

ARTICLE IV.

NOTES ON DR. RIDDLE'S EDITION OF ROBINSON'S HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS; BEING A CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPLETE HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS.

BY THE REV. CHARLES LEAMAN, OF THE PRESBYTERIAN MISSION PRESS,
SHANGHAI, CHINA.

THE greatest question of the age, and all ages, is the person and work of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: to know him in living reality, and the age and circumstances in which he moved, and the relation of him and his age to the rest of lives and ages. To the understanding of this, it is of paramount importance that the life of our Lord, as given in the four Gospels, be put together in harmony, that they may explain and fill out each other, and so give the complete testimony as handed down by the inspired biographers. There have been certain ones since the beginning of the Christian church who have so put the narratives together that they complement each other. One of the last of these laudable efforts appears in the revision of "Robinson's Harmony of the Gospels," by Dr. Riddle. In this, the main positions of Robinson, and indeed the text of the harmony, are left unchanged, which shows that a *finality* is being reached, and gives good promise of a final and complete, at least a generally accepted, harmony of the four Gospels, which will be the kernel of all future lives of Jesus.

It is to contribute to this final result that I offer the following remarks on "A Complete Harmony of the Gospels,"—how far it may be complete, and on what principles determined. Robinson, as his reviser, Dr. Riddle, wisely assumes,

must be taken as the basis ; and the few points where completeness demands a change from his arrangement, are what we are to consider. Where Dr. Robinson's arrangement seems to require changes, we shall endeavor to follow the suggestions of the natural sense of each and all the narratives and, by judicious and careful comparison of all the circumstances, secure that arrangement, which if it does not admit of positive assertion, yet will appear appropriate, probable, and on the whole satisfactory to most, if not all, who are sufficiently interested carefully to examine the evidences.

THE DEPARTURE INTO GALILEE.

This departure means the one after which Jesus made no visit to Jerusalem for a considerable period, while he formally begins and vigorously prosecutes a ministry of teaching, healing, and itinerating in Galilee. This, evidently, is not the going into Galilee mentioned, John iv. 1-3 (Robinson), because "after these things there was the feast of the Jews ; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." (John v. 1.) It is best to place this important and final departure, with Andrews, after the feast (see editor). This period in Galilee agrees admirably with the evidently long period of more than a year between the close of John v. at the feast and John vii. 2, where Jesus is about to go up to the feast of Tabernacles.

It is not necessary to suppose, with Andrews, that, for the two or three months previous to this feast, after which he departed into Galilee, our Lord was necessarily "in retirement." That there is no report of his work does not imply this ; yet it seems safe to suppose that he was not so active as after the imprisonment of John, when he formally opened his Galilean ministry. That John should give something of the previous Galilean work and the Synoptists nothing, is natural ; because John and a few others were already informally called and followed him as witnesses, while till after the imprisonment his work in Galilee had not yet formally begun, nor were the twelve as yet formally called. Yet Jesus had by no means been in retirement at any time, but as, in Jerusalem and

Galilee, he had continued teaching in private,—as in the case of Nicodemus,—and nourishing and strengthening the faith of his disciples, a few of whom had already been informally called, so during these few months he no doubt continued such labors, “as his custom was.” (Luke iv. 16.)

The Synoptists intimate, by mentioning his going into Galilee, that there was a Judæan ministry other than his baptism and temptation; but it is only John who gives anything of it. All that we have of our Lord’s work from the Passover, A. D. 27, when he cleansed the temple, to the Second Passover, A. D. 28, is to be found in John ii. 13—iv. 54 inclusive.

THE FINAL DEPARTURE FROM GALILEE.

John does not intend to give a definite statement in regard to a final departure from Galilee, as he does not definitely state the going into Galilee. But he mentions no return after speaking of our Lord’s going up to the feast of Tabernacles, and this is generally accepted by Robinson and others as indicating his final departure. Matthew and Mark agree in the brief statement of his final departure from Capernaum into the borders of Judæa beyond Jordan, where he healed and taught, and so intimate, without mention of time, that he had a ministry there. Luke speaks of his departure, more particularly, “when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up.”

It is best with Robinson and others not to suppose a return to Galilee after the feast of Tabernacles, but rather to suppose that he went from this feast beyond Jordan, as mentioned by Matthew and Mark, whither he had sent the seventy, as mentioned by Luke, while on his way to Tabernacles; and it seems probable, in this view, that the seventy were sent from that other village (Luke ix. 56) into the region whither he would go after the feast; and that then, after his brethren had gone up to the feast, he secretly went up in the midst of the feast.

