

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

THE GOSPELS  
AS  
HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

London: FETTER LANE, E.C.

C. F. CLAY, MANAGER



Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET

Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS

New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

THE GOSPELS  
AS  
HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS

PART II  
THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

BY  
VINCENT HENRY STANTON, D.D.  
FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE  
ELY PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE :  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1909

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

## PREFACE

**I**N the preface to Part I the aim and plan of the whole work were described. In accordance therewith we shall now pass from the consideration of the evidence in regard to the history of our Canonical Gospels which is afforded by traces of the use of them in early days, by express statements about them, and by the position they held in the Church before and at the close of the Second Century, to the examination of the Gospels themselves. A few of the discussions in Part I will prove of service in connexion with points that must now come before us. But the significance of the conclusions there reached will be chiefly felt when, in the last Part, we consider more generally the value of the Gospels as historical records.

In the present Part, as in the last, I have endeavoured both to indicate clearly the results which appear to me to be well-established, and also to advance knowledge by further investigations. From the positions stated, and the brief accounts of the reasons for them, and the references to opposite views, in Chapter I, the reader will, I hope, be able to gather what the chief turning-points have been in the history of speculation and inquiry on the subject of the relations of our first three Gospels. A study of that history, the review and the testing of the arguments that have been employed in regard to questions that have been raised in the past, form the best discipline that the student can undergo in order to prepare him for grappling with problems that still press for solution.

The inquiries with which we shall be engaged in the present Part have this advantage over those with which the last was occupied, that the means of verifying descriptions of the phenomena to be explained, and therefore, also, of forming an independent judgment upon the theories propounded, are at the disposal of a far larger number of students. They have the Gospels in their hands. Valuable aids also for the work of comparing the Synoptic Gospels have been provided, especially in England, as in the *Synopses* of Mr W. G. Rushbrooke, and Dr A. Wright, and the studies and tables contained in the *Horæ Synopticæ* of Sir J. C. Hawkins. I have sought also to add to such aids in the Additional Notes to the first four chapters, and the two Tables at the end, of this volume.

The fact, too, that in pursuing these inquiries a fuller and more accurate knowledge of the actual contents of the Gospels will be acquired, should be an encouragement to those who are inclined to be disheartened by the difficulties of the subject, the variety of views with which they are confronted, and the intricacy of the considerations upon which decisions must depend. Their labour cannot be wholly thrown away.

V. H. S.

TRINITY COLLEGE,  
CAMBRIDGE.

*May 31, 1909.*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS: THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

	PAGES
The importance of the Synoptic problem . . . . .	1-2
Reasons for deferring the consideration of the question of the credibility of the miraculous . . . . .	2-4
More attention should be paid to the subject of critical method	5-6
The assistance to be derived from the study of the history of investigation and controversy in regard to the Synoptic problem . . . . .	6-8
Positions in regard to which a large amount of agreement has been attained :	
1. The resemblances between the Synoptic Gospels are such as require us to suppose connexions through Greek sources . . . . .	8-16
2. The relations between the first three Gospels cannot be adequately explained by the influence of oral tradition . . . . .	17-29
3. Our third evangelist was not to any considerable extent dependent upon the first (or the first upon the third) for the common contents of their Gospels . . . . .	29-30
4. A record which, if not virtually identical with our St Mark, is at least most nearly represented in it, was largely used in the composition of our first and third Gospels . . . . .	30-44
5. There was a second principal source common to our first and third evangelists, consisting mainly of Discourses and Sayings of Jesus, which they inde- pendently combined with their Marcan document	44-9



	PAGES
Questions remaining to be discussed . . . . .	50-1
ADDITIONAL NOTES :	
I. Indications that our first and third evangelists have revised St Mark, or a source closely resembling St Mark . . . . .	51-3
II. Doublets . . . . .	54-60

## CHAPTER II.

### THE COMPILATION OF THE UTTERANCES OF JESUS, AND THEIR TRANSMISSION TO THE GREEK-SPEAKING CHURCH.

The subject of the earliest preaching of the Apostles . . . . .	61
The need for dwelling upon the Precepts of Jesus must have been felt from the first . . . . .	61-2
Differences between the needs of the Aramaic-speaking districts of Palestine and those of Jews and others belonging to the Greek-speaking world . . . . .	63-4
Evidence of the Epistles of the New Testament as to the communication in Greek of the Teaching of Jesus . . . . .	64-7
Circumstances affecting the translation of the Utterances of Jesus into Greek . . . . .	68-9
The amount of verbal agreement which implies derivation from the same document . . . . .	69-74
The different arrangement in St Matthew and St Luke of the non-Marcian matter . . . . .	74-6
Clues for the reconstruction of the lost common source . . . . .	76-9
Review of the non-Marcian matter common to St Matthew and St Luke . . . . .	79-102
Results as to the form and contents of the common Greek Logian document . . . . .	102-6
The Beatitudes in St Matthew and St Luke . . . . .	106-8
The attitude to the Mosaic Law displayed in the "Sermon on the Mount" in St Matthew . . . . .	108-9
Theories as to the source from which the Teaching of Jesus contained in St Mark was derived . . . . .	109-112
The form of that Teaching characteristic of this Gospel . . . . .	112-114

# Table of Contents

ix

	PAGES
The Discourse on the Last Things in Mark xiii . . . . .	115-121
ADDITIONAL NOTE:	
Analysis of the Discourses of Jesus in St Matthew . . . . .	122-9

## CHAPTER III.

### EARLY ACCOUNTS OF THE MAIN FACTS AND FEATURES OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY AND PASSION.—THE HISTORY OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MARK.

In the work of evangelising the Greek-speaking world accounts were needed of the character and deeds of Jesus, as well as of His Teaching . . . . .	130-1
The influence of the oral period in shaping the Gospel records	131-5
The "many" Gospel narratives referred to in Luke i. 1 . . . . .	135-7
Three views of the history of the composition of St Mark between which the choice lies . . . . .	137
The method to be pursued in investigating the history of the composition of St Mark . . . . .	138-9
The consentient differences of St Matthew and St Luke from St Mark in Marcan contexts :	
The theories of B. Weiss and E. Simons . . . . .	139-141
Four causes to which the differences in question may be attributed . . . . .	141-150
The circumstance which lends significance to omissions from St Luke of sections of St Mark . . . . .	150-2
Review of sections of St Mark omitted from St Luke, for the purpose of determining the contents of the Marcan document used in the composition of St Luke . . . . .	152-170
Recent theories of the compositeness of St Mark . . . . .	170-180
The question of authorship :	
Mark the hearer of Peter . . . . .	180-3
The purpose of the work . . . . .	183-4
The march of events in the narrative as a whole . . . . .	184-8
The general uniformity of style . . . . .	188
Various marks of authenticity . . . . .	188-191
Discussion of traits which have been alleged to be unhistorical . . . . .	191-200

	PAGES
A recent theory as to the original termination of the Gospel . . . . .	200-2
Conclusions . . . . .	202-3
<b>ADDITIONAL NOTES :</b>	
I. Style as a means of distinguishing the passages added to Proto-Mark . . . . .	204-6
II. The coincident differences from St Mark in the first and third Gospels . . . . .	207-219

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST LUKE.

The matter peculiar to this Gospel :

The contents of Chapters I and II has sometimes been supposed, as in the theories of B. Weiss and Feine, to have been derived from the same source as the remainder of the peculiar matter in St Luke, but without sufficient ground . . . . . 220-3

(1) The first two chapters and the Genealogy: they were probably derived from a Greek document, of Palestinian origin . . . . . 223-7

(2) The two chief insertions:

Various views to be considered as to the source or sources of the remainder of the peculiar matter . . . . . 227-8

Review of the contents of the two chief insertions . . . . . 228-230

The parables peculiar to this Gospel . . . . . 230-2

Alleged traces of Ebionism in this Gospel . . . . . 232-7

The compassion of Jesus for the lost of Israel illustrated in this Gospel . . . . . 237

(3) The remaining pieces peculiar to this Gospel . . . . . 238-9

Conclusions as to the sources of the matter peculiar to this Gospel . . . . . 239-40

The authorship of this Gospel :

The question of the authorship of the Third Gospel is bound up with that of the Acts . . . . . 240-1

Objections to the Lucan authorship of the Acts examined and found inconclusive . . . . . 242-255

The evidence for the Lucan authorship afforded by the "we"-sections in the Acts . . . . . 255-9

# Table of Contents

xī

	PAGES
The accurate knowledge of localities and institutions shewn in the Acts . . . . .	260
Two other lines of argument, similar in character but of opposite tendency, which bear upon the question of the authorship of the third Gospel and Acts . . . . .	260
The alleged medical language in these writings . . . . .	261-3
The alleged signs of acquaintance with the works of Josephus . . . . .	263-274
The value of Luke's authentication of the truth of his record, and the time at which he composed it . . . . .	274-5
ADDITIONAL NOTE :	
The employment of characteristics of style, vocabulary and thought in different portions of the Lucan writings as a means of determining the origin of those portions severally.	
Aids for the study of the Lucan style and vocabulary ; passages examined in the present note. . . . .	
1. Luke's revision of his Marcan document . . . . .	276-7
2. Luke's peculiar matter . . . . .	278-290
3. The authorship of the "we"-sections in the Acts . . . . .	291-312
	312-322

## CHAPTER V.

### THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MATTHEW.

Recapitulation of points in regard to the composition of this Gospel which have been already decided . . . . .	323-4
The cause of the greater brevity with which some narratives are told in St Matthew than in the corresponding sections of St Mark . . . . .	324-6
Review of the Marcan sections omitted in St Matthew . . . . .	326-7
Review of the Discourses in St Matthew with special reference to the matter embodied in them which is peculiar to this Gospel . . . . .	327-336
The Parables in St Matthew . . . . .	337-340
An apocalypse of the Last Judgment . . . . .	341-2

	PAGES
The citations from the Old Testament in St Matthew :	
The two classes into which they fall . . . . .	342-4
The source of one class appears to be a catena of fulfilments of prophecy . . . . .	344-5
Its compass . . . . .	345-6
The narrative of the Birth and Infancy of Jesus . . . . .	346-7
Instances of the influence of Old Testament language upon Gospel narratives . . . . .	347
Traditions peculiar to this Gospel of which the source cannot be indicated. . . . .	347-351
Touches due to the evangelist :	
Eschatological language . . . . .	351-4
Titles bestowed on Jesus . . . . .	354-5
Expressions in the Lord's Prayer and the account of the Institution of the Eucharist due to liturgical use . . . . .	355
The injunction to baptise in the Three-fold Name . . . . .	355-9
The leading ideas in St Matthew . . . . .	359-363
The author of the Gospel . . . . .	363-7
The time of its composition . . . . .	367-8
Its value as a historical document . . . . .	368-9
ADDITIONAL NOTE :	
A few remarks on <i>Les Procédés de Rédaction des Trois Premiers Évangélistes</i> , by F. Nicolardot . . . . .	370-1
INDEX . . . . .	372

---

Table I. Comparison of the Contents and Order of the Synoptic Gospels.

Table II. The matter common to St Matthew and St Luke which is not derived from St Mark.

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS: THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

IN the first Part of this work I have discussed the history of the reception which the Four Gospels met with in the second century, and have thereby arrived at certain conclusions in regard to the times by which they must have been composed, the quarters whence they emanated and the amount of authority which, on these grounds and by virtue of the position accorded to them in the Church, they possess. Some questions which we had to consider related to individual Gospels, especially the fourth. Nevertheless we found that the history of the recognition of the Fourfold Gospel had to be regarded as a whole in order that even its parts may be understood. In the examination, however, of the Gospels themselves, to which we now pass, I shall group together the first three and reserve the fourth for subsequent study. This division of the subject will be understood at once by anyone who is at all likely to open this volume. The remarkable similarities between the first three Gospels in contents, arrangement and phraseology, owing to which they have received the name now so familiar of the Synoptic Gospels, supply the elements of a literary problem of unusual intricacy, but also of great interest and importance. In connexion with the inquiry into it we shall need to bear in mind the peculiar characteristics of the Fourth Gospel in so far only as may be necessary for realising the contrast between it and the other three; for the perception of this contrast will force upon us the conviction that the resemblances between the first three must be due to a cause, or causes, more special than simply the fact that their theme is the same.

But while the history of the composition of the Synoptic

Gospels forms a subject by itself, the view that we are led to take of it will at the same time have an important bearing upon the question of the historical character of the Fourth Gospel. For in order to estimate fairly the significance of the difference between their and the Johannine representations of the Person of Jesus and the course of His Ministry, it will be necessary to ask whether their origin is such as to preclude the probability of incompleteness, or even error, in their accounts. I would urge this consideration upon the attention of those in whose thoughts the question of the character of the Fourth Gospel overshadows all other Gospel problems, and who, perhaps not unnaturally, are becoming somewhat weary of the discussion of the Synoptic question. But apart from this it should be obvious that as the Synoptic Gospels are some of our chief authorities for the Gospel history, we cannot afford to leave any points unsettled in regard to their relations to one another and origin, which it is reasonable to hope might be decided by fuller investigation. Moreover, even in the exegesis of the Gospels severally we are brought face to face with this subject. The commentators in treating of passages in one of them which have parallels in one or both of the others cannot forbear from referring to those parallels, and the question is thus raised whether this or that difference ought to be regarded as a diverse tradition, or as due to the feeling and reflection of one or other of the evangelists, and consequently valuable chiefly as a very early comment; or again when a series of sayings is to be examined we want to know whether their collocation is likely to be original or the result of compilation.

It must be added, however, that our investigations in the present Part will only serve to contribute material towards an estimate of the historical value even of the Synoptic Gospels. Before a final estimate can be formed it will be necessary to enter fully into the question of the credibility of the supernatural element in them, which I wish to refrain from doing before the last stage of our whole inquiry. It may seem more difficult to avoid taking account of this feature of the Gospels in the present Part, where the contents of three of them will come directly before us, than it was in

the first Part, where we were concerned only with external evidence. Nevertheless, there are strong reasons for thinking that its consideration may well be, and should be, kept separate from that of the indications of an ordinary kind as to the trustworthiness, or untrustworthiness, of the Gospels; and that after we have examined these we shall be in a better position for forming an opinion upon it. Further, as these reasons apply with quite as much force to the treatment of the Fourth Gospel as to that of the other three, it will be most convenient to defer the subject in question not simply to the end of the present Part but to the concluding one, when all four Gospels can be dealt with together.

The principal reasons for deferring it are the following<sup>1</sup>. First, it is coming to be recognised that miraculous stories in an ancient writing, even if they are to be themselves rejected, do not discredit the whole document in the way that they were once supposed to do. If indeed we found someone in our own or recent generations relating miraculous occurrences we might be justified in regarding him as a man of bad faith, or of weak judgment, and unusual credulity, and consequently in treating him as an untrustworthy witness even when he made statements in themselves not improbable. Accordingly in the eighteenth century, and a considerable part of the nineteenth, deists and sceptics held that the supernatural element in the Gospels brought suspicion upon their statements generally. In so judging they failed, through the unhistorical habit of mind then still prevalent, to make allowance for the wide difference between their own age and that in which the Gospels were produced. In a time when all men, including the most highly educated and those of the greatest sobriety of judgment, found no difficulty in believing marvels of all sorts, a writer's testimony in regard to more ordinary events is not prejudiced by the circumstance that he also records miracles; or if in any degree it is, the question how far it should be held to be so is a delicate one. Clearly,

<sup>1</sup> With the following remarks cp. especially Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christenthums*, p. 16 ff., Eng. trans. *What is Christianity?* p. 25 ff. Also Professor Burkitt's Paper, read to the Church Congress at Liverpool in 1904, *Church Congress Report* for that year, p. 130.



therefore, it is advisable that the evidence as to the authenticity of any such record should first be examined, irrespectively of the peculiar nature of portions of its contents.

A further reason for doing this lies in the fact that—as will be far more commonly allowed now than would have been the case even a few years ago—the connexion between mind and body is very imperfectly understood, and that consequently some classes at least of miracles described in the Gospels might have happened as (in a certain sense) natural effects of the presence of a very wonderful Personality, Who excited faith in Himself in a remarkable degree. Room is left on this view, to a still larger extent than on the last, for attributing a historical character to the Gospel narratives, should the evidence as a whole make it reasonable to do so.

Yet again, those who, on the ground of their belief in the Divinity of Christ, would refuse to allow that what is recorded of Him is only to be regarded as possible if it can conceivably belong to the category of 'the natural,' may yet feel strongly that the question how far a supernatural element is actually to be admitted, and the hypothesis of illusion and legend excluded, cannot be determined *à priori*.

But it may be said that the convictions or prepossessions of a writer in regard to a matter of such profound interest as the historical truth of supernatural facts, which are assumed as the basis for the Christian Creed, must subtly influence his reasoning in all inquiries connected therewith, even though he may profess to decide subordinate questions on their own merits. Certainly it is difficult to avoid being biased, especially in coming to a decision upon doubtful and obscure points, by the bearing which the conclusions reached will have upon ulterior positions. But I am convinced that there may be bias of more than one kind and in more than one direction, and that those who are strongly attached to the Creed of the Christian Church are not alone in being liable to such a fault. The best safeguard against allowing the critical judgment to be thus affected is to be found in a strong sense of the need that there is at the present time for investigations from which all partiality has been excluded, coupled with a lively realisation of the temptation in one's

own case to some particular form of it, and the practice of constant self-scrutiny in order to discover whether it has been resisted.

But differences of another kind also have a large share in determining opinions that are formed on the subjects with which we are dealing. We hear much of scientific criticism and its application to the history of the rise of Christianity. The validity of the processes of science should be beyond question and the results which it obtains sure. Yet there are serious discrepancies in regard both to facts, theories, and worse still, modes of argument, among those who aim at being scientific critics. The truth is, no doubt, that the study of history can never be made fully scientific in the sense which the term has when used of physical inquiries, and that in the field with which we are concerned—the history of the rise of the Christian Faith—the difficulties are of a kind to put the equipment and the capacities of the investigator to a peculiarly severe test. But the hope of clearer and more certain knowledge and of a larger measure of agreement cannot be relinquished even here;—here, indeed, it would be less possible to do so than anywhere. And I am sure that, with a view to progress towards the attainment of these ends, far more attention needs to be given to the question of right critical method, the principles which should guide the judgment, the temper and habits of mind which the inquirer should cultivate, the kind of experience which he may find most useful and of which he should seek to avail himself, than these subjects have hitherto commonly received. It is true that the discussion of method, whether in the *Novum Organum* or subsequently, seems to have contributed little towards the making of discoveries in physical science. But there is this great difference between physical science and the study of history. In the former the investigator can usually have recourse to experiment, or (as in astronomy) to predictions which experience verifies, and these means of ascertaining the truth of his theories are so much more effective than all others as generally to supersede them. In consequence of such tests being available, many a hypothesis which seemed promising to the student when it occurred to

him never emerges, so to speak, from his laboratory, or (if it does) speedily receives a happy despatch from other workers and is heard of no more. On the other hand, in early Christian history and other studies of a similar nature, the field becomes encumbered with unsound theories, and it takes often a long time and much labour, which might have been more profitably expended, before criticism can dispose of them effectually. Often they win favour at first through their very faults, because a one-sided presentation of the facts can be made more striking than a fuller one would be. This is a grave counterpoise to the advantages that have at times been derived from the publication of speculations, which have been imperfectly tested by their authors. It is not, I think, sufficiently felt that inasmuch as in historical criticism no practical verification of our theories is possible, there is special reason for carefully surveying, and considering, the legitimacy of the grounds on which they rest. It would perhaps be unprofitable to attempt to lay down rules of right method. A tact, which is undefinable, in the application of sound principles of reasoning is at least as important as the principles themselves. But it may not be useless to insist, that while pursuing such inquiries as we are engaged upon, the mind ought to be constantly exercising reflection upon its own processes<sup>1</sup>.

It has long been recognised by those who have closely compared the first three Gospels that the resemblances between them in regard to words and phrases, the forms of sentences and of paragraphs, and the sequence of narratives, are such as to shew that there must be a relationship between them, either through the dependence of the Gospels themselves one upon another, or upon two others, according to the order of their priority, or through the use of a common source or common sources, in writing, or in the form of approximately fixed oral tradition; or by some combination of these various causes. And during the past 120 years or so, during

<sup>1</sup> Dr Sanday has done good service in his work on *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, by the stress he has there laid on the question of method. See also Harnack, *Sprüche*, pp. 3 f., 143.

which especially the phenomena in question have been investigated and discussed, the most diverse explanations of them have been proposed. In commencing the study of a subject which has this history, it is the part of common prudence that we should endeavour to turn to account the experience and the labours of the past. I make this remark, obvious as it is, because the student may not unnaturally shrink from doing this owing to the effort which it involves, and because there seem to me to be signs in some of the critical work of recent times that there has not been sufficient preparation of this kind before undertaking it, and that the work has suffered in consequence.

I desire in this chapter to state certain conclusions which have, I believe, been adequately established through investigation and controversy. In framing them I have had regard to the most salient facts, or most impressive groups of facts, to which attention has been drawn by discussion, rather than to shades of difference between theories. Where two interpretations of classes of facts agree to a considerable extent, I have allowed for them in the same proposition as alternatives, in order to draw attention to their common element, which in general corresponds, as might be expected, to the clearest part of the evidence. As propositions defining in a guarded manner the inferences which may most surely be drawn from the facts, they would, there can be little doubt, command the assent of a decided majority of critics at the present day. I am well aware that they would not command universal assent; and in justifying my statements it will be necessary for me to meet arguments adverse to them which are employed by writers, some living and some belonging to quite recent times, whose opinions are entitled to respect. I shall give reasons in every case; but it will be suitable to give them succinctly on points which have been much debated and where a large amount of agreement has been attained. In laying such stress on the agreement of critics, I would not be thought to imply that I would ask anyone to accept the conclusions without independent examination. But if we put any confidence at all in the faculties of the human mind, we must feel confirmed in our own views when

we find that they are in accord with those of a large number of persons highly qualified to judge.

But in addition to these well-assured results—for such I am convinced they are—of long and full inquiries, there are other points as to which much fuller investigation appears still to be required. These I shall indicate in the present chapter with a view to their being discussed in the sequel. By thus distinguishing between positions which have been already made good and the work that remains to be accomplished, we shall learn how to employ our own labour to the best advantage.

I. As the first ascertained point let me state that *the phenomena of relationship between the Synoptic Gospels cannot be explained as the result merely of translation from a Hebrew, or Aramaic, source. The similarities of phrase are such as require us to suppose connexions through Greek sources.*

In recent times, as well as in the early days of Gospel criticism, some have attempted to get behind our Greek Gospels to one or more Semitic documents used in them. It has not been my intention in what I have just asserted to rule such inquiries out of court, and the guarded statement which I have made above will be readily accepted, I believe, by most of those who engage in them. But the amount of verbal agreement between the three Synoptics, and between St Matthew and St Luke throughout considerable portions of the matter contained in both of them but not in St Mark, is far too great to be accounted for as the result of the accidental choice of the same expressions by different translators. This may be held, perhaps, to have been settled once for all when Eichhorn, who had at first maintained that in our Synoptic Gospels we possess three independent translations made by the evangelists themselves, or by others, from more or less expanded and altered editions of a primitive Aramaic Gospel<sup>1</sup>, felt himself compelled afterwards to supplement this view by the supposition that the three translators, though not directly dependent one upon another, had nevertheless all

<sup>1</sup> See his *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur*, Bd. 5, p. 784, pub. 1794.

used the same older translation in order to shorten their own labour<sup>1</sup>.

But the above proposition is not an otiose one. Even when facts are not denied, their significance may be ignored. And so it appears to me that those who of late have been much occupied with attempts to trace in our Gospels the effects of diversity of translation from a Semitic source, have often considered too little how the question of the interpretation of the evidence on which they lay stress is affected by the signs of relationship through Greek in the Gospels generally. Herein the chief interest and importance at the present time of the proposition at the head of this section will be found to lie. And a few reflections now upon this point may serve to render clear the course to be pursued in this work, and to lighten future discussion.

Let me premise that I do not desire to see the Synoptic question restricted so rigorously as some still think it should be, or as for a long period, which ended only a few years ago, it practically was, to an investigation of the relationship of Greek documents<sup>2</sup>. I hold that it has been sometimes too readily assumed that where a Semitic original existed, our evangelists knew only one and the same translation of it. There is at least one important case in which, as it seems to me, some of the phenomena are to be explained by the use of different versions—that of the discourse in St Matthew commonly called the Sermon on the Mount, and its Lucan parallel<sup>3</sup>.

But there are such strong reasons for thinking that the same Greek sources were used in large portions of the Gospels, that we are bound in the first instance to consider how far the hypothesis of the use of these Greek sources will carry us. And there is a presumption in favour of attributing differences between parallel passages in the Gospels, wherever

<sup>1</sup> *Einleitung in das N.T.* 2te Ausg. 1820, Bd. 1, p. 161 ff.

<sup>2</sup> P. Wernle confines the Synoptic question to this; consequently the study of Aramaic forms of thought and speech are, according to him, in place only in connexion with the origin and history of the Gospel tradition, which he regards as a wholly distinct subject (*Die Synoptische Frage*, pp. v, vi). Cp. to the same effect H. J. Holtzmann, *Hand.-com. zum N.T.* I. p. vi.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 80 ff.

this can reasonably be done, to a certain freedom to which the evangelists felt entitled in their use of these common sources, and in which their varieties of taste and of purpose were displayed, instead of assuming the collateral use of a Semitic original, or of a multiplicity of versions of it, whose very existence is doubtful, and the knowledge of them by the evangelists still more so, and thus increasing the elaborateness and artificiality of the supposed process of composition. I will proceed to illustrate the bearing of these remarks by a few criticisms on recent writers.

A. Resch has made an elaborate study, not only of divergences between parallel passages in the Gospels, but also of textual variations, and of the different forms in which Sayings of Christ that appear to be in reality the same are given, whether in the Gospels, the Epistles and other writings of the New Testament, or by early Christian writers outside the Canon; and he has suggested Hebrew words and phrases which, through independent rendering, might have given rise to these differences<sup>1</sup>. Now objection may obviously be taken to the soundness of an inquiry in which a single cause is assumed without regard to other possibilities. He should have compared other explanations which may be given of the differences to which he draws attention. It is evident that in many cases the same expression which might be preferred as a better translation might also, partly on the same grounds of taste, be preferred by an editor, where the question of correct translation did not enter. Again, differences due ultimately to translation might have appeared first in various forms of Greek oral tradition, and in this way have affected writers who had not a Semitic document before them, and perhaps could not have used one.

What I wish, however, specially to lay stress upon in connexion with Resch's investigations is the unsatisfactory relation in which they stand to the Synoptic question generally. He starts from certain positions which have been arrived at by the employment of the ordinary methods of Gospel criticism, and presents the results of his own inquiries into the traces of a Semitic Gospel as a testing and

<sup>1</sup> *Agrapha*, 1889; *Aussercanonische Paralleltexzte*, Pts. I., II., III., 1893—5.

confirmation of those previous conclusions<sup>1</sup>. This would seem to be practically equivalent to an admission that the value of the inferences to be drawn from such facts as he adduces must depend largely upon their agreement with views already rendered probable by a surer method. And for a portion of Resch's presuppositions in regard to Gospel sources it may justly be claimed that they have come to be widely held, but unfortunately not for the whole of them by any means. He adopts the theory of B. Weiss as to a primitive document containing not only Sayings and Discourses of Jesus, but a considerable number of narratives, and he would extend the amount of matter of this kind beyond the point that Weiss does. And, further, he assumes with Weiss that in the composition of St Mark, as well as of St Matthew and St Luke, this primitive document was used both for Sayings of Christ, and for not a few of the narratives<sup>2</sup>. But these are all very questionable hypotheses. The last, as to Mark's use of this primitive (Semitic) Gospel, is so especially. Resch, writing in 1889, confessed that it had still to win its way to general acceptance, though he was confident that it would do so. But it has not as yet succeeded in doing so, and we shall presently see that it has exceedingly little to recommend it; while it is open to serious objections<sup>3</sup>. The moral which I would draw is that inquiries such as those of Resch can properly take only a strictly subordinate place in the general investigation and consideration of the problem of the Gospel sources.

Again, Dr E. A. Abbott thinks that instances of erroneous translation of particular words and phrases in the LXX. furnish a clue whereby to distinguish errors of translation in St Mark which were corrected in the two other Synoptics; and from these indications he infers that behind all three Gospels there lay a document, which was written, as he maintains, in Biblical Hebrew<sup>4</sup>. First, I must point out, as I have done in

<sup>1</sup> See *Agrapha*, § 5, p. 27 f.; *Aussercan. Paralleltexzte*, I. § 9, p. 152 f.

<sup>2</sup> A. Resch, *Agrapha*, pp. 27—8; *Aussercan. Paralleltexzte*, II. § 3, p. 12 f.

<sup>3</sup> For the writings in which B. Weiss has maintained this theory, and for the names of some of his adherents see pp. 49, n. 3, 109, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Clue, A Guide through Greek to Hebrew Scripture*, 1900; *The Corrections of Mark adopted by Matthew and Luke*, 1901.



criticising Resch, and in my general remarks on the class of theories we are now considering, that it is not enough to shew that certain phenomena *might* have arisen in a certain way; this does not prove that they even probably did arise thus, unless we have looked round and assured ourselves that no other equally good or better account can be given of them. The instances adduced by Dr Abbott in support of his theory, which are of any force, appear to me to be few in number, and to count for little when viewed in connexion with the phenomena of the Gospels generally. Yet on such evidence he proposes to build a peculiarly plain and certain demonstration<sup>1</sup>. It is to be observed that he is not conscious, as Resch undoubtedly is, that such means of inquiry as he employs are unlikely to prove serviceable unless the investigator takes care to be guided by indications as to the sources and composition of the Gospels which are supplied to him by other methods of criticism<sup>2</sup>. Further, his view of the way in which translation has affected the form of the Gospels compares unfavourably with Resch's, because the use of the original which he supposes is of a more artificial kind. Among Christians of the latter half of the first century there was no such desire for verbal accuracy in the Gospel records, especially in the case of narratives—to which (as well as to Sayings of Christ) Dr Abbott often applies his principle—as would have led our first and third evangelists to turn to a Hebrew document used in St Mark (supposing such to have existed) in order to correct it in points of detail. In the case of the Old Testament, in spite of the fact that its verbal inspiration had long been an established tenet, attempts were not made to correct the errors of the LXX. till a later time, either by Jews or Christians, and then chiefly (it would seem) in consequence of the use of the LXX. by Christians in controversy with Jews. Moreover, any persons sufficiently well acquainted with the original language to make corrections would scarcely have confined their alterations to the few

<sup>1</sup> See the extraordinary passage, *Clue*, p. xviii f.

<sup>2</sup> Dr Abbott is quite heedless of all such considerations. He even assumes a Hebrew document used in common by the fourth evangelist and the three Synoptics. See *Clue*, iv. § 3.

instances which can with plausibility be explained in this way, and have retained so largely in the same contexts the words of their less skilful predecessor.

I pass to Wellhausen. It is a special and valuable feature of his recently published commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels, that he points out Aramaisms. It must always be a matter of interest in studying the Gospels to observe signs of the Semitic background, whether we are concerned with exegesis, or with the question of sources. But in the latter connexion, more particularly in the case of a narrator such as Mark, we have to consider whether we have to do with a somewhat literal translation from a Semitic document, or with a writer who is to a large extent (it may be) reproducing narratives which he had heard told in Aramaic, and to whom it was natural to think in Aramaic though he has written in Greek, while the dialect of Greek which he employed had itself also been previously affected by Semitic forms. My complaint against Wellhausen is that he ignores these distinctions, and that while he implies more or less plainly in various places that the instances of Aramaic forms of thought and expression which he adduces are signs of translation from an Aramaic document, they might be equally well accounted for in one or other of the remaining ways which I have mentioned<sup>1</sup>. And the question which of these views is right is an important one in connexion with the problem of the origin of the Gospels.

Objections the same as, or similar to, those which I have urged in the case of the three last-named writers, also lie against the inferences as to the sources of the Gospels which

<sup>1</sup> E.g., see *Das Evang. Marci*, II. 10; VI. 8; VIII. 29. Cp. his *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI. pp. 188—194. He there speaks of "the Aramaic foundations" which may be discerned as remnants glimmering through "the Greek of the Gospels," and that in truth not only in the Logia passages. And again of "the traces of the Aramaic originals of the Gospels."

More recently he has discussed the question of a written Aramaic original of the Gospels in his *Einleitung in die Drei Ersten Evangelien*, 1905, pp. 35—8, though still very inadequately. The few instances on which he builds his case for such an original of St Mark are such as can well be explained by the effects of oral translation. The question of a written Aramaic source of the matter common to our first and third Gospels but not in St Mark, is an entirely different one.

J. T. Marshall<sup>1</sup>, Merx<sup>2</sup>, F. Blass<sup>3</sup>, and R. A. Hoffmann<sup>4</sup> have drawn from the Aramaisms and Hebraisms which they contain. On the other hand it is satisfactory to observe that the precariousness of such inferences as to sources, and the caution that is needed in regard to the whole subject, are fully recognised and insisted upon by G. Dalman, who has specially addressed himself to the task of recovering the form and precise force of the Sayings of Jesus in the language in which they were spoken, and who is eminently fitted by his linguistic equipment for the work<sup>5</sup>.

Thus far I have said nothing on the difference of view which has come before us as to the Semitic language in which the supposed primitive record was composed. The criticisms which I wished to make did not turn on this point. But it will be suitable to add a few remarks upon it at this place. I cannot but think it to be far the most probable that at any rate the language of a record which consisted largely of the Teaching of Jesus would be Aramaic, not Hebrew. It is an accepted fact that a dialect of Aramaic was the language spoken in Galilee<sup>6</sup>. We cannot indeed doubt that Jesus must have read and deeply pondered the Old Testament for Himself and must thus have become familiar with Hebrew. There is some force also in Resch's contention that the people generally would be able to understand more Hebrew than

<sup>1</sup> "The Aramaic Gospel," articles in the *Expositor* in 1891 and 1892. Prof. Marshall's work is unsatisfactory on other grounds besides those indicated above. See the Critique by W. C. Allen and S. R. Driver, *Expositor* for 1893. See also G. Dalman's judgment, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 49, Eng. trans. p. 61 f.

<sup>2</sup> On Merx's views see H. J. Holtzmann's art. "Die *Marcus-controverse* in ihrer heutigen Gestalt," in *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, x. p. 20, n. 6.

<sup>3</sup> See *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 210 ff., and *N.T. Grammar*, Eng. trans. p. 203, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Das Marcusevangelium und seine Quellen*. Hoffmann pursues his theme—the attribution of differences between parallel passages in the Gospels and of textual variations in the same passages to diversity of translation—through 644 large octavo pages. His line of argument is peculiarly incomplete and uninteresting, because he does not suggest the original expressions of which he supposes the different Greek ones to be renderings. I cannot pretend to have read more of his work than sufficed to shew me his method.

<sup>5</sup> See his Introduction in *Die Worte Jesu*, especially §§ 3—7.

<sup>6</sup> Dalman adds that there is no reason to suppose anything different in regard to Judaea (*ib.* p. 6, Eng. trans. p. 7).

they would have been masters of for purposes of conversation; and further that Hebrew words and expressions which they were accustomed to hear in the passages from the Scriptures read in the Synagogues would have had peculiarly solemn and impressive associations for their ears, and might for that reason have been employed by Jesus. It is quite possible that He may occasionally have introduced such phrases in His Teaching. Yet it is evident that when the Targums began to take shape, and the directions contained in the Talmud were given regarding the interpretation in Aramaic of the passages from the Hebrew Scriptures read in the Synagogues, any teacher who desired to be generally and fully understood must have spoken mainly Aramaic. There is no reason to suppose that the circumstances of our Lord's time were different in this respect. And it is most unlikely that disciples who had heard His words uttered in this language, and who were themselves accustomed to speak it, and were addressing those who spoke it, would alter their form. Nor is it probable that any great change in this respect would be made when they were written down<sup>1</sup>, though the Hebraic element may have been increased in some degree from considerations of style. Some Hebraisms, as distinct from Aramaisms, found in the Gospels may be due to this cause. On the other hand Dalman seems more inclined to attribute them to the influence of the LXX. upon evangelists writing in Greek, and he points out that they are specially common in St Luke<sup>2</sup>. I would, however, add that the question whether Luke may not in his first two chapters, where Hebraisms are specially abundant, have used a document which was originally written in Hebrew, not Aramaic, is quite a distinct question from that of the language in which a primitive record of the Teaching of Jesus was composed.

The extent to which Greek was spoken in Palestine is another of the linguistic conditions which should be borne in mind in connexion with the history of the composition of the Gospels. It will not be necessary for me to refute the opinion

<sup>1</sup> On the probability that such a primitive record was in Aramaic not Hebrew, cp. Dalman, *ib.* Introd. §§ 5, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Dalman, *ib.* pp. 29—34 (Eng. trans. pp. 36—42).

which was formerly received with some favour that both Greek and Aramaic were generally understood throughout Palestine in the time of Christ, the latter being the language of homely and familiar intercourse, while the former was customarily employed on public occasions and in religious instruction, so that it would be natural for Christ to use it, and that He in fact did so<sup>1</sup>. It may be doubted whether any country was ever bilingual in the sense that the masses of the population in all parts were masters of two languages. It is not in this sense that Wales, for instance, or Brittany, can even now be called bilingual in spite of the primary schools. In Palestine three districts, Judaea, Galilee and Peraea, were occupied by a Jewish population which spoke Aramaic. Most of them might know a few Greek words and phrases, picked up in their intercourse with strangers with whom they had traded; but a few only who had resided abroad, or who had been brought into close contact with high Roman officials, or with the court of Herod, where doubtless Greek was in common use, can have understood or been able to speak that language well. The Ministry of Christ was confined to this distinctively Jewish region; and within it the first communities of believers in Him were formed. But this central portion of the land was well-nigh surrounded by a belt of Greek cities and their territories; and it is a significant circumstance that thus within Palestine itself, from the moment that the new faith began to be carried beyond its original borders, the necessity arose for setting forth in Greek the Christian Way of Salvation and the facts of the Gospel.

It will be important for us presently to consider how the tradition, or traditions, which must have begun to be formed in Greek from a very early time, were related to those delivered in the Aramaic-speaking Church, and what has been here said is a preparation for this.

II. In the proposition at the head of the last section one mode which has been tried of explaining the phenomena

<sup>1</sup> This view was first put forward by Isaac Voss. In recent times it has been pertinaciously maintained by Professor A. Roberts. See his *Discussions on the Gospels*, 1st edition, 1862; *Greek, the Language of Christ and His Apostles*, 1888. For a refutation of it see Neubauer, *Studia Biblica* for 1885, p. 39 ff., and Schürer, Pt. II. § 22.

of the Gospels is pronounced insufficient; I must pass a similar verdict upon another, which has had even greater vogue, in my next proposition which is this:

*The relations between the first three Gospels cannot be adequately explained simply by the influence of oral tradition.*

Among writers on the Synoptic problem not only in Germany but also in England there is now a very large amount of agreement as to the untenableness of the Oral Theory of the origin of the Gospels<sup>1</sup>. But it is probable that especially in England there are still many persons interested in Biblical studies who adhere to it, or who will at least want to know the reasons why it should be rejected. It was maintained in the books on the Gospels most widely read in England a few years ago, and several of which are still, and

<sup>1</sup> The following English writers may be mentioned among others: Sanday, *Expositor* for 1891, i. p. 180 ff. Sir J. C. Hawkins, *Expository Times*, vol. XIV. p. 18 f. See also *ib.* XV. p. 122, and as to another common document, *ib.* vol. XII. p. 76 (he expresses himself somewhat ambiguously in *Horae Synopticae*, p. 42, n. 2). Dr Armitage Robinson, *The Pilot* for June, 1900 (he shews what he thinks in his little book on *The Study of the Gospels in Handbooks for the Clergy* by the fact that he does not even allude to the Oral Theory). F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, 1906, p. 34 ff. Dr E. A. Abbott, who in his article in the 9th edition of *Encyclopaedia Britannica* seemed to leave the question open, plainly assumes the use of written documents in his *Clue*. Salmon, *Introduction to N.T.* ch. ix. p. 159 ff., 1st edition 1885, replies effectively to one of the chief arguments of the advocates of the Oral Theory, and appears to incline to the view that the common source was documentary and not simply oral. In the *Human Element in the Gospels* there are passages in which he seems to adopt that theory himself, see pp. 27, 74; but there are many others to the opposite effect (e.g. pp. 71, 223). It is with reluctance that I have drawn attention to these inconsistencies in a work of such a veteran scholar, which he had not the opportunity of revising. But I feared that, if I did not, I might be accused of misrepresenting him.

Dr Wright says (*Synopsis*, 2nd edition, p. x) "Bishop Westcott maintained to the last that it was the only satisfactory solution of the problem." I suppose he refers to the fact that successive editions of his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* were published from which it appeared that his position in regard to the Synoptic problem remained unchanged. But I am not aware that he wrote anything fresh upon it, and he never lectured on it during the twenty years of his Cambridge professoriate. He had become engrossed in other subjects, and there is reason to think that he never seriously reconsidered this question after the publication of the second (or first full) edition in 1860. The text and the notes of chapter III. (on "The Origin of the Gospels") remained substantially unchanged in all subsequent editions.

for good reasons are likely to continue to be, in common use<sup>1</sup>. And at the present time Dr A. Wright, who has rendered valuable service in the promotion of the study of the Gospels by his *Synopsis*, has in the Introduction to it and in other writings<sup>2</sup> argued vigorously in its defence.

I think, therefore, it will not be superfluous for me to state as concisely as I can the chief objections to it, especially as recent writers who have declared against it have either refrained altogether from giving the reasons why it is unsatisfactory, or at most have indicated them very slightly.

It must first be noticed that the Oral Theory, in the form in which it has been generally held, does not seem fully satisfactory to Dr A. Wright himself, and that a modification in part resembling his has also been put forward by a German writer. It used to be said that a common form of oral Gospel arose as the joint result of the teaching, interchange of thought and experience, and influence upon one another, of the twelve Apostles during the first stage of the Church's life. "They remained together," Dr Westcott writes, "at Jerusalem in close communion for a period long enough to shape a common narrative, and to fix it with the requisite consistency<sup>3</sup>." They and other evangelists adhered to this common form in their missionary work in different parts of the world, though at times expanding or otherwise adapting it. And so "the original oral Gospel, definite in general outline and even in language, was committed to writing in the lapse of time in various special shapes, according to the typical forms which it assumed in the preaching of different Apostles. It is probable that this oral Gospel existed from the first both in Aramaic and in Greek<sup>4</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> Besides Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, I may mention the Prolegomena to vol. I. of Alford's *Commentary*, Bishop Alexander's *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, Godet's *Commentary on St Luke*. A more recent commentary on St Luke in which it is adopted is that of Dr Plummer in the International Series.

<sup>2</sup> *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, 1890, *Some New Testament Problems*, 1898, and *St Luke in Greek*, 1900.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. 171.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* p. 192. I have quoted from Westcott as one of the latest representatives of the theory in its original form. Gieseler, the author of the theory, writes

G. Wetzel, however, the German writer to whom I have alluded above, while he holds that the same person in often repeating the same narrative will fall into a stereotyped way of doing so, observes that it is impossible to conceive how the modes of narration of different persons should have contributed to form a fixed type<sup>1</sup>. Accordingly he supposes that it fell to the lot of one Apostle in particular to instruct Hellenistic Jews who visited Jerusalem, in regard to the facts of the life of Jesus, of which they, more than residents in Palestine, needed to be informed. For reasons which do not appear to be weighty and which it is unnecessary here to state, Wetzel imagines Matthew to have been the Apostle upon whom this duty devolved. As fresh people came he had to go over old ground again and again. Ere long through habit his selection of pieces and the words and the order in which he gave them became approximately fixed. His hearers impressed what he told them upon their memories as accurately as possible in order to be able to repeat it to others when they departed to their own homes. "Doubtless, however," he adds, "many of them made short notes during the instructions, or immediately after them, to aid their memories." Out of their notes and reminiscences of Matthew's lectures, many—the "many" of Luke's Preface—compiled accounts of the life of Christ, in which some of them also

to much the same effect (*Die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien*, 1818, §§ 6—8). He also grapples somewhat more closely with the question how the fixed form would be preserved. He thinks that disciples of the Apostles from often hearing them deliver it would naturally have it imprinted upon their memories. He is against supposing any express learning by heart. "Ein mechanisches Auswendiglernen der Erzählungen, welches mit der Begeisterung jener Zeit einen zu schneidenden Contrast bilden würde, darf man deshalb noch nicht annehmen," p. 106.

<sup>1</sup> *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1883, p. 9, "Wie die Erzählungen verschiedener Personen allmählich in einen gemeinsamen Erzählungstypus zusammengefloßen sein sollen, ist unvorstellbar." Dr Edersheim drew the attention of English students to this work in *Studia Biblica*, 1. p. 75 ff.

K. Veit (*Die Synoptischen Parallelen und ein alter Versuch ihrer Enträtselung mit neuer Begründung*, 1897) also defends the Oral Theory. The main improvement upon Gieseler's statement of it which he suggests is that more stress should be laid on the analogy between the Oral Law among the Rabbis and the Oral Gospel among the early Christians, and that Christ's own instruction of His disciples should be supposed to have been given on the Rabbinic plan.



variously inserted pieces which they had derived from other Apostles. The similarities and differences of our three Synoptic Gospels are to be explained in this way<sup>1</sup>.

Dr A. Wright, again, tells us that he would "be the first to admit that the correspondences between the Synoptists are too numerous and too minute to be accounted for by oral teaching," unless "formal lessons" are meant thereby, "which his (Peter's) catechumens committed to memory?" St Peter, according to him, began this work of instruction in Jerusalem, teaching in Aramaic; Mark acted as his interpreter there to those who only understood Greek. Thus arose the first oral source which was carried to other Churches by those who had thoroughly learnt it and had so become fitted to be themselves catechists. In Jerusalem, side by side with this Petrine-Marcian narrative, another collection of matter was formed, the Matthaean *Logia*. These were similarly transmitted, though subsequently to the tradition before mentioned, to Churches among the Gentiles, in a more or less extended form<sup>2</sup>.

These changes in the Oral Theory have, I cannot doubt, been felt to be required in consequence of that fuller view, which has been obtained in process of time, of the facts to be explained. Nevertheless, the theory has thus been deprived of that appearance of simplicity which it possessed in its earlier form, and which was its great charm, especially as contrasted with the earlier theories of the use of common documents or of interdependence, such as those of Eichhorn and Griesbach. Wetzel's hypothesis, indeed, is not open so largely to the charge of artificiality as Dr Wright's is, but he escapes it by calling in the aid of writing to account for the preservation of the same form in the transmission of the original Gospel from Jerusalem to different parts of the world. Dr Wright's supposition of an elaborate system of catechizing and of schools of catechists may, so far as Palestine is concerned, be partially justified by the precedent of the

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.* p. 143 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, 2nd edition, p. xiv.

<sup>3</sup> *Composition of the Gospels*, p. 62 ff.

Rabbinic schools, and the habits of mind of the East generally which made learning by heart natural. But it fits ill with the conditions prevailing in the mixed communities of Grecian Jews and Gentiles in the Graeco-Roman world. Here as soon as the need was felt for adopting measures to preserve unaltered the contents and arrangement of the tradition, it would be obvious to have recourse to writing<sup>1</sup>.

We are concerned at present not with establishing any particular documentary theory but with shewing the inadequacy of the Oral Theory. Nevertheless, it will add very greatly to the clearness of our discussion if we have at least the outlines of a definite documentary theory before our minds, so that we may compare it with the oral. And fortunately the documentary theory which I would desire to bring into competition with the oral one is based on the same general grouping of the phenomena, and up to a certain point interprets them also in the same way, as the Oral Theory does. Hence the comparison will be simple and direct. The Oral Theory acknowledges, though partly in a sense of its own, the priority of St Mark; that is to say, it holds that this Gospel corresponds most nearly in its contents and form to the earliest oral Gospel, which has also indeed been retained in the two other Synoptics, but which is there enlarged in two different ways by the introduction of other matter. I shall suppose on the other hand, in general accordance with the so-called "two-document theory," that St Mark, or a document used and most nearly represented in St Mark, has been to a large extent reproduced in the two others, and that the additional matter included in them has been derived from another document, or from sources having some documentary connexion with one another.

<sup>1</sup> The argument, it would seem, on which Dr Wright relies for shewing why this was not done, is that "the possession of documents might lead to torture and death, but no one could discover or erase the treasure of the heart." *Synopsis*, *ib.* p. xiv; cp. *St Luke's Gospel in Greek*, p. x. But there is no reason whatever to think that there would have been any special danger connected with the possession of written Christian records in the Apostolic Age, or for long afterwards. Besides it is clear that, if it existed, it did not deter men from committing the Gospel history to writing a few years later than the time of which Dr Wright is speaking.

It is with an explanation of the facts somewhat of this kind that the advocates of the Oral Theory have mainly to reckon. There was a time when the diversity of documentary hypotheses that had been put forward could be appealed to in order to shew that the Synoptic problem could not be solved by such a method<sup>1</sup>. But this argument has in great degree lost its force owing to the growth of agreement as to the documentary sources. Now, on the oral hypothesis, it is necessary to assume that the common outline of the Gospel narrative could be carried to and preserved in places widely removed from one another, with but little change in the order of a long series of sections, and to a large extent in the same words, although the general form, at all events, and the descriptive portions possessed none of the sacredness of a book that had come to be regarded as inspired, and in spite of the fact that the oral tradition was still undergoing expansion.

This last is a point which deserves special attention. The earlier form of the Oral Theory breaks down conspicuously, as it seems to me, from its failure to explain the absence from St Mark of the additional matter common to St Matthew and St Luke; while Dr Wright's form also, as well as the earlier one, breaks down from its inability to give a natural account of the way in which this matter came to be combined with the common outline in those two Gospels in the manner it is, and without causing more disturbance to that outline than it has done. This additional matter consists mainly of Christ's Teaching and is of the highest interest and value. We should certainly have expected that it would be included in the contents of the oral Gospel which was everywhere to be taught, if these contents were agreed upon in Jerusalem by the Twelve before their separation. It is strange that Gieseler and those who adopted his view did not perceive this; and also that they did not feel the necessity of explaining how, notwithstanding its original omission, the matter in question was handed on till it was embodied—as to the position given it quite differently, yet much of it in almost

<sup>1</sup> E.g. see Westcott, *Introduction*, p. 201.

exactly the same form—in the traditions represented in St Matthew and St Luke.

Dr Wright avoids some difficulties which here suggest themselves by supposing that two traditions circulated separately from a very early time, one that represented in St Mark, the other consisting chiefly of the Sayings of Christ. He makes Jerusalem the home of them both, where he imagines them to have existed "side by side in friendly rivalry<sup>1</sup>." This is surely most unnatural; they could hardly have been kept from being intermingled if taught in the same Christian community. But to urge this particular point against him would be simply an *argumentum ad hominem*, because I believe that a better account can be given of the way in which the two traditions may probably have originated within the oral period<sup>2</sup>.

But it is upon the way in which the Sayings of Jesus have been combined with the Synoptic outline that I desire to fix attention. So long as a collection of them merely existed in the form of an oral tradition, it could only be transmitted to and learnt in different Christian communities piece by piece, and so be gradually incorporated in the tradition which had been previously current. And this is in point of fact what Dr Wright supposes. But the actual disposition of the matter in question in both our first and our third Gospels is not what would have been likely to result from such a process. There are too many signs of intentional and skilful arrangement. Luke resolved, apparently, to keep this additional matter separate. He has given it in three portions. The matter relating to the preaching of the Baptist and to the Temptation he has naturally placed before the commencement of Christ's Ministry; the next portion he has inserted immediately after the appointment and list of the Twelve, the third and longest on Christ's departure from Galilee when He had ended His Ministry there. In each of the two latter some matter peculiar to St Luke has also been included. In St Matthew, on the other hand, narratives from St Mark and pieces of non-Markan matter are much more intermingled in the account of the early part of Christ's Ministry. But

<sup>1</sup> *Synopsis*, p. xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> See below, pp. 61 ff., 130 ff.

in the arrangement there are clear signs of a design to exhibit from the outset the character of His Teaching as well as His power as a worker of miracles<sup>1</sup>. It is to be observed, also, that with pieces from St Mark others have been united which were of similar purport, and seemed to belong to the same occasions, and that nearly the whole of the Teaching of Jesus given in this Gospel has been collected in a few more or less well-constructed discourses, each of which has a distinct aim and character<sup>2</sup>. These facts can be naturally explained only if we suppose that our first and third evangelists each had both the Marcan outline and the additional matter, or a considerable portion of it, lying before him in a written form, when he set about combining them, so that he could frame a plan how best to introduce the latter into the former and could systematically carry out his plan.

Further, it is highly improbable that, if the original outline was known simply as an oral tradition, the sequence of its sections could, when additions were made, have remained so little altered as we see it to have been on comparing St Matthew and St Luke with St Mark. Again and again, after the introduction of other matter, the thread of the common order is resumed at the point at which it had been left. This would be natural enough if the evangelists had a written source to which they recurred; but if they were depending upon memory the natural effect of the working of the laws of association would be that when some fresh incident or piece of Teaching was recalled the old order of thought would be more or less extensively disturbed<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> These statements can be readily verified by Table I. at the end of this vol.

<sup>2</sup> Their structure will come before us partly in the next chapter and still more fully in ch. v.

<sup>3</sup> Dr Wright suggests (*Synopsis*, p. xvii) that the accepted order was clung to in oral repetition to aid the memory. But even if it were granted that the Christians of the first generation are likely to have perceived the advantages of a *Memoria technica*, the supposition would hardly seem to be consistent with that kind of combination of order with departures therefrom to which I have referred. Dr Wright also suggests that the oral Gospel was divided into Church Lessons, one for every Sunday in the year, and that Luke, and I suppose also other catechists, were thus assisted in preserving the original order of sections (*St Luke's Gospel*, p. xi). This is a more astonishing anachronism even than that referred to p. 21, n. 1. How could such a division be made while the current tradition was still

I have laid stress thus far on the close similarity of order between the three Gospels, so far at least as the contents comprised in the shortest of them are concerned. It is much easier to obtain a comprehensive and correct view as to the extent of their correspondence in this respect<sup>1</sup> than in respect to all the details of phraseology and mode of presentation throughout their parallel sections. Nevertheless this latter class of facts, also, demands attention. In examining similarities and differences of phraseology we must distinguish between the Words of Christ and the narrative portions of the Gospel history. There would be special reason for aiming at verbally exact reproduction in the former case, whether oral tradition or writing were the means employed. But it may well be doubted whether such close agreement as we actually find in a large proportion of the parallel passages which give the Teaching of Jesus could have been secured through oral tradition. Both the individual Sayings and

in process of expansion? Moreover, in the account of public worship by Justin nearly 100 years later, there is no trace of such a table of lessons. "The prophets and the Apostolic Memoirs were," he tells us, "read so far as time permitted" (*Apol.* i. 67).

