark has constructed his record in a manner which leads him first to insert his brief notice of the two disciples to whom He appeared as they went toward the country-seat, and of their giving a report to the residue and obtaining no credit, and then to subjoin in the immediate connection this statement: "Lastly, He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen Him after He was risen.

How, then, is this phrase "lastly" used, as if they did not see Him subsequently to this occasion? For the last time that the apostles saw the Lord upon the earth was really the time when He ascended into heaven, and that event took place on the fortieth day after His resurrection. Now, is it likely that He would upbraid them at that period on the ground that they had not believed those who had seen Him after He was risen, when by that time they had seen Him themselves so often after His resurrection, and especially when they had seen Him on the very day of His resurrection,-that is to say, on the first day of the week, when it was now about night, as Luke and John record? It remains for us, therefore, to suppose that, in the passage under review, it was Mark's intention to give a statement, in his own concise fashion, simply on the subject of the said day of the Lord's resurrection; that is to say, that first day of the week on which Mary and the other women who were along with her saw Him after daybreak, on which also Peter beheld Him, on which likewise He appeared to the two disciples, of whom Cleophas was one, and to whom Mark himself also seems to refer; on which, further, when it was now about night, He showed Himself to the eleven (Thomas, however, being excepted) and those who were with them;

and on which, finally, the persons already instanced reported to the disciples the things which they had seen. Hence it is that he has employed the term "lastly," because the incident mentioned was the last that took place on

this same day. For the night was now coming on by the time that the two disciples had returned from the place where they had recognised Him in the breaking of bread, and had made their way into Jerusalem and found the eleven, as Luke tells us, and those who were with them, speaking to each other about the Lord's resurrection and about His having appeared to Peter; to whom these two also related what had occurred on the way, and how they came to know Him in the breaking of bread. But, assuredly, there were also there some who did not believe. Hence we see the truth of Mark's words, "Neither believed they them. When these, therefore, were now sitting at meat, as Mark informs us, and when they were talking of these subjects, as Luke tells us, the Lord stood in their midst, and said unto them, "Peace be unto you," as Luke and John both record. Moreover, the doors were shut when He entered among them, as John alone mentions.

And thus, among the words which, as Luke and John have reported, the Lord spoke to the disciples on that occasion, this expostulation also comes in, which is instanced by Mark, and in which He upbraided them for not believing those who had seen Him after He was risen. 76. But, again, a difficulty may also be felt in understanding how Mark says that the Lord appeared to the eleven as they sat at meat, if the time referred to is really the beginning of the night of that Lord's day, as is indicated by Luke and John. For John, indeed, tells us plainly that the Apostle Thomas was not with them on that occasion; and we believe that he left them before the Lord entered among them, but after the two disciples who returned from the village had been conversing with the eleven, as we discover from Luke. Luke, it is true, presents a point in his narrative, at which we may fairly suppose, first, that Thomas went out while they were talking of these subjects, and then that the Lord came in Mark, however, who says, "Lastly, He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat," compels us to admit that Thomas also was there. But it may be the case, perhaps, that he chose to style them the eleven, although one of the company was absent, because the same apostolic society was designated by this number at the time previous to the election of Matthias in the place of Judas.

Or, if there is a difficulty in accepting this explanation, we may still suppose that, after the many manifestations in which He vouchsafed His presence to the disciples during the forty days, He also showed Himself on one final occasion to the eleven as they sat at meat,—that is to say, on the fortieth

day itself; and that, as He was now on the point of leaving them and ascending into heaven, He was minded on that memorable day specially to upbraid them with their refusal to believe those who had seen Him after He had risen until they should first have seen Him themselves; and this particularly because it was the case that, when the) preached the gospel subsequently to His ascension, the very Gentiles would be ready to believe what they did not see. For, after mentioning this upbraiding, Mark at once proceeds to subjoin this passage: "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. If, therefore, they were charged to preach that he who believes not shall be condemned, when that indeed which he believes not is just what he has not seen, was it not meet that they should themselves first of all be thus reproved for their own refusal to believe those to whom the Lord had shown Himself at an earlier stage until they should have seen Him with their own eyes?

77. In what follows we have a further recommendation to take this to have been the last manifestation of Himself in bodily fashion which the Lord gave to the apostles. For the same Mark continues in these terms: "And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. Then he appends this statement: "So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by signs following. Now, when he says, "So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven," he appears probably enough to indicate that this was the last discourse He held with them upon the earth. At the same time, the words do not seem to shut us up to that idea absolutely. For what he says is not, "after He had spoken these things unto them," but simply, "after He had spoken unto them;

and hence it would be quite admissible, were there any necessity for such a theory, to suppose that this was not the last discourse, and that was not the last day on which He was present with them upon the earth, but that all the matters regarding which He spake with them in all these days may be referred to in the sentence, "After He had spoken unto them, He was received

up into heaven. But, inasmuch as the considerations which we have detailed above lead us rather to conclude that this was the last day, than to suppose that the allusion is specifically to the eleven at a time when, in consequence of the absence of Thomas, they were only ten, we are of opinion that after this discourse which Mark mentions, and with which we have to connect in their proper order those other words, whether of the disciples or of the Lord Himself, which are recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, we must believe the Lord to have been received up into heaven, to wit, on the fortieth day after the day of His resurrection.

78. John, again, although he tells us plainly that he has passed over many of the things which Jesus did, has been pleased, nevertheless, to give us a narrative of a third manifestation of Himself, which the Lord granted to the disciples after the resurrection, namely, by the sea of Tiberias, and before seven of the disciples,—that is to say, Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, the sons of Zebedee, and two others who are not mentioned by name. That is the occasion when they were engaged in fishing; when, in obedience to His command, they cast the nets on the right side, and drew to land great fishes, a hundred and fifty and three: when He also asked Peter three times whether He was loved by him, and charged him to feed His sheep, and delivered a prophecy regarding what he would suffer, and said also, with reference to John, "Thus I will that he tarry till I come." And with this John has brought his Gospel to its conclusion.

79. We have next to consider now what was the occasion of His first appearance to the disciples in Galilee. For this incident, which John narrates as the third in order, took place in Galilee by the sea of Tiberias. And one may perceive that the scene was in that district, if he calls to mind the miracle of the five loaves, the narrative of which the same John commences in these terms: "After these things Jesus went over the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of Tiberias. And what should naturally be supposed to be the proper locality for His first manifestation to the disciples after His resurrection but Galilee? This seems to be the conclusion to which we should be led when we recollect the words of the angel who, according to Matthew's Gospel, addressed the women as they came to the sepulchre. The words were these: "Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified. He is not here; for He is risen, as He said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay: and go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead; and, behold, He

goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see Him: lo, I have told you. Mark presents a similar report, whether the angel of whom he speaks be the same one or a different. His version runs thus: "Be not affrighted: ye seek Jesus of Nazareth which was crucified; He is risen; He is not here:

behold the place where they laid Him. But go your way, tell His disciples and Peter that He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see Him, as He said unto you. Now the impression which these words seem to produce is, that Jesus was not to show Himself to His disciples after His resurrection, but in Galilee. The appearance thus referred to, however, is not recorded even by Mark himself, who has informed us how He showed Himself first to Mary Magdalene in the early morning of the first day of the week; how she went and told them that had been with Him as they mourned and wept; how these persons refused to believe her; how, after this, He was next seen by the two disciples who were going to the residence in the country; how these twain reported what had occurred to them to the residue, which, as Luke and John agree in certifying, took place in Jerusalem on the very day of the Lord's resurrection, and when night was now coming on. Thereafter the same evangelist comes next to that appearance which he calls His last, and which was vouchsafed to the eleven as they sat at meat; and when he has given us his account of that scene, he tells us how He was received up into heaven, which event took place, as we know, on the Mount Olivet, at no great distance from Jerusalem.

