

ARTICLE V.

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.

[Continued from Vol. xlv. p. 94.]

THE VISIT TO ZACCHÆUS.

THE next passage where a change from Robinson's order might be made with advantage, is in the order of this visit, which he leaves in the order given by Luke, connecting ix. 1 with the healing of the two blind men, and not with the visit. But that the visit to Zacchæus and the parable should come before the healing of blind Bartimæus, i. e., that Luke xix. 1-28 should come before xviii. 35-43, is most probable from the following reasons:

The external testimony of Matthew and Mark. Mark is the most definite of the Synoptists as to the place and time of the healing. With him Matthew agrees; and of course Luke's language, which is "less specific" (Riddle), must be explained by them. Their specific statement is that the healing was done "as he went out from Jericho," "in the way." The specific statement must be accepted as it is unless explained further by some more specific statement in another connection. The "general" statement of Luke must be explained, or needs explanation, as far as it seems to conflict with the others. With this direct

and external testimony of Matthew and Mark to the scene and time of the healing, agrees, also, the internal testimony of Luke himself. And, first, Luke xviii. 35, "as he drew nigh unto Jericho," is not specific, but Luke speaks "in a general way" (Riddle). In all this portion of Luke (ix. 51-xviii. 28) he speaks of all the events done in the way, on Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, with which all statements of time and place are connected in a more or less general way. As Luke draws toward the close of this journey, in his narrative, and speaks of the healing of the blind man, he thinks sufficient to mention it, as the previous events, in connection with the journey, "as he drew nigh" to the city. Not that this necessarily "refers to the first approach to Jericho." Nothing more can, necessarily, be attached to Luke's statement, from the general way in which he is speaking of all the events of the journey, than, that Jesus has reached a stage of progress which brings him "nigh" Jericho. Luke does not state the time or manner of Jesus' approach, or whether the healing occurred when he was going in or out of the city. He had been on this journey, now already, as we know from John, for six months, in which he must have made many circuits and gone up and back to Jerusalem several times, as Luke himself hints, and near the close, "as he drew nigh unto Jericho," he healed a blind man. So it would seem, from the general character of Luke's narrative, that the careful reader would not, necessarily, infer that Luke must mean that this miracle occurred on the first approach of Jesus to the city. And certainly only a quibbler would insist that Luke's account necessarily contradicts Matthew and Mark in what they say in reference to the position of this incident.

As therefore Matthew's and Mark's statement can be allowed to stand as the specific statement as to the position of the event, and Luke's statement in conformity to the general character of his narrative in this peculiar portion is best considered as not affirming any more

than that the actual position was "nigh" unto the city, the transposition of the account of this visit to Zacchæus seems most desirable; and that it is best, is further confirmed by the specific statement in Luke himself: "And he entered and was passing through Jericho" (xix. 1), since the Revised Version, "was passing through," compels us to connect the story of Zacchæus with that verse (Riddle). And as it is a definite statement by Luke, for at least the meeting with Zacchæus, and as Matthew and Mark are definite as to the healing taking place "as he went out from Jericho," then, if Mark and Matthew are allowed to stand, it seems clear that at least the meeting with Zacchæus occurred before the healing of Bartimæus, and hence, this visit of Zacchæus must be placed before that miracle. Although the meeting with Zacchæus was as Jesus "was passing through," yet he might have passed out of the city and on the way to the house outside, and "as they went out from Jericho," might have healed the blind man. But this does not seem so probable, as the intimations in the accounts of Mark and Matthew are that after the healing they followed him, in the way up to Jerusalem. But even if this order be admitted, still, the meeting with Zacchæus (xix. 1-6) must be placed before the miracle.

In order that this visit to Zacchæus may remain in the order given by Luke, and yet be reconciled with the specific statements of Matthew and Mark, some, as Robinson, suppose that Jesus came to Jericho and remained there some days, and from it made "excursions," and "he would naturally visit points of interest in the vicinity; as, for example, the fountain of Elisha, a mile or more distant." But, as there is no intimation of such a sojourn in any of the narratives, and since, moreover, the time when he should be "received up" was "well-nigh come," the attitude of the Jews, the urgency of the multitudes who followed him in the way to the Passover, and all the circumstances at this point of his great and final journey,

make it most unlikely, that he remained more than over night at Jericho, that is, as we now say, the night of Thursday, March 30th, A. D. 30. That Jesus made even one "excursion," for any purpose, is most improbable; and that he went in and out, and around the city, "sight-seeing," may be a supposition worthy of this "globe-trotting" age, but is in the highest degree absurd. But any supposition is made entirely unnecessary, and the difficulties are more naturally and easily overcome, by the transposition of the two events. This relieves the apparent difficulties, and makes unnecessary any supposition or straining of the several accounts.