Among his grounds for maintaining the Oral Theory, Dr Wright lays special stress upon the fact that Luke omits many of the names of persons and places given in St Mark. He contends that Luke would not have done this if he had had St Mark before him in a written form, because he shews that he valued such details, which, as a good historian, he could not fail to do (*New Testament Problems*, p. 63 f., and *St Luke's Gospel in Greek*, p. xi). It might be sufficient to reply that no one is perfectly consistent, and that an inclination to give such details might often be overborne by other considerations. But in point of fact it is one thing to give details which connect incidents that are related with the general course of history, or with well-known persons, as Luke shews himself anxious to do; quite another to bring in names that would be wholly unfamiliar to the readers addressed, and may well have been so also to the evangelist himself. It might well seem to him, for instance, suitable to write "a certain blind man sat by the way begging" in place of "the son of Timaeus, Bartimaeus, a blind beggar, sat by the way." When he does bring in names of places or persons that would be unknown he frequently does so apologetically, adding "called" (e.g. "a city called Nain," vii. 11; cp. ix. 10, xix. 2, xxiii. 33, A. i. 12, xxvii. 8, 16) or "by name" (i. 5, x. 38, xxiii. 50, etc.). And when he omits such names altogether he is not untrue to his character as a historical writer. It is the oral narrator rather than the writer who needs to use proper names of persons however obscure and in themselves unimportant, especially in narrating to children and simple people, in order to make his story clear and to impress it upon the memory.

<sup>1</sup> See Table I.

longer pieces of Teaching given in St Mark reappear in St Matthew with exceedingly little variation on the whole. In two instances he gives a form of saying which has a different dogmatic effect<sup>1</sup>, and in a third<sup>2</sup> he has substituted, as the reply to the same question, a similar though different answer, consisting of a saying to which there is a parallel (though not a close one), in a different context in St Luke. With these exceptions the changes which our first evangelist would appear to have made in Sayings of Jesus which he found in St Mark are quite inconsiderable<sup>3</sup>. Often indeed he seems to combine what he has taken from two sources, one of which agrees with St Mark; but even in doing this he often gives the matter which he takes from each in such a way that it remains distinguishable; he interweaves passages<sup>4</sup>, keeping whole sentences from two sources intact, or he inserts clauses from one into the sentences of the other without altering the form<sup>5</sup>. The divergencies of St Luke from St Mark in Words of Christ given by both are decidedly greater; yet the agreement is often very close<sup>6</sup>.

Once more, in the matter common to St Matthew and St Luke but not found in St Mark, there are pieces of Christ's Teaching, extending in some instances to many verses, which are almost verbally identical in the two Gospels.

In the descriptive portions there was not the same reason

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xvi. 27=Mk viii. 38; Mt. xix. 17=Mk x. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Mt. xvii. 19, 20=Mk ix. 28, 29.

<sup>3</sup> The chief are Mt. xvi. 6=Mk viii. 15 (where *καὶ Σαδδουκαίων* is substituted for *καὶ τῆς ζήτησης Ἡρώδου*); Mt. xvii. 12=Mk ix. 12; 13, where a clause, which comes in very awkwardly in the middle of Mk v. 12, is omitted and provision is made for what seems to be the purport of it at the end of the sentence. At Mt. iv. 17=Mk i. 15, the difference is probably due to a reviser's hand in Mk; see p. 142.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Mt. xii. 25 ff. with Mk iii. 23 ff. and Lk xi. 17 ff. (see Analysis, p. 126). Again cp. Mt. xviii. 6 ff. with Mk ix. 42 ff. and Lk xvii. 1, 2 (see Analysis, p. 129).

<sup>5</sup> For the insertion, or rather the addition of a clause cp. Mt. xvi. 4 with Mk viii. 12; there is a parallel to the addition at Lk xi. 29=Mt. xii. 38, 39. See also the following insertions to which we have no parallels, Mt. ix. 12, 13=Mk ii. 17 and Mt. xii. 3—8=Mk ii. 25, 26, 28.

<sup>6</sup> For a long passage throughout which the agreement is close see Mk x. 17—27=Lk xviii. 18—27. See also the following shorter pieces: Mk x. 14, 15=Lk xviii. 16, 17; Mk xii. 43, 44=Lk xxi. 3, 4; Mk xiv. 13—15=Lk xxii. 9—12.

for adhering to one form, and there is in point of fact in these portions a larger amount of diversity between the Gospels. Yet even here between the sections in St Mark and the Matthaean and Lucan parallels thereto we may note almost throughout an astonishing amount of agreement in the forms of paragraphs and of sentences, and the order of clauses, and in words and phrases.

It will, however, be urged that the strength of the case for the Oral Theory lies in the differences of the Synoptics from one another which are intermingled with the resemblances, and that this combination of resemblances and differences can only be satisfactorily explained on that theory. It would have been unworthy, it will be said, of any of the evangelists to make wholesale use in their own Gospels of written records already composed by others, and if they had done so they should have reproduced them with greater fidelity. But this is to look at the matter too much from the point of view of the present day, and in particular to ignore the very peculiar conditions under which the Gospels were composed. There can in reality be no question that writers of former times, very specially in the case of historical records, felt themselves at liberty to adopt what had been compiled before as if it were their own, and in doing so to modify and add to it, in a way that at the present day no honourable and self-respecting writers would, and to an extent that those who are not of this character would not dare to do. The difference of feeling on the subject, and of the real morality of the act, lay partly in the absence of the pecuniary advantages and consequent legal rights connected with authorship, but perhaps even more in the fact that before the invention of printing, the distinction must often have been a shadowy one between copying for the private use of an individual, or of a limited circle, and publication. He who copied a document and in doing so partly abridged, partly enlarged it, may never have contemplated the possibility that his MS. would itself be copied, and that what he had taken from others without full acknowledgment would be regarded as his own. Further, in the case of the evangelists it is to be observed that the facts which *ex hypothesi* they took from



previous written records were in reality the common property of the Church. So far as the statement of them already made was satisfactory it would be suitable to reproduce it. The men who had indited these records would themselves have made no claim to authorship in the ordinary sense, and the later of the writers with whom we are concerned were of the same generation, or approximately so, as those whose work they used. They are likely to have possessed additional information, oral and written, of an equally trustworthy character, or what seemed to them to be such; and where it did not agree with the document which in the main they used they would not have hesitated to follow their own preferences in their own record. Oral tradition must still have been a living thing<sup>1</sup> at the latest time at which any one of the Synoptic evangelists wrote, and still more so in his early life. If he had been accustomed to hear a Saying of Christ given in a form, or an incident placed in a connexion, different from that in which he found it in his document, he would naturally correct or modify the latter in accordance with his own memory. Many of the more material differences as to events and their sequence, and the form of Christ's Sayings, may thus rest on independent evidence upon which the evangelist who altered his principal document relied. But it must be remembered, also, that there was not in that age such a sense of the importance of verbal exactness in the repetition even of Christ's Words, as we might have expected; the practice of the early fathers in quoting them is proof of this<sup>2</sup>. So also one or other of the evangelists may in some cases have persuaded himself that a particular arrangement of incidents, which had seemed to him the most suitable, gave the true historical order.

Lastly, very many of the differences in the parallel sections of the Synoptics do not by any means strengthen the case for

<sup>1</sup> Even Papias, it will be remembered, could speak of the *ζῶσα φωνή καὶ μένουσα* in regard to facts of the Gospel history (Eus. *H.E.* III. 39).

<sup>2</sup> Zahn, *Einleit.* II. p. 324, forcibly appeals to differences in the N.T. itself in regard to the form of the Lord's Prayer, the Institution of the Lord's Supper, and one or two other points, in order to shew that there could not have been among the early believers such uniformity of oral tradition as would of itself account for the amount of agreement that we find between the Synoptic Gospels.

an oral hypothesis, but on the contrary give clearly the impression that they are due to the revision of St Mark by the authors of the two other Gospels. They are of the nature of stylistic improvements, and consist in the employment of more polished Greek words or constructions for uncouth ones, the compression of passages by the removal of redundancies or the omission of comparatively unimportant details, and the more logical, or more effective arrangement of clauses, or of the points in a description. Or they display the idiosyncrasies of the first or the third evangelist<sup>1</sup>. And yet their limited extent in each instance suggests that they have been made in a document, which held in check (as it were) those who sought to improve upon it, continually bringing them back to what lay before them. If they had simply committed to writing an oral tradition, they would probably have moulded it much more freely so far as the literary form was concerned<sup>2</sup>.

III. It follows from what has been thus far urged in this chapter that in seeking for a solution of the Synoptic problem, we must look primarily for relations between the Synoptic Gospels either through the direct dependence of one upon another, or through the common use of Greek documents. As regards connexions of the former kind it will be well at once to lay down one proposition upon which it will not be necessary to dwell at length. Some subsequent discussions will thus be simplified.

*Our third evangelist was not to any considerable extent dependent upon the first (or the first upon the third) for the common contents of their Gospels.*

Hardly anyone will, I believe, at the present day dissent

<sup>1</sup> See Additional Note, p. 51 ff.

<sup>2</sup> I have discussed the character of the evidence generally because it is only by a survey of the whole mass of evidence that the question as to the use of a written source, or written sources, can be decided. But as an individual instance hard to account for on an oral hypothesis I may mention the three successive predictions of the Passion, given at exactly corresponding points and with the peculiarities of the several announcements preserved in each Gospel (Mk viii. 31=Mt. xvi. 21=Lk ix. 22; Mk ix. 31=Mt. xvii. 22, 23=Lk ix. 43, 44; Mk x. 32-34=Mt. xx. 17-19=Lk xviii. 31-33. It is surely most unlikely that in oral tradition the different occasions and the words used at them would not have been confused.

from this statement. E. Simons has, it is true, maintained that our third evangelist had read St Matthew and that he was in certain particulars affected by his reminiscences of it<sup>1</sup>, and he has also succeeded in convincing a certain number of critics of the truth of his view. I shall discuss it fully in a later chapter. But Simons, and those whom he has persuaded, only suppose Luke's acquaintance with St Matthew to be accountable for certain quite subordinate touches in his Gospel. I have sufficiently allowed for their view in saying that he "was *not to any considerable extent* dependent upon St Matthew."

In the matter common to St Matthew and St Luke, but not found in St Mark, there are many sentences, and even whole paragraphs, which are almost verbally identical, but the arrangement of this matter in the two Gospels is, as we have already observed, widely different. The task of separating the various portions of this matter from the contexts in which they stand in St Matthew and putting them together and introducing them again as they appear in St Luke would have been a very troublesome one, and there could be no good reason, so far as we can see, for undertaking it. Again, in those portions of his subject-matter which our third evangelist has in common with both the other Synoptics he is on the whole very much closer to St Mark than to St Matthew. Lastly, in his account of the Birth and Infancy of Jesus he has manifestly not drawn from our first Gospel. On all these grounds we are justified in asserting that *in the main at least* he was not dependent upon that Gospel in the composition of his own work.

IV. We may now pass on to consider more fully that view of the documentary relations of the Synoptic Gospels which I have already implied when discussing the Oral Theory. It is embodied in the two remaining propositions laid down in this chapter. The first of these is that

*A record which, if not virtually identical with our St Mark, is at least most nearly represented in it, was largely used in the composition of our first and third Gospels.*

This thesis, which is now one of the most widely accepted

<sup>1</sup> *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* 1880.

results of modern criticism of the Gospels, cannot claim support, it must be admitted, either from early tradition, or from long prescription. Early tradition, as represented by Irenaeus, though it did not expressly affirm the independence of the evangelists, might most naturally have been understood to imply it. Augustine, however, from observing the close similarity in matter and language between St Matthew and St Mark was led to surmise a connexion between them. In forming his conception of that connexion he did as little violence as possible to existing prepossessions. He supposed that Mark, the disciple of Apostles, whose Gospel ordinarily stood second, and never first, in the list of the Gospels, had made use of the Gospel by an Apostle, which stood at the head of that list. Both Augustine himself and the Church of his day would have refused to believe in the inverse relation between these Gospels. And the same may be said of the whole Middle-age. Further, during the sixteenth, seventeenth and the greater part of the eighteenth centuries, while some scholars asserted the independence of St Mark, the rest with scarcely an exception adhered substantially to the Augustinian view of its relation to St Matthew<sup>1</sup>. At length Griesbach added St Luke to St Matthew as a source of St Mark, maintaining that the last-named was wholly derived from the other two. He first indicated this view incidentally in 1783 in a praelection on the "Sources whence the evangelists drew their narratives of the Resurrection<sup>2</sup>," and elaborated it in a dissertation published in 1790<sup>3</sup>. But meanwhile G. C. Storr had taken the decisive step which opened out a wholly new point of view. In an essay, *Ueber den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte Johannes* (§ 58 ff.), published in 1786,

<sup>1</sup> For a convenient summary of opinion among the theologians of the Reformation up to the middle of the eighteenth century, see Lardner's *Credibility, Supplement*, Pt. I. ch. 10 (pub. 1756). This may be supplemented from J. D. Michaelis, *Introduction*, 4th edition (1788), trans. by Marsh, vol. 3, Pt. I. ch. 5, §§ 4—7.

<sup>2</sup> See the closing paragraphs pp. 255—6 in his collected *Opuscula Academica*, II. published in 1824.

<sup>3</sup> The title of this dissertation is *Commentatio quâ Marci evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur*. It was republished in a revised and much enlarged form in 1794, and is so given in the *Opuscula*, II. pp. 358—425.

he suggested that St Mark was prior to, and used in, both St Luke and St Matthew, and afterwards defended this thesis forcibly and emphatically in a reply to Griesbach (1790)<sup>1</sup>. For a long time this view found little favour, but from 1835 onwards the claims of Mark's Gospel to be regarded as either itself the source from which the authors of both our first and our third Gospels derived the matter which they have in common with it, or to have preserved most nearly the character and outline of that source, have been powerfully urged by a succession of writers<sup>2</sup>. And this view has ever increasingly commended itself to students of the Synoptic problem during recent years.

Keim was, I think, the latest writer of eminence who held Griesbach's theory<sup>3</sup>. No small part of the importance which once belonged to it was due to the fact that Baur<sup>4</sup>, and the older members of the Tübingen school generally, had espoused it with confidence; yet A. Hilgenfeld, the ablest of the later members of that school, declared in his *Introduction to the New Testament* (1875) that he had long asserted St Mark to be independent of St Luke, though not of St Matthew<sup>5</sup>. C. Holsten, also, another of the later disciples of this school, took up the same position<sup>6</sup>. On another side Th. Zahn has sought to adhere to the traditional view of St Matthew, while recognising to some extent the signs of secondariness in it relatively to St Mark. He has accordingly revived a view

<sup>1</sup> See *In librorum N.T. historicorum loca quaedam*, vol. III.; *Diss. prima*, pp. 63—8.

<sup>2</sup> Lachmann (*De ordine narrationum in evangeliiis synopticis*, Stud. u. Krit. 1835), and C. G. Wilke (*Der Urevangelist*, 1838) prepared the way for this view by contending that St Mark was "prior" to the two other Synoptics, either in the sense that in it the oral tradition is exhibited in its earliest form, or as a document. Some of the chief writers to establish definitely the position that our St Mark itself, or a document most nearly represented in it, was actually used in the composition of our first and third Gospels were C. H. Weisse in *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, 1838, and *Die Evangelienfrage*, 1856; H. J. Holtzmann, *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863; C. Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen über die Evangelische Geschichte*, 1864; B. Weiss, *Das Marcusevangelium*, 1872.

<sup>3</sup> See his *Jesus of Nazara*, 1867, vol. I. p. 118, Eng. trans.

<sup>4</sup> *Die kanonischen Evangelien*, 1847, p. 535 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Einleit. in d. N.T.* p. 504 f. He had written to this effect in 1850 and Baur replied in *Das Marcusevangelium*, 1851.

<sup>6</sup> *Die Synopt. Evang.* 1885.

suggested by Grotius, that Mark used the Hebrew Gospel by the Apostle Matthew, and that the translator of the latter in turn made use of Mark's rendering for those parts in which he had already given one<sup>1</sup>.

Holsten's chief arguments for the priority of St Matthew are of a kind which would appeal to few, if any, minds now. They are of the approved Tübingen type, being drawn from the supposed relations of parties in the second century. But Hilgenfeld aims at being critical in the more ordinary sense of the term, and his arguments deserve consideration. Again, it would not be right to disregard what is urged by a man of Zahn's learning and position. The question, therefore, of the relations between St Matthew and St Mark must receive special attention. Yet it is not desirable that it should be isolated from other parts of the Synoptic problem. That problem must be considered as a whole. The full strength of the case for the use of St Mark in the composition of St Matthew can only be realised when St Luke also is compared with both these. It was a merit in Griesbach's hypothesis that it brought the relations between St Mark and the two other Synoptics into view together. And consequently in any attempt to deal comprehensively with the evidence bearing on the origin of the Gospels this hypothesis can hardly fail to appear on the scene, as an alternative explanation, albeit one to be rejected.

Let me then first describe certain salient features of relationship between the Synoptics which are beyond dispute, and to which I have already alluded in more or less general terms<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Annot. in Evang. secund. Matth.* preface, near end, "Sicut autem Marcus usus est Matthaei Hebraeo, ni fallor, codice, ita Marci libro Graeco usus est, mihi videtur, quisquis is fuit Matthaei Graecus interpres: nam quae Marcus ex Matthaeo desumerat, idem hic iisdem prope verbis posuit, nisi quod quaedam a Marco Hebraico aut Chaldaico loquendi genere expressa propius ad Graeci sermonis normam emollivit." Zahn refers to Grotius, *Einleit.* II. pp. 196 and 322.

Salmon seems at the end of his life to have inclined to the same view, see *The Human Element in the Gospels*, p. 405, comparing therewith pp. 41 f., 301, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Statements (a) to (d) following may be readily verified by examining Table I. at end of vol.; for (e) a Synopsis such as Rushbrooke's or Wright's is of course necessary.

### 34 *Features of relationship between the Gospels*

(a) While the narratives of the Birth and Infancy of Jesus in St Matthew and St Luke are widely different, these Gospels begin to agree with one another and with St Mark from the point at which the latter begins, namely with the Ministry of John the Baptist.

(b) By far the greater part of the subject-matter of St Mark is found in *both* St Matthew and St Luke, and there is on the whole a close parallelism between all three in the arrangement of this matter. In other words there is a common outline; into this in St Matthew and St Luke a considerable amount of additional matter has been quite diversely introduced.

(c) With very few exceptions, our first and third evangelists, so far as they omit incidents or sayings given in St Mark, do not omit the same ones; the result being that almost all the sections in St Mark are found also in one or other of the two remaining Synoptics; that is to say, there are very few passages peculiar to this Gospel.

(d) When the sequence of narratives in St Matthew or in St Luke differs from that in St Mark, the other one agrees with St Mark. In other words St Matthew and St Luke do not, save in one or two instances, unite against St Mark as to order. When all three do not agree in respect to it, we have the same sequence in St Matthew and St Mark, or in St Luke and St Mark.

(e) There is, further, an agreement which is generally considerable and sometimes very full between St Mark and each of the two other Synoptics in the manner in which incidents are related, and in phraseology. All three frequently agree in these respects. But there are also commonly particulars of this kind in which St Matthew and St Luke each separately agrees with St Mark. On the whole the correspondence is closest between St Matthew and St Mark; but there are some cases in which the correspondence is closer between St Luke and the parallel passage in St Mark than between the latter and a parallel in St Matthew. Finally it is to be observed that the amount of agreement in statements or words between St Matthew and St Luke alone, in all those portions of their Gospels which are in substance con-

tained in St Mark, is trifling in comparison with the agreement of each separately, and even of both together, with St Mark.

Now if, instead of supposing, with Griesbach, that Mark extracted his matter from the two others and worked together what he took from them, we suppose that the authors of these Gospels used St Mark, or a document resembling St Mark, and each in his own way revised and supplemented it, we have a simple and natural explanation of these phenomena. We are not then under the necessity of finding a reason for the absence from St Mark of much interesting matter which is contained in the two other Synoptics. Again, the fact is accounted for, not only that there is a large amount of agreement both in sequence and in language between St Matthew and St Mark and between St Luke and St Mark, but also that to a less but yet considerable extent St Matthew and St Luke agree with one another in agreeing with St Mark.

This parallelism between St Luke and St Matthew in Marcan contexts is, it should be observed, left altogether unexplained by Griesbach's theory. That theory calls for another besides itself to complete it, and such a supplementary theory is not forthcoming. We should not, indeed, be at a loss for one, if we could hold that either our first or our third evangelist had used the work of the other as one of his principal sources, but that possibility has already been excluded<sup>1</sup>.

The case is not, I think, substantially altered when we pass from a broad and comprehensive survey of the contents of the three Gospels to the examination of particular passages.

It is true that in some instances phrases, or whole sentences, occurring separately in St Matthew and St Luke but conjointly in St Mark, might have been intentionally combined in the way that Griesbach's theory assumes<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, early and mediaeval writings in which more than

<sup>1</sup> See p. 29 f.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. at Mk i. 32 = Mt. viii. 16 = Lk iv. 40, it would not have been difficult to combine *ὄψις δὲ γενομένης* (Mt.) *δύροντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου* (Lk) into *ὄψις δὲ γενομένης ὅτε ἔδυσε ὁ ἥλιος* (Mk).



one source has been drawn upon would supply not a few illustrations of patchwork of this kind. The conflate readings of which there are many in manuscripts of the Gospels may likewise be compared. But, in the first place, those who hold that a document most nearly represented by our St Mark lay before the two other Synoptics are not precluded from supposing that an editor of the former has here and there introduced into it touches from the two other Gospels. Further, it would in very many cases have been an exceedingly troublesome, or even an impossible, task to frame St Mark's account out of the parallels in the two other Synoptics. His narrative appears to *underlie* them both, but cannot be said to combine them. Their different expressions have not been fitted together in St Mark, but can reasonably be regarded as recastings of St Mark<sup>1</sup>.

It will also be remembered that in discussing the Oral Theory I have referred to the many indications of the revision of St Mark in St Matthew and St Luke. We were then concerned with a theory according to which St Mark represents the Gospel tradition in its earliest form, and this would account for the peculiar vividness and freshness which has been often noticed in this Gospel. But the comparative loss of this characteristic in the two latter, so far as it is admitted,

<sup>1</sup> E.g. cp. Mk i. 30, 31 = Mt. viii. 14, 15 = Lk iv. 38, 39, *vv.* immediately preceding one of the instances given, p. 35 n. 2. The statement as to the illness of Simon's mother-in-law is made by Mark in a separate sentence. The writer of St Matthew brings it into the one which describes Jesus coming to the house; he has, however, an equivalent for Mark's *κατέκειτο* and uses the same word for "being in a fever." Luke, on the other hand, has a sentence of the same form as Mark's to describe the sick person, but has no word corresponding to *κατέκειτο* and a different expression for *πυρέσσουσα*. Mark's words might well have suggested the form either in St Matthew or in St Luke; but it is inconceivable that any rational being would have set himself to fuse the two and thus have produced what Mark has written. The same holds of other parallelisms between St Mark and St Matthew, and St Mark and St Luke, in the same verses.

As another example take Mk ii. 24 = Mt. xii. 2 = Lk vi. 2. In St Mark and St Matthew the Pharisees address Jesus on the subject of the conduct of His disciples, but in St Mark only is the form interrogative—*ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν*; In St Luke also they ask a question, but it is addressed to Jesus and the disciples together, or to the latter—*τί ποιεῖτε*; Here again it cannot be supposed that anyone would have tried to give what the first and third evangelists have written in Mark's form; but that the expressions of each of the former should have been derived from the latter is natural enough. Such cases are innumerable.

would be attributed, by those who hold that theory, to the imperceptible influences of oral repetition of the tradition, though it might also be due to the different treatment of such a tradition. We examined, however, the differences in question and saw that they were of a kind which could only naturally be the result of the use of the contents of St Mark lying before the other two writers in a documentary form<sup>1</sup>. It is unnecessary to go over this ground again here. I would insist only upon the point that, while in the case of some of the differences between St Matthew or St Luke and St Mark, considered in themselves, the change might almost equally well be supposed to have been made on either side, there are many in which it is easy to understand why our first or third evangelist should have altered Mark's form but not possible to assign a good reason for Mark's having altered theirs; and that there are not instances to set over against these, at all comparable in number, where it would be more natural to suppose that Mark has made the alteration. The latter appears to have been clearly the less experienced writer and to have had less mastery of Greek. But such an one would have been scarcely more likely than a writer of greater skill to substitute awkward turns of expression for better ones, or a less for a more simple and lucid arrangement, in a record which on the whole he closely followed. On the other hand, that uncouthness should be remedied and solecisms removed is just what we should expect of a revising hand. Further, our first evangelist repeatedly connects two narratives closely in time where Mark's language is vague. And surely it is more likely that the juxtaposition of two narratives in a document should have been taken to imply immediate sequence in time, than that a definite indication of time should have been obliterated. Once more it is improbable that a devout Christian would omit words expressive of reverence for and faith in Jesus which he found in his source, as Mark must have done if he had St Matthew before him<sup>2</sup>. Instances of these kinds clearly have weight in proving that the second Gospel was used in the composition of the first and third, and not either

<sup>1</sup> See p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> See Table of instances on p. 51 ff.

the first or third in that of the second. But when once we are convinced that this is the true relation between them, it will also seem natural to explain many differences of that ambiguous kind to which reference has been made above, as due to the revision of St Mark.

It was, however, as we have seen, maintained to the end by Hilgenfeld, that our Greek Gospel according to St Matthew, was prior to and used by Mark; while Zahn maintains that a Hebrew original of that Gospel was used by him. What then are their arguments?

Both Hilgenfeld<sup>1</sup> and Zahn<sup>2</sup> give lists of instances in which the dependence of Mark is, they think, evident. We are entitled to assume that they have brought forward those which they consider to be the strongest. Some, but by no means the majority, appear to have force<sup>3</sup>. It is to be observed, however, that the admission of a certain number of expressions in which the advantage in regard to priority is on the side of St Matthew does not militate against the acceptance of the proposition stated above. Even those who suppose our St Mark to be practically identical with the work which lay before the first and third evangelists can have no difficulty in assuming that subsequently to the time of their use of it some alterations were made in it by copyists. But we have also left another view of the relations of the three Synoptics open, as an alternative, namely that instead of our St Mark being regarded as the source of the two others, all three should be held to have used a common source, which was edited even in St Mark to some extent, though not to the same extent as in the two others. If so, there may well be cases in which the original document is more accurately reproduced in them than in St Mark.

I have here allowed for certain cases in which St Matthew—and for the matter of that St Luke also—may give us an

<sup>1</sup> *Einleit.* pp. 505—10.

<sup>2</sup> *Einleit.* II. pp. 330—2.

<sup>3</sup> The most significant in Hilgenfeld's list—less than a third of the whole number mentioned by him—appear to me to be those occurring in Mk vi. 3; vi. 8, 9; x. 12; x. 24 (Western and Syriac); x. 30; xiv. 30, 72; xiv. 58. Mk vii. 1—23 may be added from Zahn's list. Some of them will come before us in the course of our inquiries.

earlier form of words than St Mark. But among these I do not include those brief accounts of discourses in St Mark<sup>1</sup>, in the form of which Zahn sees clear signs that they were extracted from St Matthew. These passages of St Mark are interesting and important in connexion with the inquiry into the sources and composition of the Gospels. Whether their features do, or do not, point to their being extracts from a fuller written record I will not at this point consider; suffice it to say that for several reasons the record from which he made the extracts cannot have been St Matthew<sup>2</sup>.

I will now examine briefly the chief reasons of a broader kind which Zahn gives for his view. (1) He maintains that the Grotian theory is the only one which corresponds with the tradition in regard to the composition of the Gospels, because according to tradition Matthew composed his Gospel in Hebrew at an earlier date than Mark composed his, so that Mark might have used the Hebrew Matthew, but not Matthew Mark, while Mark's differences may be put down to his reminiscences of Peter's teaching<sup>3</sup>. In reality, however, this theory sets aside the tradition about Mark in favour of a less precise or trustworthy one in regard to Matthew. The account of the Elder related by Papias represents Mark as simply writing down what he remembered of Peter's teaching. And even if it be allowed that this statement need not exclude the possibility of his having also made use of other material written or oral, it certainly does not suggest that

<sup>1</sup> Mk i. 7, 8; vi. 8—11; xii. 38—40.

<sup>2</sup> Zahn lays special stress on the combination of the indirect with the direct form of speech in certain passages of St Mark and a separate introduction (three times *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*, once *καὶ ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων*) for the latter, when (according to Zahn) he is about to make an exact extract from his authority. See *Einleit.* II. pp. 327, 330, 332. In Mk i. 4, 7, 8 and vi. 8—11, we have also briefer accounts than in Matthew's parallels. But (as we have already observed, p. 23 f.) when we compare Luke's Gospel we see that our first evangelist in the latter case has in reality combined a short account such as Mark's with other matter which Luke has kept separate. By analogy it is probable that in i. 4, 7, 8 Mark is not extracting (see further, p. 109 ff.). Again, when Mark uses *ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* at ii. 27, it is not to introduce an extract from St Matthew, for the saying he proceeds to give is not in St Matthew, while at vii. 9, where the formula is again used, he is not turning from indirect to direct, and in the whole context he is somewhat fuller than St Matthew.

<sup>3</sup> *Einleit.* II. pp. 322 f. and 326.

he mainly derived his Gospel by translation from Matthew's Hebrew work. Nor is it probable that if he was a hearer of Peter the store of his recollections would have supplied hardly anything substantial to be added to what he found in Matthew—little in fact beyond a certain number of vivid touches in narratives already related there. The most striking differences between St. Matthew and St. Mark are differences in the placing of certain incidents, and Zahn considers that Mark departed from Matthew in these respects under the influence of his reminiscences of Peter's teaching<sup>1</sup>. But Mark's arrangement is just the one feature in his Gospel, which, according to tradition, is *not* to be attributed to Peter. How far we are bound to follow this tradition about the composition of Mark in regard to this question of the order of narratives, and in other respects, may be matter of opinion; but at least it is entitled to more weight than the far vaguer words about Matthew proceeding from the same source<sup>2</sup>, or the later statements of Irenaeus and Eusebius.

(2) Zahn holds that the Gospel according to St. Matthew was expressly written, even to its minute details of contents and form, for Jews and Jewish Christians of Palestine, and that it could not, therefore, have been dependent upon a Gospel written for Christians outside of Palestine<sup>3</sup>. To this it is sufficient to reply that, although this Gospel was undoubtedly addressed to Jews and Jewish Christians, it does not appear that those resident in Palestine were before the writer's mind, rather than those of the Dispersion<sup>4</sup>.

(3) Zahn urges that "the Matthew-Gospel presents itself as a work of large design and a single casting (von grossem Entwurf und aus einem Guss); the Mark-Gospel as a piece of mosaic carefully put together out of many pieces<sup>5</sup>." With regard to the latter part of this assertion little more can be said at this place than that this is as far as possible from being the impression which the Gospel according to St. Mark gives to the majority of readers. We get a different view

<sup>1</sup> *Einleit.* II. p. 325.

<sup>2</sup> See vol. I. pp. 52—7 of the present work.

<sup>3</sup> *Einleit.* II. p. 324 (4).

<sup>4</sup> See below, the chapter on the Gospel according to St. Matthew, pp. 330, 359—363, 365 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Einleit.* II. p. 325 f.

from Hilgenfeld, who attributes the alterations which, as he supposes, Mark made in Matthew to a desire to set forth the Gospel history in a way to bring out more forcibly the unfolding drama of Christ's work and the reception that He met with<sup>1</sup>. I believe, however, that Zahn is right in finding in St Matthew a more manifest unity of design, such as the writer must himself have been conscious of<sup>2</sup>. And I would ask, Would not a writer who had a clearly conceived plan for his whole work be more likely to feel impelled to alter the arrangement of the matter in a document lying before him, than one who wrote artlessly? Zahn, however, implies that the unity in Matthew shews that the work is of "a single casting," the product of a mind working freely. But when we analyse that impression of clear purpose which we get in reading this Gospel, we perceive that it is produced by a limited number of comments which he has made, especially in the form of citations from the Old Testament, and some incidents and sayings peculiar to himself which he has included, as well as the manner in which he has arranged some portions of his matter. All this he could have done, with the object of giving prominence to certain aspects of the history, even while he in the main reproduced a record, or records, which had preceded his own.

(4) Zahn admits that there are indications of the use and revision of St Mark in our Greek St Matthew. But he has not been at the pains, as one who recognised this feature should have been, to measure the extent of these indications<sup>3</sup>. Further, he has attributed a very complex piece of labour to the translator of Matthew's work into Greek, and one which he is unlikely to have performed. For while following Mark's rendering more or less closely, and often very closely indeed, wherever it existed, he has nevertheless, according to Zahn, restored the order of the original, and translated from it all that large and important part which was lacking in St Mark. Surely one who must accordingly have regarded himself strictly as engaged in making a translation, and who

<sup>1</sup> *Einleit.* p. 513 f.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 359 ff.

<sup>3</sup> He refers to them *Einleit.* II. pp. 327 and 332 (A. 3).

was fully competent for that task, would have found it more troublesome than helpful to make large use of a work which only reproduced portions of his author and even these not in regular order, or with exactness, or in such polished language as he could write himself.

Before finally dismissing the hypothesis that Mark depended upon Matthew, it remains to be said that like Griesbach's theory, even if it supplied as satisfactory an explanation of the phenomena immediately in question as the hypothesis of Mark's priority does, it would be at a disadvantage when compared therewith in that it does not carry us so far on the road to a reasonable solution of the Synoptic problem generally. For even though the critics whose views we have now been considering do not preclude themselves from supposing that Luke used Mark's Gospel, it is certainly more likely that if this work was only a fragmentary translation of an Apostolic Gospel, a fact which Luke could hardly have failed to know, he would have sought for someone to interpret the original to him if he was himself unable to read it. Further, there is the matter to be accounted for which is not in St Mark, but which is common to St Luke and St Matthew. The critics who suppose St Matthew to be prior to St Mark are unable to explain satisfactorily how our third evangelist obtained this matter<sup>1</sup>. A far more satisfactory view than they can offer us of its presence in both St Matthew and St Luke will come before us presently.

I have been occupied thus far in this section with the defence of the proposition at the head of it. Before leaving

<sup>1</sup> Neither Hilgenfeld nor Zahn faces the facts in regard to the matter common to Luke and Matthew. Hilgenfeld declares that Luke has "certainly used at least the Matthew-Gospel, and indeed not merely in its canonical but also in its pre-canonical form" (*Einleit.* p. 570; cp. also p. 609 top). But he does not attempt to justify this assertion. Zahn on the other hand supposes that Luke had obtained through oral tradition the discourse-matter which he has in common with Matthew (*Einleit.* II. p. 406). This is indeed a lame conclusion for one who has rejected oral tradition in another case, where it is not more inapplicable. Surely it would have been nothing short of a miracle that a form of words should have been arrived at by direct translation from a Hebrew book, so similar to that which, on this hypothesis, had been independently handed down by oral tradition.

it, I must touch on some questions connected with the relations of our first and third Gospels to the Marcan record which it does not determine.

A considerable number of sections in our St Mark have not been reproduced at all in St Luke, and a few (for the most part, as I have said, different ones) are wanting in St Matthew. Nevertheless it has been commonly, though not universally, supposed, that the same Marcan document lay before both evangelists and that when matter is found in St Mark and also either in St Matthew or St Luke, but not in the other of them, its absence from that other is due solely to the action of the evangelist, who for some reason decided to omit it. But it has sometimes been asked whether the Marcan document which Luke knew was not a less extended one and nearer to the original than that used in our first Gospel, though the latter corresponded more closely with our present St Mark. If this should appear to be the case, it will evidently be a fact of great importance in connexion with the history of the Gospel according to St Mark. The idea is not suggested by our proposition above, but there has been no intention of excluding it<sup>1</sup>.

Again, it has been and is most commonly held that our first and third evangelists obtained from their Marcan document only such matter as we still have in our St Mark, and that all other matter common to them was taken from another source. But some, and among them H. J. Holtzmann, have maintained that certain pieces even of this other matter common to the first and third Gospels, but not in our St Mark, were contained in the original Marcan document and derived thence by our first and third evangelists; in other words that Ur-Marcus was of larger, not of less, compass than our St Mark. I doubt, however, whether even Holtzmann adheres any longer firmly to this view; and I do not know of any other critic who has in recent times advocated it. I do not think it will be necessary for me to discuss it at length<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> For the discussion of it, see below, p. 152 ff.

<sup>2</sup> It had been held by some critics several years before Holtzmann; Weisse in *Die Evangelienfrage* (1856), p. 88 f., so far modified the theory of the sources of



Finally, there is that class of instances in which the first and third Synoptics agree in differing from St Mark, for the most part only as to a word or two, or a short phrase, in passages which are on the whole parallel with that Gospel. We must try to account for these satisfactorily. It seems natural to suppose that in the case of some of them at least the original form of the Marcan document has been better preserved by our first and third evangelists than in our St Mark, though Holtzmann who at one time explained the phenomena in question chiefly in this way, has now adopted another theory<sup>1</sup>.

V. We now pass to the final thesis of this chapter.

*The matter common only to our first and third evangelists, and consisting mainly of Discourses and Sayings of Jesus, was to a large extent derived by them either from a document used by both, or from two closely allied documents in both of which large portions of that matter had been embodied in the same written form; and it was independently combined by each of them with the Marcan document.*

The view that a written source existed, from which our first and third evangelists for the most part drew those Discourses and Sayings which they give in much greater abundance than Mark, was in its origin closely associated with the interpretation of the statement of Papias that "Matthew composed τὰ λόγια in the Hebrew tongue, and each man interpreted them as he was able." In 1832 Schleiermacher had urged that τὰ λόγια here referred specifically to the Teaching of Jesus<sup>2</sup>. Next Lachmann, accepting this view of Matthew's work, and imagining our first and third Gospels to be developments formed by the embodiment of oral tradition with this document, pointed out that the narratives common to these Gospels and to St Mark are in the main arranged in all three in the same order, the Gospels which he had at first put forward (see for it below, p. 45) as to allow for its possibility. For Holtzmann's earlier view see *Die Synoptischen Evangelien* (1863), p. 75 f. (on Lk vi. 20—49), p. 77 f. (on Lk vii. 1—10, Mt. viii. 1, 5—10), p. 92 f. (on Jn vii. 53—viii. 11). For his present position in regard to this question see *Einleit.* p. 350.

<sup>1</sup> It is referred to above, p. 30, and fully discussed, p. 139 ff. As to Holtzmann, see reference at end of last note.

<sup>2</sup> *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1832, p. 735 ff.

as though it were something prescribed to them, but he argued that so far as they differ, the order in St Mark is the original one<sup>1</sup>. Then C. H. Weisse<sup>2</sup>, using the points gained by these two writers, but not satisfied with Lachmann's idea of the combination of a document with an oral tradition, held that it was our second Gospel itself with which Matthew's collection of Discourses had been in the Canonical Matthew and in St Luke independently combined. Moreover he maintained that the writing by Mark, referred to by Papias, was our Gospel according to St Mark, which Schleiermacher had denied.

The conception of two principal documentary sources from which the Gospel history, as set forth in the Synoptics, was mainly derived, did not at once find favour. In 1856 Weisse wrote that still no one had joined him in this conclusion, which, as he contended, naturally followed from the positions previously established<sup>3</sup>. A few years later, however, the truth of this theory, at least as regards its general outlines, was very ably maintained by H. J. Holtzmann in his thorough work, *Die Synoptischen Evangelien* (1863), and by C. Weizsäcker, in his suggestive *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte* (1864), and it has increasingly commended itself and is now very widely accepted. It explains admirably the broad features in the relationship of the first and third Gospels to one another and to St Mark. It also explains to a large extent the phenomenon of "doublets," that is to say the instances in the first and third Gospels of the repetition of Sayings where one member of the pair commonly has a parallel, both as regards its form and position, in St Mark, while the other member, although the same in substance, differs somewhat in form and is placed in quite a different context, often in the midst of matter common to the first and third Gospels but not found in St Mark<sup>4</sup>. From the latter, on the other hand, such re-

<sup>1</sup> *De Ordine narrationum*, etc. See especially pp. 577, 582.

<sup>2</sup> See his *Evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*, 1838, i. p. 29 ff., and *Die Evangelienfrage*, 1856, p. 78 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Evangelienfrage*, p. 85.

<sup>4</sup> Weisse appears to have been the first to point out the significance of "doublets" and to give the name (*Evangelienfrage*, p. 146).

petitions are almost wholly absent, the reason being, as it is natural to assume, that it is not composite, at least in the sense that the two others are<sup>1</sup>. There are also cases in which our first evangelist appears to have interwoven matter from a non-Marcian source with similar matter in his Marcian source, while Luke has given only the former. These have not, perhaps, commonly been reckoned as doublets; but the name may fairly be extended to them, and it is convenient that this should be done. Although we have no repetition here of substantially the same matter in different contexts of the same Gospel, there is evidence of the existence of the same matter in two different sources, both of which have been used in one of our Gospels<sup>2</sup>.

It is a very significant fact that in the great majority of instances of "doublets," one source appears to have been the Marcian document, and the other also a source *common* to St Matthew and St Luke. But there are a few cases in which one at least of the sources cannot be identified.

It may well, however, be doubted whether the "two-document hypothesis" in the simple form in which it was at first, and has been frequently since, put forward, can adequately account for all the facts which it has been held to explain. There are at all events several points which need to be cleared up. In the statement which I have made above, I have allowed for alternative views. Our choice between them must depend upon subsequent inquiry.

Portions of the non-Marcian matter common to the first and third Gospels are so closely alike in them that the two evangelists must have possessed these portions at least in the same written form. The arrangement, however, even of these closely similar portions is very different, not only relatively to the Synoptic outline (which is accounted for by the independent use of a second document), but also considered by themselves. The same pieces are differently united to other pieces; the same Sayings occur in wholly different contexts. Furthermore the degree of verbal similarity varies greatly in different parts. It is necessary to ask whether

<sup>1</sup> See the Table on p. 54.

<sup>2</sup> See *ib.* pp. 57, 58, nos. 4, 5.

these differences are to be traced solely to the diverse revision and adaptation of the same document by the two evangelists; or whether it is not more probable that two somewhat widely different editions of the same document came to their hands.

The question whether there were two forms of the document used respectively in the first and third Gospels cannot be separated from that of the probable relation of such forms to the common original. It has generally been supposed that an Aramaic (or Hebrew) document existed which contained the non-Marcian matter common to St Matthew and St Luke. Dalman has, however, recently suggested that even the ultimate source from which this matter was derived might have been a Greek composition<sup>1</sup>. This point must, therefore, be considered; but should we come to the conclusion that this Semitic source did exist, there will still be need to inquire how its contents came to be known in Greek-speaking churches. Was there a single translation of it, or were there, as Resch supposes, several regular translations of it; or is it not possible that fragmentary, and often more or less paraphrastic renderings from it had been made at different times, and that out of these more than one Greek representative of it had been built up?

Again, we shall naturally ask whether the common original is more truly represented in St Matthew or St Luke, alike if for that original we can only go back to a Greek document, or can to any degree trace in them different versions of an Aramaic source. Some have given the preference to St Matthew, some to St Luke; but on examining different passages in detail we may find that now one, now the other, probably has the advantage, in such a way that it would be difficult and hardly worth while to decide, to which on the whole the palm should be assigned.

The idea of a source other than St Mark (or than a document like St Mark) which our first and third evangelists might have used, was suggested (as we have seen) in the first instance by the fragment of Papias regarding a compilation

<sup>1</sup> *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 56 f. (Eng. trans. p. 71.)

## 48 Use of "the Logia" as a title for a document

by the Apostle Matthew of "the Logia," rightly interpreted to mean more particularly the Sayings and Discourses of Jesus<sup>1</sup>. And this is the character of the matter primarily in question here. Accordingly this second source has frequently been called "the Logia." It must be said, however, that this name seems to make the theory of the sources of the Gospels depend too much on the evidence of Papias' fragment, from the directness with which it appears to refer to that fragment. It should, also, be observed that Papias himself does not employ it as the *title* of the writing which he is describing, as the modern use of the expression may be supposed to suggest. To call the source we are considering simply "the Logian document" cannot, I think, be open to the same objection, and I shall myself so designate it after a certain point in my argument has been reached. This will imply no more than that this source was in the main a collection of "Logia" in the sense in which, as we have

<sup>1</sup> It is true that, as Dr Salmon sarcastically observes, there is "no authority earlier than the nineteenth century" for this use of the word (*Human Element*, p. 29). But it is a perfectly natural and suitable one and entirely in accord with the prominence which the Words of the Lord Jesus had in the thought of Christians at the time in question. We have only to turn to the fragment of Papias on Mark's writing for an illustration. Note there especially the words *οὐχ ὡς περ συνταξῶ τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων*. Where could Christians look for oracular utterances if these were not such? Moreover, it is impossible that a single Apostolic writing, on the ground of its inspiration, could at this time, or at any time, have been called "the Oracles" (see vol. I. p. 53 f. of the present work). Prof. Burkitt's recent suggestion (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 127) that the *Logia* of Matthew of which Papias writes, were a collection of "Messianic proof-texts," like the *testimonia* of Cyprian, does not commend itself to me as any more probable. For (1) The natural name for such a work as he supposes would have been *μαρτυρίαι*, as his own illustration reminds us, or *ἐκλογαί*, the name by which Melito, the younger contemporary of Papias, describes the collection of such passages which he made (ap. Eus. *H.E.* iv. xxvi. § 13); (2) The use of *τὰ λόγια* as the description of a particular set of extracts from the Old Testament, when the whole Old Testament was commonly so called, would be too confusing to be thought of. The use of the definite article would also have implied completeness, whereas the inclination of the time was rather to exercise ingenuity in finding prophecies and types in all parts of the Scriptures; (3) The proposed meaning is inconsistent with the rest of the statement in which it occurs. For the words "everyone interpreted them as he was able," plainly from the connexion in which they stand, refer to translation from Hebrew (or Aramaic) into Greek. Now there would be no need for this in the case of passages from the Old Testament, since the LXX. was in common use.

learnt from the words of Papias, the term was probably used among Christian believers of the end of the first and the beginning of the second century. It would not be fair, however, to adopt even this name prior to discussion. For there are diverse views on the subject of the contents and character of our document. B. Weiss, for instance, holds that it comprised a considerable number of narratives, and his whole theory of the relations of our three Synoptics is to a large extent bound up with this conception of it<sup>1</sup>. Recently, too, Professor Burkitt has expressed his opinion that it was "a real 'Gospel' and that it contained a story of the Passion<sup>2</sup>." For the present, therefore, in accordance with the fashion which has recently come in, I will call it "Q."

It remains only to indicate the important place which, as I have said, "Q" occupies in Weiss' solution of the Synoptic problem. He maintains that Mark drew not only Sayings and pieces of discourse, but also a good many narratives from the same primitive document which lay before the other two Synoptics. He calls it "the oldest source." According to this critic, Mark combined what he took therefrom with his reminiscences of Peter's preaching. The two others used both our Mark and "the oldest source," the latter both in its original form and parts of it also in a derived form, as it was reproduced in Mark. In this way he accounts for many of the agreements of St Matthew and St Luke against St Mark in Marcan contexts, contending that in these instances all three were dependent upon the source in question, while the two first-named represent it more accurately<sup>3</sup>. I shall shew that this complicated theory is unnecessary and untenable.

<sup>1</sup> See below.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal of Theological Studies* for April, 1907, p. 457. On it see below, p. 105 f.

<sup>3</sup> He first put forward this theory in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* for 1864, and 1865. He applies it repeatedly in *Das Marcusevangelium und seine Synoptischen Parallelen*, 1872. He maintains it in the Introduction to the Com. on St Mark in the 8th ed. of Meyer's N.T., 1892, in his *Manual of Introduction to the N.T.*, Eng. trans. II. p. 246 ff., and in *Die Geschichtlichkeit d. Markusevang.* 1905. A list, which is nearly, though not quite, complete of the passages in which, according to Weiss, Mark is dependent upon the "oldest source" is given by A. Resch, who is a follower of Weiss, in his *Aussercanonische Paralleltex-te*, Heft 2. p. 13.

The conclusions which have been stated in this chapter as the surest so far attained in regard to the solution of the Synoptic problem, all have to do, it will be observed, with that problem strictly understood, i.e., with the phenomena of relationship between our three first Gospels. And they go far to account for those phenomena. Some points, however, in connexion with them have still to be cleared up, and for this it is requisite that we should have a more precise idea of the two chief sources of the common matter in the Gospels than we have in the preceding pages felt able to give. But these sources themselves, so far as we can define them, must evidently be objects of the greatest interest and importance. In some respects they are of greater importance even than our present Gospels. We must endeavour to learn all we can about their origin and composition.

Dr Schmiedel, in his able article on the Gospels in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* has pointed to the investigation of "sources of sources" as the task to which critical students of the Synoptic Gospels have now to address themselves<sup>1</sup>. It will be our duty to consider whether, or how far, any such earlier sources of our two principal sources are discoverable. But it is clearly also conceivable that the two sources in question may not have had any such complex literary history as the expression "sources of sources" seems to suggest. They may have arisen—I believe it will be found that in all probability they did, in the main, arise—from the writing down of oral tradition; or that, so far as earlier written records were used in them, these also were fragments of tradition committed to writing. If so, the identification of the source from which various pieces come is likely to be in many cases impossible. We can then ask only whether the representations of facts in different parts are consistent with one another, and whether the matter is, or is not, homogeneous in doctrinal character.

Unquestionably, however, there is a history lying behind the appearance of our sources, and it is necessary that we should endeavour to trace it in order that we may understand how they were produced. Light will, also, thus be

<sup>1</sup> Vol. II. col. 1868.

thrown, I believe, on the form of the sources themselves. These various questions with regard to our two principal Synoptic sources will occupy us in the next two chapters. In the study of the relations of our Gospels it is the Marcan document which first emerges to view; but, at the present stage of our inquiry it will be best, for reasons which will appear as we proceed, to fix our attention first upon the source in which the Teaching of Jesus was chiefly preserved.

### ADDITIONAL NOTE I. TO CHAPTER I.

#### INDICATIONS THAT OUR FIRST AND THIRD EVANGELISTS HAVE REVISED ST MARK, OR A SOURCE CLOSELY RESEMBLING ST MARK.

This list is only illustrative; other examples may be noticed by the reader in almost any section of St Matthew or St Luke parallel to St Mark. I have given special prominence to the signs of revision by our first evangelist, as revision by Luke will hardly be disputed.

In the present table I have indicated only a few cases (and those in brackets) in which the first and third Synoptics differ from Mark *in the same way*; I believe that such as I have here given and a fair number of others are due to accidental agreement in the revision of St Mark. (On this subject see below, p. 139 ff.)

(a) Asyndeta are usually mended; they are contrary to the genius of the Greek language and even in St Mark are rare. Mk x. 28, 29: Mt. xix. 27, 28: Lk xviii. 28, 29. (In the former case Mt. introduces *τότε*, Lk *δέ*; in the latter both have *δέ*.) Mk xii. 14 *ὅ*: Mt. xxii. 17 (Mt. introduces a clause with *οὐν*). Mk xii. 23: Mt. xxii. 28: Lk xx. 33 (both Mt. and Lk introduce *οὐν*). Mk xii. 24: Mt. xxii. 29: Lk xx. 34 (Mt. introduces *ἀποκριθεὶς δέ*, Lk *καί*).

(b) The number of repetitions of *καί* in connecting sentences and clauses is reduced, usually by the use of a participle, but sometimes also in other ways.

Mk vi. 1, 2: Mt. xiii. 53, 54. Mk vi. 7: Mt. x. 1: Lk ix. 1. Mk vi. 33: Lk ix. 11. Mk xi. 27, 28: Mt. xxi. 23.

(c) A subject is supplied where Mark is indefinite. Mk i. 32: Lk iv. 40. Mk ii. 3: Lk v. 18. Mk ii. 18: Mt. ix. 14: Lk v. 33. (In Mk it is not clear who ask Jesus the question; Mt. makes it the disciples of John, Lk "the Pharisees and their scribes" who have been mentioned



at v. 30.) Mk iii. 2 : Mt. xii. 10 : Lk vi. 7. (The subject is definite in Matthew because he has introduced *αὐτῶν* in the preceding verse.) Mk v. 35 : Lk viii. 49 (for Mk's "they come," Lk has *ἔρχεται τις*). Mk viii. 14 : Mt. xvi. 5.

(d) At Mk x. 33, 34 there is a change of subject from the chief priests to the Gentiles, in two successive clauses of the same sentence linked by *καί*. At Mt. xx. 19 this is remedied by turning *καί ἐμπαίξουσιν* into *εἰς τὸ ἐμπαίξαι*, and at Lk xviii. 32 by turning the verbs into the passive with Jesus as subject.

(e) Various colloquialisms or awkward constructions rectified. Mk vii. 11, 12 : Mt. xv. 5. (For Mark's incomplete structure we have a complete one in Matthew.) Mk viii. 28 : Mt. xvi. 14 : Lk ix. 19. Mk viii. 36 : Mt. xvi. 26 : Lk ix. 25. Mk xiv. 11 : Mt. xxvi. 16 : Lk xxii. 6. Mk x. 26 : Mt. xix. 25 (*τίς ἄρα* for *καὶ τίς*). Mk xiv. 2 : Mt. xxvi. 5 (*μήποτε* followed by future is replaced by *ἵνα μή* with conjunctive). *ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ* Mk i. 25, 26, etc. is changed in Lk iv. 35 *a* and *b* into *ἐξέρχεσθαι ἀπό*.

(f) Statements are made shorter and more compact, often by the omission of some unnecessary repetition.