Thus Mark nowhere relates the actual fulfilment of that which he declares to have been announced beforehand by the angel. Matthew, on the other hand, confines his statement to a single occurrence, and refers to no other locality whatsoever, whether earlier or later, where the disciples saw the Lord after He was risen, but the Galilee which was specified in the angel's prediction. This evangelist, in short, first introduces his notice of the terms in which the women were addressed by the angel; then he subjoins an account of what happened as they were going, and how the members of the watch were bribed to give a false report; and then he inserts his statement [of the appearance in Galilee], just as if that were the very event which followed immediately on what he has been relating. For, indeed, the angel's words, "He is risen; and behold, He goeth before you into Galilee," were really such as might make it seem reasonable to suppose that nothing would intervene [before that manifestation in Galilee]. Matthew's version, accordingly, pro-

ceeds as follows: "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw Him, they worshipped Him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you:

and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. In these terms has Matthew closed his Gospel. 80. Thus, then, were it not that the consideration of the narratives given by others of the evangelists led us inevitably to examine the whole subject with greater care, we might entertain the idea that the scene of the Lord's first manifestation of Himself to the disciples after His resurrection, could be nowhere else but in Galilee. In like manner, had Mark passed over the angel's announcement without notice, any one might have supposed that Matthew was induced to tell us how the disciples went away to a mountain in Galilee, and there worshipped the Lord, by his desire to show the actual fulfilment of the charge, and of the prediction which he had also recorded to have been conveyed by the angel. As the case now stands, however, Luke and John both certify with sufficient clearness, that on the very day of His resurrection the Lord was seen by His disciples in Jerusalem, which is at such a distance from Galilee as makes it impossible for Him to have been seen by these same individuals in both places in the course of a single day. In like manner, Mark, while he does report in similar terms the announcement made by the angel, nowhere mentions that the Lord actually was seen in Galilee by His disciples after He was risen. These, therefore, are considerations which strongly force upon us an inquiry into the real import of this saying, "Behold, He goeth before you into Galilee! there shall ye see Him.

For if Matthew himself, too, had not stated that the eleven disciples went away into Galilee into a mountain, where Jesus had appointed them, and that they saw Him there and worshipped Him, we might have supposed that there was no literal fulfilment of the prediction in question, but that the whole announcement was intended to convey a figurative meaning. And a parallel to that we should then find in the words recorded by Luke, namely, "Behold I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected; which prediction certainly was not accomplished in

the letter. In like manner, if the angel had said, "He goeth before you into Galilee, there shall ye see Him first; or, "Only there shall ye see Him; or, "Nowhere else but there shall ye see Him; unquestionably, in that case, Matthew would have been in antagonism with the rest of the evangelists. As the matter stands, however, the words are simply these: "Behold, He goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see Him; and there is no statement of the precise time at which that meeting was to take place-whether at the earliest opportunity, and before He was seen by them elsewhere, or at a later period, and after they had seen Him also in other places besides Galilee;

and, further, although Matthew relates that the disciples went away into Galilee into a mountain, he neither specifies the day of that departure, nor constructs his narrative in an order which would force upon us the necessity of supposing that this particular event must have been actually the first appearance. Consequently, we may conclude that Matthew stands in no antagonism with the narratives of the other evangelists, but that he makes it quite competent for us, in due consistency with his own report, to understand the meaning and accept the truth of these other accounts. At the same time, as the Lord thus pointed, not to the place where He intended first to manifest Himself, but to the locality of Galilee, where undoubtedly He appeared afterwards; and as He conveyed these instructions about beholding Himself at once through the angel, who said, "Behold, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see Him; and by His own words, "Go, tell my brethren, that they go into Galilee, and there shall ye see me;"-in these facts we find considerations which make every believer anxious to inquire with what mystical significance all this may be understood to have been stated.

81. In the first place, however, we must also consider the question of the time at which He may thus have shown Himself in bodily form in Galilee, according to the statement given by Matthew in these terms: "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them; and when they saw Him, they worshipped Him; but some doubted. That it was not on the day of His resurrection is manifest. For Luke and John agree in telling us most plainly that He was seen in Jerusalem that very day, when the night was coming on; while Mark is not so clear on the subject. When was it, then, that they saw the Lord in Galilee? I do not refer to the appearance mentioned by John, by the sea of Tiberias; for on that occasion there were only seven of them present, and they were found fishing. But I

mean the appearance detailed by Matthew, when the eleven were on the mountain, to which Jesus had gone before them, according to the announcement made by the angel. For the import of Matthew's statement appears to be this, that they found Him there just because He had gone before them according to appointment.

It did not take place, then, either on the day on which He rose, or in the eight days that followed, after which space John states that the Lord showed Himself to the disciples, when Thomas, who had not seen Him on the day of His resurrection, saw Him for the first time. For, surely, on the supposition that the eleven had really seen Him on the mountain in Galilee within the period of these eight days, it may well be asked how Thomas, who had been of the number of these eleven, could be said to have seen Him for the first time at the end of these eight days. To that question there is no answer, unless, indeed, one could say that they were not the eleven, who by that time bore the specific designation of Apostles, but some other eleven disciples singled out of the numerous body of His followers. For those eleven were, indeed, the only persons who were yet called by the name of Apostles, but they were not the only disciples. It may perhaps be the case, therefore, that the apostles are really referred to; that not all but only some of them were there; that there were also other disciples with them, so that the number of persons present was made up to eleven; and that Thomas, who saw the Lord for the first time at the end of those eight days, was absent on this occasion.

For when Mark mentions the said eleven, he does not use the general expression "eleven," but says explicitly, "He appeared unto the eleven. Luke, likewise, puts it thus: "They returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them. There he gives us to understand that these were the eleven—that is to say, the apostles. For when he adds, "and those who were with them," he has surely indicated plainly enough, that those with whom these others were, were styled "the eleven" in some eminent sense; and this leads us to understand those to be meant who were now called distinctively Apostles. Consequently, it is quite possible that, out of the body of apostles and other disciples, the number of eleven disciples was made up who saw Jesus upon the mountain in Galilee, within the space of these eight days. 82. But another difficulty in the way of this settlement arises here. For, when John has recorded how the Lord was seen, not by the eleven on the mountain, but by seven of them when they were fishing in the

sea of Tiberias, he appends the following statement: "This is now the third time that Jesus showed Himself to His disciples, after that He was risen from the dead. Now, if we accept the theory that the Lord was seen by the company of the eleven disciples within the period of these eight days, and previous to His being seen by Thomas, this scene by the sea of Tiberias will not be the third but the fourth time that He showed Himself. Here, indeed, we must take care not to let any one suppose that, in speaking of the third time, John meant that there were in all only three appearances of the Lord. On the contrary, we must understand him to refer to the number of the days, and not to the number of the manifestations themselves; and, further, it is to be observed that these days are not presented as coming in immediate succession after each other, but as separated by intervals in accordance with intimations given by the evangelist himself. For, keeping out of view His appearance to the women, it is made perfectly plain in the Gospel that He showed Himself three several times on the first day after He was risen; namely, once to Peter; again to those two disciples, of whom Cleophas was one;

and a third time to the larger body, while they were conversing with each other as the night came on. But all these John, looking to the fact that they took place on a single day, reckons as one appearance. Then he identifies a second—that is to say, an appearance on another day—with the occasion on which Thomas also saw Him; and he particularizes a third by the sea of Tiberias, that is to say, not literally His third appearance, but the third day of His self-manifestations. Thus the result is, that after all these incidents, we are constrained to suppose this other occasion to have occurred on which, according to Matthew, the eleven disciples saw Him on the mountain in Galilee, to which He had gone before them according to appointment, so that all that had been foretold, both by the angel and by Himself, should be fulfilled even to the letter.

