

and full of happy significance. For it is a true evangel—the gospel of the grace of God in all its simplicity and persuasiveness.

CHRIST CHURCH SERMONS. BY THE REV. E. F. SAMPSON, M.A. (*Longmans*. Crown 8vo, pp. xlv + 292.) Sermons preached to university men need not differ from sermons delivered to other men. But these do. Not in that they are short; not in that they deal with great doctrines and bring them always down to the test of daily life, insisting that they must *walk*. They differ in a subtle aroma of reasonableness—a deference almost to the understanding; as if university men had only to be shown what it is expedient for them to do and they may be counted on to do it. And Mr. Sampson knows his men. He has not spent all these years in Oxford for nothing. His preliminary essay is a clever piece of writing, and probably as useful as it is clever. For, first, he traces the progress that vital religion has made in Oxford since the Tractarian movement began, and then he bravely says that the danger ahead is the abuse of money, and Oxford men had better recognise ‘that the present distribution of property is not a Divine ordinance, and may be amended or entirely changed without mortal sin.’

BARBED ARROWS. BY C. H. SPURGEON. (*Passmore & Alabaster*. Fcap. 8vo, pp. viii + 295.) A companion to *Feathers for Arrows*. The illustrations have been gathered from Spurgeon’s sermons, and they are mostly well worth the gathering. Not a few are very familiar now, but some had almost been forgotten.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL AND ITS RELATIONS. (*Sunday School Union*. Fcap. 8vo, pp. 79.) (1) ‘To the Home,’ by Dr. Dods; (2) ‘To the Church,’ by the Rev. Hugh Black; (3) ‘To Amusements,’ by the Rev. George Jackson; (4) ‘To Athletics,’ by the Rev. A. R. Buckland; (5) ‘To Temperance,’ by Principal Simon; (6) ‘To Biblical Criticism,’ by Dr. Dods; and (7) ‘To the Business of Life,’ by the Rev. A. R. Henderson. So they are not harmless and helpless essays, they are subjects of the utmost pressure to-day. And they are not men of facile pen and miscellaneous knowledge, they know just the subjects that they write upon, and few are they that know them better. An exceptionally opportune and valuable little volume.

EVERYBODY’S MEDICAL GUIDE. (*Saxon*. 16mo, pp. 122). Some of Saxon’s ‘Books for Everybody’ we do know and can judge. If this is as good as they are, it is very good indeed.

The Integrity of Luke i. 5–ii.

BY MR. F. P. BADHAM, M.A., EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

THE integrity of the first two chapters of St. Luke has been impugned in three different directions. It has been suggested (1) that these two chapters are derived from a Hebrew original, and that this is at anyrate the case with the three Psalms; (2) that the Psalms once existed separately, and have been post-added to the narrative; (3) that the second chapter is older than the first, less Hebraic in style, and contains naturalistic implications incompatible with the idea of miraculous conception. My purpose is to examine the validity of these three hypotheses.

Now, as to a Hebrew original, all one’s sympathies are at first enlisted in its favour. The whole cast of this section is so thoroughly Hebraic.

So many first-rate Hebraists have given this theory their suffrages. Closer scrutiny, however, shows irrefragably that the Hebraic appearance is delusive, for, without possible exception, the Old Testament references are all derived from the Septuagint.

The obligation of Luke i. 5–ii. to the Old Testament is obvious, but the full extent of this obligation may easily be overlooked. Every word, every detail has to be carefully scrutinised. When, for example, Elisabeth’s friends came to share in her rejoicings (*συγχαίρειν*), we find that it is after the fashion of Sarah’s (Gen. xxi. 6). When Mary treasures up (*διετήρει*) the premonitions of her Son’s greatness, it is as Jacob did in

the case of Joseph (Gen. xxxvii. 11). And when the Baptist shows his joy (*ἐσκήρτησε*), we are reminded of the pre-natal movement of Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxv. 22). In that old-fashioned but most useful book, Gough's *Old Testament Quotations*, one finds the quotations in Luke i. 5-ii. reckoned at about forty, but anyone, with the concordance of Trommius or Hatch by his side, can bring the number up to nearly eighty. Nearly eighty quotations, and all agreeing with the Septuagint!