Mk i. 29—31 : Mt. viii. 14, 15 : Lk iv. 38, 39. (Notice especially in Mk *ἐξεληθόντες ἦθον* in v. 29 and in v. 31 *προσεληθόν*.) Mk i. 32—34 : Mt. viii. 16 : Lk iv. 40, 41. (Note Mk's double mention of the two kinds of sufferers in v. 32 and 34 and the manner in which this is avoided in Mt. and Lk, especially the former.) Mk viii. 32, 33 : Mt. xvi. 22, 23. (Mark after using *ἐπιτιμᾶν* of Peter's words to Jesus, uses it again in the next verse of the words of Jesus to Peter.)

Mk x. 46 : Mt. xx. 29. Mk xi. 4—6 : Mt. xxi. 6. I omit those cases in which Matthew or Luke has given a whole narrative in a more meagre form than Mark's, as a different view may be taken of these. (See in regard to such cases in the former p. 324 ff.)

(g) Rearrangement of points in a narrative with a view to clearer, or more logical description.

(Instances of this class occur only in St Luke.)

Mk ii. 2 ff. : Lk v. 17 ff. (Mark first mentions scribes at v. 6, Luke refers to their presence at the outset in describing the scene.)

Mk v. 22, 23, 35—43 : Lk viii. 41, 42, 49—56. (The age of Jairus' daughter mentioned by Mark at the end is given by Luke at the beginning.)

Mk vi. 37 ff. : Lk ix. 13 ff. (The number stated by Mark at the end is mentioned by Lk at v. 14 in order to explain the perplexity of the disciples.)

Mk xv. 22 ff. : Lk xxiii. 32 ff. (The two malefactors are noticed in Luke in the procession to Golgotha, and their crucifixion is mentioned along with that of Jesus.)

(k) Rearrangement of a piece of discourse. (Instances of this class occur only in St Matthew.)

Mk vii. 6—12 : Mt. xv. 3—9.

Mk x. 3—9 : Mt. xix. 4—8.

(i) Substitutes are employed for unusual words or words used inappropriately.

Mk ii. 4 : Mt. ix. 2 : Lk v. 18. (Matthew and Luke use κλίνη for κράβατος. Matthew also uses κλίνη in the context and Luke other substitutes. In Acts v. 15 and ix. 33, Luke uses κράβατος, distinguishing it, in the former of these places, from a κλινάριον. For some reason he thought it inappropriate in the case of the paralytic.)

Mk xv. 1 : Mt. xxvii. 2. (Matthew uses ἀπήγαγον in place of ἀπήνεγκαν in regard to Jesus.) Cp. Mk xi. 7 : Mt. xxi. 7 : Lk xix. 35. ἄγειν in Mt. and Lk, for φέρειν, of leading the colt.

Mk xii. 37 : Mt. xxii. 45 : Lk xx. 44. (Matthew and Luke both use καλεῖν instead of λέγειν.)

Mk xv. 4 : Mt. xxvii. 13 (οὐκ ἀκούεις used in St Matthew in place of the colloquial ἴδε. Cp. omission of ἴδε Mt. xxvii. 47 in parallel to Mk xv. 35).

(j) In St Matthew there is frequently a definite and close mark of connexion in time between successive narratives, where in St Mark it is vague. Mk i. 14 : Mt. iv. 12. Mk ii. 1 : Mt. ix. 1. Mk ii. 13 : Mt. ix. 9. Mk iii. 1 : Mt. xii. 9. Mk iv. 1 : Mt. xiii. 1. Mk vi. 30 : Mt. xiv. 13. Mk viii. 1 : Mt. xv. 32.

(k) Expressions of reverence and faith occurring in St Matthew but absent from St Mark, though a devout Christian would not have been likely to have omitted them if they were found in a document lying before him.

Mk vi. 51 : Mt. xiv. 33. Mk viii. 29 : Mt. xvi. 16. The use of κύριε is also decidedly less frequent in St Mark.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE II. TO CHAPTER I.

## DOUBLETS

(i.e. repetitions which point to the use of more than one source).

## 1. Doublets in St Mark.

- i. *The greatest in the Kingdom of God is he who is willing to serve.*

Mk ix. 35 = Mt. xxiii. 11.

Mk x. 41—45 = Mt. xx. 24—28 = Lk xxii. 24—27.

[Note that the setting of the precept at Matthew xxiii. 11 is unlike that in Mark ix. 35; also that the teaching contained in Mark x. 41—45 and in the parallel in Matthew is quite differently placed in Luke, though the substance and in large measure the form and language are the same.]

- ii. *The two accounts of feeding the multitude:*

Mk vi. 34 ff.; viii. 2 ff.

2. Cases where St Matthew and St Luke have each of them a parallel with the other, occurring in the midst of non-Markan matter, and also either both of them, or one of them, a parallel with St Mark.

- i. *Warnings to disciples in respect to the hostility they would meet with.*

Mt. x. 19, 20 = Lk xii. 11, 12.

Mt. xxiv. 9—14 = Mk xiii. 9—13 = Lk xxi. 12—19.

[The passage in the *Charge to the Twelve* in Mt. x. corresponds closely to the passage in the eschatological discourse in Mk xiii., whereas in the piece corresponding to this in Matthew's eschatological discourse, though the sense is the same, there is a good deal of difference of form.]

We further note that the same form evidently underlies Mt. x. 19, 20, and Lk xii. 11, 12; and though only these two verses are parallel in this piece there are other parallels in the immediate context, including some more cases of doublets; see Nos. xi. and xii. below.]

- ii. *Taking up the cross.*

Mt. x. 38 = Lk xiv. 27.

Mt. xvi. 24 = Mk viii. 34 = Lk ix. 23.

[There is sufficient similarity between the form of the saying in St Matthew and in St Luke in their non-Markan contexts, and difference

from St Mark, to suggest some connexion between them other than through St Mark. Luke has the present infinitive *ἐρχεσθαι* in his Marcan parallel and the present indicative *ἐρχεται* in the other. Note that Mt. x. 37 and Lk xiv. 26 are also parallel.]

iii. *How the soul may be saved or lost.*

Mt. x. 39=Lk xvii. 33.

Mt. xvi. 25=Mk viii. 35=Lk ix. 24.

[Substantially the same relation between the Marcan and non-Marcan passages as in the last case.]

iv. *Whosoever hath, etc.*

Mt. xiii. 12=Mk iv. 25=Lk viii. 18 b.

Mt. xxv. 29=Lk xix. 26.

[Our first evangelist, in his non-Marcan context, places the saying at the end of the parable of the Talents, Luke at the end of the similar parable of the Minae. The first and third evangelists also here agree in a difference of form from St Mark, and from their own parallels to St Mark. The former inserts *καὶ περισσευθήσεται* both times of quoting the saying.]

v. See I. i. above.

vi. *Divorce.*

Mt. v. 32=Lk xvi. 18.

Mt. xix. 9=Mk x. 11, (12).

[There are points in which the form of the saying is the same each time of its occurrence in St Matthew ; but in other respects there is agreement at the former place with St Luke and at the latter with St Mark.]

vii. *The power of faith.*

Mt. vii. 7=Lk xi. 9.

Mt. xvii. 20=Lk xvii. 6.

Mt. xxi. 21, 22=Mk xi. 23, 24.

[Two sayings on the power of prayer and of faith (named absolutely), which are widely separated in two passages of St Matthew and of St Luke, occur together in St Mark, and in the parallel to the latter at Mt. xxi. 21, 22.]

viii. *Demand for a sign, and reply.*

Mt. xii. 38, 39=Lk xi. 16, 29.

Mt. xvi. 1, 2, 4=Mk viii. 11, 12.

[The words of Christ's reply in the two places in St Matthew are almost identical and most like the Lucan parallel. It should be noted

that much of the matter which intervenes between the demand for a sign in Lk xi. 14 and the reply in v. 29 is given shortly before the demand at Mt. xii. 38. Cp. further 3. iii. below.]

ix. *The first last, etc.*

Mt. xix. 30 = Mk x. 31.

Mt. xx. 16 = Lk xiii. 30.

[The second passage in St Matthew has the same conciseness as the former, but there is an inversion ("the last first and the first last," instead of "the first last and the last first") which so far makes it resemble the saying in St Luke.]

x. *The purpose of a lamp.*

Lk viii. 16 = Mk iv. 21.

Lk xi. 33 = Mt. v. 15.

[Luke has peculiarities which he introduces each time. In the place where the context is parallel to Mark, he has *ὑποκάτω κλίνης* like Mark's *ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην*. But his *οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἄψας* and *ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν* are equivalent in meaning to Matthew's *οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον* and *λάμπει πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ*.]

xi. *That which is hidden shall be made manifest.*

Lk viii. 17 = Mk iv. 22.

Lk xiii. 2 = Mt. x. 26.

[The form of the saying at the two places in St Luke is quite distinct, and the one corresponds with St Mark, the other with St Matthew. Even in the earlier place, however, in St Luke there is one expression—*ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῆ*—which agrees not with St Mark but with St Matthew.]

xii. *Those who fear to confess Christ before men shall not be acknowledged hereafter by Him.*

Lk ix. 26 = Mk viii. 38.

Lk xii. 9 = Mt. x. 33.

[There is again a clear distinction, even more so indeed than usual, between the Marcan and the non-Marcan form. Moreover in the present instance there is parallelism in the context in the latter case as well as in the former.]

xiii. *Acknowledgment of followers of Christ is acknowledgment of Christ.*

Lk ix. 48 (mid.) = Mk ix. 37 b.

Lk x. 16 = Mt. x. 40.

3. Similar matter occurring in two contexts in St Luke, one of them parallel with St Mark has been combined in St Matthew in a single passage.

i. *Charges to disciples in regard to their missionary work.*

Lk ix. 2—5 = Mk vi. 8—11 }  
 Lk x. 3—12 } = Mt. x. 5—16.

[In the same context as the latter passage from St Luke there are other parallels with St Matthew. Cp. Lk x. 2 with Mt. ix. 36—38 and Lk x. 12—15 with Mt. xi. 21—24. On Lk x. 12 see p. 88.]

ii. *Warnings against, and denunciations of, Scribes and Pharisees.*

Lk xi. 39—52 }  
 Lk xiv. 7, 8, 11 } = Mt. xxiii. 1, 6, 7a, 12, 13, 23—36.  
 Lk xx. 45—47 = Mk xii. 38—40 }

[Matter found in three similar passages in St Luke appears in the verses of St Matthew which I have given. On the parallelism in the case of Lk xiv. 7, 8, 11 see below, No. 6.]

iii. *The suddenness of Christ's appearing.*

Lk xvii. 20—37 }  
 Lk xxi. 20—23 : Mk xiii. 14—23 } = Mt. xxiv. 15—41.

[The second passage in St Luke overlaps the first only in one verse ; Lk xxi. 21 = Lk xvii. 31. But in order that the significance of the repetition should be duly estimated the whole contexts in the three Gospels should be compared. It should be noted also that Lk xvii. 31 agrees more closely with Mk *vv.* 15, 16 than Lk xxi. 21 does, and that there is a parallel to Mk xiii. 21 at Lk xvii. 23 not found in Lk xxi.]

4. The following cases of the combination in St Matthew of matter occurring in St Mark, and not in the same but only in a different context in St Luke, should be compared with those under the last head<sup>1</sup>.

i. *The reply of Jesus to the charge of collusion with Satan.*

Mk iii. 19b—30 }  
 Lk xi. 14—26, xii. 10 } = Mt. xii. 22—32.

[Our first evangelist follows Mark in regard to the place at which he introduces this attack, while he agrees with Luke as to the miracle, which was the occasion of it, except that he makes the daemonic blind as well as dumb. In *vv.* 25—28 and 30, he agrees almost exactly with Luke, but in *v.* 29 with Mark. *Vv.* 31, 32 are a combination of Mk *v.* 28 with a form of saying found in Lk xii. 10.

Matthew and Luke also both refer to the demand for a sign in the same connexion.]

<sup>1</sup> On the inclusion of these as instances of doublets see above, p. 46.

ii. *Comparison of the Kingdom to a mustard plant.*

Mk iv. 30—32 } = Mt. xiii. 32.  
Lk xiii. 18, 19 }

[The saying in St Luke is not taken from the Marcan document; though its purport is the same, it has distinct features and occurs in a wholly different context amidst matter taken from a non-Marcan source. Our first evangelist combines the features of both, and places it in the same context as Mark.]

iii. *Offences.*

Mk ix. 42 } = Mt. xviii. 6, 7.  
Lk xvii. 1 }

[The same remarks apply as in the last case.]

5. The following case is peculiar. A passage occurring in St Mark (in the "little Apocalypse") is in substance twice repeated in St Matthew; and its form is exceedingly close to that in St Mark when it is placed differently, while it is not so close when it appears in a context parallel to that in which it stands in St Mark.

Mt. x. 17—22 = Mk xiii. 9—13 } = Lk xxi. 12—19.  
Mt. xxiv. 9—14 = Mk xiii. 9—13 }

[On this doublet see pp. 93, 116, 330.]

6. A case in which two members of a doublet in St Matthew appear to be combined in St Luke.

*The tree is known by its fruit.*

Mt. vii. 16—18 } = Lk vi. 43—45.  
Mt. xii. 33—35 }

[Luke's passage occurs in a context corresponding to that in which the former passage stands in St Matthew; and his *v.* 44 corresponds with *v.* 16 in that passage and has nothing like it in the other. But on the other hand in St Luke the various similes are not applied to false prophets, as they are in the Sermon on the Mount in St Matthew, but to words as an indication of character, as they are in the second passage in St Matthew.]

7. Cases where there is apparently a doublet in St Matthew but no parallel to one member of it in either of the other Gospels.

i. *Opening the eyes of two blind men.*

Mt. ix. 27—31.

Mt. xx. 29—34 = Mk x. 46—52 = Lk xviii. 35—43.

[Mk viii. 22—26 should also be compared.]

ii. *The dumb daemonic.*

Mt. ix. 32—34.

Mt. xii. 22—24 = Lk xi. 14, 15.

[There is close agreement between the two passages in St Matthew and that in St Luke. The only noteworthy difference is that in the second, that which is followed by Christ's reply, the daemonic is represented in St Matthew as not only dumb but blind.]

iii. *Get rid of any offending member.*

Mt. v. 29, 30.

Mt. xviii. 8, 9 = Mk ix. 43, 45, 47.

[The phrase *ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ* is used in both passages in St Matthew but not in St Mark.]

8. A doubtful case of a doublet in St Luke.

*Humility the condition for exaltation.*

Lk xiv. 11 = Mt. xxiii. 12.

Lk xviii. 14.

[There may well be some connexion between the former passage in St Luke and that in St Matthew. The saying as to humbling oneself is pointed in both cases by a reference to those who chose chief places. Also the acts of Pharisees seem to be in view in Luke as well as in Matthew. The words were spoken according to St Luke at an entertainment in the house of a Pharisee, where the guests would probably also be Pharisees. (On other passages more or less parallel, see above, No. 3. ii.) The saying recurs in St Luke at the end of the parable of the Publican, where it has a very natural place. It may have belonged there equally, and have been found by the evangelist repeated there in the same source from which he took the other passage; or he may have repeated it himself, on account of its suitability. In either of these cases it would not be, properly speaking, a doublet.]

9. The following should not, I consider, be reckoned as doublets:

i. Mt. iv. 23 = Mk i. 39 = Lk iv. 44.

Mt. ix. 35 = Mk vi. 6 *ὁ* = Lk viii. 1.

ii. Mt. xxiv. 42 } = Mk xiii. 33, 35.  
Mt. xxv. 13 }

iii. Mt. ix. 13 and xii. 7.

iv. Mt. xvi. 19 and xviii. 18.

[In the last two cases there are no parallels to St Matthew in the other Synoptics, and the evangelist has probably repeated the words in question because of their striking character, and their suitability on each occasion.]



v. Mt. xiii. 9=Mk iv. 9=Lk viii. 8.

[The saying—*εἰ τις ἔχει (or ὁ ἔχων) ὄρα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω*—occurs also at Mk iv. 23, Mt. xiii. 43, Mt. xi. 15, Lk xiv. 35; but all the contexts are different, and such a short saying which is, as Sir J. Hawkins says (*Hor. Syn.* p. 87), “an adjunct to other sayings,” might frequently be repeated.]

vi. Mt. ix. 36=Mk vi. 34.

Mt. xiv. 14*a*.

[The evangelist himself has probably repeated the words expressing compassion on the multitude.]

vii. It also appears to me very doubtful whether Mt. x. 15=xi. 24; iii. 7=xxiii. 33; iii. 10=vii. 19, mentioned by Schmiedel as doublets (*Encycl. Bibl.* col. 1867—8), or Lk xxi. 18=Lk xii. 7, ought to be so regarded.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE COMPILATION OF THE UTTERANCES OF JESUS, AND THEIR TRANSMISSION TO THE GREEK- SPEAKING CHURCH.

THE great aim of the preaching of the Apostles in early days after their Master had been taken from them was (as the Book of Acts shews) to prove that although He had been crucified, He was indeed the Christ. In the nature of things this must have been the theme upon which they chiefly dwelt. For the secret of the independent life of the new community of believers and of its power of growth lay in this conviction. Moreover those among whom it was first proclaimed did not require to have an account given them of the character and work of the prophet of Nazareth. It was unnecessary to define for them the subject in the proposition "Jesus is the Christ"; they required only to have the truth of the predicate established to their satisfaction. They had frequently seen and listened to Jesus, or had at least heard much about His deeds. Nevertheless, even disciples who were familiar with the main facts of His Ministry must from the first have experienced the need of His precepts in their daily life. And the Twelve more particularly would have been most untrue to the instruction they had received, if they had not sought to mould their own lives and those of their fellow-believers according to the pattern which He had set before them, by the express use for that purpose of His injunctions. Sayings and little pieces of discourse would be often repeated and engraven upon the memory of the faithful, especially those that inculcated a righteousness the principles of which were shewn to be implied in the Mosaic Law, but which was altogether

higher and nobler than that which the Pharisees founded upon their interpretation and practice of the Law ; or again, those which exhorted to confidence in the Heavenly Father's care in the midst of the anxieties and sorrows which the position of the early believers brought upon them in large measure ; or those which held out the hope of future blessedness. Ere long also, as the need arose, other Sayings would be called to mind, which prescribed rules for the guidance of the missionaries of the Gospel, or for the common life and behaviour to one another of the members of the infant Christian communities. Precepts taught in this way would often be given without any very precise indication, if any at all, of the connexion in which they were first spoken. There would also be a tendency to group together Sayings, or pieces, which bore upon the same or similar points<sup>1</sup>.

The circumstances to which I have here referred would be likely to engender a habit in the early Church of Jerusalem favourable to the formation of a separate collection of the Sayings and Discourses of Jesus, such as, on a consideration of the common matter in our first and third Gospels we see reason to think must have existed<sup>2</sup>. In the structure, also, of this matter, and the topics therein treated we have indications of the process of compilation which has been suggested. We should further observe how immediately suitable certain portions of the Teaching which had been given by Jesus to His disciples and the multitudes in Galilee and Judaea and Peraea would be to converts from among the same people after His death. They, like the disciples made in His lifetime, were allowed to retain their Jewish customs, but needed at the same time to be instructed in the spiritual meaning and purpose of the ancient Law, and they had examples constantly before their eyes of the Pharisees whom Jesus had denounced, and were doubtless frequently brought into conflict with them as He had been. They could not fail to feel strongly the force of many passages, the value of which would not have been at once perceived elsewhere. Added to this, the Teach-

<sup>1</sup> In regard to the formation of the tradition of the Teaching of Jesus I have found Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 369 ff. (Eng. trans. II. ch. 2), specially useful.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 44 ff.

ing could be preserved among them without any labour of translation.

Let us turn now to the work of evangelisation among Greek-speaking people. I have had occasion to allude to the view that the sources of our Gospels may have been wholly Greek from the first<sup>1</sup>. I have now to urge that in this supposition some important considerations are overlooked. The delivery of the Gospel in Greek, even when carried on in close proximity to its delivery in Aramaic, was subject to widely different conditions. In the latter case the persons addressed had for the most part considerable previous knowledge of Jesus, in the former they had little or none. Jews residing in the Greek cities on the coast had had no opportunities of personal contact with Him, except in so far as a few may have sought Him out; and the Hellenists in Jerusalem must, generally speaking, have been strangers there, who visited it at the times of the Jewish feasts, and remained at furthest for a few weeks. When such people were called upon to accept Jesus as the Christ, it must usually have been necessary to give them some general information about the life and character of Jesus. It is probable, therefore, that the formation of a tradition of His Teaching, separately from the account of His life, never took place among the Greek-speaking believers, as we have seen that it probably did quite naturally in the primitive Aramaic-speaking Church. Further, it is most likely for several reasons that the Teaching of Jesus was not at first, or for a good many years, communicated in Greek with at all the same fulness. To render pieces of any length orally from an original which had not itself been committed to writing—and this for some time it cannot have been—must have been a matter of serious difficulty. Few, if any, minds would be capable to any large extent of the three-fold effort of remembering in one language and translating into another, and at the same time fixing in the memory what had just been translated before passing on to the next sentence. Those, moreover, among the evangelists and teachers who knew the Teaching best in its original form were not masters

<sup>1</sup> See p. 15.

of Greek ; while those who had most facility in Greek had had comparatively limited opportunities of gaining a complete knowledge of the Teaching. There must have been a strong disposition in either case to rest content with the repetition of a few striking and significant Sayings of the Master, or with an attempt to give the gist of what He had said on particular subjects. That which was not directly applicable to those addressed would also at first be passed over. The circumstances and requirements even of Jews living in the cities of the Graeco-Roman world, whence the Hellenists who visited Jerusalem came, or where the Gospel was preached, were not in all respects the same as those of the inhabitants of the Jewish districts of Palestine. The special evils of Pharisaism cannot there have bulked so largely. And the questions of the observance of the Law and the relation of Christ to Moses, though they soon became burning ones in mixed Jewish and Gentile communities, presented themselves under a different aspect. It is hardly necessary to add that the missionaries of the Gospel were compelled to meet habits of thought and moral and spiritual needs which were still more markedly different, when the heathen, and converts freshly made from among them, had to be primarily considered.

The most direct evidence which we possess of the spread of the Gospel in the Apostolic age is to be found in the Epistles of the New Testament and the Acts of the Apostles. It will be natural therefore to ask whether any light is thrown by these writings, and in the first place by those of St Paul, upon the subject of the delivery in Greek of the evangelic tradition, and more particularly of Christ's Words.

It is not altogether easy to determine the place which the facts of the life of Christ on earth, and His precepts, occupied in St Paul's thought and teaching. It has often been and still is asserted that he was indifferent to them; and in support of this view his own declaration is quoted that "even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more<sup>1</sup>." Nevertheless to one for whom the Death of Christ meant so much, as it unquestionably did for

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. v. 16.

St Paul, His life as mortal man must also have meant very much; for the one implied the other. He felt, too, the greatness of His sacrifice not only in dying but in coming to live as a man amongst men, as he shews in the exceedingly striking passage in the Epistle to the Philippians<sup>1</sup>, and scarcely, if at all, less impressively in the brief and simple words of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσεν πλούσιος ὢν, "though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor<sup>2</sup>." It is true that in these instances the Apostle appeals to the supreme acts in Christ's sacrifice of Himself, comprehensively considered, as an incentive, rather than to particular traits in His life of labour and suffering, or than to the motive of obedience to His precepts. And yet it is hard to suppose that one who could thus dwell on the power of Christ's example did not, as occasion offered, draw out in his oral teaching some of those details of the life of Christ and of His Passion which were fitted to bring the greatness of His self-abnegation vividly before the mind, or that he did not enforce the principles of Christian conduct by some at least of Christ's words<sup>3</sup>. To a certain extent he does in his Epistles bring Christ before us in the character of the lawgiver for Christians. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians he appeals to commands of Christ on the sanctity of marriage, on the maintenance to be afforded to the missionaries of the Gospel, and on the Eucharistic commemoration of His Death, and also clearly distinguishes between the authority belonging to such commands and to his own recommendations<sup>4</sup>. In the First Epistle to the Thessalonians he refers in more general terms to injunctions to live purely, which he had laid upon his converts, as proceeding from Christ Himself<sup>5</sup>. He seems, also, to base the

<sup>1</sup> Phil. ii. 5—11.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. viii. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. iv. 20 strongly suggests that systematic instruction in a Christ-like character, by reference to His Teaching as well as His example, had been given. "Ye did not so learn Christ, if so be that *ye heard Him*, and were taught in Him, even as truth is in Jesus." Moreover, even those who do not regard this Epistle as the composition of Paul himself will yet admit that it is Pauline. The language quoted is therefore in any case good evidence of what had been customary in Churches which St Paul had founded.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 10; ix. 14; xi. 23; vii. 12, 25. The meaning of xiv. 37 is more doubtful.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Thess. iv. 2 f.

assurance that "those who are left unto the coming of the Lord shall in no wise precede those that are fallen asleep" upon some express word of Christ<sup>1</sup>. And when he says in another place, "Yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night," he may well be reminding them of a Saying of Christ with which they were familiar<sup>2</sup>.

The consideration of some other writings of the New Testament will supply a useful warning against drawing inferences from mere paucity of evidence on the point now before us. Let us turn to the Acts of the Apostles. It will not be denied that the author of the Acts—whether he was Luke, the companion of St Paul, or not—had previously composed our third Gospel. He was, therefore, beyond question thoroughly familiar with the Sayings and Discourses of Jesus. Moreover, he did not lack opportunities for quoting some of them, if not in his narrative, yet in those speeches which he has introduced, and which, it is thought, he himself framed, at least in part, to suit different occasions. Yet he has given in this book only a single Saying of Jesus, and that, moreover, one which does not occur in his own, or any other, Gospel<sup>3</sup>. Again, there is strong reason to think that the First Epistle of St John was by the author of the Fourth Gospel, and if not, it must at any rate have proceeded from someone belonging to the same circle. Now not only does the Fourth Gospel contain many Sayings and Discourses of Jesus, but it is now generally maintained, and is in all probability true, that the author was well acquainted with the Synoptic Gospels. This writer lays great stress upon the importance of "keeping Christ's commandments<sup>4</sup>," and "His word<sup>5</sup>," and of imitating His example<sup>6</sup>. But he mentions distinctly only one commandment of His—given in the Fourth Gospel—"Love one another<sup>7</sup>." He describes it as "the announcement which ye heard from the beginning<sup>8</sup>," i.e., from the time that the Gospel had first been preached to them. He gives it

<sup>1</sup> 1 Thess. iv. 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* v. 2. In addition to the references to particular sayings which have been noted we have also a reference of a general kind by St Paul to the Words of Jesus in 1 Timothy vi. 3, if this Epistle is allowed to be his.

<sup>3</sup> A. xx. 35.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Jn ii. 3, 4; iii. 23, 24.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.* ii. 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* ii. 6.

<sup>7</sup> *Ib.* iii. 23.

<sup>8</sup> *Ib.* iii. 11.

also in one passage in a form not found exactly in any of the Gospels:—"This commandment have we from him that he who loveth God love his brother also<sup>1</sup>." He says also that He (apparently "Jesus Christ<sup>2</sup>") "promised eternal life." This is no doubt the purport of many passages in the Gospels, but no one passage in particular seems to be in view. I may also note in passing that one broad feature of Christ's Ministry is referred to:—"the world knew him not<sup>3</sup>." In the Second Epistle of John there is a general reference to "the Teaching" (*τῆ διδαχῆ*) of Christ<sup>4</sup>. The Epistle of James is interesting on different grounds from those writings which have hitherto been noticed. Its date must be considered uncertain; some have thought that it was written early in the Apostolic Age. However this may be, we find that it has numerous points of similarity with the Teaching of Jesus recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, and yet His authority is not once appealed to, unless it be for the promise of eternal life in a clause where the subject of the verb is indefinite<sup>5</sup>. Other writings than those mentioned contain nothing that is in point for our present purposes.

Clearly, therefore, it would be a mistake to lay great stress on the silence of the Epistles in regard to the Teaching of Jesus, considering their character and the aims which the writers for the most part had in view. Still, if His utterances were already available for citation to the extent and in the form that they were when the Gospels according to St Matthew and St Luke, not to say also that according to St Mark, were composed, it is strange that not more of them should have been quoted in substance, and none of them in the same form as that in which we have them in our Gospels. And the strangeness of this is increased by the consideration that the Teaching and the human example of Christ evidently occupied a larger place in St Paul's scheme of thought than they are often supposed to have done, as also by the further consideration that we have other Epistles besides his. The evidence, then, of the writings which have come before us, taken collectively<sup>6</sup>, points to the conclusion that, at the time

<sup>1</sup> 1 Jn iv. 21.    <sup>2</sup> 1b. ii. 25.    <sup>3</sup> 1b. iii. 1.    <sup>4</sup> 2 Jn 9.    <sup>5</sup> Jas i. 12.

<sup>6</sup> The reason here given cannot well apply to a writing of a date so late as that of 1 Ep. Jn must have been.



when most of them were composed, the tradition of Christ's Teaching can only to a very limited extent have been delivered in Greek. And this view is confirmed by considerations of general probability. For some years the amount of this Teaching known in Greek-speaking Churches would be increased slowly by the method of oral rendering from an Aramaic tradition preserved in the memory. Information about it would be demanded from those who knew that tradition. And as time went on Gentile Christians would be prepared to understand and appreciate larger portions of the Teaching, especially through their increased familiarity with the Greek Old Testament; just as we modern Christians are enabled the better to understand Christ's Teaching through our having entered upon the ancient inheritance of the Jew. They would learn to adjust their own minds to a form of teaching which had not been in the first instance designed for them. And they would wish to know as fully as possible the actual circumstances in which the new Faith to which they had surrendered themselves began, and all the utterances of Him in Whom they believed.

But however ready those believers who knew both Aramaic and Greek might be to try to satisfy this demand, it must, for the reasons given above, have continued to be a difficult task so long as the original tradition had not been committed to writing. When once this was done the work of translation could be carried on with far greater facility. And in spite of the fact that the habits and circumstances of the Aramaic-speaking Church would make the preservation of an oral tradition of teaching comparatively easy and natural among them, the time could not fail to come when it would be written down. The convenience of those who were called upon to translate it into Greek would itself supply a motive for doing so. Whether then Papias' statement that "Matthew was the first to put together in writing the utterances of Jesus, after which each man interpreted them as he was able," is in all respects accurate or not, I cannot doubt that he indicates for us what was in truth the beginning of a new era in the transmission of Christ's Teaching to the Greek world.

In my first volume I have discussed the meaning of the

words "each man interpreted them as he was able" in Papias' statement<sup>1</sup>. They may most naturally be taken to imply that, just as the Targumists in the Jewish synagogues rendered the ancient Hebrew Scriptures into, and explained them in, the Semitic dialects of a later time and of different regions, so in like manner copies of the Aramaic document containing the utterances of Jesus used to be orally rendered and explained to congregations, or Christian friends, who understood only Greek. Some pieces may probably have been written down from the lips of these interpreters. We must also ask whether the transition to the making and the use of full and regular written Greek translations was an abrupt one. May not the habits of mind of the Targumist have continued for a time even when writing was employed? That is to say, may not the translator have sometimes paraphrased his original instead of keeping close to it, and may he not have considered what portions were most suited to edification? These are some of the possibilities which must be borne in mind as we examine the actual phenomena of our Gospels.

Before this chapter is concluded we shall have to consider the question whence Mark obtained such Sayings and pieces of discourse by Jesus as he gives. But we must first fix our attention on our first and third Gospels, where matter of this kind is much more abundant. One supposition has already been dismissed. It is certain that they did not use *throughout* two independent translations of the Aramaic source for this common matter. The resemblance in many pieces is far too close to allow of our supposing this<sup>2</sup>.

But we can see almost at a glance that there are other parallels where there is sufficient similarity in substance to lead us to suppose that the same piece of Christ's Teaching is represented, but where the differences in expression, and even in idea, are very considerable. And between the extremes of agreement and divergence there is every degree of resemblance in the various instances. Now we have to endeavour to decide which of these parallel passages in the two Gospels should, and which should not, be held to have

<sup>1</sup> Vol. 1. p. 55 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 25 f.

been derived from the same Greek document. This cannot be an easy task, but one difficulty, which will probably occur to many minds, namely, that of the uncertainty of the text, is not (I think) so serious as it may seem to be at first sight. A few years ago, it may be said, well-established and settled conclusions as to the true text of the New Testament appeared to have been reached through the labours of a long series of critics, crowned by those of Westcott and Hort; but more recently some fresh evidence has been discovered, and views before accepted have been challenged even on many points not touched by this fresh evidence. Is it not then essential that in the solution of a problem, in which the extent of verbal resemblance and difference between parallel passages is a factor, these textual questions should first be faced? If so, our inquiry would have to be greatly prolonged, and our confidence in our final results would be weakened by all the doubts left behind by our textual investigation. But the considerations by which we must be guided, in forming a judgment upon the cases presently to come before us, are of a kind not to be affected by a limited number of variations in the text. Certainly, when we seek to determine whether our first or our third evangelist most accurately represents the common source, in passages which we have agreed to regard as derived from that source, questions relating to the true text of each must be of importance. But in the preliminary task of ascertaining the matter taken by both from that source, we need concern ourselves only with fairly broad distinctions between it and other cases of resemblance. It would be impossible to have any finely drawn line between the amount of difference that is, and such as is not, compatible with the use of the same document. I do not think that even the adoption of the extreme views of Blass on textual criticism would seriously alter our results as to the contents of the common document, and I am quite sure that the amount of diversity existing among the majority of critics should not do so. I may add that the standard of comparison which I propose to apply to the parallelisms between our first and third Gospels in matter common to them but not found in St Mark, is of a kind that will reduce to a minimum

the danger of error arising through uncertainty as to the text<sup>1</sup>.

We are not unprepared for the possibility that there might be a good deal of inequality in the extent to which our first and third evangelists would agree in different portions of their reproductions of a source from which they took the Words of Christ. For we have seen that in their use of their Marcan document, while our first evangelist has on the whole in giving Words of Christ kept very close to this source, as Luke has also in many places<sup>2</sup>, with the result that the two

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 74. Harnack begins his inquiry into the contents of "Q" by an examination of the individual passages reproduced from "Q" in the two Gospels with a view to the determination of "the text of Q," and this necessarily involves considerations as to the true text of St Matthew and St Luke in the passages in question (*Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, p. 6 ff.). But his reasons for including passages, and for the arrangement and character of the whole, are independent of it, and I shall restrict myself in the main to these more general questions first. In addressing English readers, at any rate, this course will (I believe) be the most advisable, seeing that many of them will probably have to be persuaded that a clear conception of the lost source can be attained. And the expediency of this course will, I think, be manifested when we come below to the discussion of an important particular question as to the contents of the lost source. See p. 80 ff. I may, however, take this opportunity of quoting Harnack's exceedingly interesting and important statement as to the conviction to which his textual studies have led him. "Ich habe mich aufs neue davon überzeugt, was ich schon bei meinen Studien über den Text der Apostelgeschichte gelernt hatte, dass der nicht zu verachtende Cod. D mit seinen partiellen Trabanten, sowie die Sonderlesarten anderer Zeugen (Chrysostomus!) von Blass ungebührlich überschätzt werden. Aber auch Wellhausen geht in dieser Richtung m. E. zu weit. Ich vermag auch nicht anzuerkennen, dass der Lukastext auf den Matthäustext den Einfluss nachträglich gehabt hat, den Blass annimmt, halte vielmehr ihm gegenüber viel stärker an dem Westcott-Hortschen Texte fest" (*ib.* p. 5).

My own attitude in textual matters is that I accept the critical principles, and in the main the results, of Westcott and Hort, subject to two modifications: (1) the available evidence appears to me to be more defective than they supposed; we must allow for a somewhat larger measure of uncertainty than they allowed for; and give weight to considerations of intrinsic probability in attempting to come to a decision in more cases than they did; (2) when the Sinaitic and Curetonian Syriac agree in supporting a "Western" reading, such a reading must be held to be equally well attested with what Westcott and Hort call the "neutral" reading. I say only "equally well attested." For although the agreement of witnesses in such different quarters of the globe is striking, and may point to an original far back, it is also quite possible that there may have been some link between the two, through communication between the East and the West, which would do away with the force of the agreement. In the actual state of our knowledge such cases cannot therefore be decided (except on grounds of intrinsic probability).

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 25 f.

remain close to each other, there are nevertheless contexts in which, as a result of their independent departures from the original added together, the difference between them is very marked. The variations from the Marcan record appear to have arisen partly from individual taste in matters of style and idiosyncrasies of thought and feeling, partly, it may be, from some want of care in copying, partly, again, from reminiscences of phrases, and additional touches, to which they had become accustomed in the oral tradition which they had heard and taught, and perhaps, also, from reminiscences of what they had read in some other document. Such actual reminiscences of what they had learned and repeated orally, or read in other writings, probably supplied the ground for the more substantial changes. For it is unlikely that the evangelists would have permitted themselves much liberty in emending entirely *proprio motu* the form in which they had received the Utterances of Jesus. And we have, moreover, evidence that neither their individual mental characteristics, nor purely accidental causes, operated to any great extent. For these are causes which would be likely to act with a fair degree of equableness at all times, with the result that we should find approximately the same amount of variation in different parts of the parallel accounts. On the other hand, diversities produced by reminiscences of oral teaching, or of other documents, might well be more considerable in some passages than in others. Still, the other causes mentioned may have contributed their quota to the total sum of differences, and it is with this total that we are mainly concerned. Further, our first and third evangelists have in some parts combined matter derived from oral tradition, or from another written source, with their Marcan document, but they do not appear to have wholly set aside the latter for some other authority throughout any section which they have in common with him. They seem at most to have preferred some other form of particular Sayings, or portions of Sayings.

Let us then inquire how far the matter common to St Matthew and St Luke only can be referred to a second source, called for convenience "Q," which they used in the same way as their Marcan document. Will causes such as those which explain differences between St Matthew and

St Luke, where both are parallel with St Mark, suffice to account for all the differences between them in respect to this other common matter; or so far as they do not, what explanation can be given of the phenomena? These are questions which have been far too little considered by writers on the Synoptic problem, and yet till they are answered, a clear and well-grounded theory of the sources of the Synoptic Gospels must be impossible.

From what has already been said it will be evident that it is no easy thing to decide what amount of difference between the first and third evangelists in their accounts of a piece of Christ's Teaching is compatible with their having employed the same written source for it, and modified it only under the influences that I have named. Short pieces certainly cannot furnish a standard, for they may happen to be cases in which there were exceptional reasons for divergence. And unfortunately a large proportion of the Words of Christ in St Mark to which there are parallels in the two other Synoptics are individual Sayings embedded in narrative. We have, however, one discourse of some length—that on the Last Things—where the three Gospels correspond closely in order of thought and substance, and yet differ considerably. (Mk xiii. 5—33 = Mt. xxiv. 4—36 = Lk xxi. 8—36.) It is a case in which we should expect variation if anywhere; for the theme stirred men's feelings deeply and must have been constantly dwelt upon, and there was a manifest disposition to mould the language of prophecy in accordance with experience. The next longest continuous pieces of Christ's Teaching given in all three Synoptics are the parable of the Husbandmen (Mk xii. 1—11 = Mt. xxi. 33—44 = Lk xx. 9—18), and the parable of the Sower, with its interpretation (Mk iv. 3—9, 11—20 = Mt. xiii. 3—9, 11, 13, 18—23 = Lk viii. 5—8, 10—15). In these passages, again, as might be expected, the amount of difference is above the average. In reproducing a parable, which was of the nature of a narrative, an amount of freedom might be held to be lawful, which would be recognised as unsuitable in recording a precept. A fresh touch might be introduced here and there to add vividness. In the interpretation of a parable also there would be a natural inclination to amplify, or adapt, in order to bring out the

lesson. It is reasonable then to suppose that these instances shew us the maximum amount of divergence from the main source that lay before the two writers, which was likely to occur, so long as it was not wholly disregarded and another account used in its place, by one or other of them. We will seek for help from the indications thus supplied in endeavouring to estimate the significance of the various degrees of agreement between different portions of matter common to St Matthew and St Luke only. The danger, such as it is,—I have said that it is not great—of error arising in our conclusions owing to our text not being the true one, is to a large extent avoided in applying this standard, because the textual corruption is likely to have been of much the same kind on both sides of the comparison, so as to have affected the amount of resemblance between St Matthew and St Luke in their Marcan and non-Markan parallels to approximately the same degree.

But there is another fact which is of great importance in connexion with our present inquiry. Reference has already been made to the different methods of introducing their non-Markan matter which our first and third evangelists have adopted<sup>1</sup>. They necessarily had to face a somewhat perplexing problem of arrangement when they undertook to combine with the Marcan narrative other matter which they had severally gathered from different quarters, and more particularly that supplied by a document which each had, consisting largely of Sayings and Discourses. Luke decided on the easiest, though not the most artistic plan. He determined to bring in the greater part of his additional matter in two masses at two different points of the Marcan outline, which seemed to him suitable and convenient, and so to keep it almost entirely separate from the matter which he took from the Marcan document<sup>2</sup>. Our first evangelist, on the other hand, chose to use his non-Markan source, or sources,

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 23 f.

<sup>2</sup> See Table I. at end of vol. It will be noticed that two passages—but only two—to which there are parallels in St Matthew only occur in St Luke subsequently to the end of his long insertion, viz. the "Parable of the sum of money given to servants to trade with" (Lk xix. 12—27 = Mt. xxv. 14—30), and the "Promise to the disciples that they should judge the tribes of Israel" (Lk xxii. 28—30 = Mt. xix. 28).

of information *pari passu* with his Marcan document, and wherever possible to unite pieces of discourse from the two which either evidently did, or which could naturally be taken to, refer to the same occasion. A desire, closely allied to this, to bring together Teaching which bore on the same or similar topics is manifested in the fact that he has collected nearly all that he had to deliver of the Teaching of Jesus in eight discourses, placed in different connexions, but each on a theme of its own<sup>1</sup>.

Now if we ask in which of the two writers, whose methods of procedure have just been described, the contents of a document which both have used, or two editions of which they respectively used, is most likely to be given in its original order, there can be no question that it is in St Luke. This evangelist evidently sought by his plan for uniting the matter from his different sources to interfere with the substance of each as little as possible. This did not prevent him from emending the style. And it may be observed that he did this in reproducing matter from "Q" far more freely than our first evangelist does<sup>2</sup>, as we might have expected from the manner in which each has dealt with his Marcan document. On the other hand, our first evangelist's plan involved him in rearrangement, and this would be likely to affect his treatment of a Collection of Sayings more than that of a narrative in which there was a thread of historical sequence, to which he would feel it right in general to adhere. In the case of Sayings and short pieces of discourse, when they were not set in a continuous narrative of events, the only arrangement possible would be one according to topics, and in the contents of "Q," as it may be inferred from St Luke, we can see indications of such an arrangement. But if the author of St Matthew thought the arrangement capable of improvement he would feel quite at liberty to alter it, especially if the pieces in the source, like so many in St Luke, had prefixed to them only some slight introduction like "Jesus said to His disciples."

The conclusion to which we are led by this general

<sup>1</sup> See the Analysis, pp. 122—9.

<sup>2</sup> This is very fully shewn by Harnack. See his statements, *ib.* pp. 31, 78.



consideration of the plans of the two evangelists respectively is, I believe, confirmed when the contexts are examined in which the pieces placed differently in the two are found. No good reason can be given why Luke if he had found the several passages placed in his source as they are in St Matthew should in any instance have changed their positions to those which they occupy in his own Gospel; whereas it is generally easy to see why the first evangelist should have brought them into the connexion in which they stand in his discourses. On the other hand, it is true that Luke seems to have provided introductions for several of the pieces, either from his knowledge of tradition, or from his own imagination; and it may be suggested that in doing this he too would be induced to rearrange his matter, though with a different object from that which the author of St Matthew had. These descriptions, however, by Luke, of occasions on which various pieces of discourse were uttered, are wholly indefinite as to their time and connexion. It is far more probable that they have been fitted in at certain points in his source, with a view to imparting life and an appearance of naturalness to his record, than that the sequence of paragraphs in the source should have been altered on account of them. In one or two places he has, I believe, made slight transpositions in the contexts of "Q" in order to be able to connect some additional matter therewith more conveniently; but with these exceptions I see no good grounds for thinking that he has changed the order.

These, then, will be our chief clues in seeking to reconstruct "Q" so far as that is possible<sup>1</sup>. (i) The pieces

<sup>1</sup> Reconstruction may be thought too bold a word. But at least it is important that we should ascertain as clearly as we can, and put together, all that may be inferred with most probability in respect to the source of non-Markan matter common to our first and third Gospels. No criticism of the Synoptic Gospels that aims at being scientific can well avoid this task. Reconstruction in such a case is after all a matter of degree. No one, I imagine, thinks that it can be more than partial. And, on the other hand, no assertion or suggestion whatever can be made about the source which does not imply at least a measure of reconstruction in the mind of him who makes it. My friend and colleague, Prof. Burkitt, who declares the reconstruction of "Q" to be impracticable, has himself propounded a tolerably comprehensive and definite view of it (see above, p. 49). He says at the same time that he would not have it supposed that he is sceptical as to the commonly received reconstruction of the Pentateuch (*Gospel History*

are to be singled out which our first and third evangelists must be supposed to have taken from a common source, on account of their agreement in the form in which they give them; and in cases that seem doubtful, because of the

*and its Transmission*, p. 12 ff.). The comparison of the Pentateuch is suggestive. I would point out that the means which we have at our disposal in the two cases are of an essentially different kind. In the Pentateuch there are different strata discernible, composed in different ages and with different aims, whereas the Synoptic Gospels were approximately, if not strictly, the product of a single generation and the work of men whose point of view was substantially the same. We could hope for little from noting internal peculiarities in our first Gospel, or our third Gospel, taken by itself, which would be analogous to what has to be done in the case of the Pentateuch. But in other respects the criticism of the Gospel has an enormous advantage over that of the Pentateuch, as regards its resources. We can *compare* two works in which the lost source has been more or less extensively reproduced. And that is not all: our problem is greatly simplified by the fact that we are able to separate off, first of all, those large portions of these Gospels in which use was made of another source, of which we still have in our hands at least an approximately true representative—the Gospel according to St Mark. Moreover, from the treatment of this last-named source by our first and third evangelists, we are able to judge how they would be likely each of them to treat another document. “We see clearly enough,” Professor Burkitt observes, “that we could not have reconstructed the Gospel according to S. Mark out of the other two Synoptic Gospels, although between them nearly all Mark has been incorporated by Matthew and Luke. How futile, therefore, it is to attempt to reconstruct those other literary sources which seem to have been used by Matthew and Luke, but have not been independently preserved” (*ib.* p. 17; cp. also his review of Harnack’s *Sprüche* in *Journal of Theological Studies* for April, 1907, p. 454 ff.). Whether it would have been impossible to reconstruct the Marcan document to any extent is perhaps questionable. But be this as it may, the fact that we possess this document places us in a far more favourable position for the attempt to recover the contents and form of the second source.

Of the clues described above which are to guide us in our investigation, the first is obtained by examining the limits of disagreement in passages of Christ’s Teaching which our first and third evangelists have both taken from St Mark; while the third has been suggested by a consideration of the manner in which non-Marcan matter has been introduced by the two evangelists into the Marcan outline. Some instances will also come before us, especially in later chapters, where, in examining differences of form in passages derived by each from a non-Marcan source, we may get a good indication of the way in which one or other has probably altered his source from his revision of passages of his Marcan document. Our inferences are from the known to the unknown, which is surely a legitimate method of reasoning. And this principle may be applied in many more cases than it will be in this work. I shall deal only with a few that are of special interest, or which for one reason or another come before us.

The knowledge of the source obtained in this way may possibly remain very incomplete; but so far as it goes it is valuable. On Prof. Burkitt’s conjecture that “Q” contained a narrative of the Passion, see below, p. 105 f.

intermixture of difference and resemblance, we must be guided in part by comparing the manner in which the two evangelists have used their Marcan document.

(ii) In discussing some cases where matter the same in substance has been preserved in St Matthew and St Luke in widely different forms, we shall do well to bear in mind the special conditions affecting the translation into Greek of the Aramaic Collection of Sayings. There was, as we have seen, in all probability a period in which the renderings of it were fragmentary, and some of these fragmentary renderings may have been known to one or other evangelist, and may have exercised an influence, even when a version which aimed at being more continuous and complete was followed in the main. Moreover, even in such a version some portions of the original may have been given in a condensed form. If so, fuller renderings might in course of time have been substituted in these parts. Whether this is a probable explanation of the relation between the two accounts, one more meagre than the other, will depend on the character of the matter omitted in the more meagre one, and its connexion with the part common to both. Instances of the former kind—the survival of brief, fragmentary renderings—are to be found, I believe, especially in St Luke; of the latter—the substitution of a fuller rendering for a more compressed one—in St Matthew.

(iii) There is a strong presumption in favour of the view that the order in which Luke has given the pieces is in the main that of the source; and we may by the aid of this Gospel also often disengage the pieces as they stood in the source from the Marcan or other matter with which in St Matthew they have been interwoven<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Reference may here be made more particularly to three writers who have endeavoured to reconstruct the lost source common to our first and third Gospels:—H. H. Wendt (*Die Lehre Jesu*, Erster Theil, 1886); P. Wernle (*Die Synoptische Frage*, 1899, pp. 61 ff., 80 ff., 178 ff., 224 ff.); A. Harnack (*Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, 1907). In important respects they agree, and so do I with them. I have, however, endeavoured to determine somewhat more closely than they have done, how much difference in parallel passages in St Matthew and St Luke should be considered compatible with derivation from a common Greek original. In a few instances of wide difference, which they explain as due to great freedom in the treatment of the common document by one or other evangelist, I cannot bring

In St Matthew and St Luke<sup>1</sup> we find an account of the preaching of John the Baptist in which several verses are almost word for word the same and must unquestionably have been taken from the same written source. In St Luke here, as well as in St Matthew, the Marcan record has been to a slight extent at least combined with the non-Markan. There was the more reason for their being interwoven, because the position which the account actually holds in each Gospel is the only one in which it could fitly be placed. And in all probability it formed the introduction, as it were, to the collection of Christ's own Sayings, as it does to St Mark's Gospel.

This section is followed by a narrative of the Temptation in the Wilderness. Here again there is good reason for the agreement between the first and third evangelists as to the place given to the narrative. Their narratives are fuller by far than Mark's and while they differ from one another in the order of the two last temptations, in other respects the agreement between them is so close that it is most reasonable to suppose the same document to have been employed as for the Baptist's preaching.

The discourse on the "Character of the heirs of the Kingdom" is the addition to Mark to which we come next in both St Matthew and St Luke, though in the latter it is placed somewhat later than in the former relatively to the Synoptic outline. This discourse is preceded in each Gospel

myself to regard this as a probable explanation; and I have found one in the considerations referred to in my last remarks above. I may add that the present chapter was written in the summer of 1906, before the appearance of the number of Harnack's *Beiträge* above referred to; and it remains substantially unaltered. My agreement with him is the more satisfactory to me.

<sup>1</sup> From Table II. at end of vol. a comprehensive view of the matter common to St Matthew and St Luke but not in St Mark may be obtained; the pieces also which in the judgment of the present writer were, and those which were not, taken by the two evangelists from the same Greek document, are there distinguished by differences of type. Again, an Analysis at the end of the present chapter exhibits the arrangement of this matter, and other matter similar to it, in the discourses of our first Gospel. Finally, the manner in which the matter in question has been introduced into the Synoptic outline by our first and third evangelists may be easily learned from Table I., at end of vol. The use of these Tables will, I think, assist the reader in following the discussion upon which I here enter.

by a description of a gathering of crowds from all parts to hear Jesus (Mt. iv. 24, 25; Lk vi. 17—19). It is probable, therefore, that in the source itself from which the discourse was derived there were at least some indications of attendant circumstances of this kind. Luke found a place for the insertion of the discourse just after the point at which Mark, too, describes such a gathering<sup>1</sup>. Our first evangelist had his own reasons for wishing to place the discourse earlier<sup>2</sup>, and was accordingly in this instance content to introduce it where the only link supplied in his Marcan document was a reference to the activity of Jesus in teaching as well as in working miracles (Mk i. 38, 39 = Mt. iv. 23).

This discourse, as given in Mt. v—vii., contains, it will be remembered, a good deal of matter which is found only in that Gospel, and also passages of some length as well as individual Sayings which are included by Luke in his "Great Insertion<sup>3</sup>." But on the other hand the whole of what is given in the discourse in Lk vi. 20—49 is comprised in the corresponding discourse in St Matthew, with the exception perhaps<sup>4</sup> of the "Woes" (Lk *vv.* 24—26) and of two brief Sayings (Lk *vv.* 39, 40) which occur later in St Matthew, in two other contexts. It is with the discourse so far as it is common to both Gospels, that we are now primarily concerned. The beginning and end are the same in both, the order of Sayings in the intervening part corresponds in the main, though not entirely; but while in substance there is agreement, the difference in expression is often wide<sup>5</sup>. It is distinctly greater than that between the same two Gospels in the case of the parable of the Vineyard, or of the Sower, and its interpretation. It is just a little less than that in the Eschatological Discourse in Mt. xxiv. and Lk xxi. But in this last instance the number of distinct Sayings which have been added or substituted by Luke, and of modifications made for obvious reasons, are nearly twice as great as in the

<sup>1</sup> Mk iii. 7—12=Lk vi. 17—19. See Table I.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 23 f., 323, and cp. p. 85.

<sup>3</sup> See Analysis, p. 123 f.

<sup>4</sup> This is not certainly an exception. See p. 83.