To suppose, as Robinson, that the seventy were sent before the departure, against the clear statement of Luke, is

unnecessary, and interferes materially with the order of Luke's narrative, and now, "most recent harmonists, even those who agree in the main with Dr. Robinson, differ with him in the time when the seventy were sent out" (Riddle). To suppose a return to Galilee after the feast, without the least intimation from any of the Gospels, is unnecessary, and only creates the difficulty of interrupting Luke's narrative. From the four narratives it seems extremely probable that his work in Galilee was already finished before the feast of Tabernacles, and even if a return is granted, it is not claimed that there was any work done, but simply the sending of the seventy, and following them into Peræa.

The arrangement of the events connected with the final departure, as given above, best accounts for the arrangement of Luke. (1) His not speaking of the feast throws together the account of sending the seventy and that of their return. (2) It also accounts for the visit to Bethany in the early stage of this remarkable journey from Galilee. (3) Neither does it interrupt in the least Luke's narrative, which is most desirable. (4) It also accords with the nature of the commission of the seventy as stated by Andrews. And (5) it is not open to the difficulties of Robinson's supposition, that he remained in Jerusalem from the feast of Tabernacles to the Dedication.

JOHN VIII. 59 ENDS THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

That this feast ends here is most likely. For the events of at least part of chapter seven (vii. 37) and of the whole of chapter eight were on the Sabbath, "the last day, the great day of the feast." And very likely it was under cover of the evening shades, that, "they took up stones therefore to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple" (viii. 59). Thus closed the day, and it is unlikely that he returned in the morning, for the feast was over, and the Jews hostile; and no doubt his work ended for the time, at Jerusalem. The arguments that have determined Robinson in this happy decision of separating between the two feasts at this point, all still hold good; and while not

conclusive, the margin of the Revised Version adds some confirmation of it (see editor). And, moreover, as the connected account of the two feasts by John more naturally and easily divides here than anywhere else, it would seem by far the best to suppose that at this point he went out of the temple, and with but little delay went beyond Jordan, to carry out the purpose he had in sending the seventy just a few days before the feast, and to make his last great effort for that region prepared for him by John's work; and so, at the very gate of Jerusalem, make a final great and organized effort, and thus seek a reception from his own, or bring about, and hasten on, and make sure, the complete fulfilment of prophecy.

That he retired from this feast of Tabernacles beyond Jordan to fulfil this ministry in connection with the seventy, and to return again, has everything in its favor; and that it is most probable, even the omission of the fact by John in the record of the two feasts testifies. And that he went beyond Jordan and returned to the feast of Dedication, has, with all the considerations in its favor, no slight confirmation in the statement by John (x. 40) that "He went away AGAIN beyond Jordan." It is more natural to suppose that this "again" refers to his being beyond Jordan from the feast of Tabernacles to Dedication, as there are good reasons to suppose that he did, than that it refers to his work there, or his being there, before the imprisonment of John, after which he went into Galilee two years or more previous.

THE SEVENTY RETURN.

That some of the seventy at least, whom he had sent on the way to Jerusalem, a short time before the feast, should return to him here at the feast, and (when he was rejected at the feast and "went out of the temple,") should accompany him with the disciples to this work, formally prepared both by his own wisdom and the concurrence of Providence, seems probable almost to a certainty, and makes

the arrangement at this point as given by Robinson undoubtedly the best.

And, moreover, that Luke's narrative in the very first of this great journey, comes up to the very gate of Jerusalem, and mentions a visit to the house of Martha and Mary (x. 38), is so suggestive of what was most likely to occur at the feast of Tabernacles, being that first visit to Jerusalem since the imprisonment of John, that it is hard to believe that the arrangement in Robinson's *Harmony* is anything else than the real order of the events. It was probably the only opportunity they had to entertain our Lord in their own house, for a year and a half or more, hence Martha's trouble, and Mary's absorption. This visit in the early part of this journey also shows that this departure mentioned by Luke, is the same as the going to the feast of Tabernacles mentioned by John, and it also suggests the long and circuitous character of the journey spoken of by Luke, including visits to Jerusalem, as explained by John, and that this visit was at the feast of Tabernacles there can be but little if any doubt.

THE PORTION PECULIAR TO LUKE (IX. 51—XVIII. 14).

