that the idea of the Divine is practically indispensable, just as in æsthetics the idea of the beautiful, or in morals the idea of the good; but we must look beyond the practical value for a scientific justification. Our faith in God is even more difficult to justify than the validity of the ideas of the Beautiful or the Good; for these last are essentially subjective, and belong to the inmost nature or spirit itself, whereas the object of religion cannot be regarded as a simple datum of the soul. After showing that religion cannot spring merely from human wishes and needs, Troeltsch concludes that religion rests on an inner revelation of God, and that this inward experience needs the confirmation derived from the usual philosophical considerations of the harmony of thought with nature, the appearance of immanent design in the world, the moral argument, and the like. 'To abandon this scientific support of faith,' he holds, 'is a very serious matter. It may give the impression of exalted magnanimity when theologians declare their willingness to abandon every "proof of God's existence," and trust simply to the earnestness of their moral and religious experience. But they resemble the sibyl who calmly burns six of her precious books, and regards the remainder as still valuable enough to justify her in asking the same price as before. It looks a very impressive surrender (das imponirt), but it is made at the cost of an invaluable treasure.' Here, we see, the doctrine of the mutual exclusion of the spheres of philosophy and theology is breaking down. If the doctrine of God is to be scientifically treated, the theologians must not despise the aid of philosophy. One cannot exactly say what Troeltsch may mean by an 'inner revelation'; but if we take his argument to be that the religious man starts with an unproved (not unreasonable) practical hypothesis, which expresses itself first in terms of fancy, and, purifying itself along with the growth of conscience and reflexion, reveals itself finally to the reason as the implicit presupposition of all thought, then we are quite back to the region of theoretic speculation, and the barriers between scientific theology and philosophy disappear.

(*To be concluded.*)

The Origin and Character of our Gospels.

By the late Dr. Friedrich Blass, Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Halle.

(*Translated by* Margaret Dunlop Gibson, *Hon. D.D. Heidelberg, LL.D. St. Andrews.*)

IV.

St. Matthew.

There remains Matthew, who really furnishes the most difficult problem. The name is firmly established, and occurs early, even in Papias, by whom a statement is quoted, unfortunately without any information whether it was imparted to the author by John the Elder or not, as was the case with the one about Mark. 'Matthew wrote the sayings in the Hebrew (that is, the Aramaic) tongue, and every one translated them as well as he could.' These words in their brevity leave much to be desired. Only the Sayings or Discourses, and nothing further? And were they something in the style of the 'Logia' lately discovered in Egypt, in which all is dissolved into unconnected details: 'Jesus says,' and then again 'Jesus says,' and so on? But that would be in conflict with the actual fact, as we see it in Matthew, and is not indicated by anything. Nor is it necessary to admit that Matthew has given us only proverbs and speeches, but nothing or next to nothing of narrative; especially if we allow that Papias, whose own work was entitled 'Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord,' spoke about it in his Introduction, and told where these sayings were to be found, and then came on to Matthew. There is no emphasis on 'sayings' in the passages quoted, as Zahn has well pointed out; the emphasis is chiefly on 'in the Hebrew tongue.' It may be added that Papias speaks

about the same things first in the passage about Mark 'what was said or done by the Lord,' and then abbreviating 'the sayings of the Lord.' On the other hand, if, as at first appears, our Greek Matthew is one of many translations from the Aramaic made by different people, Matthew himself having written in Aramaic, it is not impossible that the translator added much out of other sources to which he had access. We must, in any case, believe that Matthew wrote in Aramaic, and there is a good deal that we can appeal to.

The passage 1^{21}, 'Thou shalt call his name *Jesus*, for he shall *save* his people from their sins,' can only be understood from Hebrew, where for 'save' the verb must be used from which the name *Jesus* is derived; in Greek the passage is as obscure as in German. But, unfortunately, the Aramaic Syriac also has quite a different verb for this meaning, so that the Syriac translations are not clearer. Yet possibly Matthew may have here used the verb of the kindred Hebrew; for, as Zahn reminds us, this word was familiar to every Jew in 'Hosanna,' which likewise contains it, as well as from other uses of it in the liturgy. It is, moreover, important that Matthew generally gives quotations from the Old Testament in the Hebrew original; on account of which in our Matthew they are in a special Greek translation, whereas the others, even Paul, use the common Greek Old Testament (the LXX). There is therefore no doubt that our text is a translation, and, according to the traditional expression, one of several translations. Zahn understands it otherwise: 'Every one translated from it (orally) as well as he could' (till a translation was made). But then an alteration of the expression[1] would be required. It may be so, but it cannot be proved. It is, however, a fact that nothing is known of any further translation of the Aramaic Matthew, and there are no evidences of any in the variants of the text; on the contrary, the text of Matthew is surer than that given us by any other of the Gospels. I leave here out of account the question of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which for a long time was held by that learned Church father, Jerome, the author of the Latin Vulgate of the Old and New Testaments, to be the Aramaic (Hebrew) original of our Matthew, but which certainly was no such thing.

Matthew as an Apostle comes into every list of the Apostles given in the Gospels and in Acts; but otherwise and with a history only in the Gospel of Matthew itself (9^{9}), where his call from the custom-house is narrated, according to which his designation in the list of Apostles of this Gospel is 'Matthew the Publican.' Mark, however, tells the story, or one like it, of Levi (a better reading is 'James') the son of Alphæus. Luke also speaks of a 'Levi' (5^{27}). If we pursue this further, we come on a whole chain of questions, with which we shall not trouble ourselves. This much is clear at once, that as a publican Matthew could *write*, which cannot be taken for granted about any other Apostle, and that he could also *count*. Through the former talent he was called before others to the composition of a Gospel; and through the latter we may explain the curious play on numbers in the genealogy of chap. 1, besides other things which rest on intentional symmetry of figures, to be noticed shortly.