<sup>5</sup> In one Saying only do they agree closely throughout, that on "the Mote and the Beam" (Mt. vii. 3—5=Lk vi. 41, 42).

discourse in Lk vi. This is a circumstance which should be allowed for in comparing them. Like these instances, which we decided to apply as tests, the discourse on the "Character of the heirs of the Kingdom" was doubtless one where variations might be likely to occur, since its precepts would have been often taught orally. Still, it would seem that the amount of difference between the account of it in St Luke and the parallel portions in St Matthew at least reaches, if it does not even go beyond, the extreme limit that can be allowed for where the same Greek document was employed<sup>1</sup>. And consequently the hypothesis that the two evangelists used different translations suggests itself as at least an alternative explanation. I am not prepared to say how much resemblance there would probably be between the renderings of two translators. But there can be little doubt that the amount of difference would be likely to be greater than in the case of two editions or adaptations of the same Greek document. And if, on the other hand, it should seem at first sight improbable that two translators should both independently employ some of the words and expressions which are common to the parallels before us, it should be borne in mind that reminiscences of oral teaching might so influence the minds of two translators as to make their renderings more similar than translations by different hands would ordinarily be. The supposed translators would not in point of fact have been in the full sense independent, because they would have shared in greater or less degree the same special vocabulary

<sup>1</sup> The number of words which are the same, or partly the same (different parts of same verb, or noun, owing to differences in the formation of the sentences) may be compared with the total number of words in the passage in order to obtain the proportion of resemblance. Even the smallest words should be counted, such as *καί, δέ, γάρ*. The similarity or difference in regard to these little words is often significant as shewing similarity or difference in the structure of the sentences. For the extent of the passages to be compared, I have taken Luke. I make the proportion in the parable of the Vineyard '5, in that of the Sower '657; in the interpretation of the latter parable '534; in the Eschatological Discourse in Lk xxi. only '391; in the Discourse in Lk vi. '403. But it should be observed that in the discourse in Lk xxi. *vv.* 18, 19, 22, 24, 28, 34, 35, 36 and parts of *vv.* 18, 19 are additional matter not represented in Matthew, making 147 words out of a total in the whole discourse of 447; while in Lk vi. *vv.* 24, 25, 26, 39, 40 are not represented in parallel in Mt., making 81 words out of a total of 548. This is clearly a point of importance when we are comparing them.

and associations. For instance, the general form and most prominent words of the Beatitudes, or such a saying as ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (or τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) in Mt. v. 12 = Lk vi. 23, 25, would be fixed in their minds through tradition, before they began to translate. While such a saying as that on "the Mote and the Beam" might have been remembered by both as an oft-repeated proverb. But further, the later of the two translators may have been acquainted with the version previously made, and have reproduced it here and there.

On the whole then the view that the resemblances and differences in these parallels may be accounted for by the supposition that our two evangelists used different translations here is not an unreasonable one. And there are some other facts to be considered, which will, I believe, recommend it further. It appears to be highly probable that the sections on "the relation of the New to the Old Law" and on "the contrast between the right and the Pharisaic practice of three great parts of religious observance" (Mt. v. 17—48, and vi. 1—8, 16—18) stood in the Aramaic original virtually as they do in St Matthew. Though in the Lucan discourse neither of these topics is treated, the sayings of which its paragraph on love and meekness is composed are all to be found in St Matthew under the last two heads of the section on the Law, viz., those on the Law of retaliation and the Rule of loving a neighbour and hating an enemy. Moreover, there are signs in the Lucan form of some rearrangement, such as might be necessary in order to provide for a new and suitable beginning of the paragraph, when there had been an omission. For the maxim ἀγαπάτε, etc., which Luke at v. 27 introduces with the words ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω, etc., occurs in St Matthew after sayings which Luke postpones to it, and the consequence of so using it has been that Luke has found it necessary to repeat it at v. 35, in order to resume the thread, with πλὴν prefixed to apologise (as it were) for doing so<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> For referring these passages to the original I may claim the support of Wendt, *ib.* p. 57 ff., and Wernle, *ib.* p. 62 f. Harnack, on the other hand, *ib.* p. 128 f., excludes them. It is the most important point on which I differ from him. The reason he gives, viz. that the individuality of Matthew appears in them, seems to me inadequate. Why should not this attitude in regard to the Law have been found in the Logian source?

In circumstances such as those upon which I have dwelt in the earlier part of this chapter it would not have been unnatural that in the first communication of this discourse to Gentiles the piece about the Jewish Law should have been omitted as unsuited to them. But it seems to me improbable that Luke himself should have passed it over, if he found the passage in a Greek document lying before him ; for the desire for full knowledge in regard to the Lord's Teaching must have been already strongly felt. It is the more unlikely that he should have done so because he gives an emphatic saying on the inviolability of the Law contained in this passage, along with some of its teaching on marriage, in a different context (xvi. 17, 18). Even supposing then that Luke had thought it unnecessary to give the whole of the passage on the Law, it would have been most natural for him to have given a summary of it in its original position, if his Greek source had contained it. Indeed, it would have been a strong measure for anyone to have set the piece aside, if he had found it ready translated in a document which he had in his hands. It is easier to understand that one who was translating the discourse for use in a Gentile Church might have omitted it, as a passage not directly suited to them.

The contrast between the right and the Pharisaic practice of Almsgiving, Prayer and Fasting (Mt. vi. 1—8, 16—18), which follows the exposition of the true principles of the Law, seems to belong to the same connexion and to come from the same source, and there would be the same reason for omitting its translation<sup>1</sup>. We find also indications of its existence in St Luke, though they are somewhat less marked than in the case last discussed. For the Woes in St Luke may be regarded as a kind of generalisation of the condemnation of the Pharisees preserved in St Matthew. The words *ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν* in Lk vi. 24 should be compared with *ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν* in Mt. vi. 2, 5, 16.

From all this it follows that Luke's account of the discourse was not taken from the version used in St Matthew,

<sup>1</sup> The Lord's Prayer has, however, been transferred to Mt. vi. 9—13 from a later context in the same document. Whether the saying that follows in *vv.* 14, 15, stood in this connexion in the Aramaic source may be left an open question. See below, p. 329.



which contained the paragraphs referred to. Further, it will not, I think, be suggested that these paragraphs alone were separately translated and incorporated with the Lucan version of the rest. One who had translated those long paragraphs would naturally continue his work of independent translation to the end of the discourse. But this discourse might, owing to its special practical value, have been translated and copied, and have passed into the hands of the author of the Greek St Matthew as a separate piece, and have been substituted by him here for the compressed version in the document which he elsewhere followed. Or again this substitution might already have been effected in his copy of that document. I do not suggest that he himself made the fuller version which he gives, partly because it seems to me more likely that an independent rendering of limited extent should be due to one who had a more limited aim than the author of this Gospel; partly for a reason which will come before us in a later chapter<sup>1</sup>.

But we should not be justified in arguing that because the version of the discourse used by our first evangelist embraced a larger part of the contents of the original than that used by Luke did, it was, therefore, in all points more exact. It would, however, be inexpedient to interrupt our general review of the contents of "Q" by an inquiry of this kind. Something will be said on this subject before this examination of the document in question is concluded<sup>2</sup>.

By the preceding discussion we have incidentally been led to the interesting and important conclusion that the sections on the relation of the New to the Old Law, and on the contrast between the true and the Pharisaic performance of three great departments of religious observance, which we have in Mt. v. 17—vi. 18, but which are not given by Luke, did in all probability stand in the Aramaic original of the discourse in a position corresponding to that which they occupy in our first Gospel. It may likewise here be suggested that the little piece containing Sayings on the Pharisaic desire for human approbation, the permanency of the Law and the inviolability of marriage (Lk xvi. 15, 17, 18), which Luke places much later, had first been given as a brief, oral rendering or account

<sup>1</sup> See p. 343 f.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 106 f.

of the passages just referred to, when no full translation of them existed, that it had become current in tradition, or been written down in some short record, and so had reached our third evangelist.

But we must proceed with the examination of the passages which have to come under our consideration, in the order in which Luke gives them. The discourse which we have been considering is followed immediately in St Luke by the narrative of the healing of the centurion's servant, while in St Matthew one other narrative only is interposed—that of the cleansing of the leper, which was taken from the Marcan document. The first and third evangelists also agree verbally, to a considerable extent, in their accounts of this incident, and there seems to be no good reason for doubting that each of the two evangelists is here reproducing a narrative which stood next to the discourse on the "Character of the heirs of the Kingdom," in a Greek document which was a source to both. Luke, however, has introduced several particulars derived probably from tradition, while in St Matthew a piece is added on the subject of the Gentiles who should be received into the kingdom, to which we shall come much later in Luke's order.

Luke continues after this to give other non-Markan matter, including the important incident of the Baptist's message and the discourse by Jesus that was called forth thereby. Our first evangelist places this incident and discourse somewhat differently, both with reference to the sequence of the Synoptic outline, and to other matter taken from "Q." (xi. 1 ff.). His design seems to have been to use it as a climax after the series of illustrations of the Saviour's Teaching and miracles which occupy the first half of his account of the public Ministry. The Words of Jesus on this occasion fall naturally into two divisions; the first consists of His reply to John's inquiry and reflections on his prophetic character; in the second He comments on the reception accorded both to John and to Himself. At the point of division Luke characteristically interposes a few words (vii. 29, 30), in which he notes the different attitude to John of the publicans and people, on the one hand, and of the Pharisees on the other, and the different ways in which con-

sequently they were affected by the language of Jesus about him. Our first evangelist, again, after his different manner, has at the end of the first part of the discourse introduced a Saying (Mt. xi. 12, 13) about John's work given in another context and in a different form in St Luke (xvi. 16), and has also at the end of the whole added some pieces, which do not seem properly to belong here, as they have nothing to do with the subject of John the Baptist, but only with the attitude of men to Christ (xi. 20—30). But both parts of the discourse given in St Luke are given also in St Matthew in an almost verbally identical form, and must undoubtedly have been derived by both evangelists from the same document. Luke's same insertion of non-Marcian matter contains also two narratives peculiar to his Gospel; he places the one before, the other after, the incident of the Baptist's message (vii. 11—17, 36—50). Lastly at the end of the insertion there is a reference to a missionary journey. Now, if we pass on at once to Luke's next insertion into the Synoptic outline at ix. 51 ff., omitting the intervening Marcian matter, the earliest pieces having parallels also in St Matthew, to which we come, relate to the calling of the disciples of Jesus, His own homelessness in which those who followed Him were required to participate, and the missionary work which lay before them (Lk ix. 57—60, x. 2, 3—12 = Mt. viii. 19—22, ix. 37, 38, x. 5 a, 7—16). These pieces are also some of those in which there is very close agreement between the two Gospels. Now let us mark the position of these pieces in St Matthew. They occur in close proximity to the mention at ix. 35 of a missionary tour in which Lk viii. 1 has its truest parallel. There are, then, strong grounds for thinking that in "Q" a reference to a missionary tour by Jesus introduced the teaching about the missionary calling of His disciples. Luke has broken that connexion by giving the former piece at the end of one insertion, and then relating many narratives from his Marcian document before he resumes the use of "Q."<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, he has to some extent

<sup>1</sup> According to Mark also the sending forth of the Twelve to preach was preceded by a missionary journey of Jesus Himself. See Mk vi. 6 b. But Lk viii. 1 is (as I have said) most nearly parallel to Mt. ix. 35. Note in the two latter the mention of 'cities' as well as 'villages,' and 'the preaching of the kingdom of God.'

suggested the same idea as the sequence in the source did, seeing that he has associated the Sayings and directions regarding the missionary calling of disciples with Christ's journeying towards Jerusalem.

The Saying on 'the need of labourers to gather in the spiritual harvest' and the charge containing directions for the guidance of the missionaries of the Gospel, which were according to Luke delivered to seventy disciples (Lk x. 1 ff.), who were about to be sent forth, are in St Matthew connected with the Mission of the Twelve (Mt. ix. 37 ff.). The form of the saying on the need of labourers is identical in the two Gospels, save for the different order of two words. The whole of the language of the Charge has not been embodied in St Matthew, though portions of it have been. It should be remembered that our first evangelist has evidently combined this piece with the shorter Charge given to the Twelve in his Marcan document (Mk vi. 8—11)<sup>1</sup>. Expressions taken from the latter have in some instances been employed instead of similar ones from the former. Moreover, the adaptations required when two parallel accounts were united would naturally lead to rearrangement of sentences and to the use of some words and phrases not found in either. We need not hesitate then to conclude that portions of this Charge in the first and the third Gospels belonged to "Q." Probably the words which introduced it in that document were not very precise as to the occasion, so that the first and third evangelists were able to take different views of the circumstances in which the Teaching in question was delivered. The former supposed that this passage of his second source referred to the time of the sending forth of the Twelve described in his Marcan one; Luke on the contrary supposed the occasion to be a distinct one, when an additional body of preachers was commissioned.

The precise extent of this Charge, as it stood in "Q" may not be altogether easy to determine. The concluding passage in the discourse to the Twelve in St Matthew (*vv.* 40—42) corresponds with the last saying of the Charge in St Luke

<sup>1</sup> See Analysis, p. 124 f.

(v. 16), just as the ends of the discourse in Mt. v.—vii. and Lk vi. correspond. And between the common commencement and ending our first evangelist has, in the case now before us as well as in that one, introduced several pieces placed later in St Luke. But it may also be questioned whether the Apostrophe given in Lk x. 13—15 does not appear here through a slight displacement, and whether it should not stand after the conclusion of the Charge and immediately before the Thanksgiving which follows in *vv.* 21, 22. These two little pieces present the contrast between those who have rejected and those who have received the truth. Our first evangelist gives them together, though he places them in another context (Mt. xi. 20—27). The Apostrophe does not fit in altogether suitably at the end of the Missionary Charge, since the cities named in it were those in which Jesus had already preached, not those to which His representatives were being sent. But seeing that there seems to have been a reference to the judgment on Sodom (cp. Mt. x. 15), near the end of the Charge, as given in the source, as well as in the Apostrophe addressed to Chorazin, etc., it may well have occurred to the evangelist to weave the two together.

The two paragraphs of which I have just been speaking are given by the two evangelists so nearly in the same words, that both must have been derived from the same Greek document. The same holds of the Saying, "Blessed are your eyes," etc., which stands next in St Luke (x. 23, 24), and the connexion of thought is natural. In St Matthew, however, the two former have not unsuitably been placed in the discourse in which the reception accorded first to John the Baptist and then to Jesus is treated of (Mt. xi. 21—24, 25—27), and the latter in the passage on the privileges enjoyed by the disciples, which is connected with their having the parables interpreted to them (Mt. xiii. 16, 17).

The words "Blessed are your eyes," etc., are followed in St Luke by the question of a lawyer from whom Jesus draws forth a statement of the two great commandments of the Law (Lk x. 25—28); these must be compared with the similar question and reply in St Mark placed in that Gospel among the incidents of the last few days of the life of Jesus,

at Jerusalem (Mk xii. 28—34), and the parallel in St Matthew standing in the same connexion (Mt. xxii. 34—40). Luke has no parallel at that point to St Mark, though on the whole he follows the Marcan order closely in that part of the Gospel history. He doubtless omitted the incident there, because he had already given a very similar one, taken from another source, in his "Great Insertion." It is further to be observed that he represents differently the motive of the scribe. The latter asked his question in order to "tempt," or "try," Jesus, instead of (as Mark states) because he approved the answers which he had already heard. Now in this, as well as in some of the other differences between St Luke and St Mark, our first evangelist agrees with the former. There is good reason, then, for thinking that "Q" contained an account of the lawyer's question and the reply, substantially as Luke gives it, and that, as in several other instances, the first evangelist has combined what he read in that source with what he read in his Marcan document, even while he adhered to the order of the latter.

It is to be added that here again a slight dislocation of the original sequence may have taken place in St Luke's reproduction of the source, as might easily happen when more matter was being introduced. For the question asked by a scribe in order to tempt Jesus would come in more naturally in connexion with the series of paragraphs on the conflict of Jesus with the Scribes and Pharisees, Lk xi. 14—54. The teaching addressed to disciples would also then not be interrupted.

We have next to consider<sup>1</sup> the 'Instruction on prayer' in Lk xi. 1—13. After a request by the disciples to be taught to pray, which may possibly have been imagined by the evangelist as an introduction, we have the Lord's Prayer, an Example of successful importunity, and an Exhortation to earnestness in prayer. The second of these is peculiar to Luke. But the two others are both given in the discourse in Mt. v.—vii. There are differences in his form of the Lord's Prayer, but these differences, mostly amplifications, may reasonably be attributed to the influence of the liturgical

<sup>1</sup> I.e. passing over two pieces peculiar to Lk, viz. *the parable of the Good Samaritan*, and the incident connected with *Martha and Mary*.

usage to which the evangelist had become accustomed. It would not be strange that he should give the prayer in the form in which he himself knew it best, even though in the document which lay before him it appeared in that briefer form in which we have it in St Luke. The Exhortation to earnestness in prayer is placed a little later in the Matthaean discourse. In the form of this piece the two Gospels agree closely on the whole, and it is to be referred to the source common to them.

From the instruction and encouragement given to disciples we turn now to contention with the sceptical and actively hostile. I have already spoken of one passage (Lk x. 25—28), which falls under this head, and which may, I think, in the document which we are endeavouring to reconstruct, have stood at the beginning of a division treating of that feature of Christ's Ministry. In this division we have next the Accusation of collusion with Satan. The relations between the three Synoptics noticed in the instance of the lawyer's question appear here again, but more strikingly. There is a corresponding account in St Mark, but it is clear that Luke's is taken from a different source (Mk iii. 21—30; Lk xi. 14, 15, 17—26). In St Mark the accusation, made (it is expressly said) by "scribes from Jerusalem," is compared (it would seem) with the declaration of His own relatives that "He is mad." In St Luke the suggestion of the Pharisees is introduced by the mention of a case in which He cast out a "dumb devil." Again, while a portion of the reply of Jesus is the same in substance in both St Mark and St Luke, there are sentences in each which are wholly independent. Moreover, Luke has passed the account by at the place where it should have occurred according to the Marcan outline, and given it in his "Great Insertion," where certainly the far larger part of his matter is not derived from the Marcan document. Lastly, our first evangelist evidently had the two accounts before him and has combined them (Mt. xii. 22—32). He has introduced this accusation at a point in his outline corresponding approximately to that at which it stands in St Mark, but has prefixed the same incident as Luke does by way of providing an occasion for it. Further, he has in

the reply of Jesus interwoven sentences taken now from the Marcan, now from the non-Markan accounts. Another form of attack, the demand for a sign (Lk xi. 16, 29—32; Mt. xii. 38—42) is also connected by both our first and third evangelists with the accusation of collusion with Satan, and much of the matter relating to this also is identical in form in the two Gospels, and must have been taken from "Q."<sup>1</sup>

The reply of Jesus to the Demand for a sign is followed in St Luke by two proverbial sayings on light (Lk xi. 33—36). The first of these has a parallel, though not one which is close in form, at Mt. v. 15. There its application to the responsibilities of disciples and its suitability to the place which it occupies are obvious. In Lk xi. 33, on the contrary, it interferes with a good connexion; for the second saying which insists on the need for singleness of eye would be naturally suggested by the perverse attitude of the Pharisees and others, which had just before been exhibited. It is difficult not to suppose that the first saying in which the figure of a lamp is used was introduced here because the same figure was employed in the second, which has a rightful place in this context. As to the first of the two sayings the arrangement of the source has, I believe, for once been preserved in the first and not in the third Gospel. The passage of the discourse in which it there occurs was probably (we have seen) not known to Luke in its original form and position, though some of its matter had reached him disjointedly. One of these fragments he introduces at the place now before us. But the other saying on light not only occupies a fitting place in its Lucan context, when the preceding saying has been removed, but it also closely resembles in language its parallel at Mt. vi. 22, 23, and must have been derived by both evangelists from the same Greek document. There is good reason then to hold that the two evangelists have, as to this saying, kept to their usual parts, Luke giving it in the position in which he found it in "Q," while our first evangelist used the matter in "Q" for the compilation of longer discourses.

The series of passages in this part of St Luke, treating of

<sup>1</sup> See the Analysis, p. 125 f.



the conflicts of Jesus, concludes with a denunciation of the Pharisees and Scribes by Jesus, followed by vehement attacks upon Him from their side (Lk xi. 39—54). Their rejoinders and the occasion on which the denunciation was delivered are mentioned only in this Gospel, and may have been contributed by the evangelist, but much of the matter contained in the denunciation itself is found in the still longer passage on the same theme in St Matthew, where it stands at the conclusion of Christ's public Ministry (Mt. xxiii.). The agreement, however, in form between St Matthew and St Luke is not so close as in many other passages, and the former contains a good deal of peculiar matter which appears from its character to be in the main authentic<sup>1</sup>, and also to be closely connected with that which is common to both Gospels. It seems probable, therefore, that here, as in the discourse on the Heirs of the Kingdom, a fuller rendering of the Aramaic original has taken the place of a brief account of it in the document used by Luke. Our first evangelist has combined this fuller discourse with the corresponding section in St Mark.

This account in St Luke of the acute opposition between Jesus and the Pharisees and Scribes is immediately followed in that Gospel by an exhortation to His disciples—describing the spirit and manner in which they ought to face and endure the opposition and persecution to which they must look forward (xii. 1—12). In St Matthew the greater part of this paragraph has been placed in the Mission Charge addressed to the Twelve (Lk xii. 2—9 = Mt. x. 26—33; Lk xii. 11, 12 = Mt. x. 19, 20). But the larger portion of it must in all probability have been taken from the same source by the first and third evangelists. The form and purport of the Saying at the beginning on the making known of that which is secret is indeed different in the two Gospels; Luke has not improbably modified the form of the Saying in the source in favour of one otherwise known to him. But on the whole the agreement of *vv.* 2—9 in St Luke and *vv.* 26—33 in St Matthew is fairly close. The Saying at Lk xii. 11, 12, on 'not being anxious as to the answer to be given when arraigned' appears somewhat earlier in the Matthaean

<sup>1</sup> See p. 335 f.

Mission Charge, and in a different context. Although the Saying there given (Mt. x. 19, 20) agrees in substance with the one just referred to in St Luke, and although it may have been included in "Q," it would seem that our first evangelist did not derive it from that source; for it forms part of a passage common to St Matthew and St Mark<sup>1</sup>, and in expression it resembles the latter much more closely than it does the parallel in the third Gospel<sup>2</sup>. The saying on "speaking against the Son of Man" in Lk xii. 10, has been given (Mt. xii. 32), in the discourse occasioned by the Accusation of collusion with Satan, where a Saying that resembles it occurs in the Marcan parallel. In this instance, as in others which we have noticed, our first evangelist has been (it would seem) guided by his Marcan document in regard to the position which he has assigned to the Saying, and influenced by "Q" as to its form.

To proceed with our review of the contents of Luke's "Great Insertion": after a piece peculiar to him, in which Jesus warns one who was not a disciple, and then the multitude, against covetousness, we come again to an exhortation addressed to disciples, Lk xii. 22—34, given in almost exactly the same form at Mt. vi. 25—34, 19—21<sup>3</sup>. It consists of the Sayings, so familiar to us, on trust in God for the necessities of life and on seeking His Kingdom. As the piece stands in St Luke its lesson appears to be suggested by that of the piece on covetousness which has been given just before. But if we suppose that piece removed we still have a good, and perhaps a better, connexion of thought. For those who were to preach Christ's Gospel were required to renounce worldly possessions with a view to this work which they had to do, and for those so engaged the injunction to put confidence in their Heavenly Father's care had special significance. This aspect of the Teaching in question appears most clearly in *vv.* 32 and 33 *b*, which are peculiar to Luke. Our first evangelist, on the other hand, feeling that the lessons

<sup>1</sup> Mt. x. 17—22 = Mk xiii. 9—13. On this piece see pp. 116, 330.

<sup>2</sup> Mt. agrees with Lk against Mk in this Saying only in one slight turn of phrase.

<sup>3</sup> There is the difference of arrangement here indicated, but the language is almost identical.

taught in this passage were, in their essence at least, applicable to all the children of God, has placed it in the discourse in which he has sought to present the most general view of the Teaching of Jesus on the Way of life.

From the passage last discussed we pass in the immediate sequel to three which enjoin watchfulness for the return of the Christ. The first of these (Lk xii. 35—38) contains the main idea of the parable of the Ten Virgins at Mt. xxv. 1—13,—that of servants keeping their lamps burning, and otherwise in a state of readiness, so that they may open the door immediately to their Master when he returns from his wedding. The Lucan figure might conceivably be due to abbreviation of the parable of the Ten Virgins, by someone who felt that the full parable was unsuited to Greeks, on account of the Eastern features of the imagery. But I do not think that this is what has happened. And it is evident that, as our first evangelist was acquainted with the parable of the Ten Virgins he might well have substituted it for the shorter piece<sup>1</sup>.

In the form of the next two pieces, that on 'watching lest the Son of Man should come as a thief' and on 'the prudent steward' (Lk xii. 39, 40 and 42—46 = Mt. xxiv. 43—51), there is very close agreement between the two evangelists. Doubtless in both cases the immediate or ultimate source was "Q." Luke interposes a remark by Peter at v. 41.

From this point onwards to the end of the "Great Insertion" there is a much larger proportion of matter which is altogether peculiar to St Luke than before, and much even of that which may be reckoned common to him with St Matthew, as regards substance, is markedly distinct in form. Further, although much of the teaching comprised under the head of this common matter is suitable to the closing period of Christ's Ministry, it is nevertheless more difficult to trace signs of order in this part of the "Great Insertion," after the pieces peculiar to Luke have been removed, than we have found it to be up to this point. The cause may be partly that some of the pieces which are in

<sup>1</sup> See further below, p. 99, and p. 340 in Chapter on St Matthew.

substance common have not been derived from the document generally used, but either from some other document or from tradition. We should certainly expect that among the additional pieces collected independently by the two evangelists some, though not derived from the same written record in Greek, or even it may be in Aramaic, would yet have ultimately a common origin and be in substance the same. The two evangelists, when they looked beyond their two principal documents, would not be likely to light only on different matter. But again, the introduction of matter not contained in the principal source would sometimes, even in the case of a writer who proceeded on Luke's plan, lead to rearrangement of that which was taken from that source itself. A couple of instances in which this has probably happened have already come before us; and in the part where a great deal of additional matter has been included it would be natural that there should be more dislocation.

It will be convenient to notice first the pieces which may with most reason be held to have been derived by both evangelists from the same document. The Saying on 'the divisions between near relatives which would arise as a consequence of His coming' (Lk xii. 51—53) and that on 'its being necessary for those who would be His disciples to set aside human relationships and to bear the cross' (Lk xiv. 26, 27), may be taken together. They seem properly to belong to one another, and are given as though they formed one piece in Mt. x. 34—38. The amount of verbal agreement between the two Gospels in these sayings, though not so great as in several other passages, is nevertheless quite sufficient to allow of our supposing them to have been derived by both evangelists from the same Greek document. Luke may have been induced to separate them because the first seemed to him to fit well with another saying which he had himself collected, "I have come to kindle a fire," etc. (xii. 49, 50); while the second could suitably be connected with sayings on 'counting the cost' and 'renouncing earthly possessions' (xiv. 28—33), which were likewise part of his special store.

The parables of the Mustard Plant and Leaven at Lk xiii.

18—21, are introduced very abruptly, and it is difficult to see any other position which they could occupy in this part of his Gospel where the connexion of thought would be more obvious. In Mt. xiii. 31—33 the pair stand in the connexion in which the first of them is found in St Mark, viz., in the group of parables at the head of which we have that of the Sower. But our first and third evangelists appear to have known both as a pair from "Q"; for the former has in giving the first of them combined phrases from the Marcan and Lucan forms in a very noticeable manner, while in the second, where he had only "Q," he is in close agreement throughout with Luke. The Apostrophe to Jerusalem, "the slayer of prophets," in Lk xiii. 34, 35 and Mt. xxiii. 37—39, is identical, except for two or three exceedingly slight verbal differences. Luke has, according to his view as to the period to which a large portion of his non-Marcian matter could best be referred, connected it with the journey towards Jerusalem, and has supposed it to have been spoken when Jesus was in Herod's territory (xiii. 31—33), somewhere nearer probably to Herod's own place of residence than He had been in Galilee—especially those central and northerly parts of Galilee which He had frequented. In St Matthew it concludes the denunciation of the Pharisees and Scribes, immediately after which Jesus departs from the courts of the Temple for the last time. In the source it may have preceded the passage on the Coming of the Son of Man given in Lk xvii. 22—37. The supposition that this was its original position will, I think, be confirmed by a consideration of the only two passages occurring between it and the Coming of the Son of Man in Luke's "Great Insertion" which have close parallels in St Matthew, viz. xiv. 26, 27 and xvii. 1—4<sup>1</sup>. We have already seen reasons for connecting the former of these closely with xii. 51—53<sup>2</sup>. The latter also would suitably follow the warnings to disciples given in those two pieces.

The description of the Future Coming of the Son of Man comes nearly at the end of Luke's "Great Insertion," being followed only by two parables which are peculiar to him. Our first evangelist has embodied the substance of part of

<sup>1</sup> See Table II.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 95.

this eschatological passage and uses many of the same expressions in his Discourse on the Last Things. As in some other cases we may here attribute omissions and differences on his part to his having united matter taken from different sources, and shall be justified in supposing "Q" to have been one of these.

In two instances of which I have not yet spoken the origin of the similarity between the two Gospels is specially difficult to determine. The first is the incident of the Healing of the dropsical man on the Sabbath with the defence of His act made by Jesus on the occasion (Lk xiv. 1—6). This may have had a place in the source and may have been in the mind of our first evangelist (Mt. xii. 9—14) who may have drawn thence the argument with which he supplements the account of a similar incident taken from Mk iii. 1—6. The other is the figure of the Lost Sheep (Mt. xviii. 12—14), which is expanded into a parable in Lk xv. 4 ff. and differently applied. But so far as the two Gospels correspond in substance the language also is very similar<sup>1</sup>.

The remaining Sayings and longer pieces in St Luke which have parallels in St Matthew, but not in St Mark, reached the two evangelists I believe by different channels, oral or written. There are a few quite short Sayings, scattered through the concluding portion of Luke's "Great Insertion," and one subsequent to it, which are given in very similar, and sometimes practically identical form in St Matthew<sup>2</sup>. Not only, however, do the two evangelists place them in wholly different settings, but in St Luke they are connected in each case with matter that is peculiar to him, and seem to belong to it so closely that there would be no proper position left for them in this portion of his Gospel if the pieces with which they are respectively associated were removed. Let us notice, for instance, that in Lk xii. 58, 59, on 'the unwisdom of deferring the payment of a debt.' The purpose with which this proverbial Saying is quoted here depends wholly on the Saying peculiar to Luke which precedes, on men's blindness

<sup>1</sup> See further on this subject p. 331 f. below.

<sup>2</sup> Lk xii. 58, 59=Mt. v. 25, 26; Lk xiv. 11=Mt. xxiii. 12; Lk xiv. 34, 35=Mt. v. 13; Lk xvi. 13=Mt. vi. 24; Lk xxii. 30=Mt. xix. 28.

in regard to the signs of the times (*ib. vv.* 54—57). The significance which the proverb about payment has in the position which it holds in Mt. v. 25, 26 appears to be quite different. Again, to take the Saying in which the agreement of language is most striking (Lk xvi. 13 = Mt. vi. 24): we may fairly say, I think, that to explain its place in St Luke we must suppose it to have been attracted (so to speak) to the parable of the Unjust Steward, rather than that parable to have been attracted to it. And at the same time no stress can be laid on the closeness of agreement in the case of this Saying with the parallel in our first Gospel—and still less can it be in the others which have been enumerated—because (as I have already had occasion to remark) single pithy Sayings might easily be remembered and reproduced in the same form, or might have been textually assimilated by very early copyists, of whose action our existing textual evidence gives no indication.

Again the difference between the Saying concerning 'winning one's life through sacrificing it' at Mt. x. 39 and Lk xvii. 33, not only in form but also in the application suggested, makes it probable that in Mt. x. it comes from a different source (perhaps current oral teaching). At the same time such a Saying probably stood in "Q" in the eschatological passage reproduced in Lk xvii. 22—37. Our first evangelist may have passed it over, though he knew it there, in his conflate Eschatological Discourse in chh. xxiv., xxv.

I have still to speak of two little groups of Sayings. The three in Lk xiii. 24—29 go well together, and it seems not improbable that our first evangelist also may have known them as forming a single piece. He has given corresponding Sayings separately, indeed, but near together and in the same order, the first two in the concluding part of his discourse on the 'Character of the heirs of the Kingdom' (vii. 13, 14, 22, 23), and the third at the end of the narrative of the centurion's servant (viii. 11, 12). Nevertheless, in the case of the two former Sayings the form of expression is widely different in the two Gospels. In the first (Mt. vii. 13, 14), the image is that of "a gate" by which "a way" is entered, whereas in Lk xiii. 24 f., it is that of "a door" and "a house." In the second

Saying the false professors claim, according to Mt. vii. 22, 23, to 'have prophesied and wrought miracles in Christ's Name'; in Lk xiii. 25—27 they say that they 'have eaten and drunk in His presence,' and that He 'has taught in their streets.' In the third Saying there is fairly close similarity between the two Gospels; nevertheless the phrases and words which are the same are such as might well have been used independently in two reports<sup>1</sup>.

In Lk xvi. 15—18 we have four Sayings on the Pharisees and the Jewish Law. I have already suggested a way in which Luke may have come by three of these<sup>2</sup>. The remaining one, on the place occupied by John the Baptist at the turning-point between the age of the Law and Prophets and that new age which had now come, is included in the Matthaean discourse on the Baptist. It is surely probable that the whole little piece was put together in the process of oral teaching, and that Luke received it through such teaching, or found it in some document other than "Q."

Lastly, the parables in St Luke of the Great Supper (xiv. 15—24), to which guests are summoned by one servant, and the Ten Minae given one apiece to ten servants (xix. 11—28) have affinities with, and yet differ in conception from, those in St Matthew of the Wedding-feast for the king's son to which guests were summoned by successive bodies of servants (xxii. 1—14), and of the Talents, five, two and one, given respectively to different servants (xxv. 14—30). We saw that Luke is more than usually free in his treatment of his Marcan document when reproducing from it the parables of the Sower and of the Vine-dressers<sup>3</sup>. But the freedom required on the part of the first and third evangelists in the use of a common original, in order to produce out of it the pairs of parables now before us, would far exceed that shewn in those instances. Nor is the relation of the members of the pairs the same as that which we have observed between the exhortation to the disciples to be watchful as servants awaiting the return of the bridegroom and the parable of the Ten Virgins. There the figurative exhortation in Luke might have been intended to give succinctly the lesson of the full

<sup>1</sup> See further on these Sayings, p. 352.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 84 f.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 73.



parable. On the contrary in the case now before us we have in each Gospel the independent development of the same idea. Weizsäcker, when noting the greater degree of variation which seems to have been held permissible in the parables than in the precepts of Christ, compares the difference to that between the Haggadah and Halachah among the Jews. In connexion with this interesting remark I would point out the very small extent to which parables seem to have been included in "Q." The only two which there is strong reason to think were comprised in it are those of the Mustard Plant and the Leaven<sup>1</sup>. It may well be that parables were not regarded in the strict and full sense as "Logia," and had not been embodied in the same formal tradition which was first orally delivered and then written down. It would be quite natural that the Christian Halachah should be kept distinct from Christian Haggadah. This would explain the fact that the parables recorded by our first and third evangelists are to so large an extent different ones. If the parables were not contained in the early source used by both, but were preserved for a long period in floating tradition, each might well have become acquainted with different parables.

It has been observed above that, while throughout Luke's "Insertions" pieces taken from "Q" are intermingled with pieces from other quarters, the latter become specially plentiful towards the close of the last and longest "Insertion." This is just what one would expect, whether these other pieces were contributed by Luke himself or by someone who revised and expanded the copy of "Q" which Luke afterwards used. In either case it would be natural that much of "Q" should first be given, and that when only a few passages, belonging clearly to the end of Christ's Ministry, remained to be taken from it, other matter for which no obviously fitting place had so far been found, should be introduced.

The use made of "Q" in the composition of the discourses in our first Gospel is likewise a natural one<sup>2</sup>. Here as well as

<sup>1</sup> Comparisons such as those of the servants waiting for the bridegroom (xii. 35—38), the Coming of the Son of Man like that of a thief, etc., are not parables. Figurative language is used, but the intended application is made perfectly plain.

<sup>2</sup> See Analyses of Discourses in St Matthew, pp. 122—9.

in St Luke a kind of precedence has been accorded to it. Accounts of addresses taken from it—or in two instances (those of the Character of the heirs of the Kingdom and the Denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees) from fuller versions which it contained in an abbreviated form—have furnished the groundwork of the first four of the principal discourses, just as the accounts from the Marcan document have done in the discourse illustrating the Teaching by parables, that on Offences and on the Last Things. Further, several of the pieces which the first evangelist has taken from the common document—those which he has transplanted as well as those which form the basis of certain of his composite discourses—are of not inconsiderable length, and none are very short single Sayings. Such brief, separate Sayings there are, occurring in both Gospels, which closely resemble one another in form as well as in substance, but which are very differently placed in the two. We have, however, already inferred from their position in St Luke that they were probably not found in the common document. And it may now be added that although, if they had been included in it, the first evangelist might have taken them thence and given them a new setting, yet it would be less likely that he should have dealt thus with small fragments than with longer pieces which were more noticeable, and could more easily be regarded as distinct wholes. In the case of single brief Sayings it is more natural to suppose that he was guided in the place that he gave them by associations arising from oral tradition, or from what he had read in other documents, than by the intention to rearrange his main sources. And it may be remarked that we have one instructive example of a saying differently placed in St Luke and St Matthew, which owes its position in the latter to the fact of its being included in a piece not derived from “Q<sup>1</sup>.”

In the preceding discussion the question has been left open whether the matter peculiar to the first and third Gospels respectively, as also the matter which is in substance the same in both, but too different in form to have been derived from the same document, was added by the evangelists themselves,

<sup>1</sup> See p. 92 f. on Lk xii. 11, 12 (Mt. x. 19, 20).

or had already found a place in revised and expanded forms of the common source, which they severally used. We shall in later chapters consider this question in connexion with the subject of the composition of these Gospels. In the present chapter it has been my aim to ascertain the contents of the chief source of non-Marcian matter common to the first and third Gospels, which was also in all probability the earliest consecutive and relatively complete representative of the Aramaic Collection of the Sayings of Jesus. But incidentally we have also been led to single out in St Matthew two discourses in which a fuller version of the original seems to have been substituted. I subjoin a conspectus to shew the form of the source which may be deduced from the available evidence, according to the view of it taken above.

*THE LOGIAN SOURCE IN GREEK, KNOWN TO AND USED BY OUR FIRST AND THIRD EVANGELISTS, OR EMBODIED IN TWO DOCUMENTS WHICH WERE USED BY THEM SEVERALLY.*

*The ushering in of the Ministry of Christ.*

The preaching of the Baptist. (Lk iii. 3, 7—9, 16 *b*, 17; Mt. iii. 5, 7—12.)

The Baptism of Jesus. (Lk iii. 21, 22; Mt. iii. 13, 16, 17.)

The Temptation of Jesus. (Lk iv. 1—13; Mt. iv. 1—11 *a*.)

*The first stage in the preaching of the Gospel.*

The discourse on the Character of the heirs of the Kingdom. (Lk vi. 17—49.)

(N.B. A fuller version of this discourse is substituted in Mt. (v. 3—vi. 8, vi. 16—18, vii. 1—5, 12, 15—21, 24—27) for that contained in the Greek document which was in other parts a common source.)

The faith of the Gentile centurion and its reward. (Lk vii. 1—10; Mt. viii. 5—10, 13.)

The message of John the Baptist, and the reply of Jesus to it and His remarks on the character of John, and on the perverse attitude of men to both John and Himself. (Lk vii. 18—28, 31—35; Mt. xi. 2—11, 16—19.)

*The extension of the Gospel.*

Missionary tour by Jesus. (Lk viii. 1; Mt. ix. 35.)

Warnings addressed to two men on the subject of following Him. (Lk ix. 57—60; Mt. viii. 19—22.)

The harvest plenteous but the labourers few. (Lk x. 2; Mt. ix. 37, 38.)

Directions for the preachers of the Gospel. (Lk x. 3—12, 16; Mt. x. 5 a, 7—16, 40; but for form of *v.* 40 see Mk ix. 37.)

*The rejection and the reception of Divine truth.*

Woe to thee, Chorazin, etc. (Lk x. 13—15; Mt. xi. 21—23.)

Thanksgiving that the Father reveals to the simple what is hidden from the wise. (Lk x. 21, 22; Mt. xi. 25—27.)

Blessed are your eyes, etc. (Lk x. 23, 24; Mt. xiii. 16, 17.)

*Instruction on Prayer.*

The Lord's Prayer. (Lk xi. 2—4; Mt. vi. 9—13.)

Exhortation to be earnest in prayer. (Lk xi. 9—13; Mt. vii. 7—11.)

*Jesus and His antagonists.*

The lawyer who tried Him with a question as to the means of obtaining eternal life:—the two great commandments. (Lk x. 25—28; Mt. xxii. 34—40.)

On casting out a devil Jesus is accused of collusion with Beelzebub. (Lk xi. 14, 15, 17—23; Mt. xii. 22—30.)

The man whom the unclean spirit leaves for a time only. (Lk xi. 24—26; Mt. xii. 43—45.)

The demand for a sign. (Lk xi. 16, 29—32; Mt. xii. 39—42.)

The lamp of the body is the eye (i.e. singleness of purpose is necessary for perceiving the truth). (Lk xi. 34—36; Mt. vi. 22, 23.)

Denunciation of Pharisees and Scribes. (Lk xi. 39—52; a fuller version of this discourse is substituted in Mt. xxiii. 1—36.)

*Exhortations to disciples in view of the opposition and other trials that awaited them.*

Confess Me faithfully. (Lk xii. 2—10; Mt. x. 26—33, and xii. 32.)

Trust God for the necessities of life. (Lk xii. 22—34; Mt. vi. 25—34, 19—21.)

Watch lest the Son of Man should come as a thief. (Lk xii. 39, 40; Mt. xxiv. 43, 44.)

Act as a prudent steward would. (Lk xii. 42—46; Mt. xxiv. 45—51.)

Expect divisions in consequence of Christ's work, and be prepared to set aside human relationships and to bear the cross. (Lk xii. 51—53, xiv. 26, 27; Mt. x. 34—38.)

Two parables on the secret beginnings and ultimate triumph of Christ's work. (Lk xiii. 18—21; Mt. xiii. 31—33.)

There will be offences. (Lk xvii. 1—4; Mt. xviii. 5—7, 15, 21, 22.)

The power of faith. (Lk xvii. 5, 6; cp. Mt. xvii. 19, 20, which may be a conflation of the Saying in "Q" and at Mk xi. 23.)

*The doom on Jerusalem, and the things of the end.*

Jerusalem, slayer of prophets, thy house shall be left desolate. (Lk xiii. 34, 35; Mt. xxiii. 37—39.)

The Return of the Son of Man. (Lk xvii. 22—37; Mt. xxiv. 26—28, 37—41. Cp. also x. 39.)

I feel considerable confidence in giving this as at least a list of the passages from our first and third Gospels which there is most reason to think were contained in their common non-Marcian source. But there is some ground for going further. The simple and natural order of this outline, and the compactness of the whole, suggest that we may have here *approximately* its whole contents. There may indeed be among pieces peculiar to St Matthew or St Luke a few derived from this source which have not been included above; we cannot say that neither evangelist would ever omit what

the other took<sup>1</sup>. But the amount of such matter which we have not the means of distinguishing, and so have failed to gather in, is not likely to have been considerable, because in that case the remaining matter from the source, the derivation of which from it we have been able to ascertain, would not have presented that appearance of orderly connexion and compactness which we have found in it. For another reason, in addition to this one, it must be pronounced highly improbable that the peculiarities in Luke's narrative of the Passion were derived from this source. It is most unlikely that our first evangelist, who in other parts combines matter from this source with the Marcan document, should—throughout this large division of his Gospel, in which all the information that could be obtained would be of interest—have refrained altogether from using it, although it was available<sup>2</sup>. There is nothing comparable to this in the

<sup>1</sup> There are, no doubt, also points of detail, clauses, etc., preserved only in one evangelist. With this we are not now concerned.

<sup>2</sup> Harnack, *ib.* p. 127, also comes to the conclusion, that "Q" did not contain an account of the Passion. Burkitt (*Journ. of Theol. Studies*, p. 154 ff.) adheres to the opinion before expressed by him that it did. "I find it difficult," he writes (p. 454), "to believe that critical method is wholly to be trusted, which presents us with a document that starts off with the story of our Lord's Baptism and then gives us His words but not the story of the Cross and Resurrection." See also p. 457. The fact that "Q" contained a mention of the Baptism is the only one from which, so far as I can see, he can claim any support for his view; and it is a slender ground for forming a conception of the document in question. In reality the mention of the Baptism (possibly it was a mere reference) may have been intended only to introduce the words spoken at it, or the temptations and replies of Jesus in the Wilderness. A setting of some kind, more or less historical, was naturally given to pieces of Teaching where possible. And there could be no doubt also that Teaching connected with the Baptism and Temptation should be placed at the beginning, even though no attempt at chronological sequence was made in the rest of the work. In view of their subject-matter itself the place they occupy was the proper one for them. The Baptism is closely associated with the Preaching of John, which is the true starting-point, and the fitting prelude, for the Teaching of Jesus.

Further there would be no suitability in the document's giving a history of the Passion unless it had likewise before given at least a brief account of the Ministry. Now there is strong reason for thinking that it cannot have done this; for, if so, our first and third evangelists would not have been left free to introduce the matter taken from this source into the Marcan outline so diversely as they have done. The arrangement of the Teaching relatively to the events, in one or the other, must then have conflicted seriously with that in the source and it is not likely that either would so greatly have disregarded the source.

omission of Marcan sections by Luke, even if we assume, which we are not justified in doing, that he had them all lying before him. Besides, it is a question here not of Luke's action, but of that of our first evangelist, who has passed over only a few short sections, here one, there another, in his Marcan document.

The subject-matter and form of the document corresponded with the character of the early tradition of the precepts of Jesus among Palestinian believers, as we have been led to conceive it. Thus even apart from the general probability that an Aramaic source would be used for the Teaching of Jesus, there is good reason to hold that in the Greek Logian source which was used by our first and third evangelists, or which formed the foundation of documents used by them, we have a translation of an Aramaic document, embodying the oral tradition of those of Christ's Sayings which were felt by believers of the first days to be most needful for the conduct of their life and for sustaining their courage<sup>1</sup>.

It is impossible to discuss the doctrinal character of the Logian document without raising questions as to the true conception of the Person and Work of Christ, which I should prefer to reserve altogether for future consideration. Nevertheless, it will be expedient, I think, that I should here make a few remarks on the attitude to the distinctions of poverty and wealth, and to the Mosaic Law manifested in the two forms of the discourse on the Character of the heirs of the Kingdom.

(i) The contrast between the Beatitudes in St Matthew and St Luke is at first sight startling. The descriptions of the four classes blessed in the latter all refer to external conditions of hardship and of suffering; whereas in the former the persons on whom blessings are pronounced are (with one possible exception) characterised by moral and

<sup>1</sup> Professor Harnack (*ib.* p. 127 f.) observes that if we consider Jewish habits of thought of that time, it will not surprise us and will even seem *à priori* probable, that the Sayings and Discourses of Jesus should have been separately compiled; and that this is confirmed by the usage of Christian language which from the beginning distinguished between the words and the deeds of Jesus, e.g., Acts i. 1 and Lk xxiv. 19.

spiritual traits. But on reflection it may, I think, appear that, although the ideas suggested in the two accounts are partly distinct, they are not wholly so, and also in no wise inconsistent. In St Luke the gesture described at the beginning of the discourse—"He lifted up His eyes upon His disciples and said,"—and the direct address to them throughout should be noticed. It is not all the poor who are blessed, but Christ's disciples, *although* they were poor. This they certainly were as a class; or at least they were all working-people, and they had either been called already to give up such possessions as they had, or they would henceforth be allowed to retain only a most precarious hold upon them. Among the poor, or those comparatively so, were, and long would be, found the minds and hearts most ready to receive Christ's message. "The poor whom Jesus not only here but ordinarily has in view are also those who are susceptible of spiritual influence"<sup>1</sup>. The rich and prosperous, on the other hand, on whom Christ pronounces His woes, were then as a matter of fact almost to a man either actively opposed to the progress of the Kingdom of God, or at least indifferent to it. There is, therefore, no good ground for saying that poverty is in this passage represented as in itself a virtue and as affording a claim on God for future reward.

Turning to St Matthew we should observe that the temper there described and which was necessary for the reception of Christ's message, was one which the discipline of poverty tended to produce, while material well-being, or a good religious position in the society of the day, were very unfavourable to it. Moreover, the sharp distinction which we are prompt to make now between the humble temper of mind and the outward conditions that promote this temper would not have been drawn in days of far less introspection, and when men also shewed their feelings of self-satisfaction more naïvely, and had not learned, to the extent that we have now, that it is the part even of good manners for one who possesses personal or social advantages over others to conceal, if he cannot inwardly suppress, the sense of it. On the whole,

<sup>1</sup> Harnack, "What is Christianity?" Lect. 6, p. 60.



it appears probable that the account in St Luke of what Jesus said is most exact, considered simply as a report. The words are there seen in their direct reference to, and should be interpreted by, the circumstances in which they were spoken. Moreover, there are traces of this form of them remaining in the Matthaean version. For while in *vv.* 3—10 the statements are general, there is a relapse into direct address in *vv.* 11 and 12, and in the same verses external sufferings are indicated. Again, the "sorrowing," *v.* 4, seems to correspond with the "weeping" of Lk *v.* 21 *b*<sup>1</sup>. At the same time the additions "in the spirit" and "after righteousness" in *vv.* 3 and 6 and the additional Sayings in regard to the pitiful, the pure in heart and the peacemakers bring out the essential meaning of the teaching for after times and different states of society, without possibility of misunderstanding. (ii) I pass to the treatment of the Mosaic Law. Did the strong words that "till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law," and that "Who-soever shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of heaven" (Mt. *v.* 18, 19), and the briefer Saying to the same effect at Lk *xvi.* 17 in reality proceed not from Christ, but from some Jewish Christian, who was concerned for the permanence of the Jewish Law? Or, on the other hand, was language which appears to be of an opposite character introduced by some liberal Jewish or Gentile Christian, as a counterpoise to those Sayings? Neither supposition seems to be necessary. The mention of a "jot" or a "tittle" suggests to us the minute observance of the Law which we associate with the Scribes and Pharisees. But in the figurative language of the East it might be used to urge the importance of the strictest and most entire obedience to the great principles of the Law and conformity to its spirit, and the connexion in which the language in question is used in St Luke, as well as in St Matthew, suggests that this was the application of it intended.

There does not then seem to be good reason for supposing

<sup>1</sup> The sorrow intended might, of course, also be that which is created by the sense of individual sin.

that the Logian source in its Greek or in its original Aramaic form has been affected by the dogmatic tendencies of a translator or a compiler in either of the above cases and these are the chief ones where this might be suggested.

Our investigation has led us to the conclusion that the common Logian source was very brief, but that it should be brief is what we might expect in the case of a primitive document. Partly, however, for this very reason Sayings and parables which have been omitted from it may likewise be authentic. In discussing the contents of the document used by both our first and third evangelists, much other matter of this kind has come before us, which deserves the most careful attention. But at the present point we shall do well to consider the evidence as to the transmission of the Teaching of Jesus which is supplied from another quarter, namely from the Gospel according to St Mark.

*The Teaching of Jesus in the Gospel according  
to St Mark.*

It has been held by the majority of students of the Synoptic problem that St Mark and the Logian document were in their origin independent of one another. But a different opinion has been maintained by B. Weiss and recently by Wellhausen, though they take opposite views of the relationship between the two writings. Weiss contends<sup>1</sup> that the same document in Greek, often called "the Logia," and called by him the "Oldest source" which was used by our first and third evangelists was known also to Mark and to a limited extent used by him, though he forebore to do so nearly so freely as they did, because his special purpose was to set forth the deeds rather than the Teaching of Jesus. Weiss supposes him to have made excerpts in certain instances from discourses contained in that document, more particularly in the case of the Preaching of the Baptist (Mk i.

<sup>1</sup> For the writings in which he has done so see p. 49, n. 3. (For F. Nicolardot's justification and use of the theory see below, p. 370.)

7, 8), the Mission of the Apostles and Christ's Charge to them (Mk vi. 8—11), and the Denunciation of the Pharisees (Mk xii. 38—40); while he also derived from the same source a few other short pieces and several single Sayings. As the two other Synoptics have frequently given this matter in the form in which they found it in their Marcan source, and have also given it separately, or (as is especially true in the case of our first evangelist) have interwoven with it the same matter in the more or less different form in which they derived it directly from the Logian source, they were in reality doubly dependent upon the Logian source, though no doubt without being conscious of the fact<sup>1</sup>. This would not be impossible, though it may not seem very likely. Let us see, however, whether the actual phenomena of relationship are consistent with the theory.

In the parallels in question, alike where there is a strict doublet, and where similar matter, diversely placed in St Mark and St Luke, has been combined in St Matthew, the Marcan form is (with scarcely an exception) noticeably different from the other<sup>2</sup>. Now why, we ask, if Mark had the same Greek Logian document before him as the others, should he thus regularly stand apart from them? Is it likely that he would be always the one to alter the source? Moreover, his differences from the form which we should infer from the other two are not of the kind that suggests stylistic revision on his part, but derivation through a different channel.

The differences in the settings of the pieces are also unfavourable to Weiss' view. That in the case of the Reply

<sup>1</sup> Weiss also holds that the "Oldest source" contained a good many narratives, which Mark took from it, and which the two other Synoptics knew both through Mark, and through his source, so that they have sometimes more accurately reproduced the source than Mark has done. I shall refer to this view again in the next chapter, but for the present, I desire to confine attention to the utterances of Jesus.

<sup>2</sup> The parallel in which the resemblance is greatest is that between the account of the Preaching of the Baptist in Mk i. 7, 8 and the other Synoptics. This resemblance may, however, well be due to the first and third evangelists having combined expressions from the brief Marcan account which they had before them with the account in the Logian source.

All the parallels to be examined can be readily found from Table II. nn.

of Jesus to the accusation that He was acting in collusion with Satan is an instance on which I would lay special stress. The connexion in which it is placed by Mark (iii. 24—30) is not such a natural one as that in which it stood in the Logian document (cp. Lk x. 14 with Mt. xii. 22, 23)<sup>1</sup>. The incident of the healing of a daemonic, which was there prefixed, is not given by Mark; and yet he generally shews a special interest in cases of exorcism. It is therefore very unlikely that if he had before him a document in which this attack upon Jesus, and His defence of Himself, were represented as arising out of a case of this kind, he should have substituted another and a less obviously suitable introduction. Frequently the position of sayings in St Mark is quite as good, or better, than a different one assigned them in the other Gospels. But even here it may be questioned whether, if the latter was the one in which they stood in a document which he was using, he would have changed it, or that, if he did determine to do so, he would have been so often successful in finding a perfectly appropriate occasion for giving them.