Whenever the Septuagint and the Hebrew part company, Luke i. 5-ii. agrees with the former. Notice especially the re-echo of Gen. xviii. 14 in Luke i. 37. And in several cases the whole point of the quotation depends on some ambiguous shade of meaning which does not exist in the Hebrew. For example,—*apropos* of *συγχαίρειν* above quoted,—in the Hebrew of Gen. xxi. 6 the neighbours are not spoken of as congregating to rejoice in sympathy with Sarah, but as laughing at the bizarrerie of her child-bearing. So, again, with regard to *ἐσκήρτησε*: that secondary signification in *σκιρτᾶν*, to evince joy—and it is in this signification that it is used in St. Luke—has nothing correspondent in the Hebrew *רָצַח* (= to struggle).

When we turn from the narrative to the Psalms, the exclusive influence of the Septuagint is even more apparent. 'He hath holpen His servant Israel' recalls not the Hebrew of Isa. xlii. 1, 'Behold My servant, whom I uphold,' but the rendering of the LXX, 'Jacob is My servant, I will help him.' Again, 'the Day-spring' (*Ἀνατολή*) reminds us that the LXX rendered *צֶמַח* (= Branch) in this manner. If we turn St. Luke's *Ἀνατολή* back into *צֶמַח*, the whole metaphor of the context is destroyed—'to give light to them that sit in darkness.' In fine, Luke i. 5-ii. is a pasticcio of words and phrases culled from the Septuagint, and the conclusion that its Hebraic phraseology brings us to is that Greek had become a thoroughly Hebrew language.

We now come to the second disintegrating hypothesis, that the Psalms are detachable from the narrative. Their allusions are so general, it is urged, that they would suit almost any circumstances. But is this quite true? That apostrophe commencing 'And thou child' is surely inseparable from the narrative, for here we have someone conscious of the infant John's high destinies, and certified that the advent of the Messiah is already

assured. Such, at any rate, was the view of the compilers of the American Prayer-Book, when they excised the latter part of the *Benedictus* as unsuited for liturgical use. Then, again, in the *Nunc Dimittis*, that expression, 'according to Thy word,' appears to involve the previous explanation, 'It had been revealed to him that he should not see death.' The *Magnificat*, it is true, is more general in its language; but still even here there is a definite standpoint from which the Virgin speaks, 'Behold, from henceforth,' and it is, at least, exceedingly difficult to imagine any other occasion than such as St. Luke's narrative provides,—after the Annunciation and before the Birth. It must be remembered, too, that our protevangelist had Hannah's psalm before him. It is one thing to suggest that the psalm in 1 Samuel may be a post addition, and quite another to make a similar suggestion with regard to a narrative modelled to such an extent as Luke i. 5-ii. is upon the example of 1 Samuel.

And now we come to the third disintegrating hypothesis, that Luke ii. is separable from Luke i. 5-80.

It is quite true that the re-echoes of the Old Testament are fewer in Luke ii., but this is really necessitated by the difference of subject, for the four plain histories that we have in Luke ii. (the Census, the Shepherds, the Presentation, and the Passover) do not lend themselves to Old Testament expression in the same manner as the subject-matter of Luke i. 5-80. As a matter of fact, we find quite as many re-echoes of the Old Testament as the circumstances permit. *προβηβηκνῖα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις* recalls Gen. xviii. 11. *διετίθει*, as already noted, recalls Gen. xxxvii. The fact that the Holy Infant is made known in a manger (vers. 7, 15) recalls *ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων γνωσθίση* (Hab. iii. 2). The yearly visit of Joseph and Mary to the Lord's house has its prototype in that of Elkanah and Hannah, Simeon's blessing in that of Eli; and no doubt of correspondency is left when we compare Luke ii. 39, 40, 50 with 1 Sam. ii. 20, 21, 26: 'And they went unto their own home. And the child Samuel grew before the Lord. . . . And the child Samuel grew on; and was in favour with the Lord, and with men.'