This transposition of these events is made the more probable by its being in accord with the characteristics of all the necessary transposition of unchronological portions in Luke's narrative. After relating events connected in a general way, he anticipates, or returns to mention an important item that occurred some time previous. So in this case he has been relating matter connected in a general way with the journey as a whole, and then he mentions the incident of Zacchæus, with a definite note of the proper order with reference to the city of Jericho. So, that Luke xix. 1 should come before xviii. 35, is in perfect accord with the characteristics of such changes in Luke as found throughout the harmony.

And, besides, this transposition is in accord with, and gives force to, the possible grammatical sense, as shown by Grotius and Robinson, and agreed to by all. "*To draw nigh*, it is said, may signify not only *to draw nigh*, but also *to be nigh* or *near*. Hence the language of Luke may include also the idea expressed by Matthew and Mark, that is, while he was *still near* the city." Dr. Riddle further remarks, "This explanation is very generally rejected," and again, "Now the view of Grotius does not meet the difficulty, unless Luke xix. 1 is placed in order of time before xviii. 35."

Although this possible grammatical construction is use-

ful, even when these sections are left as given by Luke, yet when their transposition is considered, it has, no doubt, a peculiar force, and is a testimony to the desirableness and correctness of the transposition, which needs to be carefully noted. This grammatical sense has its best illustration as connected with this portion of Luke, in the after and proximate context of the Synoptists (Matt. xxi. 1; Mark xi. 1; and Luke xix. 29) themselves. These instances all show that the phrase, "drew nigh unto," needs an explanatory clause as given here in each of the Synoptists; and, in Matthew, "they drew nigh unto Jerusalem" is explained by, "and came unto Bethphage." So also, Luke xviii. 35, "as he drew nigh unto Jericho," may be legitimately and grammatically explained by the added clause, *and came unto the road going out from the city to Jerusalem*, if there is any proper and reliable testimony from Luke or the other evangelists for such an additional clause.

No doubt Luke would have made the explanation himself, but for the general character of his narrative as connected with the journey as a whole, and, the improbability of a mistake arising out of so plain a matter. That it has caused much misunderstanding is not his fault. It is like many other places in the Scriptures, which ought to be perfectly plain, yet by careless reading, and worse than careless exegesis, and undevout criticism, are made the source of much controversy.

Therefore (1) As this explanation, and the transposition of this passage in Luke, do no violence whatever to the grammatical sense; (2) As the transposition is demanded by the specific external testimony of Matthew and Mark; (3) As it accords with the general character of Luke's narrative in this peculiar portion, and the specific statement in regard to the visit in this passage itself; (4) As it is in accord with the changes in the current of Luke's narrative throughout the harmony; and (5) As it best relieves all the difficulties in regard to the healing of

blind Bartimæus,—it is thought a very necessary change, in order to secure the most probable order of the events.

The harmony, then, would be as follows:—

§ 109. *The visit to Zacchæus. Parable of the Ten Pounds. JERICHO.*
 Mark x. 46, Luke xix. 1-28.
 (46) And they came to Jericho:— (1) And he entered and was passing through Jericho. . . . (28) And when he had thus spoken, he went on before, going up to Jerusalem.

§ 110. *The Healing of Two Blind Men near Jericho.*
 Matt. xx. 29-34. Mark x. 46-52. Luke xviii. 35-43.
 (29) And as they went out from Jericho, . . . (46) . . . and as he went out from Jericho, . . . (35) And it came to pass, as he drew nigh unto Jericho, (or *was still near*).

This of Luke to be understood as explained above; that is, in consideration of the general plan of Luke's narration of this peculiar portion. The Revised Version above can be understood as only connecting this healing in a general way, as all the previous events are connected, with this momentous, circuitous, and extended journey.

But, reading it from the point of view of a complete harmony, and strict chronological narrative, it may be legitimately considered, and this, too, within an admitted grammatical sense, so as to "include also the idea expressed by Matthew and Mark, that is, while he was *still near* the city." (Grotius and Robinson.) And for the more complete harmony, a legitimate explanatory clause may be added as gathered from the good and reliable testimony of Matthew and Mark, as well as Luke himself, as follows: And it came to pass, as he drew nigh unto Jericho, *and came unto the road going out to Jerusalem*, a certain blind man sat by the wayside begging. (Luke xviii. 35.)

From the departure from Galilee until the arrival at Bethany, a complete harmony, as shown above, is as follows:—

1. He abode *still* in Galilee (John vii. 2-9).
2. The final departure: (1) In general (Matt. xix. 1, 2;

Mark x. 1); (2) Particularly (Luke ix. 51-62).