83. Consequently, in the four evangelists we find mention made of ten distinct appearances of the Lord to different persons after His resurrection. First, to the women near the sepulchre. Secondly, to the same women as they were on the way returning from the sepulchre. Thirdly, to Peter. Fourthly, to the two who were going to the place in the country. Fifthly, to the larger number in Jerusalem, when Thomas was not present. Sixthly, on the occasion when Thomas saw Him. Seventhly, by the sea of Tiberias. Eighthly, on the mountain in Galilee, of which Matthew speaks. Ninthly, at the time to

which Mark refers in the words, "Lastly, as they sat at meat," thereby intimating that now they were no more to eat with Him upon the earth. Tenthly, on the same day, not now indeed upon the earth, but lifted up in the cloud, as He ascended into heaven, as Mark and Luke record. This last appearance, indeed, is introduced by Mark, directly after he has told us how the Lord showed Himself to them as they sat at meat. For his narrative goes on connectedly as follows: "So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven.

Luke, on the other hand, omits all that may have passed between Him and His disciples during the forty days, and, after giving the history of the first day of His resurrection-life, when He showed Himself to the larger number in Jerusalem, he silently connects therewith the closing day on which He ascended up into heaven. His statement proceeds in this form: "And He led them out as far as to Bethany; and He lifted up His hands, and blessed them; and it came to pass, that while He blessed them, He was parted from them, and carried up into heaven. Thus, therefore, besides seeing Him upon the earth, they beheld Him also as He was borne up into heaven. So many times, then, is He reported in the evangelical books to have been seen by different individuals, previous to His completed ascension into heaven, namely, nine times upon the earth, and once in the air as He was ascending.

84. At the same time, all is not recorded, as John plainly declares. For He had frequent intercourse with His disciples during the forty days which preceded His ascension into heaven. He had not, however, showed Himself to them throughout all these forty days without interruption. For John tells us, that after the first day of His resurrection-life, there elapsed other eight days, at the end of which space He appeared to them again. The appearance which is identified [in John] as the third-namely, the one by the sea of Tiberias-may perhaps have taken place on an immediately succeeding day; for there is nothing antagonistic to that. And then He showed Himself when it seemed the proper time to Him, as He had appointed with them (which appointment had also been conveyed in the previous prophetic announcement) to go before them into Galilee. And all throughout these forty days, He appeared on occasions, and to individuals, and in modes, just as He was minded. To these appearances Peter alludes when, in the discourse which he delivered before Cornelius and those who were with him, he says, "Even to us who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead, for the space of forty days.

It is not meant, however, that they had eaten and drunk with Him daily throughout these forty days. For that would be contrary to John's statement, who has interposed the space of eight days, during which He was not seen, and makes His third appearance take place by the sea of Tiberias.

At the same time, even although He [should be supposed to have] manifested Himself to them and lived with them every day after that period, that would not come into antagonism with anything in the narrative. And, perhaps, this expression, "for the space of forty days," which is equivalent to four times ten, and may thus sustain a mystical reference to the whole world or the whole temporal age, has been used just because those first ten days, within which the said eight fall, may not incongruously be reckoned, in accordance with the practice of the Scriptures, on the principle of dealing with the part in general terms as the whole. 85. Let us therefore compare what is said by the Apostle Paul with the view of deciding whether it raises any question of difficulty. His statement proceeds thus: "That He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and that He was seen of Cephas." He does not say, "He was seen first of Cephas" For this would be inconsistent with the fact that it is recorded in the Gospel that He appeared first to the women. He continues thus: "then of the twelve;" and whoever the individuals may have been to whom He then showed Himself, and whatever the precise hour, this was at least on the very day of His resurrection. Again he goes on: "After that He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once." And whether these were gathered together with the eleven when the doors were shut for fear of the Jews, and when Jesus came to them after Thomas had gone out from the company, or whether the reference is to some other appearance subsequent to these eight days, no discrepancy is created. Again he says, "after that He was seen of James." We ought not, however, to suppose this to mean that this was the first occasion on which He was seen of James; but we may take it to allude to some special appearance to that apostle by himself. Next he adds, "then of all the apostles," which does not imply that this was the first time that He showed Himself to them, but that from this period He lived in more familiar intercourse with them on to the day of His ascension. Finally he says, "And last of all He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time." But that was a revelation of Himself from heaven some considerable time after His ascension.

86. Consequently, let us now take up the subject which we had postponed, and inquire what mystical meaning may underlie the report given by Matthew and Mark, namely, that on rising He made this statement, "I will go before you into Galilee: there shall ye see me. For this announcement, if it was fulfilled at all, was certainly not fulfilled till a considerable interval had elapsed; whereas it is couched in terms which seem to lead us (although such a conclusion is not an absolute necessity) most naturally to expect that the appearance referred to would be either the only one or the first that would ensue. We observe, however, that the words in question are not given as the words of the evangelist himself, in the form of a narrative of a past occurrence, but as the words of the angel, who spoke according to the Lord's commission, and subsequently also as the words of the Lord Himself; that is to say, the words are used by the evangelist in his narrative, but they are presented by him as a direct statement of what was spoken by the angel and by the Lord. This, therefore, unquestionably compels us to accept them as uttered prophetically. Now Galilee may be interpreted to mean either "Transmigration" or "Revelation."

Consequently, if we adopt the idea of "Transmigration," what other sense occurs to us to put upon the sentence, "He goeth before you into Galilee, there shall you see Him," but just this, that the grace of Christ was to be transferred from the people of Israel to the Gentiles? That in preaching the gospel to these Gentiles, the apostles would meet with no acceptance unless the Lord prepared a way for them in the hearts of men,-this may be what is to be understood by the sentence, "He goeth before you into Galilee. And, again, that they would look with joy and wonder at the breaking down and removing of difficulties, and at the opening of a door for them in the Lord through the enlightenment of the believing,-this is what is to be understood by the words, "there shall ye see Him; that is to say, there shall ye find His members, there shall ye recognise His living body in the person of those who shall receive you. Or, if we follow the second view which takes Galilee to signify "Revelation," the idea may be, that He was now no more to be in the form of a servant, but in that form in which He is equal with the Father; as He promised to those who loved Him when He said, according to the testimony of John, "And I will love him, and will manifest myself to him."

That is to say, He was afterwards to manifest Himself, not merely as they saw Him before, nor merely in the way in which, rising as He did with His

wounds upon Him, He was to give Himself to be touched as well as seen by them, but in the character of that ineffable light, wherewith He enlightens every man that cometh into this world, and in virtue of which He shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehends Him not. Thus has He gone before us to something from which He withdraws not, although He comes to us, and which does not involve His leaving us, although He has preceded us thither. That will be a revelation which may be spoken of as a true Galilee, when we shall be like Him; there shall we see Him as He is. Then, also, will there be for us the more blessed transmigration, from this world into that eternity, if we embrace His precepts so as to be counted worthy of being set apart on His right hand. For there, those on the left hand shall go away into eternal burning, but the righteous into life eternal. Hence they shall pass thither, and there, shall they see Him, as the wicked do not see Him. For the wicked shall be taken away, so that he shall not see the brightness of the Lord; and the unrighteousness shall not see the light.