A portion of this passage concerning the departure from Galilee has just been considered. The next portion of it is where the most serious dissatisfaction with Robinson's arrangement is to be found. He places Luke xi. 14—xiii. 9 in the first year of our Lord's Galilean ministry, just after his second circuit in Galilee. (Luke viii. 3.) But it is best to place this portion, as Andrews and others, in the order of Luke, after the final departure from Galilee. But of this, Riddle remarks, that many retain it in the position given by Luke. "But the most judicious are in doubt as to this point." The only reason given for this very radical transposition of this portion of Luke, is, "It is difficult to account for the remarkable correspondence between the accounts of Matthew [xii. 22—45] and Luke [xi. 14—32] unless they refer to the same miracle and discourses." Robinson thinks, "Luke is obviously parallel."

The weight attached to correspondence seems to be considerable with many, and it would seem to me by far too much. Correspondence has not influenced Robinson in other places in the harmony, and indeed if the notion were carried out strictly, that miracles, symbolical acts, reflections, and teachings were only once performed by our Lord, a proper harmony could not be secured. It is admitted by Robinson and all, that he repeated himself in the same place, at various times. It is not unlikely that beyond Jordan many events and scenes which occurred in Galilee, and even Jerusalem, were repeated; and that the recorded expression should be nearly or altogether the same is not surprising. Moreover, that wearisome repetition is not found in the four records of our Lord's life can only be satisfactorily accounted for by the fact that the Spirit of God guided the divine penmen, according to our Lord's promise on the eve of his crucifixion.

And besides, in this instance, the correspondence is only in a very brief portion of twenty-three verses in Matthew, with eighteen verses in Luke, and relates only to two points: first, the reviling of the Pharisees, that his works were of the devil, and our Lord's answer; and second, their seeking a sign, and his answer. Of the provocative cause of these demands, Mark makes no further mention than his works in general. The miracles mentioned by Matthew and Luke are not necessarily the same, and look otherwise. Now it is manifest that these revilings and questions were repeated many times in Galilee and Jerusalem, and it is by no means strange that they occurred this once beyond Jordan. From the time Jesus began to preach and to say "repent," unto this day, these same two questions are a constant annoyance to all his missionaries among the heathen. He, and his missionaries, and his doctrines, are railed at as of the devil, and what is asked is a sign. Answers to this daily tedious repetition naturally, and for teaching purposes, are uniform, and reflections on this unbelief cannot but be similar in spirit, and so naturally similar in expression. This was, in

our Lord's case, no doubt oft repeated in public and private, and would become stereotyped by the disciples in their preaching, and recorded substantially as the same words, whether in Galilee, Jerusalem, or beyond Jordan.

But correspondence still more loses its force, when it is remembered, not only that it consists in these brief passages, containing two oft-repeated questions and answers, but also that there are differences which are important to note: (1) The miracles are not represented as the same,—one is upon a blind and dumb man, the other upon a dumb man; (2) They are represented as in different places,—in Galilee, and on the way to Jerusalem; (3) Different times,—one not long after the Sermon on the Mount, the other more than a year after, when the days were nigh come that he should be received up; (4) Each record contains matter not in the other, and of a different character; (5) Luke's account, brief as it is, compels Dr. Robinson to make serious transpositions in order to gain parallelism and harmony.

These considerations remove the force of the correspondence, especially to those whose experience has been among the heathen and workers of iniquity, and not in the classroom, or in the midst of a cultivated congregation. Without this objection, there is left an easy acceptance of Luke's arrangement.

But, again, not only is the correspondence lacking in force, but the arrangement adopted by Robinson in the first place so breaks with the current of Luke's narrative, and again in the re-arrangement so interrupts it and disturbs the whole harmony, that not only does it raise a grave question, as to Luke's narrative, which it is quite difficult, if not impossible, to answer, but it makes it very plain that Luke has arranged his own record in an "order" far more satisfactory than those who from taste or caprice or supposed correspondence would arrange it for him. Moreover by Robinson's arrangement this large passage of two chapters from Luke (xi. 14-xiii. 9) is inserted in the harmony in the midst of a well-defined and large day's work, which, increased by this extra

matter from Luke, makes it the greatest day's work Jesus performed on earth, excepting the remarkably great work on the Tuesday before he suffered, and this, too, without any special reason, but only the record of his ordinary Galilean ministry.