Our reluctance to separate Luke i. from Luke ii. becomes greater when we observe how closely they are connected in style and diction. In both

our attention is called to the ritual of the temple, to the poverty of Christ's parents, to the redemption of Israel, and to the fulfilment of legal righteousness. Exceptional phrases, such as *προβεβηκώς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις*, are common to both; and what is especially noticeable in this connexion is the fact that the description of our Lord's nativity is cast in exactly the same mould as the Baptist's. 'Elisabeth's time was fulfilled that she should be delivered; and she brought forth a son. And it came to pass that on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child; and they would have called him Zacharias. . . . And all that heard these things laid them up in their heart. . . . For the hand of the Lord was with him. . . . And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit' (Luke i. 57, 59, 66, 80). Compare, 'The days were accomplished that she should be delivered. And she brought forth her first-born son. . . . And all that heard it wondered. But Mary kept all these sayings in her heart. And when eight days were fulfilled for circumcising Him, his name was called Jesus. And the child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon Him. . . . And He advanced in wisdom and in stature, and in favour with God and men' (Luke ii. 6, 7, 18, 19, 21, 40, 52).

Besides, it is not only by style and diction, but also by inter-reference that the two chapters are united. Passing over the extreme hardihood (in the face of Old Testament analogy) of supposing an account of our Lord's birth, unpreluded by any divine communication, we have the plain fact that Gabriel's announcement is referred to in Luke ii. 21, 'which was so named by the angel'; and that the expression in ver. 19, *συμβάλλουσα* (= 'comparing these things with others'), implies some strange experience of Mary's previously. Again, the description of Anna's unsullied widowhood is at least suggestive. And although that expression 'In My Father's house' cannot be legitimately quoted in this connexion (for the reference to Divine paternity may possibly be explained apart from the miraculous conception; and the apparent setting aside of Joseph has its counterpart in 'Who is My mother? Who are My brethren?'), yet there is no getting rid of those significant expressions, 'Christ the Lord,' 'the Lord's Christ.' These two expressions show that the Infant is Christ by virtue of His birth, not to be made so by subsequent adoption; and hence some

previous explanation is needed as to how this came about.

So far, then, we have not seen the slightest reason to suspect any sutures in Luke i. 5-ii. All parts of the narrative, and the Psalms as well, appear closely united. And certainly no reason is found for altering this view when we compare these two chapters with other parts of the New Testament with which they have affinities. Affinities (whatever the explanation may be) are found with other parts of St. Luke, with the first half of Acts (see especially Acts iii. 21, iv. 24, 25, 29, x. 1-4), and with the Epistle to the Hebrews, but they are common to all parts of Luke i. 5-ii. alike.

Finally comes that crucial point—the 'naturalistic' implications. In Luke ii. Joseph is styled 'father,' 'parent,' and he and Mary 'understood not' our Lord's reference to His heavenly Father, and 'wondered' at Simeon's prophecy.