For He says, "And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent; even as He shall be known in that eternity to which He will bring His servants by the form of a servant, in order that in liberty they may contemplate the form of the Lord.

INTRODUCTION

¹ This book embraces a discussion of those passages which are peculiar to Mark, Luke, or John.

Prologue.

21. As we have examined Matthew's narrative in its complete connection, and as the comparison which we have carried out between it and the other three on to its conclusion has established the fact, that not one of these evangelists contains anything either at variance with other statements in his own Gospel, or inconsistent with the accounts presented by his fellow-historians, let us now subject Mark to a similar scrutiny. Our plan will be to omit those sections which he has in common with Matthew, which we have already investigated as far as seemed requisite and are now done with, and to take up those paragraphs which remain, with the view of submitting them to discussion and comparison, and of demonstrating their thorough harmony with what is related by the other evangelists on to the notice of the Lord's Supper. For we have already dealt with all the incidents which are reported in

all the four Gospels from that point on to the end, and have considered the subject of their mutual consistency.

3 Chapter 1.-Of the Question Regarding the Proof that Mark's Gospel is in Harmony with the Rest in What is Narrated (Those Passages Which He Has in Common with Matthew Being Left Out of Account), from Its Beginning Down to the Section Where It is Said, "And They Go into Capharnaum, and Straightway on the Sabbath-Day He Taught Them:" Which Incident is Reported Also by Luke. 2. Mark, then, commences as follows: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God: as it is written in the prophet Isaiah;" and so on, down to where it is said, "And they go into Capharnaum; and straightway on the Sabbath-day He entered into the synagogue and taught them." In this entire context, everything has been examined above in connection with Matthew. This particular statement, however, about His going into the synagogue at Capharnaum and teaching them on the Sabbath-day, is one which Mark has in common with Luke. But it raises no question of difficulty.

CHAPTER II.-OF THE MAN OUT OF WHOM THE UNCLEAN SPIRIT THAT WAS TORMENTING HIM WAS CAST, AND OF THE QUESTION WHETHER MARK'S VERSION IS QUITE CONSISTENT WITH THAT OF LUKE, WHO IS AT ONE WITH HIM IN REPORTING THE INCIDENT.

3. Mark proceeds with his narrative in the following terms: "And they were astonished at His doctrine: for He taught them as one that had authority, and not as the scribes. And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit: and he cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy us? and so on, down to the passage where we read, "And He preached in the synagogues throughout all Galilee, and cast out devils. Although there are some points here which are common only to Mark and Luke, the entire contents of this section have also been already dealt with when we were going over Matthew's narrative in its continuity. For all these matters came into the order of narration in such a manner that I thought they could not be passed over. But Luke says that this unclean spirit went out of the man in such a way as not to hurt him: whereas Mark's statement is to this effect: "And the unclean spirit cometh out of him, tearing him, and crying with a loud voice. There may seem, therefore, to be some discrepancy here. For how could the unclean spirit have been "tearing him," or, as some codices have it, "tormenting him," if, as Luke says, he"

hurt him not"? Luke, however, gives the notice in full, thus: "And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him, and "hurt him not.

Thus we are to understand that when Mark says, "tormenting him," he just refers to what Luke expresses in the sentence, "When he had thrown him in the midst. And when the latter appends the words, "and hurt him not," the meaning simply is, that the said tossing of the man's limbs and tormenting him did not debilitate him, as is often the case with the exit of devils, when, at times, some of the members are even destroyed in the process of removing the trouble. Chapter III.-Of the Question Whether Mark's Reports of the Repeated Occasions on Which the Name of Peter Was Brought into Prominence are Not at Variance with the Statement Which John Has Given Us of the Particular Time at Which the Apostle Received that Name. 4. The same Mark continues as follows: "And there came a leper to Him, beseeching Him, and kneeling down to Him, and saying unto Him, If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean; and so on, down to where it is said, "And they cried out, saying, Thou art the Son of God: and He straightway charged them that they should not make Him known. Luke also records something similar to the last passage which we have here adduced. But nothing emerges involving any discrepancy. Mark proceeds thus: "And He goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto Him whom He would: and they came unto Him. And He ordained twelve that they should be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach; and He gave them power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils. And Simon He surnamed Peter; and so on, down to where it is said, "And he departed, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done: and all men did marvel. I am aware that I have spoken already of the names of the disciples when following the order of Matthew's narrative. Here, therefore, I repeat the caution, that no one should suppose Simon to have received the name Peter on this occasion for the first time, or fancy that Mark is here in any antagonism with John, who reports that disciple to have been addressed long before in these terms: "Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, A stone.

For John has there recorded the very words in which the Lord gave him that name. Mark, on the other hand, has introduced the matter in the form of a recapitulation in this passage, when he says, "And Simon He surnamed Peter. For, as it was his intention to enumerate the names of the twelve apostles here, and it was necessary for him thus to mention Peter, he decided

briefly to intimate the fact that the said name was not borne by that disciple all along, but was given him by the Lord, not, however, at the time with which Mark was immediately dealing, but on the occasion in connection with which John has introduced the very words employed by the Lord. The other matters embraced within this paragraph, present nothing inconsistent with any of the other Gospels, and they have also been discussed previously. Chapter IV.-Of the Words, "The More He Charged Them to Tell No One, So Much the More a Great Deal They Published It;" And of the Question Whether that Statement is Not Inconsistent with His Prescience, Which is Commended to Our Notice in the Gospel.

5. Mark continues thus: "And when Jesus was passed over again by ship unto the other side, much people gathered unto Him: and He was nigh unto the sea; and so on, down to where we read, "And the apostles gathered themselves together unto Jesus, and told Him all things, both what they had done, and what they had taught. This last portion Mark has in common with Luke, and there is no discrepancy between them. The rest of the contents of this section we have already discussed. Mark continues in these terms: "And He said unto them, Come ye apart into a desert place, and rest a while; and so on, down to the words, "But the more He charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it; and were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well: He maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak. In all this there is nothing which presents the appearance of any want of harmony between Mark and Luke; and the whole of the above we have already considered, when we were comparing these evangelists with Matthew. At the same time, we must make sure that no one shall suppose that the last statement, which I have cited here from Mark's Gospel, is in antagonism with the entire body of the evangelists, who, in reporting most of His other deeds and words, make it plain that He knew what went on in men;

that is to say, that their thoughts and desires could not be concealed from Him. Thus John puts it very clearly in the following passage: "But Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for He knew what was in man. But what wonder is it that He should discern the present thoughts of men, if He announced beforehand to Peter the thought which he was to entertain in the future, but which he certainly had not then, at the very time when he was

boldly declaring himself ready to die for Him, or with Him? This being the case, then, how can it fail to appear as if this knowledge and foreknowledge, which He possessed in so supreme a measure, is contradicted by Mark's statement, "He charged them that they should tell no man: but the more He charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it"? For if He, as one who held in His own knowledge all the intentions of men, both present and future was aware that they would publish it all the more the more He charged them not to publish it, what purpose could He have in giving them such a charge? Well, but may not the explanation be this, that he desired to give backward ones to understand how much more zealously and fervently they ought to preach on whom He lays the commission to preach, if even men who were interdicted were unable to keep silent?