This one day's work, with this portion of Luke, in Robinson's *Harmony* (Revised English Edition), occupies ten pages; and that it is all the work of one day can be easily seen by a glance at that *Harmony* (sections 48-56, pp. 37-47). Note particularly Matt. xii. 46, and xiii. 1, also Mark. iv. 35. That is to say, to this one day's work in which Jesus answers the blasphemy of the scribes and Pharisees, and their seeking a sign, and preaches in parables to the multitudes gathered by the sea, there is added this portion of Luke from the journey to Jerusalem. That is, together, on the same day, he talks to the people and rebukes the scribes and Pharisees for blasphemy and seeking a sign; he then dines with a Pharisee whom he rebukes, and denounces woes against the Pharisees and lawyers; and then speaks to an innumerable multitude gathered together (Robinson says in Galilee), and delivers a long discourse resembling the Sermon on the Mount; and then again on the same day by the seaside at Capernaum delivers to the great multitudes gathered together a long discourse in parables; and in the evening of the same day crosses the lake; and in the night is waked from sleep to still the tempest. While it is not impossible that our Lord should do such a great work in one day, for it is likely that during his ministry he often performed stupendous day's works, and not only for one day but consecutive days, yet, that so much of one day's work should be recorded by the Gospels, is out of analogy with the records in general. And that Luke should record part of the same day's work in its chronological order, and a larger portion as part of the journey to Jerusalem, more than a year after, and after his final departure from Galilee, is quite inexplicable, and most improbable. That this large portion

of Luke should be inserted here in the midst of this already large day's work, is the more improbable, as there are indications that this portion of Luke is a condensed account of several days' work; but this will be considered more particularly again.

Robinson likewise takes Luke ix. 57-62 from this place where Jesus is represented as having left Galilee and ascending up to Jerusalem, and places it in the midst of this same day's work, considered above, and for the same reason of correspondence. The supposition seems to have force with some that such events could not occur twice in the life of our Lord. But certainly all that is necessary, is sufficient testimony that they occurred more than once, and there is nothing in the instances themselves so peculiar as to forbid it, in the sense that a double occurrence is a contradiction. And as to the likelihood of such instances occurring twice in all our Lord's life, it is by far most probable that they would occur frequently, wherever our Lord went, whether in Jerusalem, Galilee, beyond the lake, or beyond Jordan, and most similar in quite everything, but the places and names of the persons. But even in these instances the correspondence is materially weakened by the differences in the circumstances as related by Matthew and Luke, which, as in the correspondence considered above, should have their full force. For certainly it is more easy to suppose that such events occurred twice, than to suppose that either Matthew or Luke, in the instances under review, is so absolutely unmethodical. Certainly, the instances mentioned by Matthew cannot be torn from their connection without serious violence to the narrative, and likewise the instances mentioned by Luke cannot be torn from their connection without equal, if not greater, violence to Luke's narrative, and this more especially because of the peculiar connection in which they are found in Luke, when he has just begun to relate the events of an important and final journey to Jerusalem, on which Jesus has already entered and just left Galilee. To separate Luke's account, as Andrews does, and share it with

Matthew, on the ground that it is impossible to know who of the Synoptists has recorded it in its proper chronological order, has the merit of trying to treat both fairly, but in reality does injustice to both, by intimating that neither of them knew when the incidents they recorded occurred, but simply inserted them where they found a convenient place. Surely such harmonizing is, to say the least, precarious, and as it is unnecessary as well as unfair to the Synoptists, it would be far better to allow each the benefit of his nearness to the events he records, and of his more perfect understanding of the circumstances, and therefore to allow each account to remain in its own place. In Luke's account we should then consider the incidents as occurring as Jesus and his disciples were on the way to "another village," having his face set towards Jerusalem.

The portion of Luke (xi. 1-xiii. 9) should follow in the place indicated by Robinson in the harmony, between the feasts of Tabernacles and Dedication. But not as Robinson supposes, as if Jesus remained in Jerusalem, but as Andrews and others represent, his work follows in the wake of the seventy, and (as stated by Matthew and Mark) in "the borders of Judæa beyond Jordan." As there are no internal or external reasons for changing the order of Luke, it naturally falls, as indicated by Robinson's arrangement, between Tabernacles and Dedication, and is so placed by Andrews and most recent harmonists.

That Jesus remained in or near Jerusalem between the feasts is most unlikely (John vii. 1). That he spent it in connection with the work of the seventy, according to Luke, and in the borders of Judæa beyond Jordan, according to Matthew, Mark, and John, is probable almost to a certainty. The character of the mission of the seventy, and the features of our Lord's ministry at this time, the attitude of Galilee, Samaria, and Judæa, and the indications of Luke's narrative itself, make it most probable, that at least this portion of Luke's peculiar passage belongs to the Peræan work. From Luke's own narrative it would seem probable

that of this peculiar portion a large part, if not all, records incidents connected with the work of the seventy, and it likewise would seem best to put as much of this peculiar passage as possible in the earlier period before Dedication, in connection more directly with this mission of the seventy. The position of this portion as thus indicated in Luke's own order is confirmed by,—

THE CHARACTER OF LUKE XI. I—XIII. 9.