I turn to Wellhausen<sup>2</sup>, who virtually *assumes* that *either* Mark must be dependent upon "Q," or "Q" upon Mark, and decides in favour of the latter alternative, on the ground of a certain number of instances where in parallels between Mark and "Q," the latter appears to him to be "secondary"<sup>3</sup>. But even if the marks of "secondariness" which he adduces were more convincing than many of them at least are<sup>3</sup>, they might equally well be accounted for by supposing that a source common to both Gospels has been represented with more accuracy and freshness in St Mark than in "Q," or, indeed, that the particular Sayings or traditions in question have been preserved with more truth in the one than in the other. This would no doubt affect to some extent our judgment upon the character of "Q," but it would not prove dependence generally of "Q," either upon our Greek St Mark, or upon such an Aramaic original of it as Wellhausen imagines. And that there should have been a dependence of this kind we

<sup>1</sup> See p. 90 f. above.

<sup>2</sup> See his *Einleitung in die drei Ersten Evangelien*, 1905, p. 73 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See the examination of them by Harnack, *ib.* p. 136 ff.

may well pronounce to be inconceivable. For if the author of "Q" derived from St Mark the few Sayings which both give, whence, we ask, did he obtain all the other matter of the same kind which he gives?

Dismissing then alike the view that various pieces of Christ's Teaching given by Mark were taken by him from a Greek document, which was more largely used by our first and third evangelists for matter of this kind, and also the inverse view that their Logian source was itself dependent upon the Marcan document, let us go on to consider more generally the place of Christ's Teaching in the Gospel according to St Mark. I doubt whether the supposition is sound that Mark of set purpose curtailed the amount of Christ's Teaching which he included in his Gospel. A brief study of this point may, perhaps, throw some light upon the different ways in which Christ taught, and upon the transmission of His Words, and the composition of our second Gospel.

I shall not lay stress upon the fact that St Mark contains one formal discourse, of some length, namely, that on the Last Things in ch. xiii., for this instance is in more respects than one peculiar. Again, I will not dwell upon the other pieces of continuous discourse in this Gospel—that on the Charge of collusion with Satan (iii. 22—30), the Speaking in Parables (iv. 2—34), the Ceremonialism of the Pharisees (vii. 1—23), and the Avoidance of Offences (ix. 35—50). For in the second and last of these some additions appear to have been made to the original document, as we shall see in the next chapter, while some doubt may also be felt as to whether the first and third of them are not interpolations. I desire rather to direct attention to the fact that those replies to questions and objections, and individual Sayings called forth by special incidents, of which there is an abundance in St Mark, contain instruction of the most profound significance. How much, for instance, of all that is most precious in the Teaching of Jesus, and most characteristic of it, is contained in the Sayings embodied in the three successive sections relating to the Healing of a Paralytic, the Call of Levi, and the subject of Fasting (Mk ii. 1—12, 13—17, 18—22)? Many incidents, like that of the question suggested

by the fasts of the disciples of John and of the Pharisees, are evidently related solely on account of the Words of Jesus of which they furnished the occasion ; but even some of the most striking miracles appear to be recorded<sup>1</sup> at least as much for the sake of some Word full of meaning for Christian life which was spoken in connexion with them as on account of the deed itself. As regards the preservation of Teaching in the form of questions and the replies to them, it should be observed that this was thoroughly in accordance with Jewish habits of thought, as everyone will recognise who is even slightly acquainted with the Rabbinic writings. Considered as a mode of conveying the teaching of a great Master, questions with his replies to them and incidents with the remarks which they led him to make are plainly analogous. And that much valuable instruction should have been given in the latter way, and preserved in the form in which it was given, would be specially natural in the case of One Who did not teach in the schools, but while moving about among men. The Logian document, too, contained matter of the kind just described—short narratives in each of which some great utterance of Jesus is set. But the form of instruction characteristic of it is that of the more or less closely connected series of Sayings. This feature in the document is probably to be accounted for, as we have seen, in part at least as the result of compilation for practical purposes, and it is, therefore, probable that the longer pieces which our Gospels contain do not accurately correspond with what was spoken on any one occasion. Nevertheless, it is evident that Jesus cannot have confined Himself to isolated Sayings, and that He must constantly have set forth the truths which the world needed, and which it was His mission to deliver, in continuous speech.

How then are we to explain the scarcity in St Mark's Gospel, relatively to the two other Synoptics, of continuous addresses? The answer is ready, if what I have urged in the early part of this chapter, as to the rendering of the Teaching of Jesus into Greek, be sound. The phenomena of his Gospel both as to the comparative absence of pieces of Teaching of

<sup>1</sup> E.g., the Healing of the paralytic just referred to; many others will occur to the reader.

any length, and the form in which we do at the same time learn from it much about the character of Christ's Teaching, illustrate a certain stage in the process of the transmission of the tradition of that Teaching to the Greek-speaking Church. The writer had not the longer pieces readily at his command, because a full translation into Greek did not yet exist. And supposing that he himself knew Aramaic, which is indeed probable, the same circumstances which withheld others from translating would have affected him. The tradition may not yet have been committed to writing in Aramaic, so as to make translation comparatively easy, while portions of the tradition might be felt to be more or less unsuited to believers from among the Gentiles.

In connexion with this last point, we may notice the omission from St Mark of all reference to the discourse on the Character of the heirs of the Kingdom, and of nearly all its contents. We might have expected that even if he knew this discourse only in Aramaic, or through those who could orally interpret its substance to him from the Aramaic, he would have given a brief account of it, such as he has given in the case of the Preaching of the Baptist (Mk i. 7, 8); the charge of Jesus to His Apostles on sending them forth to preach (Mk vi. 7—11); the Denunciation of the Scribes (Mk xii. 38—40). It is, however, possible that the same reason which, as we have seen, probably led to the abbreviated form of the translation of the discourse on the Character of the heirs of the Kingdom in our third Gospel, may have led Mark to pass it over altogether. That whole portion of the discourse coming near the beginning of it, which dealt with the subject of the Jewish Law and with the Pharisaic spirit, may have seemed to him unsuited for the Gentile readers for whom more particularly his Gospel was intended. Even the Beatitudes, if the Lucan form of them is the nearest to the original, as (we have seen) is probable<sup>1</sup>, may have seemed to him open to misunderstanding.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 106 f.

It remains only to discuss the history of the

*Discourse on the Last Things*

in Mk xiii.

There is not in St Mark any other account of a discourse of Jesus which in length and form resembles this one. There is no other which, like this, is an articulated whole with clearly marked and yet connected divisions. In the drama that is unfolded there are three successive acts, (i) the "Beginning of birth-throes" (vv. 5—13; the phrase ἀρχὴ ὀδίνων ταῦτα, which characterises the period referred to, is in v. 8); (ii) the "Great tribulation" (vv. 14—23, see esp. v. 19); (iii) the Appearance of the Son of Man (vv. 24—27). Finally, (iv) there are general exhortations to watchfulness (vv. 28—37) which emphasize the warnings included in the preceding portions. From these peculiarities both as to the extent and structure of this discourse, apart altogether from the nature of its contents, we may fairly conclude that it had a history different from that of the other reports of Christ's Teaching embodied in this Gospel. It is also improbable that its form is due to the evangelist himself, since he plainly has not in any other instance sought to construct a regular discourse out of different traditions, or by any other means<sup>1</sup>. The piece must in all probability have come to his hands as a separate, written composition<sup>2</sup>. But indeed this discourse

<sup>1</sup> Wendt's view (*Lehre Jesu*, I. p. 20), to which I have referred again p. 117, n. 1 below, must therefore be rejected.

<sup>2</sup> The parenthesis in v. 14—ὁ ἀναγνώσκων νοεῖτω—has also frequently been taken as a clear indication that the discourse was contained in a document. The reference in these words, it is said, must be to a reader of the discourse: it cannot be to the prophet Daniel (though some striking words from that prophet are quoted immediately before), because the prophet's name is not mentioned here. I am quite unable myself to use this argument. An allusive reference to the words of some well-known writer is surely a common thing, and may be all the more impressive from its very allusiveness. So here, the clause ἀναγνώσκων etc., has a good and forcible meaning if we are to understand by it in effect "let those who read the well-known words of the prophet be prompt to mark their fulfilment which is about to be accomplished." For citations similarly introduced see Mk ii. 25; xii. 10, 26, etc., and cp. p. 343.

It is also unlikely that a writer who professed to be simply recording an address by Jesus to His disciples should have so far forgotten himself as to refer in solemn terms to his own writing, and there would be no special appropriateness



affords a contrast, in respect of its methodical arrangement, even with those in the two other Synoptic Gospels, especially St Luke. It should also be noticed that in the case of those discourses in St Matthew which approach in some degree to the formality of structure which is to be observed in this one, there is reason to think that this character was imparted to them by the writer of our Greek Gospel, who combined different accounts.

I must now, however, go on to observe that the Eschatological Discourse in St Mark (reproduced in the two other Synoptics) appears to be composite in a different sense from those discourses in St Matthew, to which I have just referred. No one refuses to allow that genuine Sayings of Jesus are included in it; but in its general scheme of future events, and its descriptions of the calamities that should come upon the world, it closely resembles many Jewish and Jewish-Christian Apocalypses. In these portions and features of it there is not that accent of originality and profound moral significance which we find almost invariably in the remainder of the Teaching attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels<sup>1</sup>. There are also signs of compilation in connexion with the other, more probably authentic, element in this discourse. Between Mk *vv.* 9—13 and the Mission-address in Mt. x. *vv.* 17—22 there is a correspondence so close that we must suppose two writers to have derived the piece directly or ultimately from the same document, and that the one determined to place it in an address delivered by Jesus to His disciples when about to send them forth to preach, and the other in a discourse in which, near the end of His Ministry, He instructed them regarding the future. There are also parallels, though not such close ones in point of form, between other Sayings in the Discourse on the Last Things, and some that have been preserved in the Logian document<sup>2</sup>.

Two views have been taken of the origin of this composition in the position of the words, if that were their purport. The case of the writer of the Apocalypse of John (xxii. 18 ff.) is quite different. Moreover, the adjuration there is suitably placed at the end of the work.

<sup>1</sup> I confine the remark to the Synoptic Gospels simply because the Fourth Gospel is not now before us.

<sup>2</sup> Mk xiii. 15, 16=Lk xvii. 31; Mk xiii. 21=Lk xvii. 23.

tion in consequence of the features in it of which I have spoken. (i) Some have held that the groundwork is a little apocalypse of strictly Jewish origin, into which a certain number of Sayings of Jesus have been introduced. (ii) It has seemed to other critical students that some Jewish-Christian was the author, who was influenced in his general presentation of the distinctively Christian material which he had at his disposal by his Jewish conceptions, and amplified it with expressions familiar to him through Jewish writings. In this case, too, the work may perhaps not unfitly be described as a "little apocalypse," and yet the difference between the two views is not without importance in relation to the history of the evangelic tradition and of the composition of the Gospels, and they ought to be more clearly distinguished than they sometimes have been. I believe there are strong reasons for adopting the latter of them<sup>1</sup>.

The extent of the Christian element must first be considered. The warning in *v.* 6 concerning those who should come "in my name," and should deceive many, is evidently not Jewish, and with this we must place the renewed warning to the same effect in *vv.* 21, 22 against false prophets and false Christs. The early disciples of Jesus are put on their guard against illusions to which the minds of many of their fellow-countrymen would become a prey<sup>1</sup>. There is a parallel in the Logian document (see *Lk xvii.* 23; cp. also *Mt. vii.* 15, in a different context); while from the predictions of the

<sup>1</sup> The supposition that a strictly Jewish writing formed the groundwork is held by Pfeleiderer, *Urchrist.* i. pp. 382—4, though at an earlier time he held the whole to be Jewish-Christian (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1868, p. 137 f.); so also Vischer, *Texte u. Unters.* ii. 3, p. 9 n. H. Holtzmann expresses himself more doubtfully, *N.T. Theol.* i. p. 327 ("ein vielleicht ursprünglich jüdisches... apokalyptisches Stück"). On the other hand the following consider that we have here a Jewish-Christian composition: Colani, *Jésus-Christ et les croyances Messianiques*, p. 201 f.; Renan, *l'Antéchrist*, p. 292 f.; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, v. p. 237 f.; Weizsäcker, who has followed the inverse course to Pfeleiderer:—in his *Untersuchungen*, p. 124 f., he assumed a Jewish source, whereas in his *Apost. Zeit.*, p. 361 f. (Eng. trans. ii. p. 22 ff.), he contends that the work is Jewish-Christian. Wernle, *Synopt. Frage*, p. 214, is on the same side. Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, i. p. 10 ff. argues that two sources, one genuinely Apostolic, another Jewish-Christian of inferior value, were combined by Mark himself. I have argued above, p. 115, that the compilation should not be attributed to Mark.

Jewish apocalypses this trait is almost absent<sup>1</sup>. Again the paragraph (*vv.* 9—13), to which there is a parallel in the Mission-address in Mt. x., is evidently a description of what Christians would have to endure. But, further, in the section concerning the "great tribulation," the point of view appears clearly to be Christian not Jewish<sup>2</sup>. It would be impossible to understand otherwise how the question of the fate of the Jewish race and of the Holy City should be completely passed over, when to a Jewish mind it would have been so directly suggested by the whole context. It is true that in Jewish apocalypses a distinction is drawn between the righteous or "elect" among the chosen people, and the sinners amongst them. But the fulfilment of God's covenant with Israel was promised, so far as the faithful remainder was concerned<sup>3</sup>. And at the same time the severity of God's punishment of Zion was felt to be an inscrutable enigma<sup>4</sup>.

I pass to the section on the Parousia (*vv.* 24—27). The application of the passage concerning "one like unto a Son of Man" in Daniel vii. to the revelation of the Messiah, though not exclusively Christian, seems never to have taken the same hold among Jews as it did among Christians<sup>5</sup>. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the passage before us is of Christian origin. Pfeleiderer, indeed, argues<sup>6</sup> that a Christian writer could not well have omitted to indicate that the Son of Man was none other than Jesus, Who had been crucified. And certainly it was and has ever been usual in Christian thought to associate the humiliation with the future glory of the Christ; but if it were indeed scarcely possible that a Christian writer should leave the former unexpressed, we might equally have expected that a Christian editor of a

<sup>1</sup> The only instance which I have noticed is a comparatively indistinct one at *Apoc. Baruchi*, xlvi. 34, "Et erunt rumores multi et nuncii non pauci, et opera phantasiarum ostendentur, et enarrabuntur promissiones non paucae, quarum aliae vanae, et aliae confirmabuntur."

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Weizsäcker, *ib.* pp. 261, 262.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., see *Apoc. Baruchi*, xli.; xlvi. 21 ff.

<sup>4</sup> E.g., see 4 Esdras v. 21 ff.; vi. 18 ff. and 57—59; viii. 15—17.

<sup>5</sup> See the present writer's *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 61 ff., and article "Messiah," *Hastings' Dict. of Bible*, III. p. 353, col. 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Urchrist.* I. p. 383.

Jewish document would have made the necessary addition, which he could very easily have done.

The concluding exhortations may be regarded as an appendage to an earlier document, and I therefore lay no stress upon them, although none of them are distinctively Jewish, and some are distinctively Christian.

On the whole it appears that the portions of the "little apocalypse" in which it is natural to trace a Christian intention are so considerable as to leave little room for the supposition of a purely Jewish groundwork. But there is another reason for rejecting this hypothesis, which has been strangely overlooked. It was of the essence of an apocalypse that it was supposed to be communicated by some eminent person who had been chosen to receive the revelation. In the case of a Jewish apocalypse the seer was necessarily some famous character of the Old Testament. It would be impossible therefore that a Jewish apocalypse could have been mistaken for a discourse by Jesus; and even if any Christian of the Apostolic age had sought to pass it off as such, it is highly improbable that he would have succeeded in removing all indications of the prophet to whom it had before been attributed.

I have spoken only of the discourse from *v.* 5 onwards. But the revelation which Jesus is represented to have made must have been introduced in some way, and since we have come to the conclusion that the composition was a Jewish-Christian one, there is nothing to prevent our supposing the introduction to have been substantially that contained in *Mk xiii.* 1—4<sup>1</sup>. The circumstance that the prophecy was delivered to four specially trusted disciples (*vv.* 3, 4), not to the whole body, is (it should be observed) in accord with the "apocalyptic" idea, to which I have just referred, that the knowledge of the future is in the first instance communicated as a peculiar privilege.

That the composition of this writing belongs to Palestine cannot be doubted. The sign that is given, that of the desecration of the Holy Place, and the warning to escape

<sup>1</sup> *raûra* in *v.* 4 seems to refer only to the destruction of the temple, but such a catastrophe could not be supposed to come by itself.

from Judaea when this happens, are evidence of this. Various traits, also, in the description of the miseries and perplexities which were to be expected fit the state of things actually experienced in Palestine during the decade or so before the capture of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and not in the same way any other time or place. Nevertheless, it may possibly have been composed in Greek. The correspondences between some of its phrases and the LXX. are more easily explicable if it was not a translation from Aramaic<sup>1</sup>. If so we may imagine that it was written in one of the Greek cities on the border of the district that was predominantly Jewish, either beyond Jordan or near the sea-coast. And the fact that it contains a reference to Judaea, but none to escaping from Jerusalem itself is a slight confirmation of this hypothesis.

On the assumption, in itself a reasonable one, that circumstances stimulated its composition and affected at least in some degree its contents, we shall be justified in inquiring into its probable date. There is now general agreement<sup>2</sup> that the composition of this writing must have preceded the taking of Jerusalem by Titus, both on account of the absence of any allusion to that event<sup>3</sup>, and of the general indistinctness of the prospect so far as the issues of the "great tribulation," and the relation to it in time of the Parousia, are concerned. Indeed, the most natural point at which to place the composition seems to be a little after A.D. 60, when it was felt that "the birth-throes" were beginning, while trials of greater intensity, though of the same general character, might well be anticipated<sup>4</sup>. There is no good reason to see in the words τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ a reference to anything which had already happened. Belief in the ancient

<sup>1</sup> Cp. esp. *v.* 27, ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων with Zech. ii. 6, ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ συναῶξ ὑμᾶς. It is noteworthy here that the Hebrew refers to the scattering of Israel, not to the gathering of them together. Further cp. *v.* 14 with Dan. ix. 27; xi. 31; *v.* 19 with Dan. xii. 1; *v.* 24 with Isa. xiii. 10; *v.* 25 with Isa. xxxiv. 4. In the last case πῖπτοντες agrees with LXX. but not with Heb.

<sup>2</sup> So all the writers mentioned in p. 117 n. above; others might easily be added.

<sup>3</sup> I am of course speaking of the form in which Mark has given it. It has undergone alterations in St Luke which imply a later point of view.

<sup>4</sup> See esp. Weizsäcker, *ib.*, but others, too, have written to the same effect.

prophecy<sup>1</sup>, which had already acquired a definite meaning from its application to the act of Antiochus Epiphanes<sup>2</sup>, and the threatened perpetration of a similar act of impiety by Caligula, was quite sufficient to suggest the sign. Again, the warning to flee "to the mountains" may have been due to a reminiscence of Ezek. vii. 15, 16.

The author of our second Gospel, in introducing where he does the contents of this little document which we have been considering, may have been guided by genuine tradition as to a discourse of Jesus concerning things to come, which He addressed to His disciples when His public Ministry had just been closed. We may be in a better position to judge how far this is likely when we have examined the composition of this Gospel more generally.

<sup>1</sup> Dan. ix. 27, xi. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Macc. i. 54, 59.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE TO CHAPTER II.

*Analysis of the discourses of Jesus<sup>1</sup> in St Matthew.*

On these discourses see pp. 72—102, and also (especially as to the matter peculiar to St Matthew), pp. 327—336.

The headings indicating passages and individual Sayings which agree so closely in form in the two Gospels that they must have been taken from the same Greek document are printed in thick type.

Those indicating passages and individual Sayings for which probably the same Greek document was used, but the Marcan one along with it, are likewise printed in thick type.

Those indicating passages and individual Sayings which, although the same in substance in the two Gospels, were probably not taken from the same Greek Logian document, or which have been taken from St Mark, are printed in ordinary type.

Those indicating passages and individual Sayings which are peculiar to St Matthew are printed in italics.

An obelus has been prefixed to those passages, whether in substance the same in the two Gospels, or peculiar to St Matthew, which appear to come from another version.

<sup>1</sup> The construction of John the Baptist's discourse in Mt. iii. appears to be (so far as we are acquainted with the sources) so simple that it does not require analysis. At the same time the combination by the first evangelist of the account of the Baptist's preaching from the Logian document with the briefer account in Mk i. 7, 8, is important as illustrating his method.

# Analysis of Discourses in St Matthew 123

## I. THE DISCOURSE ON THE CHARACTER OF THE HEIRS OF THE KINGDOM, MT. V—VII, WITH THE PARALLELS IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST LUKE.

	Matthew	Luke
Who are truly blessed ... ..	v. 3—12	vi. 20—23
The high vocation of the disciples of Jesus:—		
To be salt ... ..	,, 13	xiv. 34, 35 <sup>1</sup>
To be light ... ..	,, 14 <sup>a</sup>	
The purpose of a lamp ... ..	,, 14 <sup>b</sup> —16	xi. 33 <sup>2</sup>
<i>The relation of the New to the Old Law</i> <sup>3</sup>		
<i>Christ has come not to destroy but to fulfil</i> ... ..	,, 17	
No word of the Law can fail ... ..	,, 18	xvi. 17
<i>Fulfilment of the Law a title to greatness in the Kingdom of heaven</i> ... ..	,, 19	
<i>Inadequacy of Pharisaic righteousness</i> ... ..	,, 20	
<i>The Sixth Commandment:—</i>		
<i>Its interpretation</i> ... ..	,, 21, 22	
<i>An inference:—“seek reconciliation before offering sacrifice”</i>	,, 23, 24	
<i>Another inference:—“Agree with thine adversary quickly”</i>	,, 25, 26	xii. 58, 59 <sup>4</sup>
<i>The Seventh Commandment:—</i>	,, 27	
<i>Its interpretation</i> ... ..	,, 28	
<i>Inference:—self-mortification necessary</i> ... ..	,, 29, 30 <sup>5</sup>	
<i>The Law on divorce</i> ... ..	,, 31	
The inviolability of marriage ... ..	,, 32	xvi. 18
<i>The Law on the sanctity of oaths</i>	,, 33	
<i>Its interpretation</i> ... ..	,, 34—37	
<i>The Law on retaliation</i> ... ..	,, 38	
<i>The contrast:—meekness under injuries</i> ... ..	,, 39—42	
<i>The Law on loving a neighbour and hating an enemy</i> ... ..	,, 43	
<i>The contrast:—love even of enemies</i> ... ..	,, 44—48	vi. 27—36 <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Mk ix. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Lk viii. 16 = Mk iv. 21.

<sup>3</sup> There are parallels in Lk to some of the Sayings included under this head; but the form of the section, and the theme treated in it, are peculiar.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 97 f.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Mt. xviii. 9, 8 = Mk ix. 47, 43, 45.

<sup>6</sup> Lk v. 27 = Mt. v. 44; Lk v. 29 = Mt. v. 39; Lk v. 30 a = Mt. v. 42 a; Lk v. 30 b = Mt. v. 40; Lk v. 34 a = Mt. v. 42 b; Lk v. 35 = Mt. v. 45; Lk v. 32, 33 = Mt. v. 46, 47; Lk v. 36 = Mt. v. 48.



## 124 *Analysis of Discourses in St Matthew*

	Matthew	Luke
- <i>The right and the Pharisaic practice of three duties of religion contrasted</i> <sup>1</sup>		
+ <i>Almsgiving</i> ... ..	vi. 1—4 <sup>2</sup>	
<i>Prayer.</i>		
<i>Pray in secret</i> ... ..	" 5, 6	
<i>Use not vain repetitions like the heathen</i> ... ..	" 7, 8	
<b>The Lord's Prayer</b> ... ..	" 9—13	xi. 2—4
Forgive that your Heavenly Father may forgive you ...	" 14, 15 <sup>3</sup>	Mk xi. 25
† <i>Fasting</i> ... ..	" 16—18	
<b>Let your treasure be in Heaven</b> ...	" 19—21	xii. 33, 34
<b>The lamp of the body is the eye</b> ...	" 22, 23	xi. 34—36
No man can serve two masters ...	" 24	xvi. 13 <sup>4</sup>
<b>Trust God for your daily needs and seek His Kingdom</b> ... ..	" 25—34	xii. 22—32
Various directions :—		
† Judge not that ye may not be judged ... ..	vii. 1, 2	vi. 37, 38
† The mote and the beam... ..	" 3—5	" 41, 42
<i>Guard that which is precious from contamination</i> ... ..	" 6	
<b>Be earnest in prayer</b> ... ..	" 7—11	xi. 9—13
† Do to others as you would they should do to you, " <i>for this is the law and the prophets</i> "	" 12 <i>a</i> " 12 <i>b</i>	vi. 31
Strive to enter the Kingdom, though the approach is narrow	" 13, 14	xiii. 24
† The tree is known by its fruit ...	" 15—20	vi. 43—45
† Mere professions are vain ...	" 21	" 46
False professors will attempt in vain to obtain admission at the last ... ..	" 22, 23	xiii. 25—27
† The two kinds of hearers ...	" 24—27	vi. 47—49

### II. THE MISSION-ADDRESS.

Rules for the guidance of preachers of the Gospel :—

<i>Confine your labours to Israelites</i>	x. 5, 6	
<b>The message and its delivery...</b>	" 7—16	x. 3—12 Mk vi. 8—11

<sup>1</sup> See p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> The sayings on Almsgiving at Lk xi. 41 and xii. 33 are not parallels to this passage.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 83 n.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 98.

	Matthew	Luke
There will be persecution : how to meet it <sup>1</sup> ... ..	x. 17—22	xii. 11, 12 Mk xiii. 9—13
<i>Flee from city to city; ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till, etc.</i> ... ..	„ 23	
The disciple and his Master ...	„ 24, 25	vi. 40
<b>Exhortation to faithful confession</b> ... ..	„ 26—33	xii. 2—9
<b>I have come to cause divisions</b> ...	„ 34—36	„ 51—53
<b>The setting aside of human relationships and bearing the Cross</b> ... ..	„ 37, 38	xiv. 26, 27
The gain which is loss, and the loss which is gain <sup>2</sup> ... ..	„ 39	xvii. 33
Attention to you is attention to Me <sup>3</sup> ... ..	„ 40	x. 16 Mk ix. 37 <sup>b</sup>
<i>He that receiveth a prophet, etc.</i> ...	„ 41	
Whosoever shall give a cup of cold water, etc....	„ 42	Mk ix. 41

III. THE MESSAGE OF JOHN THE BAPTIST AND THE DISCOURSE THEREUPON, WITH PIECES THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH IT.

<b>The Message and reply to it: the character of John the Baptist</b> ...	xi. 2—11	vii. 18—28
The epoch-making character of John's work ... ..	„ 12—15	xvi. 16
<b>The perverse attitude of men to both John and Jesus</b> ... ..	„ 16—19	vii. 31—35
<b>He upbraids the cities in which He has preached</b> ... ..	„ 20—24	x. 12—15
<b>Thanksgiving that the Father reveals to the simple what is hidden from the wise</b> ... ..	„ 25—27	„ 21, 22
<i>Come unto Me all ye that labour, etc.</i> ...	„ 28—30	

IV. AN ACCUSATION AND A CHALLENGE.

<b>He casts out a devil and is accused of collusion with Satan</b> ... ..	xii. 22—24	xi. 14, 15
---	------------	------------

<sup>1</sup> See p. 92 f.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 98.

<sup>3</sup> The Greek source common to our first and third Gospels probably contained the Saying in the form of the latter; but Mark has been followed in the former.

	Matthew	Luke
Christ's reply:—		
<b>The absurdity of the charge</b> ...	xii. 25—28	xi. 17—20 <sup>1</sup>
The strong man overcome ...	" 29	Mk iii. 27 <sup>2</sup>
<b>He that is not with Me, etc.</b> ...	" 30	" 23
All blasphemies ( <b>even against the Son of Man</b> ) shall be forgiven, saving that against the Holy Spirit ... ..	" 31, 32	Mk iii. 28, 29
Speech an indication of character <sup>3</sup>	" 33—37	xii. 10
<b>The demand for a sign</b> ... ..	" 38	vi. 43—45 xi. 16
Christ's reply:—		
<b>The Son of Man is a sign to this generation</b> ... ..	" 39—42	" 29—32
<b>The man whom the unclean spirit leaves for a time only</b>	" 43—45	" 24—26

## V. THE TEACHING BY PARABLES.

The Sower ... ..	xiii. 1—9	Mk iv. 1—9
The disciples ask for the interpretation of it ... ..	" 10	" " 10
His reply:—		
To you it is given to know, etc.	" 11	" " 11 <sup>4</sup>
Whoever hath, to him shall be given, etc. ... ..	" 12	" " 25
The explanation is withheld from men in general as a judgment	" 13	" " 12
<i>A prophecy cited</i> ... ..	" 14, 15	
<b>Blessed are your eyes, etc.</b> ...	" 16, 17	Lk x. 23, 24
The interpretation of the parable	" 18—23	" " 13—20
<i>The Tares</i> ... ..	" 24—30 <sup>5</sup>	Cp. Mk iv. 26—29
The mustard-seed <b>which a man sowed and it grew to a tree</b> and the birds found shelter <b>in its branches</b> ... ..	" 31, 32	Mk iv. 30—32 Lk xiii. 18, 19
<b>The piece of leaven</b> ... ..	" 33	" " 20, 21

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Mk iii. 23—26, which is similar but not so close.<sup>2</sup> Cp. Lk xi. 21, 22, which is similar but not so close.<sup>3</sup> See pp. 328 f., 331.<sup>4</sup> Cp. also Lk viii. 10, and see p. 211.<sup>5</sup> The parable of the Tares may have been developed from the same idea as *the Seed growing secretly* in Mk iv. 30—39, but that passage of Mk was not Mt.'s source here.

	Matthew	
"He spake not without a parable" ...	xiii. 34	Mk iv. 33, 34
<i>Citation of a prophecy</i> ... ..	" 35	
<i>Interpretation of the parable of the tares</i> ... ..	" 36—43	
<i>More parables:—the Hidden treasure, Pearl-merchant, Draw-net</i> ...	" 44—50	
<i>The instructed scribe of the Kingdom</i>	" 51, 52	

VI. ON OFFENCES.

The question, "Who is greatest?" ...	xviii. 1	Mk ix. 34
He takes a child as an object-lesson ... ..	" 2	" " 36
Except ye become as little children	" 3	" x. 15
He who humbles himself as a child shall be greatest ... ..	" 4	" ix. 35
He who receives one such child shall be greatest ... ..	" 5	" " 37
It were better for a man to be drowned than to offend one of these little ones ... ..	" 6	" " 42 Lk xvii. 2
<b>Offences must come, but woe to the cause of them</b> ... ..	" 7	Lk xvii. 1
If one of thine own members is a snare to thee, sacrifice it ... ..	" 8 <sup>1</sup> , 9	Mk ix. 43—47
<i>Despise not one of these little ones; their angels, etc.</i> ... ..	" 10	
The lost Sheep ... ..	" 12—13	Lk xv. 3—7
<i>So not the will of my Father that one of these little ones perish</i> ... ..	" 14	
<b>Reprove an offending brother privately</b> ... ..	" 15	" xvii. 3a
<i>If he will not hearken call in witnesses; and finally appeal to the Church which shall have authority from me</i> ... ..	" 16—20	
<b>How often shall we forgive an offending brother?...</b> ... ..	" 21, 22	" " 3 <sup>b</sup> , 4
<i>The parable of the unmerciful servant</i>	" 23—35	

<sup>1</sup> Mt. avoids the unnecessary repetition in Mk by introducing ἡ ὁμοίως into v. 8.

## VII. CONCERNING THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES.

Matthew

<i>The Scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat, therefore observe their injunctions; but do not imitate their practice</i> ... ..	xxiii.	1—5	
They desire deference and places of honour ... ..	„	6-7 a	Mk xii. 38, 39
<i>And to be called of men Rabbi; but be not ye called Rabbi</i> ... ..	„	7b—10	
The greatest among you shall be your minister ... ..	„	11	„ ix. 35
Whoso exalteth himself, etc. ...	„	12	Lk xiv. 11
Seven woes addressed to Scribes and Pharisees :—			
Woe to you because,			
(1) Ye neither enter the kingdom nor will suffer others to enter ... ..	„	14	„ xi. 52
(2) <i>Ye zealously make pharisees, only to corrupt them</i> ... ..	„	15	
(3) <i>Ye make much of distinctions which have no moral significance</i> ... ..	„	16—22	
(4) Ye tithe mint, anise and cummin, and neglect judgment, mercy and faith ... ..	„	23	Lk xi. 42
<i>Ye strain out the gnat and swallow the camel</i> ... ..	„	24	
(5) Ye pay attention only to externals ... ..	„	25, 26	„ „ 39—41
(6) Ye are outwardly fair but foul within ... ..	„	27	„ „ 44
(7) Ye are proving yourselves to be the true sons of those who slew the prophets of old, and will do so yet more fully ... ..	„	29—36	„ „ 47—51
<b>Apostrophe to Jerusalem</b> ... ..	„	37—39	„ xiii. 34, 35

VIII. THE DISCOURSE ON THE LAST THINGS.

Mt. xxiv., xxv.

	Matthew		
The occasion ... ..	xxiv. 1—3	Mk xiii.	1—4
Be not deceived by false prophets or by wars and the rumours of them and other calamities, which are but the beginning of the travail-pains...	„ 4—8	„ „	5—8
Ye shall be persecuted and there shall be scandals in the Church herself; the Gospel shall be preached throughout the world before the end	„ 9—14 <sup>1</sup>	„ „	9—13
A sign of the approach of the end ...	„ 15—23 <sup>2</sup>	„ „	14—23
Be not disturbed with rumours that the Son of Man has come, for His Coming when it happens will be manifest to all ... ..	„ 26, 27	Lk xvii.	23 <sup>3</sup> , 24
Where the carcase is there the birds of prey will gather ... ..	„ 28	„ „	37
The Coming of the Son of Man ...	„ 29—31	Mk xiii.	24—27
Learn from the fig-tree to expect what I have foretold ... ..	„ 32—35	„ „	28—31
Of that day and hour knoweth no man	„ 36	„ „	32
<b>The catastrophe will fall upon men unawares as the flood did ...</b>	„ 37—39	Lk xvii.	26, 27, 30
<b>One shall be taken, another left ...</b>	„ 40, 41	„ „	34, 35
Watch, since you know not when your Lord will come ... ..	„ 42	Mk xiii.	35 a
<b>Watch as you would for the coming of a thief ... ..</b>	„ 43, 44	Lk xii.	39, 40
<b>Who is the prudent steward? ...</b>	„ 45—51	„ „	42—46
The Ten Virgins ... ..	xxv. 1—13	(Cp. Lk xii.)	35—38)
The Servants who receive sums of money to trade with ... ..	„ 14—30	(Cp. Lk xix.)	12—27)
<i>The Sheep and the Goats</i> ... ..	„ 31—46		

<sup>1</sup> There is a much closer parallel to Mk xiii. 9—13 in Mt. x. 17—22, except for the Saying as to the universal preaching of the Gospel. With Mk v. 11, cp. Lk xii. 11, 12.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Lk xvii. 31 with Mt. xxiv. 17, 18.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Mk xiii. 21 with Lk xvii. 23.

## CHAPTER III.

### EARLY ACCOUNTS OF THE MAIN FACTS AND FEATURES OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY AND PASSION.—THE HISTORY OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MARK.

I POINTED out at the beginning of my last chapter that the peculiar position and special needs of the early believers in Palestine account for the collection and preservation among them of a considerable portion of Christ's Teaching in a separate form, and that the full communication of this tradition of His Words to Greek-speaking Christians was retarded by the barrier of language and other circumstances. But those who had not known Jesus required, as I have already observed, to be told something about His Person and Work and not simply to have His precepts impressed upon their minds. From the time that the preaching of the Gospel to Hellenistic Jews and to Gentiles began, such general accounts, and descriptions of particular incidents, must have been given—at first, of course, orally. In process of time attempts would be made to preserve a written record of that which had been delivered. Luke in his preface alludes to such attempts which had preceded his own work. For plainly any "narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us" must have comprised (as we read in Papias' fragment about Mark) "the things that were either said or done by Christ," and not merely the former. And this is the type of composition to which our Synoptic Gospels conform, and of which they were, no doubt, the most complete and perfect specimens. The history of these more general records is, I believe, throughout connected in a special manner with the work of evangelisation, and the establish-

ment of the Church, in the Greek-speaking world. When those who first taught the Christian faith in Greek had to supply some general information about Jesus, no instruction of precisely the same kind can have been habitually given in Aramaic which would have served them as a model, and even if there had, there could have been no such reason for making the effort to translate exactly in the case of narrative, as there was in the case of the Words of Jesus; the aim of the missionaries would simply have been to relate afresh the facts which they knew, as best they could, in the language understood by their hearers. Further, it is evidently most probable that the earliest attempts to reduce the tradition to writing were made by Greek-speaking Christians, because literary habits were more widely spread among them, and dependence upon the memory was less usual. And these early attempts in Greek would naturally form the basis of other more complete records in Greek, although (as we have seen) these records were enriched as time went on, especially in regard to the element of Christ's Teaching, by translations from the Aramaic tradition. A consideration, then, of the historical circumstances is unfavourable to the supposition, so lightly adopted by several recent critics, that the translation of an Aramaic source formed the groundwork of the Synoptic narrative; it is more natural to suppose that our Gospels were—so far as their arrangement and the form of a large part of their contents are concerned—a growth indigenous in Greek-speaking Christendom.

We will dwell for a few moments on the earlier stages of the process. And, first, let us consider the influence of the period of oral teaching. I am disposed to think that this was more important than it is held to have been by most of those who, like myself, reject the Oral Theory<sup>1</sup>. It would generally be allowed that the grouping of incidents in the Gospels is in

<sup>1</sup> The common view of critics is clearly expressed in the following passage of Wellhausen's *Einleitung*, p. 43: "The ultimate source of the Gospels is oral tradition, but this contains only dispersed matter. The pieces of greater or less compass circulate therein separately. Their combination into a whole is always the work of an author, and commonly of a writer. Particular narratives which correspond might have been taken by this or that Synoptic writer from the mouth of the people and do not serve to prove the dependence of one upon another. But



not a few cases due to links of association forged through habits of oral teaching, which must often have tended to bring together narratives connected rather in subject than in time. But oral teaching may have had a larger part than this in determining the form and contents of the Synoptic Gospels. Although, as I have shewn in ch. I, the relations of our Synoptic Gospels to one another cannot be explained on the hypothesis that the evangelists were each directly dependent solely upon a common oral tradition, it is probable that the document from which they derived their Synoptic outline and common matter was itself in large measure dependent upon tradition; and although this tradition cannot have been formally agreed upon in the way supposed by Gieseler and others who followed him, and is not likely to have had the rigidity attributed to it by them, it may nevertheless have acquired a certain amount of fixity, especially as regards some of its principal features. The fact that our first three evangelists were ready to follow—on the whole so closely—the outline in the document that lay before them is an indication that the type of narration which it represented was a widely prevalent one and had no serious rival within their knowledge.

Let us reflect for a few moments upon the circumstances which would have led to the existence of such a commonly accepted type of oral narrative. There can be little doubt that individual preachers and teachers had their customary way of telling the story of the Life of Christ. On different occasions, they might dwell at greater or less length on parts of it; they might omit or add this or that narrative. Sometimes they might only relate a particular conversation, or describe a miracle, or two or three miracles of similar character, just as they might sometimes recall a single pre-

the Synoptics also agree remarkably in their arrangement, and the supposition of their independence as writers is thereby excluded."

I have contended that there was also a general shaping of the form of the narrative as a whole during the oral period which must not be confounded with the fixing of the sequence of all the sections in a document. The advocates of the Oral Theory did not confine the work of the oral period to the former, but they help us to realise it. This is the element of truth in their theory. It is commonly overlooked at present, but it is important.

cept, or two or three precepts. But when a comprehensive account was required, they would adhere in the main to a plan which had become usual to them. And in the case of those of them whose command of Greek was limited, this circumstance would serve in a special manner to stereotype even their phraseology.

Thus far I have spoken only of the fixity of form which would naturally belong to the Gospel tradition as delivered by individuals; but different individuals might have their characteristic variations. There were, however, also influences which may well have caused a particular type to be widely prevalent. Those who had heard some eminent authority tell the story, would try to tell it in the same manner. While narrators who were wholly independent of one another might resemble each other to a large extent in their mode of presenting the facts, owing to the circumstance that they all had the same purpose.

It would be natural, then, that there should come to be a more or less commonly accepted mode of setting forth the facts of the Gospel in oral teaching, and I cannot doubt that the features of it would be more or less distinctly imprinted, also, on the earliest written records. Moreover, it seems to me that the common outline of the Synoptic Gospels—its commencement from the Ministry of the Baptist which was an obviously appropriate starting point for apologetic reasons in preaching the Gospel; its picture of the crowded days of Christ's Ministry in Galilee, designed to set forth alike His superhuman power, and attractive grace and goodness; its fuller narrative of His Last Days and Passion—corresponds, as regards its form and scope and character, with the sort of sketch, though this might no doubt often have been of a slighter nature, which the early Christian preachers and teachers are likely to have been in the habit of giving<sup>1</sup>.

Further, let it be considered how exceedingly difficult it would be to understand the production of the Synoptic Gospels, as the result simply of a literary effort. The simplest method of writing history, and that to which consequently untrained minds instinctively turn, is that of a chronicle.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Acts x. 36—39.

But the Gospels are as far as possible from being chronicles. Nor were there any models of other kinds of historical or biographical composition that would have helped the writer of the first record, and with which he could have been acquainted. The theme was utterly new, as well as transcendent, and men of the most practised literary skill would have been baffled in attempting to treat it suitably. "The experience of oral teaching," as Dr Westcott strikingly observed<sup>1</sup>, "was required in order to bring within the reach of writing the vast subject of the Life of Christ." If the Apostles had been bidden to sit down and write an account of the years that they had spent with their Master, they would have been overwhelmed by the fulness of their knowledge. But under the pressure of the work of oral instruction and limited by its conditions, with inquirers present before them, they learned how to convey a vivid impression of what He was. And so it came to pass that the tradition which had afterwards to be committed to writing was not a merely chaotic one, or of unmanageable extent. Those who wrote had not to perform to any great degree a work of selection; this had been done for them already; they could on the contrary place before themselves the far less difficult aim of "omitting nothing which they had heard and which they regarded as trustworthy<sup>2</sup>." And they had also received some indications of a plan according to which the matter might be arranged.

We may believe, then, that the oral teaching prepared the way for written records by facilitating the task of composition. It is true that our third evangelist in his reference at the beginning of his work to the labours of those who had preceded him in "drawing up a narrative" of the facts of the Gospel, as well as to the task he had himself performed, does not recognise that they or he were indebted in any way, for the form in which they presented the facts, to those who had delivered them; while Papias in his fragment on Mark not only makes no allusion to the latter's ever having heard Peter give a general account of the Gospel history, but may be

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to the *Study of the Gospels*, p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Fragment of Papias on Mark's writing, ap. Eus. *H.E.* III. 39.

thought to imply the contrary. And I have pointed out above that the expressions of these early notices would be very strange, if in the oral instruction that special attention had been given to the sequence of narratives which has according to the Oral Theory to be supposed. It is not, however, hard to understand that both Luke and Papias (or his informant) might be unconscious of the importance of what was effected by that first rough-hewing of the tradition of which I have spoken.

We will next fix our thoughts on the time when the writing down of the oral tradition began; and in this connexion we must discuss more particularly Luke's statement (i. 1) that "many" had attempted it.

According to Schleiermacher's celebrated theory Luke here refers to short pieces, consisting of a few Sayings, or the account of a single incident, or at most of some episode in the Gospel history, written on one or two tablets, or a leaf or two of papyrus; and he holds that the evangelist himself composed his Gospel largely out of such fragments. Now it is likely enough that individual Christians did make such brief memoranda both before anything more comprehensive had been attempted, and also afterwards, owing to the labour or expense involved in procuring copies of MSS. of any considerable length. And it is possible that some use may have been made of such little pieces by Luke himself and others when composing fuller records. But the supposition that the evangelist can be thinking of such mere fragments is precluded by the terms he employs—*ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων*—"to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us." Evidently he has in view compositions which aimed at giving a general account of the Gospel history as his own did, though they were less full, and he regarded them as in some points at least less accurate, than his own<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> It is customary to call Schleiermacher's view "Die Diegesen-theorie," which directly involves a mistaken translation of the word *διήγησις*. Schleiermacher's language is such as to suggest that those fragmentary records, which he imagines, might be called *διηγήσεις*, but it is fair to add that, so far as I have observed, he does not himself actually apply this name to them.

The Gospel according to St Mark, or the document more or less approximately represented thereby, which was used by Luke as one of his principal sources, answers to the description given. If, as some suppose—though in all probability mistakenly, as we shall presently see—Luke was also acquainted with the Gospel according to St Matthew, he might have this too in view. And in addition he may have thought of the source originally written in Aramaic, from which he derived much of the Teaching of Jesus, included in his Gospel, although the subordinate position of the element of narrative in it must render this doubtful. But even if he had all these three in mind, there must have been others besides to justify his speaking of “many.” We may, perhaps, find it hard to understand why many such records having the same object should have been written, and how they could not only have disappeared, but have ceased wholly to be remembered, in the generations following. It is probable, however, that any difficulty of this kind which we may feel is due to our failure to realise the special character of the process—belonging to a brief, transitional period in the early history of the Church—to which the evangelist’s words relate.

We may well suppose that the desire for written records of the Gospel history began to make itself felt in various quarters at about the same time. Surely this would in the circumstances be natural. One Christian here and another there who had some education would set himself to commit to writing the deeds and occurrences and Sayings which he had learned by word of mouth. The written records are likely—if what I have said, as to the character of the oral tradition on which they were based, is true—to have been marked by a good deal of similarity of form and contents. Moreover writers who were not absolutely the first would not be unwilling to make large use of any record already written which came to their hands. But they would not be mere copyists. While they reproduced they would not shrink from emending, and in particular they would seek to add matter which had been omitted. If so, the several writings might fairly be regarded as distinct efforts, different “attempts

to draw up a narrative," and it would be possible for a good number to be produced and to have a limited use for a time side by side. And when after a brief period most of these narratives were superseded by more complete ones, they naturally soon passed from memory. How soon the name "Gospel" was given to any such writings, on the ground that they set forth Jesus as the Christ, or whether their authors so conceived their object from the first, we cannot say. But at least whenever the account comprised both the Ministry and the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus, men had the thing.

Few at the present day will be inclined to deny that our second Gospel is the best representative which we possess of this early kind of evangelic literature. For this very reason it becomes the more important and interesting to inquire whether (1) we have it practically in its original form; or (2) we are to believe that this form has undergone a certain amount of editing and amplification, yet not so as to alter substantially its structure and character; or finally (3), as some allege, a primitive collection of narratives has been worked up with an equal, or larger, amount of other material by a later hand, or later hands, to whom the arrangement of the Gospel is mainly due<sup>1</sup>.

It will be best, I think, in this inquiry to work backwards. That is to say, we will endeavour to determine more precisely than we have hitherto done whether the Synoptic source used in the composition of our first and third Gospels, or in either of them, differed in any respects from our second Gospel, before we attempt to penetrate still further back into the history of that source. After we have followed

<sup>1</sup> Among those who in recent years have discussed the question of the original form of the Marcan document, I would name especially the following: von Soden, *Urchristliche Literatur Geschichte*, 1905, p. 71 ff., Eng. trans. p. 142 ff.; J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 1903; E. Wendling, *Ur-Marcus*, 1905; J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, 1905, pp. 53—57, taken with the passages in his Commentary on *Mark* there referred to. Loisy, *Autour d'un petit livre*, 1903, p. 80 ff.; *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, 1907, I. p. 85 ff.

Wellhausen and Loisy do not attempt the reconstruction of an earlier document, or documents, in the manner that the three first named do. They content themselves with indicating certain portions of the matter as of inferior value historically to other portions.

out the indications afforded by the documents which we have in our hands, we may enter the region where we are without this guidance.

Too little use, it seems to me, has been made of this help by those who have recently investigated the history of the composition of St Mark. There are cases in which a comparison of the other Synoptics, taken in conjunction with signs of editing in St Mark itself, will shew us what the original form of the Synoptic source was, where the indications of editing taken by themselves alone cannot do this. It will shew what the real significance of the latter is—whether the traces of secondariness imply that the whole section in which they occur was added to the original document, or whether such section, free from these signs of secondariness, was found in that document as known to the other Synoptics, so that if it had lain before us in the form in which it lay before them, there would have been no reason to suspect its originality<sup>1</sup>. More generally it may be observed, that by comparing the two other Synoptics, we may be able to distinguish stages whereby our Gospel reached its present form, and that it will be worth while in any case to know this.

Wendling, among the principles that he lays down at the beginning of his investigation, has the following: "To limit the inquiry to Mark and not to amalgamate the 'Ur-Marcus' problem with the Synoptic problem<sup>2</sup>." But he gives no good reason for this view. Nor does Wellhausen for a similar observation<sup>3</sup>. Others have not drawn the line so decidedly, but there has been no attempt to use the Synoptic parallels systematically in this inquiry so far as they will serve.

When setting forth the grounds for the belief in the priority of St Mark I noted that *for the most part* the first and third Gospels, where they do not both reproduce the words of St Mark exactly, differ therefrom each in a way of its own<sup>4</sup>. This general view of the features of relationship between the Synoptic Gospels was sufficient for the purpose which I then

<sup>1</sup> For an example, see p. 154 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Einleitung*, p. 53.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 34 f. The existence of exceptions was referred to.

had in hand. But there is a class of exceptions to which we must now turn our attention. Scattered through the parallels to St Mark in the two other Synoptics, there is a number of cases, considerable on the whole, in which they agree in using a word or phrase not found in St Mark or in omitting touches or statements, and in a few instances whole incidents, which are contained therein. It is natural to ask whether these agreements between the first and third evangelists, or any of them, are derived from a form of the text of the Common Source earlier than that in our St Mark, and it is for this reason that I notice them in the present connexion. But this question cannot be decided without taking account of other explanations of which the phenomena may be susceptible. So that the whole subject of these coincidences in disagreement from St Mark on the part of the two other Synoptics must here be examined.

*The consentient differences of St Matthew and St Luke  
from St Mark in Marcan contexts.*

Let me first notice two theories in regard to this class of phenomena which have attracted a good deal of attention.

B. Weiss sees in many of these coincidences between St Matthew and St Luke in differing from St Mark a confirmation of his favourite hypothesis of an "Oldest" or "Apostolic" source which contained many narratives as well as "Logia," and was drawn upon for both elements by Mark as well as by the two other Synoptics. This theory need not here detain us long in view of the conclusion to which we came in the last chapter in respect of "Logia" in St Mark<sup>1</sup>. If these were not derived from the Greek document which the first and third evangelists used, it is hardly probable that Mark took narratives from it. But to turn to the evidence now more particularly under discussion: a little reflexion will shew that it cannot properly be made to serve Weiss' purpose. For if the agreements of St Matthew and St Luke against St Mark may be taken to shew that a source used by all three has in certain cases been most closely adhered to

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 109—112.



by the two first-named, it does not follow that this source was the one imagined by Weiss. It is far simpler to suppose it to have been an earlier form of Marcan document. We shall not then be required to attribute to the first and third evangelists the complex procedure of using partly the original source, partly Mark's revised edition of that source. Weiss, it is true, lays stress upon the Hebraic character of some of the expressions which the first and third evangelists have preserved, as a ground for connecting them with his "Oldest source<sup>1</sup>." But such Hebraisms, or Aramaisms, might quite as well have occurred in an earlier form of St Mark; and, to speak broadly, whatever might in the one case have been removed or altered by a revising hand, so as to give us St Mark in its present form, might have been so in the other.

I turn to the contention of E. Simons<sup>2</sup> that the agreements between the first and third Gospels in differing from St Mark, or many of them, are due to the third evangelist's acquaintance with St Matthew. It is the more important to consider this view, since H. Holtzmann appears to have become a convert to it<sup>3</sup>, and it has been adopted also by some other well-known critics<sup>4</sup>. It is not wanting in simplicity, but we shall (I believe) see that it is unsatisfactory on other grounds. It is important for the proper consideration of it to observe that Simons and those who have followed him allow that the imitation of St Matthew by the third evangelist was strictly subordinate to his use of St Mark. Their hypothesis may be put in its least unnatural form if we suppose Luke to have read St Matthew at some time, to have no longer had it by him, and to have been influenced more or less unconsciously by his recollection of it<sup>5</sup>. It does not, however, seem likely that if he had read that Gospel, he would have forgotten, or been indifferent to, its more considerable additions to the Marcan and other common source, or sources, and generally have

<sup>1</sup> See Weiss, *Das Marcus-evangelium*, p. 72, on Mk i. 40. For other illustrations of various kinds of his application of his theory, see the same context; also pp. 49—50, 62, 109, 133, 334, 400, etc., of the same work.

<sup>2</sup> *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* 1880.

<sup>3</sup> *Einleit.* 350, 356 f.

<sup>4</sup> E.g., H. H. Wendt; see *Die Lehre Jesu*, p. 46.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Simons, *op. cit.* p. 108.

remained unaffected by it in his own treatment of them, while he reproduced it only in a certain number of quite unimportant particulars. That is not the way in which memory would usually work. Moreover, it may well be asked whether there is not something unsuitable in representing the third evangelist as dependent in his work of revision upon the suggestions of memory, when he plainly shews often so much freedom in revising, and such a decided mind of his own in matters of style.

But, further, the supposition of reminiscence is wholly inappropriate in connexion with the most important class of agreements between the first and third Gospels, namely, the instances in which both *omit* a passage or substantial statement contained in St Mark. It is strange that adherents of the theory have not realised this more clearly than they appear to have done. If Luke had noticed that something contained in one of his principal sources had been omitted by a writer who, like himself, had used those sources, his most natural impulse would have been to include it all the more carefully in his own work, lest it should be forgotten. It is most unlikely that he could have regarded St Matthew as an authority so superior to a source which he more commonly used, that he would have omitted a passage or phrase because he found it omitted here. Such an estimate as this would have been an anachronism, and, if he had formed it, he would have been at the pains to make larger use of this Gospel than he has done.