Chapter V.-Of the Statement Which John Made Concerning the Man Who Cast Out Devils Although He Did Not Belong to the Circle of the Disciples; And of the Lord's Reply, "Forbid Them Not, for He that is Not Against You is on Your Part;" And of the Question Whether that Response Does Not Contradict the Other Sentence, in Which He Said, "He that is Not with Me is Against Me." 6. Mark proceeds as follows: "In those days again, the multitude being very great, and having nothing to eat; and so on, down to the words, "John answered Him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in Thy name, and he followeth not us; and we forbade him. But Jesus said, Forbid him not; for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me; for he that is not against you is on your side. Luke relates this in similar terms, with this exception, that he does not insert the clause, "for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me. Consequently, there is nothing here to raise the question of any discrepancy between these two. We must see, however, whether this sentence must be supposed to stand in opposition to another of the Lord's sayings, namely, the one to this effect, "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad. For how was this man not against Him, who was notwith Him, and of whom John reported that he did not unite with them in following Him, if he is against Him who is not with Him? Or if the man was against Him, how does He say to the disciples, "Forbid him not; for he that is not against you is on your side"?

Will any one aver that it is of consequence to observe that here He says to the disciples, "He that is not against you is on your side; whereas, in the other passage, He spoke of Himself in the terms, "He that is not with me is against me"? That would make it appear, indeed, as if it were possible for one not to be with Him, although he was associated with those disciples of His who are, so to speak; His very members. Besides, how would the truth of such sayings as these stand then: "He that receiveth you receiveth me; and "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me"? Or is it possible for one not to be against Him, although he may be against His disciples? Nay; for what shall we make then of words like these: "He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and, "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto the least of mine, ye did it not unto me; and, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me," -although it was His disciples that Saul was persecuting? But, in good truth, the sense intended to be conveyed is just this, that, so far as a man is not with Him, so far is he against Him; and again, that, so far as a man is not against Him, so far is he with Him.

For example, take this very case of the individual who was working miracles in the name of Christ, and yet was not in the company of Christ's disciples: so far as this man was working miracles in His name, so far was he with them, and so far he was not against them. But, inasmuch as they had prohibited the man from doing a thing in which, so far forth, he was really with them, the Lord said to them, "Forbid him not. For what they ought to have forbidden was what was outside their fellowship, so that they might bring him over to the unity of the Church, and not a thing like this, in which he was at one with them, that is to say, so far as he commended the name of their Master and Lord in the casting out of devils. And this is the principle on which the Catholic Church acts, not condemning common sacraments among heretics; for in these they are with us, and they are not against us. But she condemns and forbids division and separation, or any sentiment adverse to peace and truth. For therein they are against us, just because they are not with us in that, and because, not gathering with us, they are consequently scattering.

Chapter VI.-Of the Circumstance that Mark Has Recorded More Than Luke as Spoken by the Lord in Connection with the Case of This Man Who Was Casting Out Devils in the Name of Christ, Although He Was Not Following with the Disciples; And of the Question How These Additional

Words Can Be Shown to Have a Real Bearing Upon What Christ Had in View in Forbidding the Individual to Be Interdicted Who Was Performing Miracles in His Name. 7. Mark proceeds with his narrative in these terms: "For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe on me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And so on, down to where it is said, "Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another. These words Mark represents to have been spoken by the Lord in the connection immediately following what He said in forbidding the man to be interdicted who was casting out devils in His name, and yet was not following Him along with the disciples. In this section, too, he introduces some matters which are not found in any of the other evangelists, but also some which occur in Matthew as well, and some which we come across in like manner both in Matthew and in Luke.

Those other evangelists, however, bring in these matters in different connections, and in another order of facts, and not at this particular point when the statement was made to Christ about the man who did not follow Him along with the disciples, and yet was casting out devils in His name. My opinion, therefore, is, that the Lord did really utter sayings in this connection, according to Mark's attestation, of which he also delivered Himself on other occasions, and this for the simple reason, that they were sufficiently pertinent to this expression of His mind which he gave here, when He forbade the placing of any interdict upon the working of miracles in His name, even although that should be done by a man who did not follow Him along with His disciples. For Mark presents the relation of the one passage to the other thus: "For he that is not against us is on our part; for whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. This makes it plain that even this man, whose case John had taken up, and thus had given occasion for the Lord to commence the discourse referred to, was not separating himself from the society of the disciples to any such effect as to scorn it like a heretic.

But his position was something parallel to the familiar one of men who, while not going the length yet of receiving the sacraments of Christ, nevertheless favour the Christian name so far as even to receive Christians, and accommodate themselves to them for this very reason, and none other, that they are Christian; of which type of persons it is that He tells us that they do not lose their reward. This does not mean, however, that they ought at once to think themselves quite safe and secure simply on account of this kindness which they cherish towards Christians, while at the same time they are neither cleansed by Christ's baptism, nor incorporated into the unit), of His body. But the import is, that they are now being guided by the mercy of God in such a way that they may also come to these higher things, and so quit this present world in safety. And such persons assuredly are more profitable [servants], even before they become associated with the number of Christians, than those individuals who, while already bearing the Christian name and partaking in the Christian sacraments, recommend courses which are only fitted to drag others, whom they may persuade to adopt them, along with themselves into eternal punishment. These are the persons to whom He refers under the figure of the members of the body, and whom He commands to be cast out from the body, like an offending hand or eye;

that is to say, to be cut off from the fellowship of that unity, in order that they should seek rather to enter into life without such associates, than to go into hell in their company. Moreover, they are separated from those from whom they separate themselves, just when no consent is yielded to their evil recommendations, that is to say, to the offences in which they indulge. And if, indeed, they are discovered in the character of their perversity to all good men with whom they have any fellowship, they are cut off completely from the fellowship of all, and also from participation in the divine sacraments. But if they are known in this character only to some, while their perversity is unknown to the majority, they must just be borne with, as the chaff is endured in the thrashing-floor previous to the winnowing; that is to say, they must be dealt with in a manner which will neither involve any agreement with them in the fellowship of unrighteousness, nor lead to a forsaking of the society of the good on their account. This is what is done by those who have salt in themselves, and who have peace one with another.

CHAPTER VII.-OF THE FACT THAT FROM THIS POINT ON TO THE LORD'S SUPPER, WITH WHICH ACT THE DISCUSSION OF ALL THE NARRATIVES OF THE FOUR EVANGELISTS CONJOINTLY COMMENCED, NO QUESTION CALLING FOR SPECIAL EXAMINATION IS RAISED BY MARK'S GOSPEL.

8. Mark continues as follows: "And He arose from thence, and cometh into the coasts of Judaea by the farther side of Jordan: and the people resort unto Him again; and, as He was wont, He taught them again;" and so on, down to where it is said, "For all they did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, even all her living." In this entire context, all the above has been subjected to investigation already, with the view of removing the appearance of any contrariety, when we were comparing the other Gospels in due order with Matthew. This narrative, however, of the poor widow who cast two mites into the treasury is reported only by two of them, namely, Mark and Luke. But their harmony admits of no question. And from this point onwards to the Lord's Supper, which latter act formed the starting-point for our discussion of all the records of the four evangelists taken conjointly, Mark introduces nothing of a kind to make it necessary for us to institute a special comparison between it and any other statement, or to conduct an inquiry with the view of dispelling any appearance of discrepancy.

CHAPTER VIII.-OF LUKE'S GOSPEL, AND SPECIALLY OF THE HARMONY BETWEEN ITS COMMENCEMENT AND THE BEGINNING OF THE BOOK OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

9. Next in succession, therefore, let us now go over the Gospel of Luke in regular order. We shall omit, however, those passages which he has in common with Matthew and Mark. For all these have been already handled. Luke, then, begins his narrative in the following fashion: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of these things which have been fulfilled among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed. This beginning does not pertain immediately to the narrative presented in the Gospel. But it suggests to us to be cognizant of the fact, that this same Luke is also the writer of the other book which bears the name of

the Acts of the Apostles. Our ground for holding this opinion is not merely the circumstance that the name of Theophilus occurs there as well as here. For it might quite well happen that there was a second person with the name of Theophilus; and even if it was one and the same person that was referred to in both cases, still another composition might have been addressed to him by a different individual, just as the Gospel was written in his behoof by Luke.