This shows some signs of a formal aggressive and vigorous ministry, such as followed his going into Galilee after the imprisonment of John. The whole of this portion of Luke has the appearance of a record of a ministry extending through some time, may be some days or weeks, and this passage appears closely connected, not so much because of the events occurring in one day, as from Luke's manner of recording them. The marks of similarity between this and his Galilean ministry are: (1) It is preceded by a special and formal appointment of disciples; (2) It begins with a marked season of prayer (xi. 1); and (3) It is followed by miracle (xi. 14); (4) There follows popularity and the gathering of the multitudes in consequence (xi. 29 and xii. 1); (5) Then discourses to them thus gathered, similar to the Sermon on the Mount (xi. 33–36, and chapter xii.). All this indicates a ministry, not of one day only, but of several days, and in a new field. The denouncing of woes against the Pharisees and lawyers shows how severe and earnest it was, and the "set face" in which he journeyed and taught shows that our Lord, at this time, was in a new and important field, and in the midst of a remarkably aggressive and vigorous ministry. And the only possible way to obtain a correct understanding of this portion is to consider it in its connection as given by Luke, and as prefaced and recorded by himself, with what precedes and follows. When torn from its connection, especially when inserted, as by Robinson, in the early part of our Lord's Galilean ministry, it is most inexplicable. Why any judicious person, unless unduly

influenced by verbal correspondence of a small portion in Matthew with this in Luke, should think Luke so unchronological as to receive a part of the Galilean ministry as part of this marked and earnest ministry in Peræa, is difficult to see.

The above are some of the important considerations why Luke should not be so unjustly dealt with, and why almost to a certainty this passage (Luke xi. 1-xiii. 9) should be retained in its place as recorded by Luke, and as part of that work which followed the sending of the seventy "two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself was about to come" (x. 1).

Therefore, considering (1) The absence of sufficient reasons external or internal for the change, (verbal likeness giving no decisive testimony, inasmuch as it is easier to explain a correspondence than to suppose Luke so unchronological and unmethodical;) (2) The attitude of Galilee, Samaria, and Judea; (3) The whole phase of our Lord's work at this time, when the days drew nigh that he should be received up; (4) The nature of the mission of the seventy; (5) The difficulties attending the transposition of this portion of Luke to the earlier Galilean ministry; and (6) The character of the account in Luke xi. 1-xiii. 9, as discussed above,—this passage should be retained in its place as given by Luke, in accordance, says Riddle, "with the view of many, perhaps most, recent harmonists."

LUKE XIII. 10-XVII. 10.

This is still another portion of this peculiar passage in Luke where it seems desirable to change the order of Robinson. He places it after the raising of Lazarus, whereas it seems more desirable to consider it as an incident in our Lord's ministry beyond Jordan, while he "abode" there, as mentioned by John x. 40. Says Riddle, "The view now generally held is that Luke xiii. 10-xvii. 10 must be placed before the raising of Lazarus, and that from xvii. 20 (or xvii. 11) onward belongs to a journey from Ephraim to

Jericho and Bethany." He says, moreover, in the same note, "The only advantage here is in joining the events in Luke which seem to have occurred in Peræa with John's notice of a retirement to that region." But this is not the only advantage. There are other considerations which make it quite certain, that by far the best arrangement of this portion is before the raising of Lazarus. As stated above, it seems desirable to place as much of this portion of Luke, (ix. 51-xviii. 14,) between the feasts of Tabernacles and Dedication, in connection directly with the work of the seventy, as possible. Likewise it is desirable to place as little as possible after the retirement to Ephraim, not specially, however, for the reasons given by Riddle, that the raising of Lazarus "seems to form a fitting climax to our Lord's miracles; hence the tendency to place it as late as possible in the history." The raising of Lazarus cannot possibly be made the last, or near it. (See Matthew xxi. 14 and John xii. 37.) Not so much this, but rather that after the raising of Lazarus he was in retirement with his disciples (John xi. 54); and it is extremely improbable that anything like a ministry was performed by him from Ephraim, nor is there any intimation that the people resorted unto him or believed on him while there, but only that he tarried there with the disciples. The whole character of our Lord's ministry at this time seems to indicate retirement, and although it is probable he was never inactive, but always made use of the synagogue, especially on the Sabbath days (Luke iv. 15, 16); yet it seems best, and more in accord with the status of his work then, and the attitude of Judæa towards him, that there was nothing of an active ministry or any public work or journeys from Ephraim, until the final departure on this great and momentous journey mentioned by Luke (xvii. 11).