I will now proceed to mention four causes to each of which some effect ought in all probability to be attributed, and which are (I believe) jointly quite adequate to account for the phenomena under consideration. The admission of a variety of causes will be distasteful to some minds. There is a charm—an appearance of simplicity and completeness—in any theory which assigns a single cause for a large group of phenomena. But we ought not to attach much weight to a consideration of that kind. For it is evident that phenomena which we have been led for convenience to class together may have arisen in different ways. In the present case, it will be found on examination that no single cause

can afford a natural explanation in every instance, but that always one of the causes which I have specified will do so, and often more than one. To convince himself of this the student must work through all the instances. At the end of this chapter he will find a Table which will aid him in the task. Here I can only make some general remarks in regard to the different causes, and give a certain number of examples.

1. *Differences between the text of the Marcan document used by the first and third evangelists and our St Mark.*

Even by those who suppose the first and third evangelists to have used a document which was virtually identical with our St Mark, it will be admitted to be scarcely conceivable that the original text should have been preserved there perfectly intact. And there are at least a limited number of instances in which the difference between our St Mark and the two other Synoptics may most probably be attributed to alterations of the original in the former. The use of the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον absolutely (Mk i. 1; i. 14, 15; viii. 35; x. 29), which is peculiar to this Gospel, is to be explained in this way. In the two last places it could have been introduced with great ease; in the two first a little more recasting of the original form of the sentence, which we may suppose to have closely resembled that of the parallel in St Matthew, would be necessary; but this would not be difficult to effect. It is very unlikely that the third evangelist, more particularly, with his Pauline sympathies and his fondness for the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, would have avoided the use of the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in all these passages, if he had found it in his source. Again, it is difficult not to admit the probability that the description of Jesus as ὁ τέκτων in Mk vi. 3 is due to a revising hand, when we compare ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός and ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ at Mt. xiii. 55 and Lk iv. 22, and consider how naturally it might be feared that an expression of this kind would be misunderstood. The "anointing of the sick with oil" in the charge to the disciples at vi. 13 may have been suggested by the custom of the Church. The saying "the Sabbath was made for man," etc. at Mk ii. 27 has the

appearance of being an insertion. There does not seem to be any good reason why it should have been passed over in both the other Gospels, and especially in St Luke, if it was in the original document. And the connexion between it and the following saying, suggested by the *ὥστε* at the beginning of the next sentence, is somewhat forced and not in accordance with the usual style of this Gospel. The instruction on humility in Mk ix. 35—37 seems to have been rearranged. The saying placed at the beginning of the passage in St Mark stands appropriately there as a direct answer to the question which has preceded; if the two other Synoptics had found it so placed they would hardly, instead of giving it thus, have embodied it in the lesson drawn from the child. There is also nothing in either of the parallels here to correspond to the words *καὶ πάντων διάκονος*, though there is in other contexts. These words may, therefore, have been introduced here by a copyist owing to his familiarity with those other Sayings. In Mk xi. 17 the words *πάσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, wanting in St Matthew and St Luke, may have been supplied from a recollection of the passage of the prophet, and a sense of their significance.

The connexion (Mk iv. 35, 36) between the account of the Speaking in Parables and the Crossing of the Lake is a point of a different kind. In St Mark we read: “and *on that day when even was come* he saith unto them, Let us go over unto the other side, and leaving the multitude *they take him with them as he was in the boat.*” I have italicised statements that are peculiar to this Gospel. The parallel accounts in the first and third Gospels begin, on the contrary, by saying that Jesus *embarked* and make no reference to the day and hour. Moreover each of them has placed the narrative in a different connexion, Luke (it is true) only after one, but still quite a distinct, occurrence; the first evangelist considerably earlier. It would, indeed, be curious that one of the very rare occasions on which the first and third evangelists agree in differing from St Mark as to order, should be one in which the connexion was unusually precise in their common document. That the first evangelist should have disregarded this connexion would be specially strange, since he has sometimes apparently him-

self imagined such links where in his source he found only juxtaposition<sup>1</sup>. It is probable, therefore, that an editor of the Marcan document introduced the touch that Jesus was in the boat and the statement that it was the same day at evening, having inferred them from the preceding passage. We shall presently see that there are other points in that context which strengthen this supposition.

Another interesting case where a comparison of the three Synoptics seems to make it plain that the transition from one narrative to another has been unwisely tampered with by a revising hand is Mk ix. 30, 31 *a* (cp. Mt. xvii. 22; Lk ix. 43, 44 *a*). In St Mark we read, "And they went forth from thence, and passed through Galilee; and he would not that any man should know it. For he taught his disciples and said unto them, The Son of Man is delivered up," etc. The connexion implied in the "for" at the beginning of *v.* 31 is far from clear, though it might perhaps be possible to supply a train of thought which would explain it. We notice, however, that neither the statement, "he would not that any man should know it," nor the connexion of the successive sentences by "for" appears in either of the two other Synoptics. The section is introduced in St Matthew quite abruptly, just as sections in St Mark so often are: "And while they abode in Galilee, Jesus said unto them, The Son of Man shall be delivered up," etc. In St Luke, as in our St Mark, a more formal introduction has been provided, but quite differently and more skilfully. St Matthew is in all probability the nearest here to the original text of Mark, though it is suitable to attribute the use of *ἀναστρεφόμενων* (or *συστρεφόμενων*) to the author of that Gospel.

Again, the discrepancy between St Mark and the two other Synoptics in regard to the day of the Cleansing of the Temple may be due to the revision of the original document, and connected with the manner in which the incident of the barren fig-tree is told in St Mark. This is a point which we shall have occasion to discuss later. The word *δὲς* in the warning to Peter in regard to the crowing of the cock, each time that it occurs in St Mark (xiv. 30 and 72) may be an

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 53 (*j*).

addition to the original, as also the statement that it was the third hour when they crucified Jesus (xv. 25).

Those vivid little individual touches which every reader notices in St Mark, and which give character to this Gospel, belong for the most part, there can be little reason for doubting, to the original document. They are eminently natural and not such as a reviser of the Gospel would be likely to think of, or would have cared to introduce. Still it is possible that a few of them may have been added by a scribe with revising instincts, who had entered into the spirit of the work he was copying. There are, likewise, in this Gospel a class of general statements which heighten the representation of the popular impression made by Jesus, and which are not reproduced, or but partially so, in St Matthew and St Luke<sup>1</sup>. These expressions, also, are commonly, I imagine, regarded as examples of the vigour of the author's style. It is possible that they may be so; but their originality (at least, in all the amplitude in which we have them) seems to me to be more doubtful than that of the individual traits before mentioned, from which they may clearly be distinguished.

There are some other clauses and sentences peculiar to this Gospel, which may, perhaps, be insertions. If the erroneous statement in Mk ii. 26 that David came to the tabernacle to ask for bread *ἐπι 'Αβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως* was made in the original document, we can well understand its being omitted; but it may also have been an addition by a badly informed copyist. Again, in the account of the return of Jesus from the Mount of Transfiguration, it is said that He found "scribes contending with" the disciples (Mk ix. 14). There is no mention of scribes in St Matthew and St Luke, and in the immediate sequel in St Mark it is of the multitude that Jesus asks: "About what are you contending with them?" The reference to the scribes has probably been introduced by a revising hand, because these were the common opponents of Jesus and His disciples<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Mk i. 32—34; iii. 10, 11.

<sup>2</sup> There are a few other agreements of Mt. and Lk which may be assigned to this cause:—Mk ii. 13, 14, 19*b*; iv. 10; vi. 41; x. 12; xiv. 61. (See Table, p. 207 ff.)

2. *Undesigned agreement between the first and third evangelists in revising their Marcan document.* Where in St Mark the historic present, or the imperfect, is used, it is exceedingly common to find the aorist in St Matthew and St Luke (e.g. *εἶπεν* for *λέγει*); or again where in St Mark two finite verbs are linked by *καί*, to have one of them turned into the participle and the *καί* omitted; or where many successive sentences and clauses are conjoined by *καί*, to have the monotony broken by the occasional substitution of *δέ*, or by other simple devices. Changes of these kinds occur not seldom both in St Matthew and in St Luke at different points, or where only one of them is parallel to St Mark. That they should happen frequently to be in accord in making them, without either having any knowledge of the work of the other, could cause no surprise.

But there are other cases of agreement, less common than those just indicated, which may reasonably be explained by the similarity of their stylistic ideas and habits. For instance, the particle *οὖν* is very rarely used in St Mark, whereas both the first and third evangelists, aiming as they do at a more connected construction, frequently employ it, but for the most part not at corresponding points. At the parallels, however, to Mk xii. 9 and 23 (Mt. xxi. 40, xxii. 28; Lk xx. 15, 33) both use it; but plainly we do not need to look for any special reason to account for this, such as their both finding it in the same document, or the third evangelist having remembered what he had read in St Matthew. It may further be pointed out that in the former of the two places just referred to, although both use *οὖν* they give it a different position in the sentence<sup>1</sup>.

What, then, are we to say of the use three times in parallel passages by the first and third evangelists of the Hebraic *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, which is nowhere used in St Mark<sup>2</sup>? This example

<sup>1</sup> A further example of their independence in the use of the particle may be given from the same context. At Mt. xxii. 21 we find *οὖν* and in the Lucan parallel (xx. 25) *τοῦν*.

<sup>2</sup> Mt. viii. 2=Lk v. 12=Mk i. 40; Mt. ix. 2=Lk v. 18=Mk ii. 3 (Mt. ix. 18=Lk viii. 41=Mk v. 22; here Mt has *ἰδοὺ* and Lk *καὶ ἰδοὺ*); Mt. xvii. 3=Lk ix. 30=Mk ix. 4.

possesses interest both intrinsically and because B. Weiss has laid great stress on it<sup>1</sup>. Here again the expression in question is several times used in St Matthew in passages where it does not occur in St Luke, and in St Luke where it is not in St Matthew. Where, therefore, they agree in using it, they may well have done so without design, and I believe that in the last two instances given in p. 146, n. 2, this is the true explanation. It has, however, to be remembered that coincidences which, taken singly, may reasonably be regarded as undesigned, may need to be accounted for in some more special way when several occur close together. And it happens that in the two earlier parallels in which the first and third evangelists agree in using *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, they also agree against St Mark in certain other particulars, and these agreements collectively suggest some common influence acting upon both.

The question what this influence may have been will come before us under the next head<sup>2</sup>. But before I pass to it, I must say a few words on the effect of revision in leading to the absence from both St Matthew and St Luke of words, clauses and sentences which are in St Mark. I have above specified some instances of probable additions to the Synoptic source which appear in our St Mark only, and have suggested the possibility that there are others. But there are also many cases in which it may well be that both the first and third evangelists have from similar motives made the same omissions. Both often compress the Marcan narratives; frequently each does this most in narratives, or parts of narratives, where the other does not; but it is natural that sometimes their curtailments should correspond. Details in St Mark's descriptions which are really unimportant may well have seemed so to both. Others may have been passed over because they appeared to be, so to speak, rather the property of the particular narrator than part of the common tradition. A few may have been avoided as open to misconception<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 140.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. p. 148 and see Table, p. 208.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Hawkins, p. 96 ff.; though he puts down more omissions to the account of this feeling than I should be inclined to do.



3. *The influence of parallel accounts in the Logian or other documents, or of oral tradition, or habits of oral teaching.* When we discussed the contents of the Logian document, we noticed a certain number of parallels with St Mark which it included, and traced the use of them in the two other Synoptics<sup>1</sup>. It is not necessary to go over this ground here again. It is to be noted only that a certain number of instances in which St Matthew and St Luke agree in differing from St Mark are accounted for in this way.

We do not know that the first and the third evangelists were both acquainted with any other records, which contained matter corresponding to that in St Mark, but it is certainly possible that they may have been; and that they were in a measure affected thereby in their reproductions of St Mark. Again we cannot prove that both inherited the same habitual forms of statement on any points; but it is highly probable that they did so to some extent. And there are some among their agreements against St Mark which may be most suitably traced to the operation of one or other of these causes. In the account of the leper coming to Jesus (Mk i. 40 = Mt. viii. 2 = Lk v. 12) we find *καὶ ἰδοὺ* and *κύριε* in both St Matthew and St Luke. In the form also of the next sentence in each Gospel, describing the cure, the correspondence is closest in those two. The appearance of these various little agreements so near together in the same context suggests that both evangelists were familiar with the same manner of telling the story. The same is to be said of the narrative which follows next in each of the three Synoptics, that of the Healing of the paralytic. Here several of the differences from St Mark are not, even individually taken, such as two other writers would have been likely to think of independently.

Again, the position assigned in St Matthew and St Luke to Andrew in the lists of the Twelve, next to Simon Peter, although in St Mark the sons of Zebedee are for a particular reason placed there<sup>2</sup>, may be confidently attributed to habit,

<sup>1</sup> E.g. see above, pp. 79, 88 f., 90, 93; also the Analyses, pp. 123—129, and Table II. at end of vol.

<sup>2</sup> Mt. x. 2 = Lk vi. 14 = Mk iii. 16, 17.

as also may the substitution of τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι in both St Matthew and St Luke for μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι<sup>1</sup>. Probably also the fact that the description of the taunts cast at Jesus when hanging on the Cross is similar in St Matthew and St Luke, being more expanded than that in St Mark, is to be traced to the customary form of teaching (Mk xv. 30 = Mt. xxvii. 40 = Lk xxiii. 35). Once more the agreement between St Matthew and St Luke in regard to the saying "to you it has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God" (as contrasted with the singular "the mystery," and the omission of "to know" in St Mark) must be due to its having been derived by the two former from the Logian, or some other, document, or from a common tradition<sup>2</sup>.

4. *Textual assimilation.* The existing MS. evidence, so far as it enables us to trace the history of the text of the Gospels, reveals a tendency on the part of copyists to assimilate here and there the form of parallel passages in the several Gospels. It may safely be conjectured that this process began before the time from which we are able to trace it. Moreover, as there is reason to think that in very early times St Mark was less often copied than the two other Synoptics<sup>3</sup>, it is probable that during that time there were more cases of assimilation between St Matthew and St Luke than of St Mark to either of them.

It is not possible to draw a sharp line of distinction between the agreements which should be referred to the last cause and to this one. Verbal identity between St Matthew and St Luke in a clause, or sentence, not derived from St Mark, might have been brought about through a copyist of one of them having the words of the other in his mind; but it might also be due to the common knowledge of some written account, or of tradition, by the evangelists themselves. As examples, however, of cases where textual assimilation should be borne in mind as an alternative explanation, I may mention the question τίς ἐστίν ὁ παῖσας σε; in Mt. xxvi. 68 and Lk xxii. 64, and the words

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xvi. 21 = Lk ix. 22 = Mk viii. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Mt. xiii. 11 = Lk viii. 10 = Mk iv. 11.

<sup>3</sup> See vol. I. p. 17 f.

ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυεν πικρῶς in Mt. xxvi. 75, Lk xxii. 62, standing in place of ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν (Mk xiv. 72).

One important conclusion from the examination in which we have been engaged of the consentient differences of St Matthew and St Luke from St Mark does not bear directly upon the main subject of the present chapter. We have seen that there is no reason to trace them to the third evangelist's recollections of the Gospel according to St Matthew, and consequently to suppose an acquaintance with that Gospel on his part. But we have also seen reason to think that, in a certain number of instances, comparison between our first and third Gospels reveals the original form of the Synoptic source which has in St Mark been altered by some, not very extensive, additions and revision.

In the cases which we have so far been considering, there have been coincident differences from St Mark in both the other Gospels. But can differences in one only of the others afford any light as to the original form of St Mark? This is a question which ought to be asked although it must be admitted that little significance in this respect has been hitherto attached to these one-sided differences<sup>1</sup>. It is on a comparison of St Luke with St Mark that the question may be expected especially to arise—and that in fact it does arise—both because the contents of St Mark are reproduced in St Matthew so much more nearly, and also for another reason which I will give in a moment. Yet even those—and they have been a small minority<sup>2</sup>—who have held that Luke was unacquainted with the portions of the contents of St Mark which he does not give, have not, I think, insisted that the form of Marcan document known to him was necessarily earlier than the fuller one used by our first evangelist. And

<sup>1</sup> Zahn and B. Weiss, however, have alike appealed to certain instances of narratives in St Matthew from which words and sentences contained in the Marcan parallel are absent, as affording support for their respective theories of the relations of the Gospels to one another and to sources. See below, p. 324 f.

For the Marcan matter omitted from St Matthew see p. 326 f.

<sup>2</sup> Reuss is, perhaps, the most eminent critic who has held this view. See *La Bible, Nouveau Testament*, i. pp. 28 f., 81.

it would probably still serve no useful purpose to discuss the question whether it was so, were it not for the remarkable fact that a considerable number of the passages of St Mark which in their form and their connexions with their contexts bear signs more or less clear that they are interpolations, and which have been most frequently regarded as such, are included among those which Luke passes over. When once this is observed, it must surely appear desirable that the whole of Luke's omissions of Marcan matter should be examined with the object of ascertaining whether we can distinguish among them some passages which he would have been less likely to omit than others, if they had lain before him<sup>1</sup>. If the result of this investigation corresponds, as it will (I believe) be found to do, with the indications of interpolation just referred to in the Marcan matter itself, the two kinds of evidence will confirm each other.

It is not, perhaps, absolutely necessary that Luke should be held to have been unacquainted with our St Mark in order that his omission of certain passages should be held to support the view that they are insertions. Wendling, who appears to hold the common opinion that there was no difference between the Synoptic source used in the composition of St Matthew (which must have been nearly coextensive with St Mark) and that known to and commonly used by Luke, at the same time argues in certain cases that the latter criticised it by comparing it with an earlier form<sup>2</sup>. But this is rather what a critical writer at the present day might have done. It is less probable than that the form which Luke regularly used was an earlier one, in which the passages in question were wanting.

The pertinacity with which it has been and is held that the Synoptic source known to Luke was virtually identical in its compass and details with that used in the composition of St Matthew is not difficult to understand. Till a very

<sup>1</sup> Wernle has briefly examined these omissions, *Die Synopt. Frage*, pp. 4—6, and comes to the conclusion that Luke knew the sections of St Mark which he omitted. But it must appear, I believe, to anyone, who considers Wernle's reasons for thinking so in the different cases, that they are, to say the least, of greatly varying degrees of force.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 16, § 31 (*id.*). Cp. also J. Weiss, *ib.* p. 332, though the view there indicated is rather different.

recent time, in studying the relations of the Gospels, criticism has been mainly occupied with the question of the priority of St Mark broadly considered. The time had hardly come for examining separately the relations of the first and third Gospels to St Mark. Many students, also, who have made up their minds to abandon the traditional view of the order of composition of the Gospels in favour of the priority of St Mark, have not felt prepared to set it aside still further by postponing the composition of St Matthew to that of St Luke. Yet there are good grounds for thinking that our St Matthew may have been the last composed of the Synoptic Gospels; and, if so, it is obviously possible that the Marcan document may have come to the hands of the writer of it with additions which it had not received when it lay before Luke.

*The contents of the Synoptic source used in the  
composition of St Luke.*

Our third evangelist, in so far as he has reproduced the contents of St Mark, has preserved on the whole very nearly the same sequence of sections; but as regards more than a fourth of the contents of that Gospel he has either given nothing that corresponds even in substance, or else (and this applies only to a smaller portion) the form and the connexion are so different that he has plainly derived his matter entirely from an independent source. Is it possible to give a reasonable explanation of these omissions? In view of the words of his preface we are entitled to suppose that he would have been anxious to supply as complete an account of the life of Christ as he could, and that he would therefore have been disposed to include matter lying before him in a document which he commonly made use of, except when he had on the same points other information which he considered superior. On the other hand, practical considerations might induce an ancient writer, even more than one of the present time, to restrict the contents of his work. In particular he might not

wish to extend it beyond a single roll, while it was important that a roll should not be inconveniently long and bulky<sup>1</sup>. Still the limit was not an absolute one; and the question would at all events arise whether this passage of a source, or that one, should be omitted. We have then to consider whether, in the case of certain Marcan sections wanting in St Luke's Gospel, we can see reasons why they should have been omitted, while in others there appear to be none; and at the same time we are to be on the look-out for signs that any of the Marcan passages were insertions in the contexts in which they stand. The evidence of style shall be subsequently discussed.

Mk i. 16—20. *The Call of the first disciples.* There can be no reason to doubt that this section was to be found in Luke's Marcan document, and that he passes it over at the point where it occurs in the Marcan sequence, because he had that (on the whole) considerably fuller narrative of the incident to give, which we find just afterwards in his Gospel (v. 1—11).

Mk iii. 19b—30. *Attempt of friends of Jesus to restrain Him, as mad; charge of the Pharisees that He cast out devils by Beelzebub and His reply.* Luke gives a closely similar, though apparently distinct, version of the latter piece from his Logian document at a later point in his Gospel (xi. 14 ff.)<sup>2</sup> and with the intention in his mind of doing this he might have passed over the passage in St Mark. It can, also, cause no surprise that he should not relate the attempt to seize Jesus on the ground that He was mad. But it is to be observed that the charge of collusion with Beelzebub to which alone the reply of Jesus is directed appears to have been somewhat clumsily hooked on in St Mark to the assertion of others that He was mad<sup>3</sup>, with which it seems to have no real connexion. There are, also, other signs of disturbance in the Marcan context. It seems as if the incident of the mother and brethren of Jesus coming to speak to Him, at

<sup>1</sup> On the usual length of rolls see T. Birt, *Antike Buchwesen*, esp. ch. vi., and F. G. Kenyon, *Palaeography of Greek Papyri*, pp. 17, 18; and for the bearing of custom in this matter on the lengths of the two Lucan writings, Zahn, *Kanon*, 1. p. 76 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See above p. 90.

<sup>3</sup> ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη. καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς... ἔλεγον, etc.

v. 31 ff., ought to have some connexion with the mention shortly before of His friends going forth for the purpose of restraining Him, which the introduction of the charge of the Pharisees has broken. But even if the latter is removed the two pieces about His friends and His mother and brethren respectively do not in their actual form fit well together. On the whole, it seems probable that the piece on the charge of collusion with Satan was interpolated in the original Marcan document and that there have been some other slight alterations in the context<sup>1</sup>.

Mk iv. 26—34, together with *vv.* 2, 10, 13 *b*, 23, 24 *b*, 35, 36 *a*. *Portions of the account of the speaking in parables.* Luke relates that on an occasion when a great crowd had gathered, Jesus addressed *a* parable to them (viii. 4) and he proceeds to give that of the Sower. The disciples ask Him the meaning of *this* parable (v. 9). He allows that it is their privilege to have truths communicated to them which are for the time being kept back from others (v. 10) and thereupon interprets to them the parable which is in question (v. 11 ff.). After the conclusion of it the responsibilities of those who receive such special instruction are insisted on in some striking proverbial Sayings (*vv.* 15—18). In Mk iv. 1—25 we have a passage closely corresponding to the one in St Luke which I have just described, though there are certain small, but not unimportant differences to which attention must presently be directed. First, however, let us notice that after the point down to which there is parallelism between St Mark and St Luke two parables are appended in somewhat loose fashion<sup>2</sup> to the former, viz., the Seed growing without human aid and the Mustard-seed (Mk iv. 26—29 and 30—32). Luke has not in any part of his Gospel an equivalent for the first of these. The latter he has given in a different context (xiii. 18, 19), taking it from his Logian document<sup>3</sup>; and it may be suggested that he passed it over when he came to it in his Marcan document because he was intending to give it later on from his other chief source. But it should be observed that a

<sup>1</sup> Cp. M. Loisy, *Autour d'un petit livre*, p. 80 f.

<sup>2</sup> They are introduced by *καὶ ἔλεγεν*, v. 26; *καὶ ἔλεγεν*, v. 30.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 95 f.

consideration of this kind has not prevented him from including the sayings in Mk iv. 21, 22, 24 (=Lk viii. 16—18)<sup>1</sup> in their Marcan context. Further, the instruction of the disciples when Jesus was alone with them, as it stands in St Mark, involves an awkward change of time and scene; it breaks into the series of parables addressed to the people, after which He was taken straight away "in the boat as He was" to the other side. We have already seen that this last touch was probably not in the original Mark<sup>2</sup>. But to a reviser who had added more parables it would seem natural to imagine this sequel. To him, also, we may suppose are due those differences from Luke to which reference has been made above. They were introduced to suit the purpose of giving more than one illustration of Christ's speaking in parables. In the setting of the single parable which the original document contained here, the words "He taught them many things in parables" (v. 2) takes the place of "He spake by a parable." Again, after the parable of the Sower only has been recounted, it is said that "His companions with the Twelve asked Him *the parables*" (v. 10). Then at v. 13 they are asked "Know ye not *this* parable, and how will ye know all the parables?" though the preceding statements in the plural have left no ground for singling this parable out. There is good ground then for thinking that in this whole section Luke has preserved for us an earlier form of the Marcan document which was brought through additions and editing to the form in which we have it in our St Mark<sup>3</sup>.

Mk vi. 1—6 a. *The visit to Nazareth.* That Luke should not notice at this point the visit to Nazareth does not indicate that the present section was wanting in his Marcan document. He knew a much fuller account of it, which he had chosen to give near the beginning of the public Ministry (iv. 16—30).

<sup>1</sup> Lk viii. 16 is in substance repeated at Lk xi. 33; Lk viii. 17 at xii. 2; Lk viii. 18 at xix. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. p. 143.

<sup>3</sup> Wendling, *op. cit.* p. 4 ff., who likewise holds (as many critics do) that the original account of the speaking in parables has been revised and interpolated, takes a different, and (as it seems to me) a less probable, view of the interpolations and other changes, because he has neglected to take into consideration the evidence supplied by the Synoptic parallels.



Mk vi. 17—29, *The fate of John the Baptist*. It is stated in all three Synoptics that the fame of Jesus disturbed Herod, conscience-stricken as he was by his recollection of the murder of John the Baptist. In St Mark the cause of the imprisonment of John, and his execution, are thereupon described. As Luke had already, near the beginning of his Gospel, concluded his account of the Baptist's preaching, aptly enough, with a reference to his imprisonment (iii. 18—20), it would not be unnatural that he should not follow Mark in mentioning it here; and that consequently he should have passed over the remainder of this section of St Mark.

But the whole historical notice here of the Baptist may also very well be an editorial addition.

We come now to the contents of Mk vi. 45—viii. 26, the whole of which is altogether absent from St Luke, with the exception of a couple of Sayings, which are given in that Gospel in a different context. It may be noted that in Mk vi. 46, Jesus is said to have retired to the mountain after the Feeding of the five thousand in order *to pray*; and that in Lk ix. 18, the verse which follows the same narrative, though it is an introduction to the conversation that follows, Jesus is likewise said to have been *alone praying*. But this does not in itself afford sufficient ground for supposing that all the matter which intervenes in St Mark was wanting in Luke's document. This peculiar trait in Luke's description of the occasion when Simon Peter confessed his faith may well have been due to the evangelist's own imagination of the scene<sup>1</sup>. And we must consider separately for each of the pieces comprised in this portion of St Mark the question whether the document used by Luke is likely to have contained it.

Mk vi. 45—53. *The crossing of the lake after the Feeding of the five thousand*. It does not seem possible to assign any good reason why Luke should have passed over this narrative, if he had it before him. He could not well have regarded the stilling of the storm by Jesus on an earlier

<sup>1</sup> Cp. p. 282 (note on Lk v. 16).

occasion when He was with them in the boat as an equivalent. The appearance of Jesus unexpectedly to the disciples when they were toilsomely rowing against a contrary wind was plainly a different incident and taught a different lesson. But further there is an indication that two sources have been combined in this context in the discrepancy between the statement in *v.* 45 that the disciples were to "go before Him across to Bethsaida," and that of *v.* 53, "when they had crossed over they came to the land unto Gennesaret, and moored to the shore." There is not known to have been any other Bethsaida save the well-known one at the head of the lake on the east side of the Jordan; and this is clearly the place intended in the Lucan parallel (*ix.* 10). In order to harmonise the two statements it has been suggested that the disciples started to go from the place a little to the south-east of Bethsaida "across" the bay that lay between, but that they were driven westward by the wind and so came to Gennesaret<sup>1</sup>. But there is nothing of this in the passage itself, and the use of "across" in the former verse, and "having crossed" just afterwards, renders it highly improbable that it is intended. It appears to be far more likely that "to Bethsaida" comes from the conclusion of the narrative of the Feeding of the five thousand in the original document, while "to Gennesaret" was the point at which in the tradition about Christ's walking on the sea, the boat came to land. This was the destination for which they started according to the parallel passage in the Fourth Gospel (*vi.* 17), "they entered into a boat, and were going across the sea to Capernaum." The reviser who embodied the narrative in St Mark, from lack of familiarity with the localities, did not perceive that there was any want of agreement between the two statements, and he may accidentally or intentionally have transferred the words *πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν* from the account of the miracle of Feeding the five thousand where, according to the Lucan parallel, they should stand, and introduced them into the beginning of the account of the crossing which he inserted.

Mk *vi.* 54—56. *The gathering of crowds on the western*

<sup>1</sup> Cp. G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 458; also Swete's *St Mark*, *in loc.*

*side of the lake.* This description is closely connected with the preceding crossing. The landing in the parallel narrative of the crossing in the Fourth Gospel is likewise followed by a concourse of people (vi. 22 ff.)<sup>1</sup>. It must be reckoned as part of the same insertion.

Mk vii. 1—23. *Pharisaic ceremonialism.* This piece may, perhaps, also belong to the insertion. It would be more natural that Pharisees and certain of the scribes from Jerusalem should come to Him at or near Capernaum than to Bethsaida or its neighbourhood, where the miracle of Feeding was wrought. At Lk xi. 37, 38, a Pharisee expresses astonishment at the same neglect of ceremonial observances by Jesus Himself with which His disciples are here charged; but the reply called forth is different. It looks as if two distinct traditions of the Teaching of Jesus on this subject had reached Luke and a reviser of the Marcan document respectively.

If these three sections comprised in vi. 45—vii. 23 be removed, the ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς of vii. 24 would follow upon the account of the miracle in vi. 35—44. The sequence would be very similar to that at v. 43—vi. 1. The neighbourhood of Bethsaida would also be a natural starting point for the northward journey described, vii. 24 ff.

Mk vii. 24—31. *Visit to region of Tyre and Sidon; the Gentile woman's request; return to Sea of Galilee.* The incident of the Syrophoenician woman may have been passed over by Luke because he thought the words of Jesus to her might prove a stumbling-block to Gentiles; he may have so judged especially if the words at Mt. xv. 24 stood in his document. The story is vividly told, and evidently of Palestinian origin and the indications of the route followed in the journey on which the incident happened are marks of genuineness. It probably belongs to the original document.

Mk vii. 32—37 and viii. 22—26. *The cure of a deaf and*

<sup>1</sup> Wendt (*Lehre Jesu*, I. p. 43) points out that "the unrestricted public healing of the sick" here is not in accord with other descriptions in St Mark. E.g., in Mk i. 34 and iii. 10, we read only of "many" being healed. Moreover, after the return of the Twelve from their Mission at vi. 30, He does not again, except according to this one passage, exercise His Ministry publicly on the Western shore of the lake.

*dumb man, and of a blind man.* These two narratives evidently form a pair, and they may most conveniently be treated together<sup>1</sup>. Luke may have decided against the inclusion of these miracles from fear of misunderstanding in regard to the means employed in them, or from an idea that these means made them seem less remarkable than other miracles, and therefore less necessary to be recorded where there were so many to relate. We shall also see presently that Luke may have regarded the exorcism of a spirit of dumbness mentioned by him at xi. 14 as an equivalent for the former of these miracles.

Mk viii. 1—10. *The Feeding of four thousand.* The phrase which introduces this section (*ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις*) does not connect it closely with what precedes. This second account of a feeding of multitudes closely resembles the first in all its circumstances, except in the numbers of those fed, etc., and these are differences which would be likely to arise in the oral transmission of what was originally the same narrative. It is difficult not to regard the two as a doublet, and if so it is most natural to suppose that an editor took the second form of the tradition as referring to a distinct occasion and therefore determined to embody it. Luke's silence is thus explained. The context is thus also simplified by the disappearance of the first of the two crossings (*v.* 10 and *v.* 13) which occur so near together.

Mk viii. 11—13 and 15. *The Pharisees' demand.* These verses hang well together and make a complete account in themselves. They should be retained as supplying the ground into which the other incident in the present context has been dove-tailed. Luke had a parallel to this challenge of the Pharisees and the Sayings of Christ thereupon in his Logian document (see above, p. 91). The challenge is referred to by him in connexion with the exorcism of a dumb spirit and the

<sup>1</sup> Though these miracles are not described in St Matthew here, or fully anywhere, I have not treated them as instances of omissions of Marcan matter by both the other Synoptics, because in the mention of the healing of "the dumb" in Mt. xv. 30 there may be a reference to the particular instance in Mk; and because also the narratives at Mt. ix. 27—31, 32—34, may relate to the same pair, while at any rate the first evangelist's inclusion of those two would explain his passing over the similar ones in St Mark.

remarks of Jesus follow not long after in the same connexion. It is interesting to observe that in St Mark, also, when the Feeding of the four thousand is omitted, this matter is brought into connexion with the cure of a dumb man. This is a point in favour of the view that the intervening narrative is an insertion.

The clause in Mk v. 15, *καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρώδου*, should be compared with the mention of Herodians at Mk iii. 6; xii. 13. It is conceivable that the reference to this party may in all three cases have proceeded from the hand of a reviser.

Mk viii. 14 and 16—21. *The disciples shew that the two miracles of Feeding had made little impression on them.* If the Second miracle of Feeding was an addition to the Marcan document as known to Luke, so also must this piece have been, since it refers to both miracles. Moreover, it has been woven in rather unskillfully with the allusion to the leaven of the Pharisees, with which it does not seem really to have anything to do. The remark added by our first evangelist in his parallel passage (Mt. xvi. 12) reveals a perception on his part that the connexion is not obvious. But in spite of his explanation, the fact remains that the disciples by their reasonings about their lack of bread had shewn—not a disposition to follow the teaching of the Pharisees but—want of implicit trust in their Master for the supply of their need.

With regard to the sections which we have retained out of the series comprised in Mk vi. 45—viii. 26, viz., vii. 24—37; viii. 11—13 and 15, 22—26, we have one further observation to make. Topographically they group well together. They are connected with the north end of the lake of Galilee and with a journey northwards from that district; while at the point at which the parallelism of all three Synoptics recommences, Jesus again, according to Mk viii. 27 (and Mt. xvi. 13), journeys northward to Caesarea Philippi. The accurate acquaintance with places thus shewn is in favour of the narratives in question having formed part of the original document, and of the sequence at which we have arrived being the true one.

Mk viii. 32, 33. *Peter's expostulation with Christ, and the stern rebuke called down thereby.* Luke omits this, although

he keeps very close to Mark in the remainder of his account of Christ's approaching sufferings and call for self-abnegation on the part of the disciples. We can well understand that he might not have thought it necessary to record the error of a particular disciple, who afterwards became so eminent in the Church, and the condemnation passed upon him.

Mk ix. 11—13. *The conversation about the coming of Elias*, which took place during the descent from the Mount of Transfiguration. This also is omitted by Luke. The question was one of Rabbinic theology, which would not greatly concern the readers whom he had in view; and the purport of the answer, as reported, was difficult to seize. The paragraph may, therefore, well have been passed over intentionally.

Mk ix. 41—50. *Sayings on the subject of Offences*. We have here probably an addition to the original. Luke has in different contexts (Lk xvii. 1, 2; xiv. 34) given Sayings substantially the same as two of those included. But he has nowhere recorded the beautiful saying "Whosoever shall give you a cup of cold water etc.," nor the earnest warning to part with any member that proves a stumbling-block. Moreover, this passage appears to form a little collection of Sayings, put together because they bore more or less directly on the same topic. The individual Sayings, or short pieces of discourse, contained in St Mark, are for the most part—and in all the portions of this Gospel which we may regard with most confidence as original—introduced very differently, each by itself and with pointed reference to a particular question, or occasion.

Mk x. 2—12. *Question of the Pharisees regarding the marriage-law*, after Jesus has removed from Galilee to Perea. We may compare their question and His answer on Ablutions in Mk vii. 1—23. Here, as there, a parallel in Luke is wanting, except that he has a single Saying on the subject in a little miscellaneous collection of Sayings addressed to the Pharisees (xvi. 14—18). In view especially of there being other passages in our form of St Mark which may probably be regarded as insertions, this also may be held to be one. It may further be noted that when the collection of Sayings on Offences and the Answer to the Pharisees on the Marriage-

law are removed, the incident about children being brought to Jesus for Him to bless follows close upon that of Jesus Himself taking a child and teaching a lesson from it, and is thus placed in a very natural connexion.

Mk x. 35—45. *The request of the sons of Zebedee during the journey from Peraea to Jericho, and a lesson of humility taught to all the Twelve.* Nearly the whole of this latter teaching appears in Lk xxii. 24—27, where it is called forth by a strife among the disciples on the subject of pre-eminence which occurred at the Last Supper<sup>1</sup>. Presumably he placed it there because of some tradition to that effect which he had received, and with a view to this he may have decided to pass over the whole episode at the earlier point, even though he found it there in his Marcan source.

Mk xi. 11 b—14, and 19—25. *The Condemnation of the fig-tree,* wanting in St Luke, may have been inserted in our St Mark in the two parts in which it is there given, after each of which we read the same words *καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα* (xi. 15 a and 27 a; in the latter place with *πάλιν* added). In the Marcan document used in St Matthew the insertion, if such it was, was made in a single piece. It may further be noted that the last verse in St Mark has no parallel in this context in St Matthew, though a corresponding saying is included in the Sermon on the Mount (vi. 14, 15). In this same connexion we have an indication that a revising hand has been at work upon our St Mark in the difference between it and both the other Synoptics, where they represent the Cleansing of the Temple as taking place on the same day as the Triumphal Entry. (Cp. Mt. xxi. 10 f. and Lk xix. 45 f. with Mk xi. 11.)

Mk xii. 28—34. *A scribe approving what he has heard asks what is the chief commandment.* Luke (x. 25—28) had already given, apparently from his Logian source, the account of a less friendly scribe, who had interrogated Jesus on this point and had been taught the same lesson<sup>2</sup>. It would have been unsuitable to repeat the instruction.

Mk xiii. In the *Discourse on the Last Things*, the Saying in v. 10 is probably an interpolation<sup>3</sup>. The few Sayings, also,

<sup>1</sup> On this piece see below, p. 238 f.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 88 f.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. p. 142.

at the end of the discourse (*v.* 34 ff.) emphasising the duty of watchfulness, to which there is nothing to correspond at the same point, or in reality elsewhere, in St Luke, may probably have been appended, much as we have seen the two parables to have been added after Mk iv. 25, and the Sayings on Offences after Mk ix. 40.

Mk xiv. 3—9. *The Anointing at Bethany.* In spite of the fact that St Luke has related the story of another Anointing, it is strange that, if he knew this one, which is so different in most of its circumstances, and which was so significant, he should have passed it over. Moreover the sequence in St Mark is improved when we omit this narrative. As told in this Gospel it has no obvious connexion with the plots of the chief priests and the Betrayal, which form the subject of the passages preceding and following. On the whole, when we note the good sequence which Mk *vv.* 2 and 10 exhibit, if the latter is read immediately after the former, and observe that *vv.* 2 and 3 in Luke very closely correspond to them, we get the impression that a reviser has inserted here a beautiful and touching story connected with the events of the last days of Christ's life for which he wanted to find a place. It will be remembered that the fourth evangelist has introduced this narrative at a slightly earlier point—six (instead of two) days before the Passover, and that he has worked it more completely into the context by the part he has assigned in it to Judas (Jn xii. 4—6).

In the narrative of the last hours of Jesus, from the Last Supper onwards, and of the Resurrection, Luke made use of independent information, and has departed a good deal from Mark's arrangement; so that particular differences from the latter by way of omission or otherwise cause at first sight less surprise than in those portions of his Gospel where the correspondence with St Mark is on the whole closer. Nevertheless some of them are worthy of consideration in connexion with an inquiry into the original form of Mark.

Mk xiv. 22—25. *The significance of the last meal.* With this passage of St Mark, 1 Cor. xi. 23—25, and the Lucan parallel in two forms—that of the best Greek MSS. and the



“Western” text—should be compared. The text of the best Greek MSS. is in this instance also (saving a few minor differences) the text that has been commonly received. The “Western” text, adopted in this instance by Westcott and Hort on the ground that other forms are more likely to have arisen from conflation, contains the first part of the same passage down to “this is my body” inclusive in *v.* 19. Some Latin texts and the Curetonian and the Sinaitic Syriac, contain to a greater or less extent respectively the words omitted in the brief Western form, but arrange them differently from the long Greek form.

In these passages two views of the significance of the last meal are set forth: (1) according to one the bread and wine represent the body and blood of Christ, (2) according to the other the last meal partaken of together foreshadows the feast in the Kingdom of God. The former of these aspects appears with approximately the same fulness<sup>1</sup> in 1 Corinthians (*vv.* 23—25) and St Mark (*vv.* 22—24) and the longer form of the Lucan parallel (*vv.* 19, 20), as well as partially in the Western text of Luke (*v.* 19 *a*). The other aspect appears fully in both forms of the Lucan text (*vv.* 15—18), and more restrictedly in Mk (*v.* 25). It is not passed over altogether even by St Paul (see *v.* 26), though he does not quote a Saying of Christ with regard to it, but indicates it in a remark of his own, and presents it in a way to appeal continuously to Christians. He seems also desirous of connecting it with the other view (*δσάκις γάρ*), but the thought is not clear. It should further be noted that in both St Mark and 1 Corinthians, the prospective aspect is placed after the other, whereas, in the two forms of Lucan text on which I have commented, it precedes.

The two views, though distinct, are not incompatible; it is easy to understand how both might have been dwelt upon during a discourse or conversation of some length. But it was not easy to fit them together in a brief narrative. The various accounts are so many attempts to do this, none of them completely successful. With regard to the Lucan text the truth probably is, not that the Western form must be the

<sup>1</sup> The most important difference is that the words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, δσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, occur only in 1 Cor.

original one, but that the differences between it and the text of the best Greek MSS. go back to a very early time and that we have not sufficient evidence to enable us to decide between them. Further, there does not seem to be good ground for regarding the view according to which the Last Supper is a foreshadowing of the banquet in the Kingdom of God, as necessarily the earlier of the two, in spite of the Jewish character of the imagery. St Paul asserts the primitive character of the tradition which sets forth the other aspect<sup>1</sup>. There can, then, be little reason to suppose that the original form of Mark has in this passage undergone alteration.

Mk xiv. 27, 28. *Prediction that the disciples will be scattered, and appointment of Galilee as a place where He will meet them after His resurrection.* Luke places a little earlier—before the upper chamber had been left—a warning given by Christ to the disciples. It relates to the same crisis, but is entirely different in substance and form. He may have passed over the present piece partly because he had already given that other one; but there would have been a more cogent reason for doing so in the fact that the reference to Galilee did not accord well with what he had himself heard and was about to relate in regard to the Appearances of the Risen Christ. When at Mk xvi. 7 Galilee is again indicated as the place where He would meet them, while in the Lucan parallel (xxiv. 6) there is a reference to what He had said while still in Galilee, the latter should probably be regarded as an adaptation of the Marcan record by the third evangelist to suit the course of his own narrative.

Mk xiv. 55—64. *The trial and condemnation in the night.* In the early morning a more formal meeting of the Sanhedrin followed; but as regards its action we are told in St Mark only that they “bound Jesus and delivered Him to Pilate.” It is also to be observed that in St Mark we are told that when

<sup>1</sup> When St Paul says (*v.* 23) that he had received the account of the institution from the Lord, he means of course through those who had delivered to him the Lord's commandments. He names the ultimate source in order to lay stress upon the authority belonging to the injunction. The idea that the Apostle believed himself to have received it in a vision is wholly without foundation and probability. He nowhere implies that knowledge in regard to the life of Christ and His Teaching on earth were thus communicated to him.

Jesus was brought into the high-priest's house, Peter made his way inside and sat among the servants, but his denials are not related till after the trial and the buffeting of Jesus. In St Luke, on the other hand, all that relates to Peter is told continuously at the beginning of the account of the time passed in the high-priest's house, and is followed by the buffeting. Then in connexion with the morning trial—the only one that Luke mentions—he has described an examination of Jesus which corresponds in large degree to, though it is briefer than, that which took place according to St Mark in the night. Hence it has been suggested that the particulars of the trial have been transferred from a meeting in the morning, described in the original Marcan record, to their present position in St Mark, where the time is not suitable and where they divide in two the account of Peter's temptation. This looks at first sight not improbable, but on a closer examination it does not commend itself. St Mark differs from St Luke not only by having a trial in the midst of the events of the night and in the division of the story of Peter's fall into two parts, but in an inversion of the order in which the second of these parts and the buffeting stand, which would remain unexplained. On the other hand, it would be quite in Luke's manner, as we see from his treatment of the Marcan record in other places<sup>1</sup>, to bring together all that concerned Peter. He might well, also, consider that the morning trial was the one which most deserved to be described, even if he did not think (as he may have done) that it was an error to suppose that a trial (or examination) took place in the night. But in reality there seems to be no difficulty in conceiving that the account in St Mark may be substantially correct. The members of the Sanhedrin would be expecting the arrest of Jesus; the news that it had been effected would speedily reach them, and many of them would at once hurry to the high-priest's house in order to be present at the examination of the prisoner. The witnesses would be supplied from among their adherents and servants, or from subordinate officials, so that they would be at hand.

Mk xv. 34—36. *The cry Eloi, Eloi, etc., and the taunt, He*

<sup>1</sup> See p. 52 (g).

*callesth for Elias, etc.* Luke might have omitted the cry, from the idea that it might be misunderstood; the words "Father into Thy hands, etc.," seem to take its place. With the omission of the cry "Eloi, etc.," the sequel was necessarily passed over, and it may not have seemed important.

The omissions of Marcan matter in St Luke which we have discussed have all consisted of some verses, except in so far as in one or two instances small differences between the two Gospels in the same contexts have seemed to be connected with the larger ones<sup>1</sup>. I do not propose to carry further the inquiry into the text of Mark known to Luke, by examining lesser differences. So many of these appear to be due to the freedom with which Luke revised the language of his source, that it would hardly be wise to attempt to distinguish any among them as due to the source itself, where we have not the agreement of St Matthew to guide us.

The character of the subject-matter in the pieces which we have been led to single out, as wanting in a Marcan document earlier than our St Mark, remains still to be noticed. It should, I think, be allowed that it accords with the view that they were of later introduction. Several of the pieces (iii. 22—30; ix. 41—50; x. 2—12; xiii. 10, 34—37) are of a "Logian" character; for the most part they were contained—in a closely corresponding form, though the version appears to have been a different one—in the Greek Logian document used by our first and third evangelists<sup>2</sup>. St Mark has on the whole comparatively speaking little matter of this kind. If the original Mark was still more wanting in such

<sup>1</sup> It may be convenient that I should enumerate them here, although most of them are referred to almost immediately in the sequel: iii. 22—30; iv. 13 *b*, 24 *b*, 26—34; vi. 45—vii. 23; viii. 1—10, 14, 16—21; ix. 41—50; x. 2—12; xi. 11 *b*—14, 19—25; xiii. 10, 34—37; xiv. 3—9.

To these passages the smaller differences should be added, where the first and third Gospels side with one another against the second, see p. 142 ff. and the Table, p. 207 ff.

It is worthy of remark that two of the sections which have been noted as interpolations in St Mark are included in the Fourth Gospel, viz., the *Crossing to the western shore of the lake after the miracle of Feeding and the gathering of crowds on the other side*, and the *Anointing at Bethany*.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 110.

matter, a later hand might well have supplied some pieces. Again we have the Second miracle of Feeding (viii. 1—10) which appears to form a doublet with the first, and which might well have been included by an editor who did not realise that the two narratives were accounts of the same incident. We have, also, two other narratives of miracles among the passages marked as interpolations (the Walking on the water, vi. 46—52, and the Condemnation of the fig-tree to barrenness, xi. 11 b—14, 19—25), which are different in kind to any other miracles attributed to Jesus. Once more a general description of a great concourse and of many healings (vi. 54—56) has been removed, as also a statement that Jesus desired at a particular time to remain concealed (ix. 30)<sup>1</sup>. And the possibility has been allowed for, that in some other passages similar to the former and to the latter of these there may have been some heightening of the language of the original record. Here too we may not unreasonably see the hand of an editor. Other cases in which those traits appear have been left unchallenged in these pages, and I may say at once for clearness' sake that I believe they had a place in the original Marcan record and regard them as historically true<sup>2</sup>; but it might well be that some reviser of the Gospel would be inclined to, and would in fact, emphasise them over much.

I deferred the question whether any evidence as to the originality of the passages of St Mark omitted by Luke is to be obtained from their stylistic peculiarities. St Mark by its style makes upon us an individual impression among the writings of the New Testament, and this has been held to prove unity of authorship, with hardly an exception, throughout our present Gospel<sup>3</sup>. If this is true, we must set aside the conclusions just arrived at. Let us ask whether the facts

<sup>1</sup> See p. 144.

<sup>2</sup> See below, pp. 192, 195.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Hawkins, p. 122: "On the whole it seems to me that such an examination of the Marcan peculiarities as has now been attempted supplies results which are largely in favour of the view that the Petrine source used by the two later Synoptists was not an '*Ur-Marcus*,' but St Mark's Gospel almost as we have it now." He goes on to except about half-a-dozen phrases and points of detail. W. Soltau, *Unsere Evang.*, p. 30, concurs entirely in this conclusion. Dr Swete's judgment is more cautiously expressed and allows for a somewhat larger element of difference between our St Mark and the original: "The present writer," he says, "has risen from his study of the Gospel with a strong sense of the unity of the

compel us to do this. The point is not easy of decision. The peculiar character of the style in this Gospel is due to the frequent occurrence of constructions and words here which are also found, but are not so common, in other writers. In the case, then, of any particular passage which we may have reason to suspect to be an insertion, this supposition cannot be refuted merely by noting one or more instances of such constructions or words; it will at least be necessary to form some estimate of the degree to which the particular passage is characterised by them relatively to other parts of the Gospel. But, further, the peculiarities in St Mark appear to be not so much idiosyncrasies, such as the most practised writers shew, but rather traits derived from the common Greek of the time, especially as it was spoken among Jews. And it is probable that the traditions generally of the Life and Teaching of Jesus, alike in their oral and their earliest written forms, had to a large extent the same linguistic features; and consequently fragments of these early traditions, which some editor of the original Marcan document embodied therein, might likewise exhibit them in greater or less degree. Or again in making insertions he might have introduced touches here and there which were to be found in the main document that he had been copying, and the phrases of which were running in his thoughts. On the other hand, when we observe differences between the style of a particular passage and the rest of a work we cannot certainly infer difference of authorship therefrom. In judging of matters of this kind a wide margin must be left for accidental variations, or, in other words, such as we have not the means of explaining. No writer adheres at all times to the same modes of expression. If with these considerations in mind the evidence is examined, I believe it will be found that it does not contravene the result arrived at above as to insertions in the original Marcan document, but on the contrary confirms in some degree the rightness of the selection that has been made<sup>1</sup>.

work, and can echo the *requiescat Urmarkus* which ends a recent discussion. But he is not prepared to express an opinion as to the nature and extent of the editorial revision which St Mark's original has undergone" (*St Mark*, p. lxx, n. 1).

<sup>1</sup> See Additional Note, p. 204 ff.

We have determined approximately the contents of the Synoptic source known to our third evangelist. But have we in this work found the original form of this document? Before we can answer this question we must consider some recent theories as to the compositeness of St Mark.

*Recent theories as to the compositeness of St Mark.*

In the foregoing discussion we have endeavoured to learn what we could as to a form or forms of Synoptic source earlier than St Mark by comparing therewith the two other Synoptics; and we have at the same time taken account of evidence of two kinds supplied by our second Gospel itself: (*a*) indications of broken connexion, or clumsy adaptation, between successive sections; (*b*) finally, the character of the subject-matter and the literary style. It is important to distinguish between these two, because (as will, I think, presently appear) the ground afforded by the latter for inferring difference of sources is far more precarious than that afforded by the former. It is with the latter alone<sup>1</sup>—with

<sup>1</sup> I believe that all cases of ill-fitting contexts, that can fairly be reckoned as such, are included among the passages already dealt with, and certainly there are not many more. Loisy (*Around a little book*, p. 80 ff.), indeed, notes some "seams" (*sutures*) where my eyes can discern none. "La prédiction (he writes) concernant la passion et la mort du Fils de l'homme (Mk viii. 32—38) semble intercalée entre la confession de Pierre (viii. 27—30) et la promesse relative au prochain avènement du règne de Dieu." But ix. 1 is closely connected with viii. 38. Further, there is a natural sequence of thought in the whole piece. "La parabole des mauvais vigneron (xii. 1—12 *a, b*) a été introduite entre la réplique faite par Jésus dans le temple, aux chefs des prêtres qui l'interrogent touchant l'autorité qu'il s'attribue (xi. 27—33), et la retraite des questionneurs déconfits par la demande que Jésus lui-même leur adresse" (xii. 12 *c*). In point of fact the parable of the Vine-dressers follows with admirable suitability after the reply of Jesus to the question of the members of the Sanhedrin, the chiefs of the Jewish nation, and the whole of xii. 12 comes as fitly after the parable as it would after xi. 33. The only thing that is at all strange is the order of clauses in xii. 12. The chief priests should naturally have left Jesus *before* they began to plot His destruction. But it hardly seems necessary to suppose the preceding passage to be an insertion in order to account for this. This last section is likewise noted by him as an insertion in *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, i, p. 97. He there also suggests that Mk i. 40—45, the Cleansing of the leper, and vi. 1—6, the Visit to Nazareth, are insertions (pp. 87, 89) not, however, on account of any signs of a *broken*

alleged differences of point of view and interest, style and mode of treatment—that we shall be concerned in those more extensive analyses of the contents of St Mark which we are about to examine. In discussing these theories, when we find certain portions assigned to a record by Mark of Peter's teaching, to which it is held that other portions do not belong, it will be necessary to ask whether there is good ground for confining derivation from Peter and Marcan authorship (one or both) in the manner proposed. But I will ask my readers to bear in mind that my primary object in this section is not to consider the question of Mark's authorship, but to ascertain whether St Mark is or is not composite to a greater degree than we have already found it to be.

It is commonly held that a certain number of narratives, more or fewer, which Mark had heard Peter relate and had then recorded, have been embodied in St Mark. So much homage is paid to the tradition preserved by Papias. Those more especially are singled out in which it is thought that personal reminiscences can be traced. Some of the opening scenes in the account of the Ministry in Galilee are always included; but there are decided differences of opinion later on in the portions selected, and as to the notes by which various sources are distinguished. It is with the latter that we are chiefly concerned.