We base our view of the identity of authorship, however, on the fact that this second book commences in the following strain: "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which He, through the Holy Ghost, gave commandment unto the apostles whom He chose to preach the gospel. This statement gives us to understand that, previous to this, he had written one of those four books of the gospel which are held in the loftiest authority in the Church. At the same time, when he tells us that he had composed a treatise of all that Jesus began both to do and teach until the day in which He gave commandment to the apostles, we are not to take this to mean that he actually has given us a full account in his Gospel of all that Jesus did and said when He lived with His apostles on earth. For that would be contrary to what John affirms when he says that there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, the world itself could not contain the books. And besides, it is the admitted fact that not a few things have been narrated by the other evangelists, which Luke himself has not touched upon in his history.

The sense therefore is, that he wrote a treatise of all these things, in so far as he made a selection out of the whole mass of materials for his narrative, and introduced those facts which he judged fit and suitable for the satisfactory discharge of the responsible duty laid upon him. Again, when he speaks of many who had "taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which have been fulfilled among us," he seems to refer to certain parties who had not been able to complete the task which they had assumed. Hence he also says that it seemed good to him also to "write carefully in order, forasmuch as many have taken in hand," etc. The allusion here, however, we ought to take to be to those writers who have attained to no authority in the Church, just because they were utterly incompetent rightly to carry out what they took in hand. Moreover, the author at present before us has

not confined himself to the task of bringing down his narrative to the events of the Lord's resurrection and assumption; neither has it been his aim simply to have a place commensurate in honour with his labours in the company of the four writers of the Gospel Scriptures. But he has also undertaken a record of what was done subsequently by the hands of the apostles;

and relating as many of those events as he believed to be needful and helpful to the edification of the faith of readers or hearers, he has given us a narrative so faithful, that his is the only book that has been reckoned worthy of acceptance in the Church as a history of the Acts of the Apostles; while all these other writers who attempted, although deficient in the trustworthiness which was the first requisite, to compose an account of the doings and sayings of the apostles, have met with rejection. And, further, Mark and Luke certainly wrote at a time when it was quite possible to put them to the test not only by the Church of Christ, but also by the apostles themselves who were still alive in the flesh. Chapter IX.-Of the Question How It Can Be Shown that the Narrative of the Haul of Fishes Which Luke Has Given Us is Not to Be Identified with the Record of an Apparently Similar Incident Which John Has Reported Subsequently to the Lord's Resurrection; And of the Fact that from This Point on to the Lord's Supper, from Which Event Onwards to the End the Combined Accounts of All the Evangelists Have Been Examined, No Difficulty Calling for Special Consideration Emerges in the Gospel of Luke Any More Than in that of Mark.

10. Luke, then, commences his Gospel in the following fashion: "There was in the days of Herod the king of Judaea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abia: and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elisabeth;"and so on, down to the passage where it is said, "Now when He had left speaking, He said unto Simon, Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught." In this whole section, there is nothing to stir any question as to discrepancies. It is true that John appears to relate something resembling the last passage. But what he gives is really something widely different. I refer to what took place by the sea of Tiberias after the Lord's resurrection. In that instance, not only is the particular time extremely different, but the circumstances themselves are of quite another character. For there the nets were cast on the right side, and a hundred and fifty and three fishes were caught. It is added, too, that they were great fishes. And the evangelist, therefore, has felt it necessary to state, that "for all there

were so many, yet was not the net broken," surely just because he had in view the previous case, which is recorded by Luke, and in connection with which the nets were broken by reason of the multitude of fishes. As for the rest, Luke has not recounted things like those which John has narrated, except in relation to the Lord's passion and resurrection. And this whole section, which comes in between the Lord's Supper and the conclusion, has already been handled by us in a manner which has yielded, as the result of a comparison of the testimonies of all the evangelists conjointly, the demonstration of an entire absence of discrepancies between them.

CHAPTER X.-OF THE EVANGELIST JOHN, AND THE DISTINCTION
BETWEEN HIM AND THE OTHER THREE.

11. John remains, between whom and others there is left no comparison to be instituted. For, however the evangelists may each have reported some matters which are not recorded by the others, it will be hard to prove that any question involving real discrepancy arises out of these. Thus, too, it is a clearly admitted position that the first three-namely, Matthew, Mark, and Luke-have occupied themselves chiefly with the humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to which He is both king and priest. And in this way, Mark, who seems to answer to the figure of the man in the well-known mystical symbol of the four living creatures, either appears to be preferentially the companion of Matthew, as he narrates a larger number of matters in unison with him than with the rest, and therein acts in due harmony with the idea of the kingly character whose wont it is, as I have stated in the first book, to be not unaccompanied by attendants; or else, in accordance with the more probable account of the matter, he holds a course in conjunction with both [the other Synoptists]. For although he is at one with Matthew in the larger number of passages, he is nevertheless at one rather with Luke in some others.

And this very fact shows him to stand related at once to the lion and to the steer, that is to say, to the kingly office which Matthew emphasizes, and to the sacerdotal which Luke introduces, wherein also Christ appears distinctively as man, as the figure which Mark sustains stands related to both these. On the other hand, Christ's divinity, in virtue of which He is equal to the Father, in accordance with which He is the Word, and God with God, and the Word that was made flesh in order to dwell among us, in accordance with which also. He and the Father are one, has been taken specially in hand by John with a view to its recommendation to our minds. Like an eagle, he

abides among Christ's sayings of the sublimer order, and in no way descends to earth but on rare occasions. In brief, although he declares plainly his own knowledge of the Lord's mother, he nevertheless neither unites with Matthew and Luke in recording His nativity, nor associates himself with all the three in relating His baptism; but all that he does there is simply to present the testimony delivered by John in a lofty and sublime fashion, and then, quitting the company of these others, he proceeds with Him to the marriage in Cana of Galilee. And there, although the evangelist himself mentions His mother by that very name, He nevertheless addresses her thus: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?"

In this, however, [it is to be understood that] He does not repel her of whom He received the flesh, but means to convey the conception of His divinity with special fitness at Ibis time, when He is about to change the water into wine; which divinity, likewise, had made that woman, and had not itself been made in her. 12. Then, after noticing the few days spent in Capharnaum, the evangelist comes again to the temple, where he states that Jesus spoke of the temple of His body in these terms: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up:" in which declaration emphatic intimation is given not only that God was in that temple in the person of the Word that was made flesh, but also that He Himself raised the said flesh to life, in the veritable exercise of that prerogative which He has in His oneness with the Father, and according to which He does not act separately from Him; whereas it will perhaps be found that, in all other passages, the phrase which Scripture employs is one to the effect that God raised Him: neither is there any such expression, found anywhere else as that, when God raised, Christ, Christ also raised Himself, because He is one God with the Father; which is the import of the passage now before us, in which He says, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."

13. Then how great and how divine are the words reported to have been spoken with Nicodemus! From these the evangelist proceeds again to the testimony of John, and brings before our notice the fact, that the friend of the bridegroom cannot but rejoice because of the bridegroom's voice. In this statement He gives us to understand that the soul of man neither has light derivable from itself, nor can have blessing, except by participation in the unchangeable wisdom. Thereafter he carries us on to the case of the woman of Samaria, in connection with which mention is made of the water, where-

of if a man drinks, he shall never thirst again. Once more, he brings us again to Cana of Galilee, where Jesus had made the water wine. In that narrative he tells us how He spoke to the nobleman, whose son was sick, in these terms: "Except ye see signs and wonders ye believe not:" in which saying He aims at lifting the mind of the believer high above all things mutable, so that He would not have even the miracles themselves, which, however they may bear the impression of what is divine, are yet wrought in the instance of what is changeable in bodies, made objects of seeking on the part of the faithful.