3. Sending of the seventy. They went to another village (Luke ix. 56). The Lord appointed seventy (Luke x. 1-16).

4. Goes "in secret" to the feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 10-viii. 59).

5. The seventy return. Visits Bethany (Luke x. 17-42).

6. Whither he himself was about to come. Peræa (Luke xi. 1-xiii. 9).

7. Festival of Dedication (John ix. 1-x. 39).

8. Retires beyond Jordan (John x. 40-42; Luke xiii. 10-xvii. 10).

9. The raising of Lazarus (John xi. 1-46).

10. The council against Jesus (John xi. 47-53).

11. Retires to Ephraim (John xi. 54).

12. The Passover at hand (John xi. 55-57).

13. Goes up from Ephraim (Luke xvii. 11-xviii. 34; Matt. xix. 3-xx. 28; Mark x. 2-45).

14. Visit to Zacchæus (Luke xix. 1-28).

15. Heals two blind men, near Jericho (Luke xviii. 35-43; Matt. xx. 29-34; Mark x. 46-52).

16. Arrives at Bethany (John xii. 1).

The principal features of this arrangement, as opposed to that of Robinson, are as follows:—

(1) The seventy sent before the festival of Tabernacles, but after the final departure, and return the same as in Robinson after the festival.

(2) The passage in Luke xi. 1-xviii. 9 is retained in the place given by Luke, and connected with the work of the seventy in "the borders of Judæa beyond Jordan."

(3) The portion of Luke xiii. 10-xvii. 10 connected with Jesus' work after the festival of Dedication beyond Jordan, and not in the final journey from Ephraim.

(4) The principal feature, and the one where it differs most from Robinson, is, that it preserves completely the chronological order of Luke in the whole of this passage peculiar to him.

THE PLACE IN JOHN'S NARRATIVE FOR THE SUPPER.

The Revised Harmony has rightly changed Robinson's order in regard to the Lord's Supper, and placed it before the prophecy of Peter's denial, in place of after, that is, after John xiii. 35, in place of after verse 38, with the remark, that it may be placed after the one "as naturally" as after the other. While the change made by the editor is in the right direction, yet it can be hardly said that either place mentioned, is natural. John, here, as usual, has left us to judge from his account where the incident which he has omitted, occurred, and has so joined the previous and after context, that certainty is well-nigh impossible. Yet, as in every such case, by putting all things together, a judgment can be reached, which is beyond any reasonable doubt. Such is the point in his narrative when Jesus went finally into Galilee; his departure from Galilee; the point of separation between the festivals of Tabernacles and Dedication; and again, this of the Supper. Although we cannot hope to reach absolute certainty, yet there are considerations which make possible a very probable solution. The time after which the Supper occurred, is determined from Matthew and Mark, both of whom fix it after the pointing out of the traitor. The time before which the Supper occurred, is fixed alone by Luke, as before the prophecy of Peter's fall, before they went out unto the Mount of Olives. These two points, between which the Supper was instituted, being fixed by the natural suggestions of the Synoptists, it remains only to fix the point in John's narrative where the Supper was instituted. And this, again, by the harmonistic parallelism between John and Matthew and Mark on the one side, and John and Luke on the other, still further narrows our question to the period between the withdrawal of Judas and the question asked by Peter, that is, John xiii. 31-35. There would seem to be little to decide in these five verses; but still it is hoped there are grounds for a very probable judgment. After Judas withdraws, Jesus re-

marks: "Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him," and so he continues, as is supposed, until he is interrupted by Peter's question in verse 36, before which question the Revised Harmony inserts the Lord's Supper. While this is possible, it does not seem the most probable, or most natural, that Peter should break the silence after Supper with a question, especially, as it is connected with the conversation before the Supper, and directly suggested by that conversation. And, moreover, it does not agree with Peter's character, that he would have the question suggested before, and reserve it until after Supper. The question of where to insert the Supper, resolves itself into: Where do the remarks of Jesus on Judas' withdrawal end, and where does the conversation after Supper begin? It seems to me the most natural answer to this, is, Between verses 32 and 33. This seems the most natural ending of the one and beginning of the other. It affords a convenient step for the insertion of the Supper, and gives an appropriate beginning of the long and final discourse of our Lord to his disciples, which follows. And besides, the question of Peter is not an introduction, but only a part of the discourse already begun, just as the questions and answers to Thomas and Philip, afterwards, were parts of the familiar conversation that he had with his disciples after Supper. So we should think it best that from verse 33, "Little children, yet a little while I am with you," and on to the end of chapter xvii., is the conversational discourse of Jesus after the Supper, and is connected with the remarks after the withdrawal of Judas (verses 31, 32) only in idea, as narrated by John, who omits the Supper. The conversation was suggested by the withdrawal, and so remarks uttered by our Lord immediately on the withdrawal are appropriately and briefly given by John, who begins at once to relate the long and burning discourse after Supper. Indeed, all of our Lord's acts and words from the time he finally left the temple, and, especially, after they met to

eat the Passover, is one long-drawn-out discourse around the idea of his near departure, "Now is the Son of man glorified," "Yet a little while I am with you."