As therefore it would not seem best to put more than from this point in Luke (xvii. 11) on, after the retirement at Ephraim, and it would also seem desirable to put as much as possible of this peculiar passage in Luke before the feast of Dedic-

tion, why not put the whole of this portion (Luke x. 10-xvii. 10) before that feast? This would probably be best if it were not for Luke xiii. 35, which cannot be well separated from what precedes in this portion. It is true this might have been uttered by our Lord before the Dedication, yet it would seem unlikely that he went up to Jerusalem again after this declaration, before the triumphal entry to which it more immediately refers. So it would seem best to place this verse and the portion xiii. 10-xvii. 10 connected with it, after, and not before the Dedication.

As an objection to this arrangement, what Robinson says in emphasis of "abode" seems somewhat plausible; yet the verses following (John x. 41 and 42) leave room for a kind of ministry and work that there seems no room for after the retirement to Ephraim. Indeed, what John says in these verses agrees with the statements of Matt. xix. 1, 2 and Mark x. 1, that many came unto and believed on him there. They agree in allowing a ministry, but probably not of the character of that which he performed between Tabernacles and Dedication (Luke xi. 1-xiii. 9), but still a ministry.

To this agrees the character of this portion (Luke xiii. 10-xvii. 10).

This is a connected portion, and is so considered by Meyer. In the absence of good external or internal evidence to separate it into parts, this judgment must be accepted, and it is accepted by most. The characteristics of this portion in contrast with those of the previous portion show quite clearly that it belongs to a ministry in connection probably with the ministry of the seventy, indicated in the previous portion, but yet of a different character, and as Luke himself affirms, as he was on the great journey to be received up.

The first portion (xi. 1-xiii. 9) is more elementary and more aggressive in the "places whither he was to come," similar to his first works in Galilee when he manifested his glory. But in this second portion, xiii. 10-xvii. 10 (similarly to what we find in the latter part of his Galilean ministry, when he

teaches more in parables), to the end of the journey, and indeed till the night in which he was betrayed, he teaches mostly in parables and symbolic actions. This method of teaching suited the character of his ministry, at the time after the Dedication, when Jews from Jerusalem had most probably followed him to stir up the people to opposition, and watch him how they might accuse and condemn him.

This kind of parabolic teaching, and this less aggressive ministry, suited better, also, his purpose after Dedication, when Jerusalem (Luke xiii. 34 and 35), that is, the church of the old dispensation, had already decided against her Lord in all his visits to her from the imprisonment of John, and most decidedly of all in this last rejection at the feast of Dedication, from which he had but lately "gone forth out of their hand"—"away again beyond Jordan." So the character of this portion differs from the previous one in its conception and progress. It has no signs of formality, or so much of aggressiveness or urgency; no woes are denounced; it does not concern itself so much with the law; there is no discourse similar to the Sermon on the Mount as in the previous portion. He inculcates humility, forbearance, repentance, and faith. He makes no formal circuit as in the previous portion, following the seventy into the places whither he should come. But as John says, he abode and many came unto him and believed; Mark says, they resorted unto him and he taught them; Matthew says, great multitudes followed him, and he healed them there; Luke says (xiii. 22), he went on his way through cities, and villages, journeying on unto Jerusalem, and (xiv. 1) he went into the house on a Sabbath to eat bread, and (xiv. 25) there went with him great multitudes, and he turned, and spake unto them, and (xv. 1) now all the publicans and sinners were drawing near unto him for to hear him (ver. 3), and he spake unto them this parable (xvi. 1), and he spake unto his disciples (xvi. 14), and the Pharisees heard all these things, and they scoffed at him, and he spake unto them (xvii. 1), and he spake unto his disciples. It is true that John says he