14. Next he brings us back to Jerusalem, and tells the story of the healing of the man who had an infirmity of thirty-eight years' standing. What words are spoken on this occasion, and how ample is the discourse! Here we are met by the sentence, "The Jews sought to kill Him, because He not only broke the Sabbath, but said also that God was His Father, making Himself equal with God." In this passage it is made sufficiently plain that He did not speak of God as His Father in the ordinary sense in which holy men are in the habit of using the phrase, but that He meant that He is His equal. For, a little before this, He had said to those who were impeaching Him with violating the Sabbath-day, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." Then their fury flamed forth, not merely because He said that God was His Father, but because He wished it to be understood that He was equal with God, when He used the phrase, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." In which utterance He also shows it to be matter of course that, as the Father works, the Son should work also; because the Father does not work without the Son. And this is in accordance with what He states a little further on in the same passage, when these parties were incensed at His declaration, namely, "For what things soever He doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise."

15. Then at length John descends to bear company with the other three, whose course is with the same Lord, but upon the earth, and joins them in recording the feeding of the five thousand men with the five loaves. In this narrative, however, he is the only one who mentions, that when the people wished to make Him a king, Jesus departed into a mountain Himself alone. And in making that statement, his intention appears to me to have been just to communicate to the reasonable soul the truth, that Christ reigns over our mind and reason purely in a sphere in which He is exalted above us, in which He has no community of nature with men, and in which He is verily by

Himself alone, as He is the Father's only fellow. This, however, is a mystical truth, which escapes the cognizance of carnal men, whose life creeps upon the lower soil of this earth, just because it is so sublime a mystery. Hence Christ Himself also departs into the mountain from the men whose habit is to seek for His kingdom with earthly conceptions of it. Thus is it that He expresses Himself elsewhere to this effect, "My kingdom is not of this world. And this, again, is something which is reported only by John, who soars high over earth in a kind of ethereal flight, and delights himself in the light of the Sun of righteousness.

Then, on passing from the narrative connected with this mountain, and from the miracle of the five loaves, he still keeps company with the same three for a little while, until the notice of the crossing of the sea is reached, and the occasion on which Jesus walked upon the waters. But at this point he at once rises again to the region of the Lord's discourses, and relates those words, so grave, so lengthened, so sustainedly lofty and elevated, which had their occasion in the multiplying of the bread, when He addressed the multitudes to the following effect: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled. Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life. After which sayings, He continues to discourse in similar terms for a very long period, and in the most exalted strain. At that time, some fell away from the sublime teaching of such words, namely, those who walked no more with Him afterwards. But there were also those who did cleave to Him; and these were they who were able to receive the meaning of this saying, "It is the spirit that quickeneth, but the flesh profiteth nothing. For surely it is true, that even through the flesh it is the spirit that profiteth, and the spirit alone that profiteth; whereas the flesh without the spirit profiteth nothing.

16. Next we come to the passage where His brethren—that is to say, His relations according to the flesh—urge Him to go up to the feast-day, in order that He may have an opportunity of making Himself known to the multitude. And here, again, how supremely elevated is the tone of His reply! "My time is not yet come, but your time is alway ready. The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it that the works thereof are evil. So it is the case, then, that "your time is alway ready," because ye desire that kind of day to which the prophet refers when he says, "But I have not laboured fol-

lowing Thee, O Lord; and the day of man I have not desired, Thou knowest: that is to say, to soar to the light of the Word, and to desire that day which Abraham desired to see, and which he did see, and was glad. And again, how wonderful, how divine, how sublime are the words which John represents Him to have spoken after He had gone up to the temple, at the time of the feast! They are such as these: that where He was about to go, thither they could not come; that they both knew Him, and knew whence He was; that He who sent Him is true, whom they knew not, which is much the same as if He had said, "Ye both know whence I am, and know not whence I am.

And what else did He wish to be understood by such utterances, but that it was possible for Him to be known to them according to the flesh, in respect of lineage and country, but that, so far as regarded His divinity, He was unknown to them? On this occasion, too, when He spoke of the gift of the Holy Spirit, He showed them who He was, inasmuch as He could hold the power of bestowing that highest boon. 17. Again, how weighty are the things which this evangelist reports Jesus to have spoken, when He came back to the temple from Mount Olivet, and after the forgiveness which He extended to the adulteress, who had been brought before Him by His tempters, as one deserving to be stoned: on which occasion He wrote with His finger upon the ground, as if He would indicate that people of the character of these men would be written on earth, and not in heaven, as He also admonished His disciples to rejoice that their names were written in heaven! Or, it may be that He meant to convey the idea that it was by humbling Himself (which He expressed by bending down His head) that He wrought signs upon the earth; or, that the time was now come when His law should be written, not, as formerly, on the sterile stone, but on a soil which would yield fruit. Accordingly, after these incidents, He affirmed Himself to be the light of the world, and declared that he who followed Him would not walk in darkness, but would have the light of life. He said, also, that He was "the beginning which also discoursed to them. By which designation He clearly distinguished Himself from the light which He made, and presented Himself as the Light by which all things have been made.

Consequently, when He said that He was the light of the world, we are not to take the words to bear simply the sense intended when He addressed the disciples in similar terms, saying, "Ye are the light of the world. For they are compared only to the kindled light, which is not to be put beneath a

bushel, but to be set upon a candlestick; as He also says of John the Baptist, that "he was a burning and shining light. But He is Himself the beginning, of whom it is likewise declared, that "of His fulness have all we received. On the occasion presently under review, He asserted further that He, the Son, is the Truth, which will make us free, and without which no man will be free. 18. Next, after telling the story of the giving of sight to the man who was blind from his birth, John tarries for a space over the copious discourse to which that incident gave occasion, on the subject of the sheep, and the shepherd, and the door, and the power of laying down His life and taking it again, wherein He gave token of the supreme might of His divinity. Thereafter, he relates how, at the time when the feast of the dedication was being celebrated in Jerusalem, the Jews said to Him, "How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly." And then he reports the sublime words which the Lord uttered when the opportunity thus arose for a discourse. It was on this occasion that He said, "I and my Father are one." After this, again, he brings before us the raising of Lazarus from the dead: in connection with which miracle the Lord said, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." In these words what do we recognise but the sublimity of the Godhead of Him, in fellowship with whom we shall live for ever? Once more, John joins Matthew and Mark in what is recorded about Bethany, where the scene took place with the precious ointment which was poured upon His feet and His head by Mary. And then, on to the Lord's passion and resurrection, John keeps by the other three evangelists, but only in so far as his narrative engages itself with the same places.

19. Moreover, so far as regards the Lord's discourses, he does not cease to ascend to the sublimer and more extended utterances of which, from this point also, He delivered Himself. For he inserts a lofty address which the Lord spoke on the occasion when, through Philip and Andrew, the Gentiles expressed their desire to see Him, and which is introduced by none of the other evangelists. There, too, he reports the remarkable words which were spoken again on the subject of the light which enlightens and makes men the children of light. Thereafter, in connection with the Supper itself, of which none of the evangelists has failed to give us some notice, how affluent and how lofty are those words of Jesus which John records, but which the

others have passed over in silence! I may instance not only His commendation of humility, when He washed the disciples' feet, but also that marvelously overpowering and pre-eminently copious discourse which the Lord delivered to the eleven who remained with Him after His betrayer had been indicated by the morsel of bread, and had gone out. It was in this discourse, over which John lingers long, that He said, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father also.