J. Weiss separates from the Petrine narratives<sup>1</sup> (1) a collection of "school-discussions" (ii. 23—28; vii. 1—23; x. 1—12; xii. 18—27)<sup>2</sup>; (2) a large number of Sayings of Jesus, especially such as have parallels in the Logian document

connexion, but simply for *want of* connexion, and because they seem to be introduced to "fill a void" in the history. But, to apply words of his own (p. 85), "in a work so little literary, mere want of cohesion"—such as is exemplified in these instances—"is not evidence of multiple authorship." One or two other cases of patching which he supposes, may, it seems to me, be dismissed on the same ground. (With regard to F. Nicolardot on Mark's editorial methods see below, p. 370.)

Wendling (*op. cit.* p. 13, § 28 *b*) regards vi. 1—13 as an insertion; vi. 14 connects ill, he says, with vi. 13, whereas it does so excellently with v. 43 (omitting 43 *a*). But in that way it would be connected only with the report of one miracle, whereas vi. 14 alludes to many. Moreover, he does not consider the alternative which might equally well (or I should say much more reasonably) be adopted of making the passage beginning at vi. 14, *καὶ ἤκουσεν*, etc., the insertion.

<sup>1</sup> For his list of them see *op. cit.* p. 350 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 365.



used in St Matthew and St Luke; (3) some narratives which he thinks may likewise be derived from the Logian source<sup>1</sup>; (4) some traditions of an inferior quality<sup>2</sup>. It is further to be observed that, like some other recent critics, as well as some older ones, he discovers traces of Pauline influence in St Mark. In regard, however, to the authorship of the Gospel his view approximates to the traditional one. He thinks it most probable that the different elements which have been described were worked up into the present Gospel by a Mark who was the disciple of both Peter and Paul, though whether this man was the same as the John Mark mentioned in the Acts he is doubtful.

Von Soden supposes i. 14—iv. 34 to be in the main derived from Peter; the three narratives that follow this in iv. 35—v. 43, viz. those relating to the storm on the lake, the Gerasene daemoniac, and the raising of the daughter of Jairus, he regards as typical instances of a style betokening derivation from a different source. He contrasts them with the earlier narratives. The former are more concise; the main purpose of each appears to be to give some emphatic Saying of Jesus; there are comparatively few accessory features. In the latter there is greater amplitude of description; there are more picturesque details; the writer paints with a broader brush; and the dialogues introduced are less pointed and of a more ordinary character<sup>3</sup>. In the remainder of the Gospel there is an admixture of matter from both these sources. Apparently von Soden is of opinion that whatever was not derived from Peter belongs to the same second collection and was contributed by the author of our Gospel, who combined it with the record by Mark of the Petrine narratives.

Wendling declines to start from the statement of Papias as to Mark's record of Peter's preaching<sup>4</sup>; but he arrives at much the same conclusion as von Soden in regard to the contents of the primitive document embodied in St Mark, and allows in the end that it may not improbably be a record of Petrine

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.* p. 375 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 380 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Urchrist. Lit.-Geschichte*, p. 77 ff.; Eng. trans. p. 153 ff. Cp. also *Die wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu*, p. 37 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 3 f.

reminiscences by Mark<sup>1</sup>. But the plan on which he conducts his inquiry into the composition of the Gospel, and some of its results, are interesting. He fastens upon certain passages which bear, he thinks, the clearest marks of proceeding from an editor, and after examining them proceeds to look for the same characteristics of thought and style in other parts of the Gospel<sup>2</sup>. In the course of his inquiry he discovers two layers of matter subsequent to the earliest one. He agrees with von Soden in regard to the characteristics of the narratives in iv. 35—v. 43, and takes them as crucial examples of one layer, the second in time; but he cannot find in them any special points of resemblance whatever to the latest additions<sup>3</sup>. He calls the three hands M<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>, and the evangelist. "*Cum grano salis* one may," he says, "describe M<sub>1</sub> as the historian, M<sub>2</sub> as the poet, and the evangelist as the theologian<sup>4</sup>."

I have given only a general account of these theories. It does not seem to me to be necessary that I should go more into detail in regard to them, because the tests themselves which are applied for distinguishing between different sources appear to me to be to a large extent untrustworthy, and indeed almost wholly so when they are employed independently of other considerations. Let us, first, examine the grounds on which derivation from Simon Peter is in various cases denied. To prevent misunderstanding let me say that I see no reason why Mark—assuming him for the moment to have been the author of the Gospel and Peter at least his principal informant—should not have included in it matter which he obtained through channels other than the teaching of this Apostle. The terms of the statement of Papias should not be pressed too hard, even when it is taken as substantially true. The tendency of tradition would be to exaggerate the dependence of the disciple upon the Apostle. But the question now is whether the reasons that have been alleged for attributing various portions of the Gospel to another source, or other sources, are sound.

I have already contended that the matter of "Logian" character in St Mark—including even those pieces which seem

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.* p. 25 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 4 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* p. 20.

to have been inserted by an editor—was not derived from the same Greek Logian document that the first and third evangelists used, though I have admitted that most of it was found in, and that it might therefore have been derived from, the original Aramaic collection<sup>1</sup>. But I would now point out that—except in the case of the insertions just referred to—there is no need to suppose that it came strictly speaking from that source. For Simon Peter must have been familiar with Christ's Sayings; he must in all probability have had a share, and that a large one, in the formation of the collection of them during the earlier stages of the process, and it is inconceivable that he should not to some extent have repeated them in his teaching. The mere fact, therefore, of the existence of parallels in the Logian document to Sayings contained in St Mark, is no proof that the author of the latter must have derived them from the oral or written Logian collection, and not directly and independently from the Apostle. The same may be said with regard to those "school-discussions" which J. Weiss marks off, and to which I shall refer again presently<sup>2</sup>.

Further, with regard to the varying degrees of fulness and distinctness in the settings of the Sayings, it is to be remembered that Mark may well have retained a clearer impression, and Peter himself have given more vivid descriptions, in some cases than in others. When Jesus had spoken as He walked by the way<sup>3</sup>, or as He rested in some house or taught in the synagogue of some village which was passed through in the course of a journey<sup>4</sup>, the place could not well be, and certainly would not be likely to be, so clearly defined in the record, as in the case of incidents and Sayings that were connected with his own house and the synagogue which he had been accustomed to attend at Capernaum. But he would not be the less likely on that account to repeat the instruction given, if it seemed to him to be important.

The critics are apt to think of Peter in his relation to Mark far too much as if he were simply some garrulous old

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 113f.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 179, n.

<sup>3</sup> Mk viii. 27; x. 17, 32; cp. also ii. 23.

<sup>4</sup> Mk vii. 24 (*eis oikían* without def. art.); Mk iii. 1 (*eis συναγωγὴν*).

soldier or traveller who loved to tell stories which had great personal interest for himself and were also interesting to his hearers, but which had no immediately practical bearing upon their conduct, instead of as a teacher who gave men instruction, as Papias says, *πρὸς τὰς χρείας*, "to meet their needs," an earnest preacher of the Gospel that "Jesus is the Christ," and trainer of souls in the new Way of Life.

Traces of Pauline influence in St Mark would be quite compatible with the traditional view of its authorship. Yet some at least of those that are pointed out must be examined, because if they are rightly so regarded our conception of the teaching of Simon Peter, and estimate of the value of the evidence supplied by the Gospel according to St Mark in regard to the beginnings of the Christian faith, must be affected. I refer to the prominent place which the death of Christ holds in St Mark and the significance attached to it. But there is, surely, no ground for thinking that there is anything specially Pauline here. Every believer in Jesus as the Christ had to face the fact of the Crucifixion, to explain it to himself, and to urge his explanation of it upon all whom he desired to convince. One great line of argument, we know, was that the sufferings of the Christ were foretold in the Scriptures; but that He Himself had predicted them, and had risen again from the dead after enduring them, was also a weighty consideration, and it is not strange that it should have been much insisted on. Nor could the Cross of Christ fail to make a powerful appeal to every genuine disciple to be ready to follow his Master in the path of self-denial and humility<sup>1</sup>. This is not to say that in retrospect no touches were added to the language of the predictions, which made them correspond more exactly with the events; or to deny that the impressive grouping of the repeated predictions, and calls to self-abnegation, may not in part be due to the evangelist. I contend only that we have not in all this any sign of the working of a particular tendency in the early Church. As little should this be held, I believe, in regard to two sayings contained in St Mark in which more

<sup>1</sup> Cp. in the Logian document, Lk xiv. 26, 27; Mt. x. 37, 38.

especially the significance of the Death of Christ is set forth. One of these is virtually contained, it is true, in the account which St Paul gives of the Institution of the Eucharist in 1 Cor. xi.; but, as we have seen already, he declares it to be a primitive tradition. The other is the saying that the Son of Man had come "to give His life a ransom for many<sup>1</sup>." But supposing the saying not to be genuine, the thought that the Death of Christ was thus to be regarded would still lie near at hand. There were passages in the prophets from which it could be readily inferred in accordance with the modes of interpretation then prevailing. The lines of thought really characteristic of St Paul, those which shewed how the Death of Christ had opened the Kingdom of Heaven to Gentiles as well as Jews, do not appear in either of these passages, or in other parts of St Mark.

It is also said that passages have been introduced into the Gospel with the purpose of teaching a lesson to those who thought too highly of the elder Apostles relatively to St Paul. It is not a matter of great moment whether this is really the case or not. But the indications of this intention are somewhat uncertain. To take one instance that is adduced, that of the man not belonging to the number of the Twelve, who cast out devils in the name of Jesus<sup>2</sup>. If there was a covert allusion here to the relations between St Paul and the Twelve, one wonders that the terms of it were not made a little more appropriate, by the substitution or addition of a reference to preaching, which would have been more suggestive of the work of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

I pass to differences of style and of interest. It is true that in the narratives in iv. 35—v. 43 there is an amplitude of description which distinguishes them from those in the preceding portion of St Mark; and also that the earlier narratives form as it were each the setting of some remarkable Saying of Jesus, while in each of the later groups a miracle is more exclusively the theme. But do not the two kinds of difference go together? The style of every speaker and writer is likely to vary somewhat with his subject; it was

<sup>1</sup> Mk x. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Mk ix. 38—40.

natural that where the main purpose was to record some remarkable miracle, which had been (it was felt) rendered more impressive by all its attendant circumstances, there should be far fuller description, than where the principal object was to record a striking Saying of Jesus by which chiefly the occasion was made memorable. But between the several narratives of the two classes there are, also, various degrees of difference in regard to fulness of description. For example, in the account of the Healing of the paralytic (ii. 1—12) which is commonly reckoned as one of the genuine Petrine narratives, we have several picturesque details, in particular the carrying of the sick man to the roof and lowering him in front of Jesus (*vv.* 3, 4). Moreover even in passages which are brief and on the whole concise we have expressions which reveal the writer's tendency to an amplitude that approaches to tautology<sup>1</sup>.

We will now extend our view to the three different interests which Wendling assigns to the three men who had a share according to him in bringing St Mark to its present form, those, namely, of the historian, the poet, and the theologian. Might not the same man, we would ask, have a little in him of all three, at least to the degree that would be required for putting together this record? We can see how ridiculous it would be in the case of a modern work—even one of a kind to be stamped in every part by the author's own individuality—if, ignoring reputed authorship, we assigned to different hands the passages where more or less distinct differences of interest were apparent: if, for instance, in a work consisting for the most part of dry critical discussions, we were to say, wherever we came across a passage in which the writer had permitted himself a little play of historical imagination, or manifestation of ethical feeling, "this must proceed from a different hand." The method is still more out of place in the case of a collection of traditions about the words and deeds of a remarkable personality, where the collector's own reflective and creative powers are

<sup>1</sup> E. g. i. 32, *ὅψις δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος*. i. 35, *πρωτὲν νυχα λιβαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν*. and in ii. 4 referred to above, *ἀπεστέρησαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύξαντες*.

no measure of what he will consider interesting and worthy of being recorded, if it should come before him.

It is to be added that the plan specially adopted by Wendling, the selection of certain passages which are most probably interpolations and the comparison of others with them, is unsatisfactory because the grounds on which he marks off some of his supposed interpolations are uncertain, and also because the particulars to be compared are too few to afford sound inferences. It becomes still more evident how precarious they may be when we consider that an editor would be not unlikely to reproduce in passages that he added some forms of expression and features of the history which impressed him in the record as he had received it.

It remains only to ask what aims the authors of the supposed sources, as reconstructed by the critics, could have had, to account for their form and limits. The aim of a constant hearer of Peter might be, for instance, to record all that he remembered Peter to have related both of the words and deeds of Christ. This is the aim attributed to Mark in the statement of Papias. I refer to it, however, here not in order to appeal to the authority of this tradition, but because the aim described is evidently one which might naturally have inspired and directed the action of a disciple of the Apostle. If this is assumed to have been actually his aim, then we have a right to demand that an adequate conception shall be formed of the probable contents of Peter's teaching, and in this respect, as I have contended, the theories which I have been discussing do not satisfy us. If on the other hand the compiler of a source—whether of a collection of Petrine narratives or of other traditions—has made a selection only from the matter at his disposal, the principle on which the selection would seem to have been made should be one that commends itself as likely to have been adopted.

Von Soden arrives at "the Petrine narratives" by picking out those little series of narratives in St Mark, each of which illustrates more or less distinctly some one topic—the causes of offence which the Jews found in Jesus in ii. 1—iii. 6, the want of comprehension of His character, purpose and teaching on the part of the Pharisees and His own relatives, iii. 21—35

and vi. 1—6, etc., etc. These, he maintains, were severally arranged by Mark, and put together, and this compilation formed a document of which different portions have been embodied along with much additional matter by the author of our Gospel, who is responsible for the structure as a whole<sup>1</sup>. But it must be asked whether all that Peter is likely to have said about the life and work of Jesus is comprised in these little groups of narratives; and if not, why Mark should have refrained from relating anything that did not fit under these heads? What natural want would the collection, limited in the way indicated, have supplied? If it is granted, as doubtless it should be, that Mark was not in a position to give even an approximately complete account of the Gospel history, why should he not have desired to represent it as a whole so far as he was able? And how was it that a later hand was able to dis sever the several groups, and in some instances to break them up, and to introduce them into a work of his own, in such a way that, for the most part we are not conscious of any want of unity in it? These are questions that cannot be answered in a manner that is satisfactory for von Soden's theory. One can understand well enough that Sayings should be collected and arranged without reference to historical considerations. But the collection of narratives almost necessarily implies some interest in history so far as it can be ascertained. In truth, the method in which von Soden sets to work is artificial, and his reconstruction is an idol of the critic's cave; it does not belong to the sphere of common human action, least of all to that of the Church's life in the first century<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Wendt (*Die Lehre Jesu*, I. especially pp. 22 ff., 39) has taken a similar view of the Petrine narratives to that of von Soden. But he supposes the groups to have been derived from Simon Peter himself. In part they may have been. It is in adding to the supposed groups all narratives that seem at all similar, and in confining the information derived from Peter to the matter which can be fitted into the groups that artificiality comes in.

For another reference to Wendt's view of the composition of Mark see above, p. 117, n.

<sup>2</sup> J. Weiss' theory (see above, p. 174) that one source was a small collection of "school-discussions" is not of great importance in itself because he does not doubt that the traditions included were trustworthy; but it is worth while to notice it as an instance of method, the soundness of which must be questioned on similar



Wendling does not bestow much attention upon the question of the circumstances or intentions which determined the scope either of his earliest document<sup>1</sup>, or of the work which the Second Hand produced by supplementing the earliest document with additional narratives. But he remarks that the latter ( $M_1 + M_2$ ) as marked out by him, makes a compact whole<sup>2</sup>. It covers also a considerable part of the Ministry of Christ as represented in St Mark. All the more must some of its omissions seem strange. I will here note one only. Wendling has left in it no passages relating to the call and instruction of "the Twelve<sup>3</sup>." Yet an unexceptionable witness, St Paul, alludes to the existence of this body, in a way that implies their importance, and the familiarity of members of the Gentile Church of Corinth with the designation<sup>4</sup>.

#### *The question of authorship.*

As a result of this discussion, we may, I believe, reject the view of the origin and history of St Mark, according to which a primitive document of small extent and containing little variety of subject-matter has been embodied in it, along with a large amount of additional material, by one or more later hands to whom the present arrangement is due. On the other hand, we have seen that our St Mark was in all probability preceded by a work which was somewhat shorter, but which differed little in its structure and character from our present Gospel, and into the framework of which a certain number of interpolations have been made and the text of which has been to a limited extent revised. It would seem also that there cannot well have been many interpolations or

grounds to those urged above. No sufficient motive can be suggested for making such a collection, especially as these accounts are distinguished from others only by a very shadowy line.

<sup>1</sup> p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> "Einen abgerundeten Bericht darstellt" (*ib.*).

<sup>3</sup> He even suggests that the name itself did not occur in this document, though as a matter of convenience he has retained it in the expression εἰς τῶν δώδεκα at xiv. 10, 20, 43. See p. 9, § 20, and *vv.* 24 and 41.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 5.

other considerable changes made in this Proto-Mark (as we may call it), beyond those which were specified in the course of our comparison of St Mark with the two other Synoptics. We will, however, keep our minds open to recognise any probable ones that may come before us in the course of that examination of the subject-matter in relation to the authorship upon which we are about to enter; and it must also be remembered that there may be some which we have no means of detecting and which remain unsuspected.

So far in speaking of authorship by Mark, I have contended only that the distinctions drawn between different portions of the Gospel are in certain cases untrustworthy. It remains now that we should consider carefully whether we shall be justified in regarding the document, obtained by removing from our St Mark the interpolations which have been enumerated, as a work which proceeded (approximately at least in this form) from Mark, the hearer of Peter, who had been mainly dependent upon the Apostle for that which he embodied therein.

At some points in the discussion it will be necessary to consider not merely what Peter is likely to have said, but what ideas Mark is likely to have entertained, and what independent information with regard to the facts recorded he is likely from the circumstances of his life to have possessed. And indeed it will be well that all through we should bear in mind that we are concerned immediately with Mark. Let us begin, therefore, by asking what we know of him.

We may accept, I think, as true in all probability the usual identification of the Mark of St Paul's Epistles<sup>1</sup> with the "John surnamed Mark" of the Acts. St Paul's designation of him as "the cousin of Barnabas," and the addition of the injunction "touching whom ye received commandments, if he come unto you receive him," suit well with what is related in regard to John Mark in the Acts<sup>2</sup>. Whether it is the same man who is referred to in 1 Peter as "Mark my son<sup>3</sup>," and described as "Peter's disciple and interpreter" in

<sup>1</sup> Col. iv. 10; Philemon 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xii. 12, 25; xv. 37-39.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. v. 13.

the tradition preserved by Papias, may seem more open to question. If he is the same, it is somewhat curious that in the notices in the Acts and Pauline Epistles there should be no indication—beyond the statement that Peter, when he was delivered from prison, went to the house of Mark's mother—that he was ever associated with Peter, and on the other hand none in the notices of 1 Peter and of Papias, that he was ever associated with Barnabas and Paul. It is not, however, impossible to harmonise the various statements and allusions, and early tradition seems to encourage our doing so. For when Papias, or Irenaeus, and later writers of the second and third centuries, mention Mark the follower of Peter and evangelist, it does not occur to them to distinguish him from another Mark who was more prominent in the New Testament<sup>1</sup>. On the whole, then, I believe we shall be justified in regarding the Mark of the Acts and of St Paul's Epistles as the Mark who, according to tradition, was the author of our Gospel according to St Mark, and who is commonly allowed to have had in all probability some share in the work. But we must take care not to find in the references to him in the Acts more than they actually contain. They afford no ground for the suggestion of some modern expositors that Mark was the young man who came out to see the arrest of Jesus in the night and fled, leaving behind him the linen cloth in which he had wrapped himself<sup>2</sup>; nor again for the notion which comes before us first in the sixth century, and which may well have arisen as a pleasant fancy of pilgrims to the holy places, that the house of Mark's mother was the house in which "Our Lord Christ with the Apostles founded the true Zion"<sup>3</sup>; nor lastly, for the practice of some modern critics of calling John Mark the "Jerusalemite"<sup>4</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> J. Weiss, who has recently called in question the grounds for the identification (*ib.* p. 385 ff.), interprets the silence of Papias and Irenaeus and others in a different way from that which I do. He takes it as evidence that a tradition did *not* exist that the same Mark was meant in both cases.

For the common view that the same man is intended, see Th. Zahn, *Einleit.* II. 210 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Mk xiv. 51, 52.

<sup>3</sup> Theodosius, *de Situ Terrae Sanctae*, 43, p. 20, ed. Gildemeister.

<sup>4</sup> J. Weiss, among others, does so (*ib.*).

and inferring therefrom that he must have had personal knowledge of what had passed in Jerusalem during many years. We learn only that he was in Jerusalem at the time of events which apparently happened circ. A.D. 44; and that at this time his mother had a house there which was a centre for the believers. But we do not know what his age was at this time; indeed, it is probable that he was still a young man, since Paul and Barnabas took him with them, when they departed, in the capacity of "their minister." So that even if he was in Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion, he was probably himself then a young child. Again we do not know the length of time for which his mother had been a convert, nor indeed for which she had lived in Jerusalem. It is not unlikely that Mark's parents were Jews of the Dispersion who had returned to the Holy City. His own name, and the tradition that he acted as Peter's "interpreter," and the statement that his cousin Barnabas was a Jew of Cyprus all point to this conclusion. It is not unimportant that, some 12 to 14 years after the period to which the Gospel-history relates, Mark should for a time have been domiciled in Jerusalem. But we are not entitled to assume that his residence and membership of the Church there had been of long duration.

Let us proceed to examine the Gospel itself.

The first line of our St Mark—"The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God"—was probably added by a revising hand. But it describes truly the character and *motif* of the document, as it remains, even after interpolations have been removed and the text has been amended in the manner described above. Its theme was "the gospel," essentially in the sense in which St Paul used the word. St Paul, indeed, set forth Jesus as the Christ, manifested through His Resurrection, through the gift of His Spirit and the power of His preached Word. It was thus only that he himself had personally known Him. The earliest disciples of Jesus likewise proclaimed Him under this aspect. But they naturally also went back to Christ's manifestation of Himself when on earth whereby they had been first led to believe. This was "the *beginning* of the gospel of Jesus Christ." The word

“beginning” may well have this significance. It may refer not merely to the ushering in of Christ's work by His forerunner, or to the opening of His own Ministry by the shore of the Galilean lake, but to His whole Ministry on earth as contrasted with the time subsequent to His resurrection. (Cp. Acts i. 1.) It set forth the Person and Work of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. This theological idea governs it throughout. It appears not only at great moments of the history, such as the Baptism, the Confession of Peter and the other disciples near Caesarea Philippi, the Transfiguration; nor again merely in the prominence given to the miracles of Jesus and in particular to the casting out of devils; but also in many of the Sayings recorded in it, and perhaps in none more than in the great series for the sake of which the narratives in ch. ii. are related, which are among those most widely acknowledged to be Petrine:—“Son thy sins are forgiven...The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins” (ii. 2, 10). “They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous but sinners” (ii. 17). “Can the sons of the bridechamber fast while the bridegroom is with them?” (ii. 19).

In these “leading ideas,” this spirit and aim of the work, we may with good reason trace the effect of the teaching of the Apostle Peter. If the preaching of the original followers of Jesus was not substantially of this character, the whole history of the rise of Christianity is unintelligible.

From this consideration of the theme and purpose of the work we will now pass on to review next the contents generally, and especially its arrangement. It is evident that the evangelist often does not give us fully and exactly the relations to one another in time of the events which he records; and the reason of this probably is that he did not himself know them. Manifestly narratives have sometimes been grouped together in his Gospel rather on the ground of points of similarity in their subject-matter than for chronological reasons. The fact may have been that the evangelist had heard them told thus, or that he found it convenient so to arrange them; but anyway the result may have been that incidents belonging to widely removed periods of Christ's

Ministry have in some cases been brought together. Still more often he has not been able to fill up, or at any rate he has not filled up, the interval between events that he has loosely connected together. But in spite of all this, a march of events, a progress in Christ's work and its effects, is plainly discernible in the representation that he gives of the history. There is development (*a*) in the stir created by Jesus<sup>1</sup>; (*b*) in the opposition to Him<sup>2</sup>; (*c*) in the formation of a band of chosen disciples and the position accorded to them<sup>3</sup>; (*d*) in the methods which He adopts<sup>4</sup>; (*e*) in the districts

<sup>1</sup> At i. 32—34, 37, there is local excitement at Capernaum, after the first miracle there. After this His fame spreads in consequence of His preaching and working cures throughout a considerable district, i. 38, 45. Somewhat later, at iii. 7, people from distant parts of the land appear in the crowds that gather around Him (vi. 33 ff.). But the state of mind of many also ere long shewed itself to be unsatisfactory. (See the parable of the Sower, iv. 2 ff.) And near the end of the Galilean Ministry we hear discussions as to the character to be attributed to Him, and great diversity of opinion on the subject (viii. 28).

<sup>2</sup> In ii. 1—iii. 6, we have a series of narratives which illustrate, among other things, the beginning of opposition to Him. In these cases the scribes and Pharisees mentioned appear to belong to the district. A little later, at iii. 22, we hear of "scribes who have come down from Jerusalem," and they prefer a more heinous charge than has been made before, that of collusion with Satan.

<sup>3</sup> From the outset Jesus attaches four men to Himself to be His personal companions (i. 16—20); at ii. 14, He says to another "follow me." Subsequently He "made twelve" (iii. 14) which included the first four, and probably also the publican whose call has been specially described. The creation of such a body of Twelve would serve to give a new position even to those members of it who had before been called to accompany Him. And there is, surely, nothing improbable in His having at this time formally constituted this body, with a view to the continuance of His own work, and the organisation of His kingdom. A further step is taken at vi. 7 ff., when He sends out the Twelve to preach and cast out devils.

<sup>4</sup> Jesus begins by preaching in the synagogues (i. 21, 39; iii. 1). He chooses the most natural places first, where quiet teaching can be given in the ordinary course of things. He thus also afforded the most favourable opportunity possible to the religious of Israel for accepting His message. After this, however, we do not hear of His preaching in a synagogue, except at Nazareth (vi. 2). The numbers who flocked to hear and see Him, especially in the parts where he had most exercised His Ministry, had become too great to be confined within walls. He generally teaches them on the sea-shore, or in some waste place. It may be, also, that, as the hostility to Him of the Pharisees, etc., grew, the rulers of the synagogues would generally be unwilling to give Him permission to speak.

He also, after a time, adopts a new mode of address. He speaks in parables to the multitude, while reserving the interpretation for His disciples (iv. 1 ff.). A

visited<sup>1</sup>; (*f*) in His self-revelation<sup>2</sup>. And these different aspects of the movement that there is in the narrative are suitably interrelated<sup>3</sup>.

In this sense there is an excellent order in the work; the two other Synoptics have to a great extent preserved it, and where they have departed from it, their order is generally speaking inferior<sup>4</sup>. Consequently, it used to be said, and still sometimes is<sup>5</sup>, that as Papias describes Mark's record as deficient in order, he cannot be referring to our St Mark, or to a document resembling it. But it has been pointed out by

sifting process was required in order to separate genuine inquirers after truth from those who were not such. And a fitting place is assigned to it in the narrative. (See more on this below, p. 192 ff.) The three chapters which have preceded may well cover a period of some length. The *δι' ἡμερῶν* of ii. 1 is indefinite. In several paragraphs that follow there is no connexion in time indicated. Thus there has been opportunity for differences to manifest themselves in the attitudes of men's minds towards Jesus and His message. It is hardly necessary to point out how well the parable of the Sower fits such a crisis.

Lastly, after the return of the Twelve from their Mission (vi. 30), Jesus withdraws from the regions on the western shore where He has hitherto mostly been, and apparently more and more seeks retirement, while He concentrates His efforts upon the training of His disciples.

<sup>1</sup> At i. 38, we read of a tour in the neighbourhood of Capernaum (i. 39 is probably suggested by this first mention of missionary touring and anticipates somewhat, describing what was only gradually accomplished). At v. 1, we hear for the first time of His crossing to the eastern shore. At vi. 6*b*, He takes a missionary tour more (it would seem) to the west and south-west than He has been before, since it is connected with His visit to Nazareth. After this we hear of His being at Bethsaida (vi. 45; viii. 22), which was in the territory of Philip, and of journeys to Tyre and Sidon and back through Decapolis (vii. 31), and to the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi (viii. 27).

<sup>2</sup> There is no unambiguous declaration of His Messiahship before the confession of Simon Peter near Caesarea Philippi (viii. 27 ff.) and His confirmation of it.

<sup>3</sup> The narrative in St Mark of Christ's Ministry in Galilee and other parts of northern Palestine may be divided as follows: *First period*: The opening of the work of Jesus to the first plot to destroy Him (i. 14—iii. 6). *Middle period*: The gathering of crowds from all parts and appointment of the Twelve to the sending forth of the Twelve to extend Christ's work and the alarm of Herod (iii. 7—vi. 29). *Closing period*: Christ's withdrawal with His disciples to His final departure from Galilee (vi. 30—x. 1).

<sup>4</sup> This was shewn by Lachmann in his essay *De ordine narrationum in evangeliiis Synopticis*, 1835.

<sup>5</sup> In the first half and middle part of the 19th century it was often put forward. Recently von Soden (*Urchrist. Lit.* p. 75, Eng. trans. p. 149) has made this view of the words of Papias the foundation for his own theory of the composition of our Gospel according to St Mark.

many writers<sup>1</sup> that Papias may have had some quite different standard of good order in his mind by which he tried Mark's composition, and so found it wanting. In point of fact he appears plainly to associate the want of order with its incompleteness, especially in view of its omission of many of "the things spoken," the Sayings of Jesus. That kind of good order which we with our historical training discover in St Mark, after careful study, is as little likely as possible to have been perceived by Papias, or by the elder whose words he repeats.

On the other hand the order in Mark has recently been treated as a mere fancy of modern critics. The evangelist himself, it is said, was unconscious of it; and from the connexion in which the remark is made, it appears plainly to be implied that, if so, it must be unreal<sup>2</sup>. It is probably true that the evangelist was unconscious of it, and that it is our discovery there. Logically the case somewhat resembles that of the conception into which the mind gathers up, and by which it explains, the phenomena of motion of the heavenly bodies. After a certain number of positions successively occupied by them have been observed, it is found that certain curves will, in spite of irregularities in their motions, approximately represent their courses, and that a certain law of attraction will explain their adhering to those courses. In like manner after noticing a number of particulars we form an idea of a progress depicted in Mark's record; but the circumstance that it is traced by us, not pointed out by him, only makes it the more significant. The complete artlessness of his narrative shews that the naturalness of the order must be an impress from life. It is explained if the writer obtained much of his information from Simon Peter. No doubt the Apostle may have often told only single pieces of teaching or incidents, or a few at a time, and have dwelt on their lessons. But he must also, one would think, at times have been required to satisfy the desire which, as I have contended early in the

<sup>1</sup> For some references see vol. I. p. 53, n. 2 of the present work.

<sup>2</sup> A. Schweizer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, p. 329. B. Weiss also fails to do justice to the natural progress of events in Mark's narrative. See *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Markusevangeliums*. § 1.



present chapter, must have existed for a comprehensive sketch of Christ's Ministry and Sufferings. In doing so he would have told things more or less nearly in the order in which he remembered them to have happened. And one who had repeatedly heard the story, still more one who had been employed to interpret it as it was being delivered, would be likely, in writing it down, to retain for the most part the same sequence. There is, then, good reason for the judgment of Weizsäcker: "The plan which we still recognise from our Gospel of Mark shews, however, even in the arrangement of the whole, so good a view, that the attribution of it to the disciple of Peter can but be recommended thereby<sup>1</sup>."

The singleness of aim and simplicity of structure and harmony of movement which may be observed in the Gospel are in favour of the original unity of the composition. So also is the fact that in the uninterpolated, unrevised document, as defined above, there are hardly any two passages that can be regarded as forming a doublet<sup>2</sup>; this indication of compositeness at all events is absent. The general similarity of the style points to the same conclusion. I have remarked above that the similarity between different sections of St Mark in point of style must be used with caution as an argument for identity of authorship, because some of the features in St Mark which most strike us are the unliterary form and the Semitic constructions, which may have characterised very commonly the form of the primitive traditions<sup>3</sup>. Nevertheless, the greater the extent to which an editor, or more than one editor, is assumed to have had a hand in bringing the Gospel to its present form, the more strange must it appear that the effect is not more manifest in the style of various parts. It is only necessary to compare our first and third Gospels with their parallels in St Mark in order to realise this.

To turn to notes of authenticity in the particular narratives—the general remark may first be made that the several

<sup>1</sup> *Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 399, Eng. trans. II. p. 69.

<sup>2</sup> A possible one (ix. 35; x. 43—45) has been noted in the Table, p. 54. The other mentioned there as occurring in our St Mark was not found in the uninterpolated form of the work.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 168 f.

narratives are distinct and individual to a marvellous degree. As regards their subject-matter they have no appearance of having been cast in one mould or even in two or three moulds<sup>1</sup>. The circumstances described and the characters that come before us are very various. This is rendered all the more significant as a proof that the accounts are historical by the fact that in the mode of narration, the phrases and turns of expression employed, there is a large amount of uniformity<sup>2</sup>.

I turn to passages which bear the stamp of being personal reminiscences. In doing so, I would remind the reader that, if my contention above is sound, it is not right to say that all the matter in which this character is not apparent must come from a different source. There may be good reason for assigning most of it to the same source. But even if this is a point which must be left open, it will still be true that the indications of personal recollection which we are about to notice have a significance in regard to the work as a whole, if there is good reason to believe in its integrity as a composition from the first. For they go far to shew that the author of the work was one who had himself been in personal contact with an immediate follower of Jesus.

The abruptness with which Simon and his brother, and the other pair of fishermen, are introduced at i. 16 ff., and the fact that the account of Christ's Ministry begins from their call, as also the character of the narrative of the events of the following Sabbath in Capernaum, and of the sequel, convey strongly the impression that this whole piece (i. 16—38) is derived directly from Simon Peter. There are other narratives in which Simon Peter specially appears, but I will not stop to distinguish them from those in which we seem to have the reminiscences either of this disciple, or of some other who was actually present. We have all of us probably observed, or we may easily do so, that those who

<sup>1</sup> The pair of miracles at vii. 32—37; viii. 22—26, which I have not decided above to reckon as interpolated, are (I think) the only exceptions.

<sup>2</sup> J. Weiss has drawn out very clearly this combination of monotony in the form with variety in the incidents and has used it to shew that the evangelist was not a man capable of inventing the narratives for purposes of instruction (*ib.* pp. 105—119).

relate experiences through which they have passed are apt occasionally to bring in points which are quite unnecessary for the story, but which interest them simply as part of what they remember. There are many touches of this kind in St Mark. The reference to "the hired fishermen" at i. 20 in the narrative of which I have just been speaking is an example; let me give a few others. At iv. 36 we are told that when Jesus started to cross the lake on the occasion when a storm arose "there were other boats with Him." We hear no more of these other boats, or of any people who came in them. They are mentioned only because they were imprinted on the memory of the narrator. In vii. 24, 31, the course of a long journey is indicated. No reason for mentioning this journey is apparent, except the incident connected with the earlier part of it; but this incident could have been related without tracing the whole route. Again, at ix. 5, 6, in the account of the Transfiguration, we have just such a remark as one in a dazed condition might make. But no one would have been likely to introduce it into a description of a vision of Christ's glory who did not remember that he had himself made it. In the incident at xiv. 51, 52, we have an obvious example of this common trait, as also in the mention of the fact that Simon of Cyrene was "coming from the country" (xv. 21).

The knowledge that is shewn of places<sup>1</sup>, and of the conditions of life and thought in Palestine at the time in

<sup>1</sup> The references to Capernaum (i. 21; ii. 1; ix. 33), to the lake-shore (i. 16; ii. 13; iii. 7, etc.), the hills near at hand (iii. 13; v. 5, 13; vi. 46), to desert-places among the hills or by the shore (i. 35, 45; vi. 31, 32), are life-like. Again, "the neighbouring village-towns" (*κωμοπόλεις*) (i. 38) seems, from what we read in Josephus' description of Galilee (*B. J.* III. 3. § 43), to be an exceedingly apt expression. The journey to the borders of Tyre, then through Sidon and back through the borders of Decapolis to the Sea of Galilee (vii. 24, 31), a little later that to "the villages of Caesarea Philippi" and back through Galilee (viii. 27; ix. 30), and finally that from the Jordan to Jerusalem through Jericho till they come to Bethphage and Bethany, with the Mt of Olives just in front of them (*πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ελαιῶν*, see Swete's note on *πρὸς* here: x. 17, 32, 46; xi. 1), are related as they might be by one who had actually gone over the ground. Two, however, of the geographical notices in St Mark may require some discussion.

(a) The name of the place referred to at Mk v. 1, and parallels has, it is well known, been much debated from the days of Origen. Although the reading

question<sup>1</sup> are also notes of authenticity. Moreover, taken in conjunction with the signs that our evangelist had good and precise information on many points, his silence or indefiniteness as to others<sup>2</sup> inspires confidence. It seems to shew that, in accordance with Papias' statement, he was careful not to invent.

Thus far we have been noticing indications in the Gospel which are favourable to the view that the author of Proto-Mark, as above defined, was Mark, a hearer of Simon Peter. In this connexion, however, it would not be right to refrain from considering objections to the historical character of the Gospel, so far as they bear on the question of the authorship. This last limitation will save the discussion from assuming proportions that would be altogether unsuitable while we are dealing primarily with a single document. The question with

"Gerasenes" at Mk v. 1 and Lk viii. 36, 37, may, according to the evidence which we now possess, be the best attested, I cannot but think that the force of this evidence is somewhat weakened by the probability that from an early time a well-known name may have been substituted by a copyist for a less known one. In any case, the place now called Khersa near the middle of the eastern shore is probably the place meant (see G. A. Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 458 f.), whatever the Greek name for it in the first century A.D. may have been.

(b) Two readings at x. 1 have considerable support: τὰ θρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, and τὰ θρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. If the former be adopted, the order of enumeration is not quite what we should have expected, because Jesus and His disciples would in coming from Galilee probably have crossed the Jordan near Bethshemesh and gone southward on the eastern bank through Peraea. Still the evangelist might mention "the borders of Judaea" first because they seemed to him the most important. If the *καὶ* is omitted we must suppose that *Ἰουδαία* is used somewhat loosely, which it well might be. Cp. the usage of Luke (vi. 17; xxiii. 5, etc.).

<sup>1</sup> E.g. the members of the Sanhedrin, "the chief priests, scribes and elders," confront Jesus first when He is in the court of the temple, within the enclosure of which their own halls of assembly, and for giving judgment, were situated, and they make of Him just the demand which such men would (xi. 27 ff.). Again, the Sadducees first appear here (xii. 18), very suitably since they were especially the party to which the chief-priests and their adherents belonged, not one spread throughout the land like the Pharisees. It may further be noted that the point of view (so to speak) of the time of Christ's earthly life has been preserved throughout this Gospel with wonderful fidelity; there is little, if any, admixture of ideas which became familiar only after the Church had come into existence.

<sup>2</sup> Note his use of the indefinite *πάλιν* in connecting narratives at ii. 1, 13; iii. 1, etc.; also *ἐν τ. σάββασι*, at ii. 23, and "a synagogue" at iii. 1.

which we shall be concerned will not be whether the representation of the history in our Gospel is in all respects true or not, but whether it is such as a man with Mark's opportunities of knowledge, and his beliefs—the beliefs of a Christian of A.D. 60 to 70—would, or would not, be unlikely to have given. The question of the value to be attached to his testimony, if the work is ascertained to be by him, is one that must be separately decided.

I can here consider only some salient points in regard to which difficulties have been specially raised.

First, let us consider the view that is given in our document of the use of parables by Jesus in addressing the multitude, as a judgment upon them, the interpretation being reserved for His disciples. We have seen reason to think that some expressions in Mk iv. (esp. *vv.* 2*a*, 33, 34), whereby greater stress is laid upon this method and purpose in the employment of parables, as well as a passage later in St Mark in which the disciples ask Jesus to explain a parable (*vii.* 17, 18), are interpolations. Still the fact remains that the disciples asked for an explanation of the parable of the Sower, and that Jesus, in acceding to their request, said, "Unto you is given the mystery of the Kingdom of God; but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables," etc. And the sayings also remain which imply that the disciples of Jesus are enjoying the privilege of special instruction which entails special responsibility (*iv.* 21—24).

In the Gospel, then, as we have left it, after our critical examination of the contents earlier in the present chapter, the feature in Christ's teaching now in question still appears, but it is a good deal less prominent. Jülicher, on the other hand, regards this conception of the use of parables as wholly unhistorical, and disputes the genuineness of the saying regarding "the mystery of the Kingdom of God<sup>1</sup>," and J. Weiss<sup>2</sup>, while he allows that the saying may be genuine, holds that it has been wrongly associated with the interpretation of the parable of the Sower. Other writers,

<sup>1</sup> *Gleichnisreden*, p. 118 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Alt. Evang.* p. 176 f.

also, might be cited by whom the aspect under which Christ's teaching by parables is here presented is imputed to the error of the evangelist<sup>1</sup>. At the same time it is evidently a matter in respect to which a constant hearer of Simon Peter ought not to have been mistaken.

I have already indicated the connexion of thought<sup>2</sup> between the Saying concerning "the mystery of the Kingdom of God" and other Sayings later in the same context, the genuineness of which is (it should be observed) also attested by their having been included in the Logian document<sup>3</sup>. It is true that in those Sayings the duty incumbent upon the disciples of making known that which they learn is insisted upon. But it is plainly implied that this obligation arises out of the special privilege which they have enjoyed in having the truth communicated first with peculiar clearness to them. And there is certainly nothing to hinder us from supposing, and much to suggest, that the period of Christ's companionship with the Twelve during His earthly life, and in particular the latter half of His Ministry, was peculiarly devoted to their training, and was consequently their time of special privilege<sup>4</sup>.

I would now ask whether it is out of harmony with this that Christ should at a certain point in His career have begun to speak to the multitude in language which veiled His meaning, in a way that He had not done before. It was a change in His method, as is evident even in that form of the account which I have taken to be the earliest and which is virtually that in our third Gospel. In St Mark and in our first Gospel the surprise which it caused to the disciples is brought out. We have here the additions of later hands, but those who made them may have been guided by a true instinct, or the knowledge of an authentic tradition. The new method referred to was not in all probability adopted till after He had been for some time delivering His message

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Wellhausen, *Evang. Marci*, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> The similarity of idea is specially apparent in v. 22, cp. *κρυπτόν* with *μυστήριον*.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. p. 91 f.

<sup>4</sup> This remark is made in answer to Wellhausen's observation, *ib.*, that the "Esoterismus" of the saying iv. 11, 12, is excluded by the saying about a lighted lamp in iv. 21.

in plainer terms to the crowds that gathered round Him, but who came to Him largely from motives that were morally and religiously without value, and who constantly misapprehended His meaning<sup>1</sup>. That He should choose a mode of speech which would baffle hearers of this kind still more, was not unjust nor inconsistent in any way with the character of Jesus. And the plan actually adopted was suited to its purpose; for figurative language is commonly more or less perplexing when he who uses it does not at the same time shew us what he means to convey, or to illustrate, by it; and in the case now before us it would have been peculiarly hard to be understood, because the character and substance of Christ's teaching were in many respects so new<sup>2</sup>. It was also merciful; for if it repelled the careless and indolent, it stimulated inquiry on the part of the true-hearted; and there could not be a doubt that the privilege of receiving fuller light would not be confined to those who already belonged to the immediate circle of His disciples, but would be extended to everyone who sincerely sought it.

Difficulties, then, that are felt in regard to the historical character of this feature in the narrative appear to be due to a failure to appreciate rightly the sterner aspects of Christ's Mission, and the fact that the masses of the People, both in Galilee and Jerusalem, no less than their rulers, were put to a great moral probation through His presence among them; and further—so far as the fitness of unexplained parables to be an instrument of punishment is concerned—to the difference not being allowed for sufficiently between the effect of parables when first spoken, and that which they now have after being used for centuries.

I come next to a passage, not marked by me as interpolated, which cannot well come from a disciple of Simon Peter, if the objections are valid which have recently been

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 185, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The true relation of the profoundly spiritual teaching of Jesus to the eschatological ideas, and the Apocalyptic conception of the Kingdom of Heaven, which we also meet with in the Gospels, cannot here be discussed. By Mk iv. 11 ff. and its parallels it is suggested that even such lessons as those taught by the parable of the Sower were part of "the mystery of the Kingdom of God," and so they may well have been.

made against the statements contained in it. Wellhausen<sup>1</sup> finds it inconceivable that the account of the sending forth by Jesus of His twelve disciples, as described at vi. 7 ff., to preach and to heal, can be historically true. Now, certainly, this is a matter about which neither Simon Peter nor any other member of the Twelve could possibly be mistaken, and about which Mark also might be expected to be well informed. But surely there is no good reason why Jesus should not have sought to extend the proclamation of the approach of the Kingdom of God in this way to places which He could not reach Himself, and have designed that the part assigned to the Twelve in this work should be an element in their training. Wellhausen remarks, indeed, that "although the experiment (which they had thus been led to make) succeeded, they continue afterwards precisely as lacking in independence and as passive as before." But it is hard to say that this was the case, when the record is so brief. Moreover, the time followed soon after when Jesus began more and more to seek retirement with His disciples, so that there would no longer be opportunities for them to act.

We will notice next those injunctions to be silent on the subject of His miracles, laid by Jesus upon the objects of them, or upon those who witnessed them, which are a special feature of the Gospel according to St Mark<sup>2</sup>. One instance of this kind is probably, according to what has been already said, to be set down to an editor, and to this extent the difficulty which this trait causes may be lessened<sup>3</sup>. But there are besides others; and as a class they have been considered unreal—the device of a writer who was not in contact with fact, to heighten the impression which he would give of the irresistible spread of the fame of Jesus<sup>4</sup>. In two cases the evangelist expressly notes that the effort to obtain silence proved useless. And, it may be asked, was not this to be

<sup>1</sup> *Evang. Marci*, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> See i. 44, 45; v. 43; viii. 26. Cp. also iii. 12, though this is a somewhat different case.

<sup>3</sup> Mk vii. 36.

<sup>4</sup> For the objection here referred to see especially Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis*, pp. 15, 16, 48—50.



expected? Could such acts be kept secret? And if they were kept secret, would not one great purpose, with which the miracles must be supposed to have been performed, be defeated? Is it then possible that Jesus should have given such commands? The consideration of this subject should, I think, be interesting in itself, and also instructive as to what we could expect from accounts of the Ministry of Jesus delivered by men who were His companions, and who have been on the whole reported faithfully. First, it may be well to observe that one instance is recorded in St Mark in which the man who is cured is actually bidden to go to his own house and to his friends, and to tell them of the Divine mercy shewn to him (v. 19, 20). This goes far to prove that the evangelist does not give the commands of an opposite kind merely in consequence of an obsession of his own, but that they represent genuine reminiscences<sup>1</sup>.

The injunctions of silence taken along with so much in the action of Jesus, and in the manifest purpose of His coming, which was incompatible with concealment, point, I believe, to an apparent contradiction in His conduct, which may have been, perhaps, somewhat baldly and crudely represented by the evangelist, but which involved no lack of real consistency. Owing to the cross-currents in human affairs, seeming inconsistencies often cannot be avoided even by men of the greatest steadfastness of purpose and clearness and singleness of aim. Jesus Christ, in becoming subject to human conditions, was exposed to difficulties of this kind. Indeed there was probably never a career in which they pressed more heavily. If we study the Gospels reflectively and with sympathy we may gather that He set before Himself a two-fold object—to implant in the hearts of men faith in Himself as the Christ, and at the same time to change their conception of the Christ,—to prevent His countrymen from receiving Him merely as the Christ of their expectation. And in seeking to accomplish this purpose, the two parts of

<sup>1</sup> Jesus was able to tell the healed daemonic on the eastern side of the lake to proclaim at his home and to his kinsfolk and neighbours what God had done for him, because in Decapolis there were few Jews, and Jesus Himself did not purpose preaching there.

which must have been in any circumstances so hard to reconcile, He was thwarted at every turn by opponents and by the superficial excitement and superstitious beliefs of the multitude.

His miracles must be considered in the light of the purpose which has been indicated. They were necessary in order to give authority to His Teaching<sup>1</sup> and to suggest the thought that He might be the Christ; and yet there was a constant danger that the minds of men might be too much occupied with them. It should further be remembered that in working cures Jesus cannot have thought only of establishing His claims. He must have been, and the records plainly say that He was, moved with compassion towards those in distress, and who were morally and spiritually fit to be healed. Thus He might feel constrained to heal in cases where, apart from consideration for the individuals to be relieved, He might have preferred not to do so, lest the fame which was a hindrance to His true work should be increased thereby. At the same time He would do what He could to guard against this, and even a temporary check upon the spread of rumours, till He had Himself gone to another neighbourhood, might be of service. We may, then, regard His injunctions of silence and attempts to secure privacy for His miracles as so many efforts to prevent them from looming too large in the conception that men formed of Him, and in short to keep them in their true place.

But it is also not strange that in a record based upon the information of a personal disciple of Jesus the reasons for His conduct at different junctures should not be in all respects plain. Simon Peter and other early disciples had come to believe with their whole hearts that He was the Christ, and it was their mission to testify to this conviction. It is not likely that, in looking back from their state of full assurance, and with such a message to deliver to men as they had, they would have dwelt upon the problem which presented itself to the mind of their Lord and Master in choosing the means and the times of His self-manifestation, or would have

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Mk i. 22, 27.

sought to expound it to others. They had often, it is true, found the course which He took unintelligible at the moment; but now they chiefly felt shame at the spiritual obtuseness and hardness of heart which they had displayed in not recognising Him fully for what He was, and trusting Him when they could not understand Him. Naturally, also, the most faithful reporter of what they delivered might well, through a failure to understand the more subtle aspects of his subject, exaggerate contrasts, through the omission of details, and leave many points unexplained.

Next, let me say a word in passing with regard to the Discourse concerning the Last Things in Mark xiii. It is not probable that Mark himself put it together, because in the remainder of the Gospel he shews no disposition thus to compile discourses. But it may well have been composed before he wrote his Gospel and have been included by him in his work, not added by another hand.

I come now to the Day of the Last Supper. In St Mark, as it stands, this is plainly fixed as the day of the Jewish Passover, the 14th of Nisan. The notice at xiv. 12 is explicit. Moreover, after the question of the disciples in *v.* 12 *b*, the direction at *v.* 14 and the statement in *v.* 16, it is clear that the subsequent meal at *v.* 17 ff. must be thought of as the regular passover. In St Luke there is in addition the Saying which was spoken as the little company took their places, "I have eagerly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer" (xxii. 15).

This view, however, of the time and occasion is—it is well-known—not only inconsistent with the general tenor of, and various expressions in, the account of the Last Supper and Day of the Crucifixion in the Fourth Gospel, but is also hard to reconcile with various particulars in St Mark. In Mark xiv. 1, 2 we are told that the Jewish rulers began to take steps for seizing Jesus two days before the Passover, resolving that it should not be done during the feast itself. Yet according to the sequel this is what did happen; and the fact that their intention to avoid this was foiled is not pointed out. Again, the holding of a meeting of the Sanhedrin and condemnation of an accused person to death after

the feast had begun was contrary to all precedent, and must have been an outrage to common religious feeling. Perhaps, also, the meeting with Simon of Cyrene, "coming from the country" (xv. 21), should be regarded as an incident unlikely to occur on the feast-day.

I have no suggestions to offer that could be satisfactory to others, or that are satisfactory to myself, for explaining these discrepancies. I cannot agree with those who, while they accept the view in respect to the day of the Crucifixion given in the Fourth Gospel, on the ground that it is self-consistent and in itself the more probable (which is undoubtedly the case), and while they fortify their position by reference to those indications in the Synoptic Gospels which make for the same conclusions, yet at the same time hold that the whole of this part of the account in St Mark proceeded from Mark himself. It is clearly improbable that one whose acquaintance with Jewish customs and opportunities of acquiring information as to the last hours of Jesus were what those of Mark must have been, could have been in error on the point whether the Last Supper did, or did not, coincide with the time of the Jewish Paschal Meal; and the Arrest, Trials and Crucifixion did, or did not, take place on the first of the days of the Feast.

It would be a welcome thing, if the removal of a phrase or two, such as one could imagine a revising hand might easily have introduced, would overcome the difficulty; or if traces of more considerable interpolation by an editor could be pointed out, which has created the contradiction. We might readily treat the mention of the day in *v. 12 a* as an addition to the original document, if that would suffice. But nothing would meet the case short of the supposition that the whole passage, *vv. 12—16*, has been substituted for some other connexion between *v. 11* and *v. 17*. And I doubt whether we are justified in assuming interpolations, when there are no signs of want of coherence in the immediate context, in order to escape from a difficulty. The true explanation may be of quite a different kind, though from our lack of knowledge we cannot divine it.

It does not seem to me necessary that I should here

discuss any other difficulties in the narrative of the Last Hours of Jesus. I have already had occasion to consider the differences between St Mark and St Luke in respect to the Last Supper and the events in the High-priest's house<sup>1</sup>. And as to points that are not clear in the course of the several trials, it may be remarked generally that the immediate disciples of Jesus must themselves have been dependent upon what they could learn from others for their knowledge of much that passed, and that Mark could only give the account that was current among these simple, uncultured people, whose ideas may naturally have been affected by their want of familiarity with processes of law, whether Jewish or Roman.

Finally, I must say a few words on the view recently advocated by some writers that xvi. 8 was intended by the writer of the account of the finding of the empty tomb, of which it forms part, to be the termination of the Gospel. To most critical students it has seemed that such an ending would have been too abrupt, and that it is necessary to suppose the original ending of the Gospel to have been lost. But, according to the theory to which I now refer, the finding of the empty tomb seemed to the writer to be a proof of such overwhelming force, that it sufficed to mention this alone, and that indeed the impressiveness of the conclusion would only have been weakened if he *had* added a record of appearances<sup>2</sup>. Or, to explain his feeling somewhat differently, as J. Weiss does<sup>3</sup>—he felt that he had accomplished his task when he had shewn that the predictions of Jesus in regard to His resurrection had been fulfilled, as the tomb found empty early on the third day after His Crucifixion shewed.