“abode,” which Robinson thinks is not compatible with any sort of work. But then John also says, “many came unto him; and they said John indeed did no signs; but all things whatsoever John spake of this man were true. And many believed on him there,” which intimates that he did signs, probably by words and deeds, by which they believed, while he “abode.” At least the passage is quite in accordance with the statements of Matthew, Mark, and especially Luke in this portion under consideration, as given above, *i. e.*, with his going on the Sabbath day into a synagogue, of which there were at least several, and healing an infirm woman, and instructing the people; and with his answering one who asks him while “on his way,” “Are there few that are saved?” and with his instructing the people while at a feast in a Pharisee’s house on the Sabbath, and with his stopping and turning in the way as he went around “the cities and villages” of a limited district, and instructing the multitudes that went with him, and “the publicans and sinners drawing near unto him for to hear him;” and with the scoffing of the Pharisees who heard him; and with the particular instruction of the nearer disciples as he abode beyond Jordan in the place where John was at first baptizing. There is certainly nothing incompatible between John’s account and the intimations of any of the Synoptists, nor with the idea of “abode” itself, for when it is said that Jesus “abode,” it is not meant that he was in any strict retirement. It is true, that Luke once (xiii. 22) in this portion speaks of his being “on his way through cities and villages, teaching, and journeying on unto Jerusalem.” But this is Luke’s general way of speaking of all the events in this passage peculiar to him, as he realized the tremendous reality of Jesus’ setting his face on a final and momentous journey to Jerusalem to be received up. So this of Luke is not incompatible with the notice of John, that he “abode,” for it is most probable, that while he abode there, he went around all the cities and villages “where John was at the first baptizing.”

Therefore, from the above, this portion presents the characteristics of a ministry, not, like the previous portion before the Dedication, aggressive, elementary, preparatory, following the seventy in the places he was to come, but as John says, he "abode" and went only through cities and villages, and taught in their synagogues on the Sabbath and in private houses and by the way, as he "abode" on his way to Jerusalem, in the place "where John was at the first baptizing."

John's statement, that "many believed on him there" (x. 42), shows that this last effort of our Lord in the place where John had preached repentance, was not in vain. And no doubt retirement in Ephraim was made necessary by the stinging effect of the success of this ministry culminating in the raising of Lazarus, on the Jews at Jerusalem, who gave "commandment, that, if any man knew where he was, he should show it, that they might take him."

Therefore, (1) as this is a connected portion; and (2) as it seems best to put as much of the whole of Luke's peculiar portion as possible between Tabernacles and Dedication in direct connection with the work of the seventy; and (3) as from John xi. 54 it would seem best to put as little of this peculiar portion as possible after the raising of Lazarus and retirement to Ephraim with his disciples; and (4) as Luke x. 35 and the portion connected with it cannot well come before Dedication; and (5) as the character and progress of this portion of Luke (xiii. 10-xxii. 10), as compared with the character and progress of the previous portion (xi. 1-xiii. 9), is best explained by his rejection at the Dedication and his retirement and abode beyond Jordan as stated by John; and (6) as all the statements of this portion of Luke are in perfect accord with, and are best explained by, John's notice that he abode, and many came unto him, and many believed on him there; and (7) as retirement to Ephraim is understood best from the effect of this whole ministry in connection with the seventy before, and more especially after, the Dedication, culminating in the raising of Lazarus,—from all these considerations, to-

gether with the less clear suggestions of the evangelists, it would seem altogether best to place this portion of Luke (xiii. 10-xvii. 10) as the work of our Lord after the feast of Dedication, when he went forth out of their hand away again beyond Jordan, and showed signs, and taught as he went around all that district, as he "abode" in the place where John was at the first baptizing, on his great and momentous journey to Jerusalem, till he was called by Martha and Mary to raise Lazarus.

LUKE XVII. 11-XVIII. 14.

This remaining portion of the peculiar passage in Luke, and on till the arrival at Bethany, presents no difficulty, and there is practically no difference of opinion, if we except Robinson, who dislocates from it Luke xvii. 11-19, and places it at the beginning of this peculiar passage in connection with, and as introducing, the final departure from Galilee, with which he says, it "evidently connects itself." "But if Luke's order is followed, it becomes necessary to refer verse 11 to a journey from Ephraim to Jerusalem, during which occurred all the events which follow in Luke's narrative up to the point where Matthew and Mark again become parallel, so Meyer and many others." (Editor.)

There may be urged, in favor of placing this portion from xvii. 11 on between Ephraim and Bethany, all that Robinson has stated in favor of so placing the whole of Luke xiii. 10-xvii. 10 and xvii. 20-xviii. 14 on. But there is no good reason for omitting this single passage in the midst of the whole, especially when it (xvii. 11-19) so admirably introduces and explains the course of this final journey from Ephraim to Bethany. The great probability that our Lord was in retirement with his disciples at Ephraim, and exercised nothing of an active or public ministry there, and so the desirability of putting as little as possible of this peculiar portion of Luke in this final journey from Ephraim, has been considered above. So, although Dr. Robinson is right in supposing there was plenty of time after the retirement to Ephraim for

all the events he places there, and indeed for much more, yet all the circumstances at this stage in our Lord's work, just before he should be received up, and after he "walked no more openly among the Jews, but departed thence into the country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim; and there tarried with the disciples;" "and the Pharisees had given commandment, that, if any man knew where he was, he should show it, that they might take him,"—these circumstances at the time of his retirement to Ephraim, and all the considerations suggested by the records, go to show that there was nothing of an active and public ministry from Ephraim, but what occurred on the journey as "he went on before, going up to Jerusalem," that is, at most, from Luke xvii. 11 on. Indeed, this portion including and beginning with Luke xvii. 11-19, can be located with much more certainty than any of the separated portions of this peculiar passage in Luke.