Therefore (1) As inserting the Lord's Supper after verse 38, or, as in Revised Harmony, after verse 35, interrupts the body of the after-supper discourse; (2) As the question of Peter (verse 36) like those of Thomas, Philip, and Judas, afterwards, are all parts of the familiar after-supper conversation; (3) As the exclamation of Jesus (verse 31, 32) is all that is necessary to suppose is recorded of Jesus' remarks immediately after the withdrawal of Judas; (4) As it is the most natural and appropriate supposition, that the long after-supper discourse of our Lord, closing with the prayer in chapter xvii., began with this verse (xiii. 33); (5) As from these, and all the considerations, the most natural suggestion from John's account, is, that the institution of the Supper was after verse 32, and not after verse 38 (Robinson and others), nor after verse 35 (Editor).—so, in a complete harmony, it would seem best to make this slight, yet not unimportant, change from Dr. Robinson's arrangement.

JESUS BEFORE THE JEWS AND DENIALS BY PETER.

The whole of Dr. Robinson's arrangement of the several trials before the Jews needs readjustment. See the editor's notes and his arrangement there suggested, which with little doubt, is the true order of the trial in that night of the power of darkness. That there was a trial before Annas of a less formal but of a very important character, seems quite certain, and by far the smoothest and best harmony supposes this first trial before him as affirmed by John.

For a complete harmony of the events, if thought best, the denials might be arranged into the harmony of the trial in its chronological order with great accuracy, and with but little break with the current of any of the narratives. But it will probably be thought best by many, to

leave it as the several narratives give it, as a separate account; and as John and Luke place it at the time of the first denial, and Matthew and Mark at the last, the place given it in Robinson is probably the best.

The editor remarks that the denials of Peter occurred during the period from the close of the former trial before Annas, to the end of the examination before Caiaphas. But, if the several accounts are taken in their natural sense, they suggest, that the first denial was before the examination by Annas. The first instance, at the door, as John brought him in, and the second instance of this first episode or denial, was as he sat at the fire waiting for the trial by Annas. (Matt. xxvi. 58 and Luke xxii. 55-57.)

A harmony arranging the denials in their most probable chronological order, would be as follows:—

1. Led away to judgment (Matt. xxvi. 57; Mark xiv. 53; Luke xxii. 54; John xviii. 13, 14).

2. Peter follows, brought in by John, and denies, at the door and at the fire, in this first episode (John xviii. 15-18; Matt. xxvi. 58, 69, 70; Mark xiv. 54, 66-68; Luke xxii. 55-57).

3. Before Annas (John xviii. 25).

4. First standing by the fire, second in the porch, in this second episode (John xviii. 25; Luke xxii. 58; Mark 14, 69, 70; Matt. xxvi. 71, 72).

5. Before Caiaphas, (Matt. xxvi. 59-68; Mark xiv. 55-65; Luke xii. 63-65).

6. Third Episode (John xxviii. 26, 27; Matt. xxvi. 73-75; Mark xiv. 70-72; Luke xii. 59-62).

7. "As soon as it was day," a formal condemnation, and handed over bound to Pilate. (Luke xxii. 66-xxiii. 5; Matt. xxvii. 1, 2, 11-14; Mark xv. 1-5; John xviii. 28-38).

This arrangement in a harmony would be better than putting the denials together, first, for the sake of completeness, and then again on the whole it dislocates the several accounts less. John's narrative in either case is not disturbed. Luke's narrative in this latter order is

disturbed but slightly in four verses, while in the usual order it is not disturbed, while Matthew and Mark both are less disturbed in this more chronological order of the narratives. In any case it may be said there is no dislocation worthy of special notice, or that is in the least against the chronological character of any of the narratives.

[*To be Continued.*]

ARTICLE VI.

USES AND ABUSES OF AN IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE OF INTERPRETATION.

It is an obvious principle of interpretation, that the known nature of the subject under consideration must inevitably modify the significance of the words used. The different shades of meaning conveyed by the word "bring" afford a familiar illustration. If a teacher asks a pupil to bring the book to him, the pupil takes it up by main force and transports it. If the judge commands the sheriff to bring the prisoner, it is not expected that the sheriff will take the prisoner up in his hands as the pupil did the book, but that he will simply make use of those motives of fear which ordinarily compel the prisoner to come into the presence of the judge. If the mother says to her son, "Bring your friend home with you to dinner," the word suggests neither force nor intimidation, as in the other two cases. Thus, in this simple instance, is illustrated the subtile capabilities of language, and the fact that the known nature