It was in it, too, that He expressed Himself so largely about the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, whom He was to send to them, and about His own glory, which He had with the Father before the world was, and about His making us one in Himself, even as He and the Father are one,—not that He and the Father and we should be one, but that we should be one as they are one. And many other things of a wonderfully sublime order did He utter in that connection. But who can fail to see that to discuss such themes in any manner that would be worthy of them, even if we were competent to do so, is at least not the task which we have undertaken in the present effort? For our object is to help those who are lovers of the Word of God and students of holy truth to understand that, in his Gospel, John was indeed an announcer and preacher of the same Christ, the true and truthful One of whom the other three who have composed Gospels also testified, and to whom the rest of the apostles likewise bore witness, who, although they did not take in hand the construction of written narratives, did at least discharge the kindred service in officially preaching of Him:

but that, at the same time, he was borne to far loftier heights in the doctrine of Christ from the very beginning of his book, and that it was but on rare occasions that he kept to the level pursued by the others. These occasions were the following in particular, namely: first by the Jordan, in reference to the testimony of John the Baptist; secondly, on the other side of the sea of Tiberias, when the Lord fed the multitudes with the five loaves, and walked upon the waters; thirdly, in Bethany, where He had the precious ointment poured over Him by the devotion of a woman of faith. And so he proceeds, until he meets them at the time of the Passion, which, as matter of course, he had to relate in conjunction with them. But, even in that section, and on the particular subject of the Lord's Supper, which has been left unnoticed by none of them, he has presented us with a much more affluent statement, as if he drew his materials directly from the treasure-store of that bosom of the

Lord on which it was his wont to recline. Then, again, [John shows us how] He astonishes Pilate with words of a sublimer import, declaring that His kingdom is not of this world, and that He was born a King, and that He came into the world for this purpose, that He might bear witness to the truth.

[It is in this Gospel also that] He withdraws Himself from Mary with some deep mystical intention after His resurrection, and says to her, "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father. It is here, too, that He imparts the Holy Spirit to the disciples by breathing on them giving us thereby to understand that this Spirit who is consubstantial and co-eternal with the Trinity, should not be considered to be simply the Spirit of the Father, but should also be held to be the Spirit of the Son. 20. Finally, He here commits His sheep to the care of Peter, who loves Him, and thrice confesses that love, and then He states that He wills this very John so to tarry until He comes. In which utterance, again, He seems to me to have conveyed in a profound and mystical way the fact that this evangelical stewardship of John's, in which he is borne aloft into the most liquid light of the Word, where it is possible to behold the equality and unchangeableness of the Trinity, and in which, above all, we see at what a distance from all others in respect of essential character that humanity stands by whose assumption it occurred that the Word was made flesh, cannot be clearly discerned and recognised until the Lord Himself comes. Consequently, it will tarry thus until He comes. At present it will tarry in the faith of believers, but hereafter it will be possible to contemplate it face to face, when He, our Life, shall appear, and when we shall appear with Him in glory. But if any one supposes that with man, living, as he still does, in this mortal life, it may be possible for a person to dispel and clear off every obscurity induced by corporeal and carnal fancies, and to attain to the serenest light of changeless truth, and to cleave constantly and unswervingly to that with a mind thoroughly estranged from the course of this present life, that man understands neither what he asks, nor who he is that put such a supposition.

Let such an individual rather accept the authority, at once lofty and free from all deceitfulness, which tells us that, as long as we are in the body, we are absent from the Lord, and that we walk by faith find not by sight? And thus, with all perseverance keeping and guarding his faith and hope and charity, let him look forward to the sight which is promised, in accordance

with that earnest which we have received of the Holy Ghost, who shall teach us all truth, when God, who raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, shall also quicken our mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in us. But before this body, which is dead by reason of sin, is quickened, it is without doubt corruptible, and presseth down the soul. And if, in the body, man is ever helped to reach beyond the cloud with which the whole earth is covered, -that is to say, beyond this carnal darkness with which the whole life of earth is covered,-it is simply as if he were touched with a rapid coruscation, only to sink swiftly into his natural infirmity, the desire surviving by which he may again be excited (to what is evil), and the purity being insufficient to establish him (in what is good). The more, however, any one can do this, the greater is he; while the less he can do so, the less is he.

And if the mind of a man has as yet had no such experience-in which mind nevertheless Christ dwells by faith-he ought to strive earnestly to diminish the lusts of this world, and to make an end of them by the exercise of moral virtue, walking, as it were, in the company of these three evangelists with Christ the Mediator. And, with the joy of large hope, let him in faith hold Him who is alway the Son of God, but who, for our sakes, became the Son of man, in order that His eternal power and Godhead might be united with our weakness and mortality, and, on the basis of what is ours, make a way for us in Himself and to Himself. That a man may be kept from sinning, he should be ruled by Christ the King. If he happens to sin, he may obtain remission from Christ, who is also priest. And thus, nurtured in the exercise of a good conversation and life, and borne out of the atmosphere of earth on the wings of a twofold love, as on a pair of strong pinions, so may he be enlightened by the same Christ, who is also the Word, the Word who was in the beginning, the Word who was with God, and the Word who was God; and although that will still be through a glass darkly, it will be a sublime kind of illumination far superior to every corporeal similitude.

Wherefore, although it is the gifts of the active virtue that shine pre-eminent in the first three evangelists, while it is the gift of the contemplative virtue that discerns such subjects, nevertheless, this Gospel of John, in so far as it also is in part, will so tarry until that which is perfect comes. And to one, indeed, is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit. One man regardeth the day to the Lord; another receives a clearer draught from the breast of the Lord; another is

caught up even to the third heaven, and hears unspeakable words. But all, as long as they are in the body, are absent from the Lord. And for all believers living in the good hope, whose names are written in the book of life, there is still in reserve that which is referred to in the words, "And I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him. Nevertheless, the greater the advance which a man may make in the apprehension and knowledge of this theme during the time of this absence from the Lord, all the more carefully should he guard against those devilish vices, pride and envy. Let him remember that this very Gospel of John, which urges us so pre-eminently to the contemplation of truth, gives a no less remarkable prominence to the inculcation of the sweet grace of charity.

Let him also consider that most true and wholesome precept which is couched in the words, "The greater thou art, the more humble thyself in all. For the evangelist who presents Christ to us in a far loftier strain of teaching than all the others, is also the one in whose narrative the Lord washes the disciples' feet.

SOURCES AND CREDITS

Where each text comes from, and the licence under which it may be reused. The public-domain translations are unaltered apart from the division into numbered sections. Texts marked CC BY-SA 4.0 may be copied and adapted provided that credit is given and the result is shared under the same licence.

Tractates on the Gospel of John 55–124

English translation: an older public-domain translation as collected in the Writings-Database (HistoricalChristianFaith), mostly from the Ante-Nicene, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers and similar nineteenth-century editions. SermonIndex has only divided it into chapters and short sections; the wording is the translator's own. No Greek or Latin text is shown beside it yet, and no modern English version has been made. *Licence: Public domain.*

The Harmony of the Gospels

English translation: an older public-domain translation as collected in the Writings-Database (HistoricalChristianFaith), mostly from the Ante-Nicene, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers and similar nineteenth-century editions. SermonIndex has only divided it into chapters and short sections; the wording is the translator's own. No Greek or Latin text is shown beside it yet, and no modern English version has been made. *Licence: Public domain.*