LUKE'S SEPARATED PORTIONS.

Let us now consider formally the separation of this peculiar passage in Luke (ix. 51-x. 16; x. 17-42; xi. 1-xiii. 9; xiii. 10-xvii. 10; xvii. 11-xviii. 14) and the adjustment of these sections to the distinct notices of time and place by John: Tabernacles, Dedication, beyond Jordan, raising of Lazarus, Ephraim, Bethany. (See editor.)

Some of the considerations in favor of the separation of this large portion of Luke, and their relation to John's notices of time and place, have been given in connection with the consideration of the several portions above. It will be only necessary to add, therefore, in regard to the separation of Luke's record of this great and final journey to Jerusalem as follows: (1) All harmonists accept some separation of the record. (2) This arrangement, as shown above, does no violence to Luke's narrative, but leaves all the events in the order he has left them, which, it is thought, best explains this momentous journey of our Lord from Galilee. (3) The divisions made are only those which are

generally acknowledged as distinct portions of the narrative. (4) These portions have such a natural and remarkable correspondence with the distinctly mentioned divisions of time in John, that there is no strain of either record, nor yet is it mere taste or conjecture, nor in anywise simply arbitrary, to so adjust the two narratives. (5) As John connects the accounts of the two feasts of Tabernacles and Dedication, and as Matthew and Mark speak of his going up to Jerusalem, briefly, as a departure beyond Jordan, so Luke omits all the visits to Jerusalem, and speaks of the whole as a journey to the last Passover, of which Matthew and Mark give but few incidents. Luke gives considerable, insomuch, that as John may be called the Gospel of his Judæan ministry, and Matthew and Mark the Gospels of his Galilean ministry, so Luke may be called the Gospel of his Ascent, or of his Peræan ministry. (6) This important and long ministry, at least for six months, is alone recorded by Luke, and he himself gives many hints of its very circuitous route, and probable long time; but it is only John who gives the periods, which explain and properly divide this awful journey with set face to Jerusalem, when the time drew nigh when he should be received up. (7) In view of all the considerations given in connection with the several portions, and the general acceptance of the separation, there is a great probability that it is not only the best arrangement, but the real order of the events, and the proper adjustment of the natural divisions in this passage in Luke with the notices of time in John, between the festival of Tabernacles and our Lord's arrival at Bethany.

The Gospel of the Ascent, or ministry in Perea, is, then, with but little if any doubt, as follows: (1) Having left Galilee and on the way to the feast of Tabernacles, and but shortly before this, Jesus sends out the seventy (Luke x. 1-16). (2) At or just after the feast (John vii. 10-viii. 59), the seventy return (Luke x. 17). And going out from the hands of the Jews at the feast, he goes with and follows the seventy into all the places he had sent them, and formally begins and

continues a vigorous ministry until the feast of Dedication (Luke xi. 1-xiii. 9). (3) After this feast (John ix. 1-10-42), he goes away "again" beyond Jordan, where John was at the first baptizing, and continues the ministry begun after Tabernacles with the seventy, but it is now more cautious in its character and more limited as to locality, yet open; he goes publicly around the cities and villages, in John's first field, and teaches, privately and by the way, through parables, and signs, humility, forbearance, repentance, and faith, while he "abode" there (John x. 40-42, Luke xiii. 10-xvii. 10), until called to Bethany (John xi.). (4) He then culminates the whole of this most important, final, effective, and flaming ministry in and at the gates of Jerusalem, both before and after the feast of Dedication, by the raising of Lazarus (John xi. 1-46). After this he thought best to walk no more openly, but went into a city called Ephraim and there tarried with his disciples, until the passover of the Jews was at hand (John xi. 54-55). (5) And then leaving his retirement at Ephraim, he goes with his disciples, and joins the multitudes on the road beyond Jordan, probably near the borders of Galilee, whom "he went on before, going up to Jerusalem" (Luke xvii. 11 on). Jesus, therefore, six days before the Passover came to Bethany (John xii. 1), when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, and with his face steadfastly set to go to Jerusalem (Luke ix. 51).

[*To be continued.*]