Now with regard to the terms 'father,' 'parent,' the whole question has within the last three years been entirely transformed. It has been discovered (see letters on this subject in the *Academy*, 1893-96) that at the time that our Gospels were written the idea of virgin birth was by no means novel amongst the Jews, and that the form in which it presented itself was not exclusive of human fatherhood. Legends of the time represented Isaac, for example, as having been conceived parthenically,—by the power of the Holy Spirit,—and he was said to have been 'begotten by God,' but without the slightest intention of eliminating relationship to Abraham. Hence it is the reverse of scientific to attempt to disintegrate Luke i. 5-ii. on the principle 'God's Son or Joseph's?' for, on the one hand, the expression 'Son of God' (Luke i. 35) does not *necessarily* imply anything more than is implied in Luke iii. 38, where Adam is so styled as deriving his existence immediately from God; and, on the other hand, the references to Joseph's paternity, pressing those references to the full, are perfectly compatible with the *παρθενεία* of Mary. It is no theological question that I am touching here (those who desire to see that question discussed may consult Duns Scotus, *An Filius Dei propter Incarnationem?*), but one purely terminological; and my point is this, that according to the ordinary terminology of the time when Luke i. 5-ii. was written, it would have been difficult for the author of those chapters (whatever

his intention) to have expressed himself otherwise than in the terms that we find.

How little is gained by interpreting the references in Luke ii. antagonistically to Luke i. ! For in Luke i., in the Annunciation section itself, we have a far stronger implication of Joseph's paternity than any to be found in Luke ii. This section opens with an assertion of Joseph's Davidic lineage, — contains a statement that Joseph's betrothed's Son shall be of David's lineage too,—and closes with an intimation that the Virgin herself was of Levitic descent. Thus it is evident that if (on a purely *à priori* view be it remembered, and in defiance of all analogies accessible) the first and second chapters of St. Luke are to be interpreted antagonistically, it is not a question of separating one chapter from the other, but of breaking up both, coherent though they are, not merely verse from verse, but word from word. Supposing they are broken up, what then? In the first two chapters of St. Matthew, virtually independent of Luke i. 5–ii., whatever may be the technical relationship, the phenomena are exactly similar. And so we are brought to the insane conclusion that two prot-evangelists — working from independent stand-points, happened to agree in juxtaposing statements which seemed to them flagrantly contradictory.

The use then of the terms 'father,' 'parent,' affords no valid ground for separating Luke ii.

from the preceding narrative. The same may be said of 'They understood not,' for, as de Wette pointed out—referring to the parallel case in Luke xviii. 34—the phrase need only mean 'They did not realise the full depth of the saying'; and the very fact that their failure to understand should be mentioned, shows that in the writer's mind they might and ought to have understood. Similarly with regard to the wonderment at Simeon's prophecy. It was on record that Mary had held aloof during the ministry, had gone out with His brethren to restrain Christ (*ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη*), and had been referred to reproachfully,—and that all this was present in our author's mind is shown by the prophecy which Mary's wonderment occasions. Simeon tells her that in the great civil war that shall break out over her Son's claims, a war that shall rive Israel asunder, even she, she of whom it might be expected least, shall be one of the waverers, one of the wounded. In short, the discrepancy, if discrepancy it be, of 'they wondered,' 'they understood not,' with previous matter is subjective, not literary.

What remains now of the case for disintegrating Luke i. 5–ii. ? We have only found reasons against doing so. With one slight reservation (for some editorship is needed to explain the fact that sections, poles asunder, like Luke i. 5–ii., and the 'we' part of Acts have yet some superficial points of contact) it may be fairly concluded that Luke i. 5–ii. is altogether one and indivisible.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

JOHN vii. 37–39.

'Now on the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believeth on Him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified' (R. V.).

EXPOSITION.

'On the last day, the great day of the feast.' —This was probably not the seventh day, but the

eighth day, which, according to Lev. xxiii. 36, 39; Num. xxix. 35; Neh. viii. 18, was reckoned along with the seven days of the feast proper. To speak of the seventh day as 'the great day of the feast' would not be very appropriate; whereas the eighth day, on which the people returned home, was, like the first day, kept as a Sabbath (Lev. xxiii. 39), and had special sacrifices (Num. xxix. 36–38).—PLUMMER.

Edersheim has given strong reasons for believing that very special ceremonial took place on the seventh day. The people, all carrying in both hands their palm, myrtle, and citron branches,