It agrees, further, with the Apostolic composition of this Gospel, that all the discourses and sayings communicated appear clearly and transparently. This is not so much the case with Luke, for the latter, especially in the middle portion of his Gospel, appears to be giving everything accurately as he had got it, without any attempt at forming an artificial composition, and regardless of whether he understood it or not. He *could* compose, as is shown by *Acts* and by the beginning of his Gospel; but to manipulate the words of his Lord according to his own taste he evidently considered not allowable, and he had not himself heard them.

On the other hand, the mistake with regard to John the Baptist is even worse in Matthew (4^{12}) than in Mark: 'When he heard that John was delivered up, he departed into Galilee,' that is, to the domain of Herod, who had put John in prison. This is related, as it is in Mark, immediately after the Baptism and the Temptation. This accords also with Mark. It is quite a plausible supposition that Matthew possessed Mark's Gospel and used it; from their comprehensive agreements one of the two must have used the other. Matthew simply does not trouble himself about the succession of events and the chronology, which perhaps he could have restored, even though he was not one of the disciples who were first called; cf. 3^{1}, '*in those days* came John the Baptist,' just after Joseph's settlement in Galilee has been related.

Of the time of the composition of Matthew's

[1] Ἡρμήνευε, imperf., instead of ἡρμήνευσε, aorist.

Gospel this only is clear, that he wrote after Luke, who knew no Gospel by an Apostle; therefore also after Mark, if the latter is to be put before Luke, as all admit. But if he wrote after Luke, then he must have remained in Palestine, or in its neighbourhood, at least longer than Peter; for his Aramaic Gospel was meant for the Aramaic-speaking Jews, and it shows in its whole character that it was written for Jews. Or must we think of the Eastern Jews of the Euphrates valley, who also spoke Aramaic? All is dark here. Eusebius says that after preaching among the Jews, when he was about to go further, he left his Gospel behind with them, as a substitute for preaching.

But the reason of its composition was possibly that Mark's Gospel (which could easily have been translated into Aramaic) was in need of being supplemented. For with Mark the introductory story was wanting, and discourses were communicated in very short measure. These are given by Matthew in great bulk, indeed with great freedom. Take chaps. 5–7, the Sermon on the Mount; 10, the sending out of the disciples; 13, parables—three pieces, which all end in a corresponding way: 'And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished these sayings,' etc. Stories are inserted between, with similar symmetry of the number of three, as my colleague Köstlin once pointed out to me: chaps. 8–10, miracles, three times three—(1) *a.* the leper, *b.* the centurion, *c.* Peter's wife's mother (there being sayings, etc., between); (2) *a.* the stilling of the storm, *b.* the demoniac, *c.* the paralytic (the call of Matthew coming between); (3) *a.* the daughter of the ruler, *b.* the blind man, *c.* the dumb man (those sayings, etc.). This again reveals, perhaps, the former publican and reckoner.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. LUKE.

LUKE XI. 2.

'And he said unto them, when ye pray, say, Father, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come.'—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

'When ye pray, say.'—*Pray* denotes the state of adoration, and *say* the prayer formally expressed. It is evident that this order 'when ye pray, say,' does not mean that the formula was to be slavishly repeated on every occasion of prayer; it was the type which was to give its impression to every Christian prayer, but in a free, varied, and spontaneous manner.—GODET.

'Father.'—There is little doubt that the texts of Luke which give the more full form of the Prayer (cf. A.V. and R.V. translations) have been assimilated to Matthew by inserting the three clauses which Luke omits. The temptation to supply supposed deficiencies would be very strong; for the copyists would be familiar with the liturgical use of the longer form, and would regard the abbreviation of such a prayer as intolerable. The widespread omission is inexplicable, if the three clauses are genuine; the widespread insertion is quite intelligible, if they are not.

In O.T. God is seldom spoken of as a Father, and then in reference to the nation (Dt 32^{6}, Is 63^{16}, Jer $3^{4.19}$ 31^{9}, Mal 1^{6} 2^{10}), not to the individual. In this, as in many things, the Apocrypha links O.T. with N.T. Individuals begin to speak of God as their Father (Wis 2^{16} 14^{3}, Ecclus $23^{1.14}$ 51^{10}, To 13^{4}, 3 Mac 6^{3}), but without showing what right they have to consider themselves sons rather than servants. Christ gave His disciples 'the right to become children of God' (Jn 1^{12}, Ro 8^{23}, Gal 4^{5}).—PLUMMER.

'Hallowed be thy name.'—The petition is not only directed against a blasphemous or irreverent mention of the sacred name; the Jewish custom of the time was to avoid even uttering the word Jehovah, preferring 'Heaven,' or some periphrasis, from a superstitious horror of giving offence by the act of presumption. But the 'name' is a Hebraistic expression for the nature and character. Thus we read of those that 'love thy name' (Ps 5^{11}). The petition is that God's nature and character may be revered. An ancient rendering of the Lord's Prayer, as early as Tertullian in the beginning of the second century, instead of this petition and that immediately following, has, 'May thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us.'—ADENEY.

'Thy kingdom come.'—The term 'kingdom of God' denotes an eternal and social state of things, but one which results from an inward and individual change. This petition expresses the longing of the child of God for that reconciled and sanctified humanity within the bosom of which the will of the Father will be done without opposition.—GODET.

THE SERMON.

The Model Prayer.

By the Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., B.D.

The basis of our prayer is to be the name