It is further said that this account, designed to give a more convincing proof of the Resurrection than appearances could, took the place of an earlier one, and that we have an indication of this in the statement that the women owing to their fear, instead of obeying the angels' command, said nothing to any man. The reference to their silence was, it

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 163—6.

<sup>2</sup> See Wellhausen, *Evang. Marci*, p. 146; Loisy, *Les Évang. Synopt.* I. p. 105.

<sup>3</sup> *Alt. Evang.* p. 344 f.

is thought, intended to explain, when this narrative was first put forward, how it had happened that thus far nothing had been heard of it.

There seem to me to be several objections to this whole theory. And, first, although (as everyone would admit) the empty tomb would be a most significant fact if conjoined with appearances, no one, surely, could ever have supposed that taken by itself alone it would be particularly convincing. The reply that an adversary or doubter could make would be obvious, that the body had been removed. Indeed passages in all the other Gospels shew how naturally this would occur to the mind<sup>1</sup>. It is most unlikely then that any early Christian writer would have stopped short at the discovery that the tomb was empty, and not have gone on to relate appearances which were already part of the Church's tradition.

The common view, then, that something followed after xvi. 8 is, we may feel confident, right. And if so, we must be cautious how we interpret the force of the words about the fear and silence of the women. The sequel, if we had it, might throw light upon their purpose. It might be intended to enhance the surprise caused to Simon Peter by Christ's appearance to him, not to apologise for a narrative that was put late into circulation. Or the reference to the fear of the women may itself be secondary, and the original statement may have stood in the form to which the parallels in Matthew and Luke testify<sup>2</sup>. It should, also, be noted that according to 1 Cor. xv. it was part of the primitive tradition that Jesus rose on "the third day" and that the apostle states this apart from, and before he proceeds to mention, the series of appearances which he enumerates. Now wherever else there is mention of the resurrection having occurred on the third day it is in connexion with the account of the finding of the tomb by the women; so that the reference to the resurrection as having taken place on a particular day in St Paul's brief summary

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xxviii. 12—15; Lk xxiv. 22—24; Jn xx. 13—15.

<sup>2</sup> Weiss, p. 340, recognises that the consentient differences of Mt. and Lk from Mk here may be thought to shew that the last-named is secondary. But he argues that in the present instance it is more difficult to suppose a change into Mk's form than the reverse. It is, however, difficult to say that the touch is not one that a somewhat tactless editor would have introduced.

may well imply acquaintance with that narrative, and lends at least some support to the belief in its primitive character<sup>1</sup>.

I would add that in the structure and contents of *vv.* xv. 40—xvi. 8, which evidently form a connected passage, there does not seem to be anything which can fairly be regarded as a sign of a different hand from that seen in other parts of the Gospel. Moreover, it may well be that we still have Mark's original ending<sup>2</sup>, which followed after xvi. 8, embodied in our first Gospel from xxviii. 9 onwards. The whole of these concluding verses in St Matthew would fit well with Mark xvi. 1—8, saving the passage about the silencing of the guard by the chief-priests (Mt. xxviii. 11—15), which is the sequel to an earlier passage (Mt. xxvii. 62—66) having no parallel in St Mark.

Let me now sum up the conclusions in respect to the origin and history of our Second Gospel to which the inquiries in the present, and in part also in preceding, chapters have led.

1. In St Mark as we have it there are a certain number of passages and phrases which appear to be interpolations.

2. When these are removed and such consequential changes in the text as are required have been made, we have a work in the form in which it was originally composed. Moreover this work does not seem to contain any smaller documents embedded in it, with the exception of the Eschatological discourse of Mk xiii.

3. This work is not a translation from an Aramaic original. No good reasons have been given for so regarding it; and it is highly improbable that if such an Aramaic work had ever existed, all trace of it in tradition should have dis-

<sup>1</sup> Cp. J. Weiss, *ib.* p. 344, in regard to this consideration. He admits that it has force, though not, perhaps, quite so much as I should attribute to it. See also Rohrbach, *Die Berichte über die Auferstehung Jesu Christi*, 1898. Wellhausen (*Ib.* p. 146) and others are certainly not justified in saying that Paul "knows nothing" of the discovery of the women.

<sup>2</sup> It is unnecessary for me to shew that xvi. 9—20 in the *Textus Receptus* were not the original ending, since this subject has been so well treated in works which are in the hands of all English students. I would refer especially to the *Appendix to Westcott and Hort's Greek Test.*, Notes on Select Readings, p. 29 ff. and Swete's *St Mark* in *loc.* and p. ciii ff. On an extended form, recently recovered, of the Longer Ending of St Mark, see *Two New Gospel Fragments*, p. 9 f., by Dr Swete in Lietzmann's series.

appeared, and that such a very different account of the composition of the Gospel should have been given. It is also entirely natural that the inception and shaping and production of the work should have been a response to the needs of Greek-speaking Christendom.

4. The character of this original work is such as might have been expected from one who had been a constant hearer of an immediate disciple of Jesus, and consequently it may be attributed to the Mark who is named by Papias, and who is, there can be little doubt, the person to whom all the allusions to a Mark in the New Testament refer.

5. Mark need not in the composition of his work have depended solely upon the teaching of Peter. He might have included information obtained from other sources oral or written; but it is doubtful whether he did so to any great extent (with the exception mentioned in 2). He did not use the Greek Logian document known to the first and third evangelists. Such pieces of "Logian" matter as he included in his work came to him by some other channel; he may well have received them directly from Peter.

6. The work was known to and used by our third evangelist approximately, if not exactly, in the form in which it proceeded from the hand of Mark.

7. Subsequently it received additions which brought it to the form in which it was known to our first evangelist, and which is very nearly that of our St Mark. These additions included some "Logian" pieces; but even these seem to be in a different version from that used by the first and third evangelists.

8. A few changes, for the most part slight ones, were made in the Marcan document used by our first evangelist, whereby the work finally attained to the form in which we know it, according to the best text that can be constructed from existing MSS. and versions.



## ADDITIONAL NOTE I. TO CHAPTER III.

### STYLE AS A MEANS OF DISTINGUISHING THE PASSAGES<sup>1</sup> ADDED TO PROTO-MARK.

The sentence from Sir John Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae* given by me, p. 168, n. 3 above, comes at the end of an inquiry in which he is largely occupied with shewing that there are signs in the first and third Gospels that their authors have revised St Mark. In this, of course, I fully agree with him. But the conclusion which I have quoted, could only be established by an examination of *the distribution* of the Marcan peculiarities throughout different passages, and it did not fall within his scheme to attempt this.

I proceed to make a few remarks first upon points of style in those passages omitted by Luke which, as we have seen, probably were not, and then upon those which probably were, contained in the Marcan document known to him.

There is not in the former set of passages<sup>1</sup> quite the usual want of variety in connecting successive sentences. The difference is specially noticeable in x. 2—12, and xiii. 34—37. Among other connecting words we have in each of these the particle *οὐν* which is used nowhere else in Mark to connect sentences, except at xvi. 19, in the added ending to the Gospel. It is found besides in Mark only at xi. 31 and xv. 12, in both of which places it is otherwise introduced, while in the former it is doubtful whether it should have a place in the text (at xii. 9 it is not genuine). Again, *ἐνεκεν τούτου* is used only at x. 7 (cp. with it *οὐ ἐνεκεν* at Lk iv. 18, and *ἐνεκα τούτων* at A. xxvi. 21). Again, *διὰ τοῦτο* which not infrequently connects two sentences in Mt., Jn, etc. is so used in Mk only at xi. 24.

The use of the historic present hardly deserves to be treated as a Marcan peculiarity; for although it is more common in St Mark than in St Matthew or St Luke it is also very common in St John and in Josephus (as Sir J. Hawkins has stated, p. 114). Its occurrence therefore in any passage does not shew that such passage

<sup>1</sup> See them enumerated, p. 167, n. 1.

is not an interpolation. Indeed, it would appear as if the first and third evangelists had in revising St Mark changed his presents into aorists partly to assert their independence; for sometimes where that Gospel has the aorist there is in the parallel a present, e.g. cp. Mk x. 4, 5 with Mt. xix. 7, 8. In point of fact, however, the use of the historic present is less prominent in the passages of our St Mark now in question than in many other parts of that Gospel.

The aorist ἀποκριθείς in combination with the present λέγει is almost confined to St Mark, where it occurs nine times; one of these is found in one of the sections under consideration, viz. at xi. 22 (ἐπιγνοὺς λέγει at Mk ii. 8, and κράξας λέγει at v. 7 may also be compared). There is, however, one other instance in the New Testament (Lk xiii. 8). The analogous and still stranger use of ἀποκριθείς with the future ἐρεῖ also occurs at Mt. xxv. 40 and Lk xiii. 25. We also have ἀποκριθείς λέγει in the LXX. at Dan. vii. 16, and ἀποκριθείς ἐρεῖ or ἀποκριθέντες ἐροῦσιν at Deut. xxv. 9, xxvi. 5, xxvii. 14, 15; Isa. iii. 7.

εἰθὺς occurs forty-one times in St Mark, i.e. rather more than twice as often as εἰθύς, or εἰθέως, in St Matthew, about six times as often as in St Luke and four times as often as in the Acts, and about seven times as often as in St John. It is found five times in all in the sections we are treating as insertions, viz. at iv. 29, vi. 45, 50, 54, and viii. 10.

In the passages before us many words occur which are not used in other parts of the Gospel, but this is partly due to the fact that the subjects treated required them. A few words and expressions may be mentioned, which, perhaps, suggest a writer whose phraseology was different from that of the author of the greater part of the Gospel.

iv. 30 πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν κ.τ.λ. This form of commencement to a parable, and the use of the word ὁμοιοῦν are without a parallel in St Mark, though there are several in St Matthew and three in St Luke. Salmon (*Human Element*, p. 238) holds that Mark learnt it here from "Q." We have seen (p. 109 ff. and p. 139 f.) that this is not to be thought of; but a reviser of the Marcan document might have done so, or might have obtained the phrase independently.

vi. 49 δοκεῖν ὄτι. This word is not used elsewhere in St Mark in the sense "to think," "to suppose." It is common in this sense in other parts of N.T. φάντασμα is used also in the parallel in Mt., but not elsewhere in N.T. Ib. 53 προσορμίζεσθαι, not used in connexion with other landings. Ib. 56 ἄν with the impf.: cp. ὅταν with

impf. in another general description at iii. 11, which may likewise, as we have seen (p. 145), have been touched up by a reviser. In vi. 56 note, also, *ἄν* with aorist, and cp. *ὅταν* with aorist at xi. 19. It is a coincidence worth noting, that *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* occurs at xi. 19 and *εἰσπορεύεσθαι* at vi. 56. *Ἰβ. τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας*: this partic. not elsewhere in Mk, but at Mt. x. 8, xxv. 39; Lk iv. 40, ix. 2; Jn v. 3, 7, 13, vi. 2, xi. 1; A. xix. 12, xx. 35; Mark has *ἀρρώστους* at vi. 5, 13.

viii. 4 *ἐπ' ἐρημίας*, elsewhere *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*. *Ἰβ. 7 ἰχθῦδια*, elsewhere *ἰχθύες*. *Ἰβ. 8 περισσεύματα κλασμάτων*: contrast the phrase at vi. 43. *Ἰβ. 10 μέρη*, elsewhere *ὄρια*.

ix. 41 *Χριστός*, used as a proper name; this may be due to a reviser later not only than Luke but than our first evangelist. *Ἰβ. 42 οἱ πιστεύοντες*; from the way in which this term is introduced, it also seems to have acquired a specific sense.

x. 3 *ἐντέλλεσθαι*, likewise at xiii. 34; elsewhere *παραγγέλλειν* (twice).

xi. 11 *ὁ ὄψέ*: so also v. 19 and xiii. 35; elsewhere *ὀψίας γενομένης*. v. 12 *τῇ ἐπαύριον*: not elsewhere in Mk, several times in Jn and Acts. v. 13 *εἰ ἄρα*, cp. A. viii. 22, xvii. 27; 1 Cor. xv. 15. v. 22 *πίστις θεοῦ*, genitive of object; cp. Rom. iii. 22, 26, etc. v. 23 *διακρίνεσθαι*, used several times in Acts and Epp. in the same sense. v. 25 *ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*: this expression, which is common in St Matthew, occurs nowhere else in St Mark (excepting again in the continuation of the present verse, according to *Text. Rec.*).

xiii. 36 *ἐξαίφνης*: four times in Lk and Acts; at Mk ix. 8 we have *ἐξάπινα*.

xiv. 6 *κόπους παρέχειν*, likewise at Lk xi. 7, and xviii. 5, and a few times in the Epp.

In conclusion I will note a few specially characteristic points of Marcan style in passages which, though wanting in Lk, I have retained as included in Proto-Mark. *πολλά* is used as an adverb at Mk vi. 20; likewise at i. 45; iii. 12; v. 10, 23, 38, 43; ix. 26; xv. 3. It is comparatively rare in the rest of N.T. (At Mt. ix. 14 and A. viii. 24 it does not belong to the true text.)

Again, *ὅτι* is used as an interrogative at ix. 28, as also Mk ii. 16; not elsewhere in N.T.

*ὁ βαπτίζων*, as epithet of John, occurs at Mk vi. 14 and 24; cp. i. 4. In Mt. and Lk *ὁ βαπτιστής* is used, as indeed twice in St Mark, viz. once in this context (v. 25) and at viii. 28.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE II. TO CHAPTER III<sup>1</sup>.

The coincident differences from St Mark in the First and Third Gospels, due to:

- (1) *Revision of the original Marcan document.*
- (2) *Undesigned agreements between the first and third evangelists in the revision of their Marcan document.*
- (3) a. *The influence of the Logian document.*  
       b. *The influence of some document distinct from both the Marcan and the Logian, or of oral tradition, or habits of oral teaching.*
- (4) *Textual assimilation between the first and third Gospels by copyists.*

In the following table the numbers refer to these explanations. In a good many cases I have suggested one or more alternative explanations, placing first the number referring to the explanation which seems to me most probable. But I have not indicated all that are possible; in particular I have refrained from attempting to estimate fully the effects of textual assimilation.

I have not included oft-recurring coincidences, such as δέ for καί, εἶπεν for λέγει or ἔλεγεν, etc.; or the frequent omission of πᾶς, πολλά, μέγας, ὀλίγος, πάλιν, εὐθύς.

Where the parallel to St Mark in one of the other Synoptics occurs in a different context, I have placed it in brackets.

Mk i. 1—4 : Mt. iii. 1—3 : Lk iii. 2*b*—4.

There is nothing in Mt. and Lk to correspond to Mk *vv.* 1 and 2*b*; moreover the order in Mt. and Lk agrees, and = Mk *vv.* 4 + 2*a* + 3     ...     ...     ...     ...     ...     ...     ...     (I)

<sup>1</sup> Wernle, *Synopt. Frage*, p. 58 ff., and Hawkins, *Hor. Synopt.* p. 172 ff., explain the coincident differences from St Mark in our first and third Gospels as I do, in a way to render the assumption that Luke was acquainted with St Matthew unnecessary.

Mk i. 5, 7, 10: Mt. iii. 5, 11, 16: Lk iii. 3, 16, 21.

For *πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα* Mt. and Lk have *πᾶσα ἡ περιχώρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου* (Lk in acc.); in the passage corresponding to *vv.* 7, 8, the order of the clauses is different in Mt. and Lk, being the same in both these, while both add *καὶ πυρὶ τοῦ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ*; for *εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς* Mt. has *ἰδοὺ ἠνεώχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί*, and Lk *ἀνεψχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν* ... .. (3*a*)

Mk i. 14, 15: Mt. iv. 17: Lk iv. 14, 15.

*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς, and πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* wanting in Mt. and Lk ... .. (1)

(Cp. Mk viii. 35 = Mt. xvi. 25 = Lk ix. 24. Mk x. 29 = Mt. xix. 29 = Lk xviii. 29—in which parallels likewise *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* occurs only in St Mark.)

Mk i. 13: Mt. iv. 1: Lk iv. 2.

*ὁ διάβολος* for *ὁ Σατανᾶς* ... .. (3*a*)

Mk i. 20: Mt. iv. 22: [Lk v. 11].

*μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν*, omitted by Mt. and Lk ... .. (2)

Mk i. 29—34: Mt. viii. 14—16: Lk iv. 38—41.

*καὶ Ἀνδρέου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου* wanting after *Σίμωνος* (1) or possibly (2); *προσελθὼν* omitted (2); *καὶ ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν* wanting ... .. (2)

Mk i. 35—37: Lk iv. 42.

Reference to Simon's action is omitted by Lk who thinks it sufficient to mention the crowd. By Mt. the whole passage (*vv.* 35—8) is omitted, probably in the process of rearranging narratives. The omission is due in each case to revision but the motive is different (2)

Mk i. 38, 39: Mt. iv. 23: Lk iv. 43, 44.

After *κηρύσσω* Mt. adds *τὸ εὐαγγ. τ. βασιλ. τ. θ.*—independent changes, but made under the influence of familiar Christian language ... .. (2)

Mk i. 40—45: Mt. viii. 1—4: Lk v. 12—16.

*καὶ ἰδοὺ* and *Κύριε* used in Mt. (*v.* 2) and Lk (*v.* 12). Again in Mt. *v.* 3, Lk *v.* 13, *ἤψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων*, instead of *αὐτοῦ ἤψατο καὶ λέγει* ... .. (3*b*)

*σπλαγχνισθεῖς* (Mk *v.* 41) omitted ... .. (2)

Mk ii. 1—12: Mt. ix. 1—8: Lk v. 17—26.

*καὶ ἰδοὺ* and *ἐπὶ κλίνης* in Mt. (*v.* 2) and Lk (*v.* 18); both also have *ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει* (Mt. *v.* 5, Lk *v.* 23) and *ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ* (Mt. *v.* 7, Lk *v.* 25); both speak of the fear felt by those present (Mt. *v.* 8, Lk *v.* 26) ... .. (3*b*)

Both omit *τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ* ... .. (2)

Mk ii. 13, 14: Mt. ix. 9: Lk v. 27, 28.

παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν... ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς is wanting in Mt. and Lk

... (1) or (2)

For aorist ἠκολούθησεν Mt. and Lk both have imperfect

... (1), (2) or (3 b)

Mk ii. 16: Mt. ix. 11: Lk v. 30.

A tautology in Mk, not in Mt. and Lk ... (2)

διὰ τί in Mt. and Lk in place of ὅτι (as interrogative)... (2)

Mk ii. 18 a: Mt. ix. 14 a: Lk v. 33 a.

There is no introduction in Lk corresponding to that in Mk, and that in Mt. is much slighter ... (1) or (2)

Mk ii. 19, 20: Mt. ix. 15: Lk v. 34, 35.

Mk 19 b is wanting in Mt. and Lk ... (1) or (2)

Mk ii. 21, 22: Mt. ix. 16, 17: Lk v. 36—38.

ἐπιβάλλει in place of ἐπιράπτει; for ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἄσχοι, Mt. has ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἄσχοι ἀπόλλυνται, and Lk αὐτὸς (viz. ὁ οἶνος) ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἄσχοι ἀπολοῦνται. γε is added to μὴ in Mt. and Lk, and the last sentence of Mk v. 22 completed by use of βάλλουσιν in Mt. and βλητέον in Lk.....(3 b), or one or two of them to (2); use of μὴ γε may be due to (4).

Mk ii. 23—28: Mt. xii. 1—8: Lk vi. 1—5.

ὁδὸν ποιεῖν (Mk v. 23) not in Mt. and Lk, the former also adds καὶ ἐσθιεῖν, the latter καὶ ἤσθιον. Mk v. 24—ἴδε τί ποιούσιν τοῖς σάββασιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν; Mt. (v. 2) has ἰδοὺ ποιούσιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ, and Lk (v. 2) τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν τοῖς σάββασιν; Mk v. 26, the clauses are differently arranged in Mt. and Lk so as to bring the exception as to the priests to the end, and the epithet μόνου is employed. These differences may be due to (3 b), one or two of them also to ... (1)

ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως (Mk v. 26) is not in Mt. and Lk

... (1) or (2)

The saying τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, etc. (Mk v. 27) is wanting in Mt. and Lk ... (1)

Mk iii. 1: Mt. xii. 9, 10 a: Lk vi. 6.

Mt. and Lk have the definite article before συναγωγὴν (4); both also use the adjective instead of the perfect pass. partic. to describe the "withered" hand ... (2)

Mk iii. 4, 5: Mt. xii. 12, 13: Lk vi. 9, 10.

οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων is not in Mt. and Lk (cp. Mk ix. 33, 34 = Mt. xviii. 1 = Lk ix. 46, 47). μετ' ὀργῆς, συνλειτουργοῦμενος ἐπὶ τῇ χωρῇ

... (2)

τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, not in Mt. or Lk; the former also omits περιβλεψάμενος ... (2)

Mk iii. 6: Mt. xii. 14: Lk vi. 11.

μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν not in Mt. or Lk ... (1) or (2)

Mk iii. 7—12: Mt. xii. 15, 16: Lk vi. 17—19. [Also cp. Mt. iv. 24, 25 and v. 1.]

According to Mk the multitudes from all parts came to Jesus when He was *by the sea*, and He continued there; according to Mt. when He saw them He went up *into a mountain*; according to Lk He came down *from the mountain* and stood ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ in their midst ... (3 a)

The reference to the boat in Mk v. 9 is of course omitted when the place of the gathering is not the seashore ... (2)

Mk iii. 14, 15: Mt. x. 1: Lk vi. 13.

The description ἵνα ᾧσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν, καὶ ἔχων ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια, are the only words peculiar to Mk, and when we consider that they were obviously of an explanatory character and that they would have been unsuitable in Mt. in the context in which the appointment of the Apostles is treated in that Gospel, it is not remarkable that they should be absent from both the parallels ... (2)

Mk iii. 16—18: Mt. x. 2, 3: Lk vi. 14.

In Mk the names of the Apostles to whom Jesus gave new appellations are placed first; in Mt. and Lk, Andrew is placed next to Simon Peter with the addition "his brother" ... (3 b)

The new name given to the Sons of Zebedee is omitted in Mt. and Lk ... (1) or (2)

Mk iii. 19—21.

Omitted by Mt. and Lk. It may possibly have been added to Proto-Mk by a reviser or extruded in Mt. by the charge of complicity with Satan and the discourse of Jesus upon it taken from the Logian document, or passed over as reflecting on the relatives of Jesus

... (3 a) or (2)

Mk iii. 23—30: Mt. xii. 25—32: Lk xi. 17—23.

In this discourse Mt. and Lk correspond more closely with one another than with Mk in some Sayings, and have others in common which are not in Mk ... (3 a)

Mk iii. 32: Mt. xii. 47: Lk viii. 20.

For Mk's ἐξω ζητοῦσίν σε, Mt. has ἐξω ἐστήκασιν ζητοῦντές σοι λαλῆσαι and Lk ἐστήκασιν ἐξω ἰδεῖν θέλοντές σε. But it is uncertain whether the verse in Mt. belongs to the true text. Hence we may have here a case of ... (4)

Mk iv. 1—9: Mt. xiii. 1—9: Lk viii. 4—8.

For ὄχλος πλείστος Mt. has ὄχλοι πολλοί and Lk ὄχλου πολλοῦ. In parallels to Mk *v.* 3, 4, Mt. and Lk both supply τοῦ before first occurrence of verb and αὐτόν after second. Both have the saying of Mk *v.* 9 ὃς ἔχει ὄψα, etc. in form ὃ ἔχων ὄψα, etc. (Cp. Mk iv. 23)

... .. (3 *β*)

Mk iv. 10: Mt. xiii. 10: Lk viii. 9.

For οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα Mt. and Lk both have simply οἱ μαθηταί: ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας is not in Mt. and Lk, and in place of the general form of the sentence there is a particular reference, though different in each ... .. (1) or (3 *β*)

Mk iv. 11: Mt. xiii. 11: Lk viii. 10.

For ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται Mt. and Lk both have ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια... .. (3 *α*) or (3 *β*)

Mk iv. 15: Mt. xiii. 19: Lk viii. 12.

For αἶρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτοὺς Mt. has ἀρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ and Lk αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν ... .. (3 *β*) or (2)

Mk iv. 21: [Mt. v. 15]: Lk viii. 16.

The Saying in Mt. and Lk is fuller in that it describes the *effect* of placing the lamp upon a stand. (Cp. also Lk xi. 33) ... (3 *α*)

Mk iv. 22: [Mt. x. 26]: Lk viii. 17. (Cp. also Lk xii. 2.)

For εἰ μὴ ἴνα and ἀλλ' ἴνα in Mk, Mt. and Lk have δ' οὐ. Again the verb γινώσκεισθαι is not used in Mk, whereas Mt. has δ' οὐ γνωσθήσεται, and Lk δ' οὐ μὴ γνωσθῆ ... .. (3 *α*)

Mk iv. 24*β*: [Mt. vii. 2 and vi. 33*β*]: [Lk vi. 38 and 31*β*].

Composite Saying wanting in both the parallels to Mk in this context ... .. (1)

Mk iv. 31, 32: Mt. xiii. 32: [Lk xiii. 19].

Here the form of the Saying in Mk and Lk differs and Mt. combines both ... .. (3 *α*)

Mk iv. 35, 36: Mt. viii. 18, 23: Lk viii. 22—25.

Peculiar to Mk we have ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὀψίας γενομένης... παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ. Mt. (*v.* 23) and Lk (*v.* 22) have ἐμβαίνειν ... .. (1)

Mk iv. 37—41: Mt. viii. 24—27: Lk viii. 23—25.

For ἐγείρουσιν καὶ λέγουσιν (Mk *v.* 38), Mt. (*v.* 25) has προσελθόντες ἤγειραν and Lk (*v.* 24) προσελθόντες διήγειραν. For ἔλεγον (Mk *v.* 41), Mt. (*v.* 27) and Lk (*v.* 25) have ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες, and also ὑπακούουσιν in place of ὑπακούει. Mt. and Lk have nothing corresponding to ἦν ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον (Mk *v.* 38), οἱ σιώπα, πεφίμωσο



(Mk v. 39). All these differences, in spite of their number, may be due to (2), though possibly some of them should be referred to (1).

Mk v. 27 : Mt. ix. 20 : Lk viii. 44.

For ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὀπισθεν ἤψατο τοῦ ἱματίου, Mt. and Lk have προσελθοῦσα ὀπισθεν ἤψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου

... (3 δ) or (4)

Mk v. 41, 42 : Mt. ix. 25 : Lk viii. 54, 55.

The Aramaic words in Mk are not given in either Mt. or Lk, nor the words καὶ περιεπάτει ... (2)

Mk vi. 3 : Mt. xiii. 55 : [Lk iv. 22].

Mk has ὁ τέκτων, Mt. ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός, Lk υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ (1)

Mk vi. 6 δ : Mt. ix. 35 : Lk viii. 1.

Again, as at Mk i. 39 and parallels a description of a missionary tour, and again, while Mk has merely διδάσκων, Mt. adds καὶ κηρύσσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τ. βασιλείας while Lk has κηρύσσω καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ... (3 α)

Mk vi. 7—13 : Mt. x. 1 ff. : Lk ix. 1—6.

With the Marcan account of an Address to the disciples, Mt. has here combined a similar one in the Logian document. The latter has been given separately by Lk (x. 1—16), but he appears also to have been influenced by it in some touches in ix. 1—6, where in the main he follows Mk.

Note the charge to “preach the kingdom of heaven” (or “of God”) in Mt. v. 7, and Lk v. 2 and x. 9. (In Mk v. 12 it is stated that they “preached that men should repent.”) In both Mt. v. 1 and Lk v. 1 the Twelve are commissioned to heal diseases. Cp. Lk x. 9. In Mk only exorcism is referred to.

Again for μὴ χαλκόν (Mk v. 8) we have in Lk ix. 3 μήτε ἀργύριον, in Mt. μηδὲ ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκόν. Again with ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς οἰκίαν (Mk v. 10), cp. εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν... εἰσέλθῃτε... εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν (Mt. xv. 11, 12), and εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλθῃτε (Lk v. 4), and εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν εἰσέλθῃτε οἰκίαν (Lk x. 5).

Again with καὶ ὅς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξῃται ὑμᾶς... ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν... (Mk v. 11), cp. καὶ ὅς ἂν μὴ δέξῃται ὑμᾶς... ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτόν... (Mt. v. 14), and καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης καὶ τὸν κονιορτόν... ἀποτινάσσετε... (Lk v. 5), and also Lk x. 10, 11 ... (3 α)

There is nothing in Lk (or Mt.) to correspond to ἤλειφον ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἀρρώστους in Mk (v. 13) ... (1)

Mk vi. 14 : Mt. xiv. 1 : Lk ix. 7.

Herod is described in Mk here and at v. 22, as *ὁ βασιλεύς*, and in both Mt. and Lk as *ὁ τετραάρχης* ... .. (2)

Mk vi. 31—34 : Mt. xiv. 13, 14 : Lk ix. 10, 11.

The Saying of Jesus, and the explanation of the need for retirement in Mk v. 31 are wanting in Mt. and Lk. In place of *ἀπῆλθον* (Mk v. 32), Mt. has *ἀνεχώρησεν* and Lk *ὑπεχώρησεν*. Both Mt. and Lk have *οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ* in place of the greater part of the description in Mk v. 33. The words *οἱ ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα*, etc. in Mk 34 *β* are wanting in both Mt. and Lk, though the former has them in a different context (ix. 36). On the other hand there is no statement in Mk that Jesus healed the sick, as there is in Mt. and Lk ... .. (1), and perhaps partly (2)

Mk vi. 41 : Mt. xiv. 19 : Lk ix. 16.

There is nothing in Mt. and Lk to correspond to the last clause of the verse in Mk—*καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν* ... (1)

Mk vi. 43 : Mt. xiv. 20 : Lk ix. 17.

Instead of Mk's *κλάσματα*, Mt. has *τὸ περισσεῖον τῶν κλασμάτων*, and Lk *τὸ περισσεῖον αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων* ... .. (3 *β*)

Mk vi. 44 : Mt. xiv. 21 : Lk ix. 14.

Both Mt. and Lk qualify the number by *ὡσεὶ*... (2) or (4)

Mk viii. 12 : Mt. xvi. 4 : [Lk xi. 29].

Mt. and Lk have *πονηρά* agreeing with *γενεά*, and *εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωῆ* added at end ; there are also other similarities ... (3 *α*)

Mk viii. 15 : Mt. xvi. 6 : [Lk xii. 1].

Mt. and Lk both have *προσέχετε* ... .. (3 *α*)

Mk viii. 31 : Mt. xvi. 21 : Lk ix. 22.

In place of *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήναι*, Mt. and Lk have *τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι* ... .. (3 *β*)

(Cp. Mk ix. 31 = Mt. xvii. 23 ; Mk x. 34 = Mt. xx. 19 = Lk xviii. 33, though in this last case Lk agrees with Mk.)

Mk viii. 35 : Mt. xvi. 25 : Lk ix. 24.

*καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* not in Mt. and Lk ... .. (1)

(Cp. Mk i. 14, 15 = Mt. iv. 17 = Lk iv. 14, 15 ; Mk x. 29 = Mt. xix. 29 = Lk xviii. 29.)

Mk viii. 36 : Mt. xvi. 26 : Lk ix. 25.

For *ὠφέλει* followed by accusative we have in Mt. and Lk the nominative and passive ; in the former *τί ὠφελήθησεται*, in the latter *τί ὠφελᾷται* ... .. (2)

Mk ix. 3 : Mt. xvii. 2 : Lk ix. 29.

*ὄσα γυαφεύς*, etc. wanting in Mt. and Lk ... .. (2) or (1)

Mk ix. 4 : Mt. xvii. 3 : Lk ix. 30.

Mt. and Lk both begin the sentence with *καὶ ἰδού* ... (2)

Mk ix. 6, 7 : Mt. xvii. 5, 6 : Lk ix. 34, 35.

Mt. and Lk have very similar transitional clauses (*ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λέγοντος*) and both add *λέγουσα* after *φωνή*.

Both refer to the fear of the disciples a little later, the latter as felt when they entered the bright cloud, the former when they heard the voice ... (3 *β*)

Mk ix. 14—16 : Mt. xvii. a : Lk ix. 37.

That so much of the description in Mk is not represented in Mt. or Lk may be chiefly due to (2); but the clause *καὶ γραμματεῖς συνζητοῦντας πρὸς αὐτούς* (Mk v. 14 *β*) to ... (1)

Mk ix. 18 : Mt. xvii. 16 : Lk ix. 40.

For *οὐκ ἴσχυσαν* both Mt. and Lk have *οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν* (2)

Mk ix. 19 : Mt. xvii. 17 : Lk ix. 41.

Mt. and Lk both join *καὶ διεστραμμένη* to Mk's *ἄπιστος*

... (4) or (3 *β*)

Mk ix. 20—29 : Mt. xvii. 15 *β*, 18—20 : Lk ix. 42, 43 *a*.

A large part of the description in Mk, including words of Jesus, is without parallel in Mt. or Lk ... (1) or (2)

For concluding saying in Mt., cp. Lk xvii. 6 ... (3 *a*)

Mk ix. 30, 31 *a* : Mt. xvii. 22 : Lk ix. 43.

Desire for privacy passed over in Mt. and scarcely consistent with Lk. (Cp. Mk vii. 24) ... (1)

Mk ix. 31 : Mt. xvii. 22 : Lk ix. 44.

For *παραδίδοται* Mt. and Lk have *μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι*

... (2) or (3 *β*)

Mk ix. 34—37 : Mt. xviii. 1—5 : Lk ix. 47, 48.

The Saying in Mk v. 35, as there placed, affords a clear answer to the subject of debate among the disciples; but in spite of this, in both Mt. and Lk the words which most nearly correspond with this Saying are placed after the child has been put forward and are introduced as part of the instruction given from this object-lesson. There is also nothing in the parallel contexts in these Gospels corresponding to the words *καὶ πάντων διάκονος*, but only in different contexts (Mt. xxiii. 11, Lk xxii. 26) ... (1)

*ἐναγκαλισάμενος* is wanting in Mt. and Lk (cp. Mk x. 16) (2)

Mk ix. 41.

The saying *ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ*, etc. is placed in Mk after *ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ἑμῶν* etc. In Mt. it occurs in the Charge to the disciples (x. 42) and is wanting in Lk ... (1)

Mk ix. 42 : Mt. xviii. 7 : [Lk xvii. 1].

Cp. Mt.'s ἀνάγκη...ἔρχεται, with closely similar words in Lk  
 ... .. (3a)

Mk ix. 48—50.

There is nothing to correspond to these Sayings at the end of the closely parallel passage in Mt. (xviii. 6—9). There are parallels to a portion of one saying (v. 50a) in different contexts at Lk xiv. 34, Mt. v. 13b. Mk v. 48 reproduces the language of Isa. lxvi. 24 (1)

Mk x. 12.

A case not noticed in Mt. or Lk, and one that would be suggested not by Jewish but by Roman customs ... .. (1)

Mk x. 13—16 : Mt. xix. 13—15 : Lk xviii. 15—17.

ἡγανάκτησεν (Mk v. 14) and ἐναγκαλισάμενος κατευλόγει (v. 16) are wanting in Mt. and Lk (ἀγανάκτειν generally has a bad sense)

... .. (2)

Mk x. 17—27 : Mt. xix. 16—26 : Lk xviii. 18—27.

καὶ γονυπετήσας wanting in Mt. and Lk ... (2) or (1)

μὴ κλέψης...μὴ ἀποστερήσης (Mk v. 19): Mt. and Lk have not the latter ... .. (2)

Διδάσκαλε (Mk v. 20) and ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἡγάπησεν αὐτόν (v. 21) are wanting in Mt. and Lk and instead of στουγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ (Mk v. 22) both have ἀκούσας (Mt. v. 22, Lk v. 23) ... (2)

Mk v. 24 is (according to the text in B<sup>88</sup>) little more than a repetition of v. 23; neither Mt. nor Lk has it (1) or (2)

If read with the addition τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ ... (1)

For τρυμαλιᾶς (Mk v. 25) both Mt. and Lk have τρήματος

... .. (2), (3b) or (4)

For οἱ δέ in Mk v. 26, Mt. has ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταί and Lk οἱ ἀκούσαντες ... .. (2)

Mk x. 29, 30 : Mt. xix. 28, 29 : Lk xviii. 29, 30.

For Mk's ἐνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Mt and Lk have other expressions  
 ... .. (1)

For Mk's ἑκατονταπλασίονα both Mt. and Lk have πολλαπλασίονα  
 ... .. (2) or (3b)

Mt. and Lk omit the particular enumeration of what shall be received corresponding to what is given up and the qualifying words μετὰ διωγμῶν ... .. (2) or (1)

Mk x. 32 : Mt. xx. 17 : Lk xviii. 31.

There is nothing in Mt. and Lk to correspond to the words καὶ ἦν προάγων...ἐφοβούντο in Mk v. 32 ... .. (2)

Mk x. 34 : Mt. xx. 19 : Lk xviii. 33.

(Cp. Mk viii. 31 and parallels above.)

Mk x. 46—52 : Mt. xx. 29—34 : Lk xviii. 35—43.

Mt. and Lk both omit the name of the beggar. There is nothing in Mt. to correspond to Mk x. 49 *b*, 50; and in Lk only ἐγγίσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ. For Παββουεὶ in Mk x. 51, Mt. v. 33 and Lk v. 41 have κύριε ... .. (2)

Mk xi. 2 : Mt. xxi. 2 : Lk xix. 30.

For λύσατε καὶ φέρετε Mt. and Lk have λύσαντες ἀγάγετε (2)

Mk xi. 3 : Mt. xxi. 3 : Lk xix. 31.

For εἶπατε Mt. and Lk have ἐρεῖτε ὅτι ... .. (2)

Mk xi. 4 : Mt. xxi. 6 : Lk xix. 32.

The description that the colt was "tied at a door without in the open street" is wanting in Mt. and Lk ... .. (2)

Mk xi. 6 *b*.

καὶ ἀφήκαν αὐτοὺς is omitted in Mt. and Lk ... .. (2)

Mk xi. 9, 10 : Mt. xxi. 9 : Lk xix. 38.

From the cry of praise and triumph as given in Mk, the words εὐλογημένη ἢ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυεὶδ are omitted in Mt. and Lk, but the form in each of these Gospels is in part peculiar ... .. (3*b*)

Mk xi. 11 *b*.

According to Mk, Jesus having arrived at the temple and merely looked round on all things, returned to Bethany with the Twelve, since it was already late; from Mt. and Lk on the contrary it would appear that the cleansing of the temple took place on the day after the triumphal entry ... .. (1)

Mk xi. 16.

Wanting in Mt. and Lk... .. (2) or (1)

Mk xi. 17 : Mt. xxi. 13 : Lk xix. 46.

πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν in Mk, not in Mt. and Lk ... .. (1)

Mk xi. 27—33 : Mt. xxi. 23—27 : Lk xx. 1—8.

The chief priests, etc., came to Jesus, according to Mk when He was *walking* in the temple, but according to Mt. and Lk when He was *teaching* there. Mt. and Lk both omit the words at the end of the question of the chief priests, etc., as it is given in Mk—*ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῆς*.

Both also introduce the reply of Jesus by ἀποκριθεὶς and have κἀγώ and οἱ δέ in that reply, and both have ἐὰν δέ in the statement of His opponents' dilemma ... .. (2) or in part (3*b*)

Mk xii. 3 : Mt. xxi. 35 : Lk xx. 10.

The subject οἱ γεωργοί is supplied by both Mt. and Lk

... .. (3*b*) or (2)

Mk xii. 7, 8 : Mt. xxi. 38, 39 : Lk xx. 14, 15.

Mt. (v. 38) and Lk (v. 14) are connected with what precedes

in a closely similar manner, the former having *ιδόντες τὸν υἱόν*, the latter *ιδόντες αὐτόν*. Further, according to Mk the husbandmen killed him and cast him out; according to Mt. and Lk they cast him out and then killed him. (Cp. Wernle, p. 60)

... .. (3b)

Mt. xxi. 44: Lk xx. 18.

The Saying about "he that falleth on that stone," etc. is not in Mk. There is some doubt even on the ground of existing textual evidence whether it had a place in the original text of Mt.

... .. (3b) or (4)

Mk xii. 14 b, 15: Mt. xxii. 17—19 a: Lk xx. 22—24 a.

*δώμεν ἢ μὴ δώμεν* and *ἵνα ἴδω* are omitted in Mt. and Lk (2)

*ἐπιδείξατε* (Mt. v. 19), *δείξατε* (Lk v. 24) for Mk's *φέρετε*

... .. (2) or (3b)

Mk xii. 22, 23: Mt. xxii. 27, 28: Lk xx. 32, 33.

For *ἔσχατον* both Mt. and Lk have *ὑστερον*, and both use *οὖν* in introducing the conclusion of the argument ... .. (2)

Mk xii. 27: Mt. xxii. 32: Lk xx. 38.

Mk's concluding *πολὸν πλανᾶσθε* is wanting in both Mt. and Lk

... .. (2) or (1)

Mk xii. 28: Mt. xxii. 35, 36: Lk x. 25, 26.

Mt. as well as Lk uses the word *νομικός* to denote the scribe; both attribute to him the purpose of tempting Jesus; in both he addresses Jesus as *διδάσκαλε*, and the words *ἐν τῷ νόμῳ* occur in his question according to Mt. and in a question put by Jesus to him, according to Lk ... .. (3a)

Mk xii. 30: Mt. xxii. 37: Lk xx. 27.

*ἐν ὄλῃ* each time (thrice) in Mt., and three out of four times in Lk; *ἐξ ὄλης* each time in Mk. The latter agrees with the LXX., the former is a literal rendering of the Hebrew ... .. (3a) or (3b)

Mk xii. 37 a: Mt. xxii. 45: Lk xx. 44.

Mt. and Lk both connect with preceding sentence by means of *οὖν*, and both use *καλεῖ* for *λέγει* ... .. (2)

Mk xii. 37 b and 38 a: Mt. xxiii. 1, 6: Lk xx. 45, 46.

The warning against the Pharisees which is introduced in Mk with the words "in His teaching, He said," was according to Mt. addressed to the multitudes and *the disciples*, and according to Lk to *the disciples* in the hearing of all the people. Further, *φιλεῖν* is used by both Mt. and Lk ... .. (3a) or (3b)

The general statement of Mk v. 37 b that "the common people heard him gladly" has dropped out in Mt. and Lk ... .. (2)

Mk xiii. 30, 31: Mt. xxiv. 34, 35: Lk xxi. 32, 33.

Mt. and Lk have ἕως ἄν for μέχρως οὗ, and strengthen a negation by μή ... .. (2)

Mk xiv. 11 δ: Mt. xxvi. 16: Lk xxii. 6.

πῶς εὐκαιρῶς παραδοῖ, Mt. εὐκαιρίαν ἵνα παραδοῖ, Lk εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι ... .. (2)

Mk xiv. 30 and 72: Mt. xxvi. 34, 75: Lk xxii. 34, 61.

The words of the warning of Jesus to Peter according to Mk were πρὶν ἢ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, ... δις is omitted in both Mt. and Lk ... .. (1)

Mk xiv. 36: Mt. xxvi. 39: Lk xxvi. 42.

The Aramaic Ἀββᾶ is omitted in Mt. and Lk and for ὁ πατήρ used as vocative, both have πάτερ; in the last clause of the sentence both use πλήν instead of ἀλλά ... .. (3 δ)

Mk xiv. 37: Mt. xxvi. 40: Lk xxii. 45.

Mt. and Lk both introduce the words πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς (2)

Mk xiv. 43: Mt. xxvi. 47: Lk xxii. 47.

For εὐθὺς παραγίνεται Ἰούδας...καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος, Mt. has ἰδοὺ Ἰούδας...ἦλθεν, etc., while Lk has ἰδοὺ ὄχλος, καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας ... .. (2)

Mt. xxvi. 50 α: Lk xxii. 48.

Mt. and Lk both add some words of Jesus to Judas, though different ones ... .. (3 δ)

Mk xiv. 51, 52.

The young man who followed with a linen cloth about his body, etc.

This incident is wanting in Mt. and Lk ... .. (2)

Mk xiv. 61: Mt. xxvi. 63: Lk xxii. 67 a and 70 a.

Mk has υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ, Mt. and Lk have υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ... .. (1) or (2)

Mk xiv. 62: Mt. xxvi. 64: Lk xxii. 69.

Mt. agrees with Mk word for word except that he has ἀπ' ἄρτι. Lk has ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν; but by the substitution of ἔσται for ὄψεσθε and the omission of ἐρχόμενον, &c., he has turned the Saying from an assertion that henceforth the Son of Man would be seen returning into an assertion that His Session at God's right hand would forthwith begin. It seems probable that Mt. has here preserved the original form of Mk. The last reviser of Mk, we may suppose, omitted ἀπ' ἄρτι because the return of Christ had not immediately taken place. Luke, on the other hand, uses for ἀπ' ἄρτι an equivalent expression, which he preferred on linguistic grounds, and overcomes the difficulty of fact by more considerable changes ... (1)

Mk xiv. 65 *b*: Mt. xxvi. 68: Lk xxii. 64.

Mt. and Lk both have the question, for an answer to which Jesus was challenged when blindfolded: *τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε;*

... .. (4) or (3 *b*)

Mk xiv. 72: Mt. xxvi. 75: Lk xxii. 62.

For Mk's *ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν* Mt. and Lk both have *ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς* ... .. (4)

Mk xv. 7: Mt. xxvii. 16: Lk xxiii. 19.

*μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν* wanting in Mt. and Lk ... .. (1) or (2)

Mk xv. 21: Mt. xxvii. 32: Lk xxiii. 26.

Mt. and Lk do not state that Simon of Cyrene was "the father of Alexander and Rufus" ... .. (2)

Mk xv. 24: Mt. xxvii. 35: Lk xxiii. 34.

The concluding words of the sentence in Mk—*ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρη*—are not in Mt. and Lk ... .. (1) or (2)

Mk xv. 25.

The statement that the time when Jesus was crucified was the third hour appears in Mk only ... .. (1)

Mk xv. 26: Mt. xxvii. 37: Lk xxiii. 38.

In the title over the Cross, Mt. and Lk both use *οὗτος*, one at the beginning, the other at the end ... .. (3 *b*) or (2)

Mk xv. 30: Mt. xxvii. 40: Lk xxiii. 35.

The description of the taunts cast at Jesus is expanded in Mt. and Lk in a similar way ... .. (3 *b*)

Mk xv. 39: Mt. xxvii. 54: Lk xxiii. 47.

For *κεντυρίων* Mt. has *ἐκατόνταρχος*, Lk *ἐκατοντάρχης* ... .. (2)

Mk xv. 43: Mt. xxvii. 57, 58: Lk xxiii. 50, 52.

In introducing Joseph of Arimathea Mt. has *τοῦνομα Ἰωσήφ* and Lk *ὀνόματι Ἰωσήφ*. Each also breaks up Mk's sentence, beginning the new one with *οὗτος*, and using *προσελθὼν* for *εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς* (2)

Mk xv. 44, 45.

Description in Mk only of Pilate's surprise that Jesus was dead ... .. (2)

Mk xv. 46: Mt. xxvii. 59: Lk xxiii. 53.

Mt. and Lk do not refer to Joseph's having *bought* the linen sheet; both also use *ἐνετύλιξεν* instead of Mk's *ἐνείλησεν*

... .. (2) or (3 *b*)



## CHAPTER IV.

### THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST LUKE.

IN discussing the history of the composition of St Mark we have arrived at the conclusion that our third evangelist knew and used an earlier and briefer form of our St Mark, and we have determined approximately its contents. Further, in Chapter II. we have ascertained approximately the contents and form of a Logian document in Greek, which either lay before and was used by our first and third evangelists in its original form, or had furnished the common foundation of the documents which they severally used. All this we may assume in proceeding now to consider the subject of the composition of St Luke. But it remains for us to investigate the source or sources of the matter peculiar to this Gospel, and also the question of the authorship of the Gospel.

#### *The source or sources of the matter peculiar to St Luke.*

Peculiar to the third Gospel we have mainly :

(1) The narrative of the birth and childhood of John the Baptist and of Jesus and the genealogy of Jesus (Chs. i. and ii., and iii. 23—38) ;

(2) A considerable number of Parables, Sayings and pieces of discourse, and some narratives, included in Luke's two principal insertions into the Synoptic outline, where they are interwoven with matter derived immediately or ultimately from a document used also in the Gospel according to St Matthew ;

(3) A much smaller number of pieces of narrative and of Sayings occurring in Marcan contexts ; namely, independent accounts of a visit of Jesus to Nazareth, and of the call of Peter and the Sons of Zebedee, and the saying "No

man having drunk old wine," etc. (Lk v. 39), in the early part of Christ's Ministry, before Luke's first insertion, and several more additions or substitutions of both kinds in the narrative of the Last Days and of the Passion.

We have to consider whether, or how far, the matter comprised under these three heads was obtained by our third evangelist from oral tradition and first put into a written form by him; or collected by him from a great variety of records such as he may be supposed to have in mind in the preface to his Gospel, but of the general character and contents of which it is impossible for us to know anything; or taken from one or more documents which we can in some measure identify.

The view that the greater part of the peculiar matter in St Luke came from a single source is presented to us in two forms:

(1) B. Weiss maintains<sup>1</sup> that besides the "Oldest source" (to use Weiss' name for the document from which the Discourses and Sayings common to the first and third Gospels were derived) and St Mark, Luke had a third document which he calls L. Both the "Oldest source" and L, though occupied most largely with the teaching of Jesus, contained a number of narratives; moreover to a certain extent they overlapped each other and St Mark. In particular L (but not the "Oldest source") contained an account of the Passion. These three documents were combined by Luke; each supplied much that was found in it alone; where there were parallel passages in two, or in all three, our evangelist chose one to follow principally, but added traits from the other one, or the other two.

(2) Feine<sup>2</sup> holds, like B. Weiss, that Luke had a special source which began with the narrative of the Infancy and contained the greater part of the remainder of the matter indicated above; but he holds that in this document the matter from the Logian Source common to the first and

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction to New Test.*, Eng. trans., 1888, II. 296 f.; *Die Quellen d. Lukas-Evangeliums*, 1907, p. 195 ff. and *Die Quellen der Synoptischen Überlieferung in Texte u. Untersuch.* Bd. 2, Heft 3, 1908.

<sup>2</sup> *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas*, 1891.

third Gospels had also been already embedded, so that Luke himself had only to combine this his special document with St Mark (though he adds that he was acquainted with the "Synoptic document" underlying St Mark, and was in some cases influenced by it, a theory with which we are not here concerned, and which I think has been disposed of by our previous enquiries).

It will be convenient, I think, that before proceeding to the examination of the different portions of the matter peculiar to St Luke we should consider broadly this conception, common to both the writers above-named, of a single source for it all.

It would seem most natural that a work which opened with a narrative of the birth and early years of Jesus should, after this beginning, give a comprehensive account of His Ministry and of the earthly ending of His career. And Weiss in point of fact claims this character for that Special Source which he supposes Luke to have used, on the ground that in Luke's peculiar material, besides the preliminary history, all sides of the public life of Jesus commonly illustrated in evangelic tradition are represented, and that it includes also many special features in the history of the Passion. It remains true, however, that some of those different sides of Christ's work are very slightly represented there, and that it would have been impossible to obtain from this matter a clear impression of the general course and chief scenes of Christ's Ministry. We shall also find (I believe) that some of the pieces peculiar to the third Gospel, more particularly in the closing portion of the narrative, bear strong marks of having been put into writing by the evangelist himself, not taken from a document; while in some cases also, where Weiss assumes that the Marcan account has been altered by Luke under the influence of a parallel passage in another written narrative, we have instances simply of his independent revision of his Marcan document, with the result on the whole that the reasons for supposing the use of such a narrative disappear.

Feine recognises more clearly than Weiss the relative incompleteness that must have characterised a single special

source of Luke. But he explains this by supposing that the writer who composed it knew the Synoptic document, and in introducing pieces of narrative aimed only at supplementing that work. But we have no right to assume that any writer, even the most unpractised, would be wholly devoid of a sense of proportion. It may be observed also that the motive suggested by Feine in the case of this unknown work did not operate in the composition of the two Gospels known to us, in which an account of the Birth and Infancy was supplied. The object of the writers in these cases evidently was to give, so far as they could, a complete narrative. The best argument, perhaps, that can be advanced in favour of a single special source used in St Luke is, that both in the first two chapters, and in much of the peculiar matter contained in the two chief insertions, there is a Jewish-Christian tone<sup>1</sup>. This, however, does not shew that they were taken from the same work, though it may shew that the several traditions were transmitted, or that documents containing them were composed, in the same Christian community, or in similar ones.

We may, then, treat (1) the contents of Lk i. 5—ii. 52, and the genealogy in iii. 23—38, apart from the remainder of Luke's peculiar matter. It might well have been put forth originally in a separate writing which came to the hands of our third evangelist. It has, also, been held that the whole is his own composition. This has recently been maintained by Harnack in his work which has become well-known in England, *Luke the physician*. He contends that "a Greek source cannot lie at the foundation of cc. 1 and 2 of the Luke-Gospel; the correspondence between their style and that of Luke is too great; it would have been necessary that the source should have been rewritten sentence by sentence. It is possible, but not probable, that for the narrative part an Aramaic source was translated. The *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus* at all events are Luke's compositions." In both Luke has purposely employed to a large extent the diction of the LXX.; but "almost all words in the *Magnificat* which depart from the form of verses of the Old Testament are

<sup>1</sup> This is fully shewn by Feine in his comments on successive sections.

Luke's special property, that is to say belong to his vocabulary." In the *Benedictus* also, he maintains, the special Lucan language is quite unmistakable<sup>1</sup>.

Now, with Harnack, I believe, what some critics appear to deny<sup>2</sup>, that it should be possible to distinguish between passages which the author of the third Gospel and the Acts has wholly composed himself and those in which he has simply revised the language of a document written in a very different style from his own; and later in this chapter a set of passages will come before us where it is of great importance in connexion with the question of the authorship of the Lucan writings to draw this distinction, and where, with Harnack, I think it can be made good. In the case of the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*, however, the proof offered by Harnack does not seem to me to be satisfactory. In one respect, certainly, these hymns are peculiarly suitable for the purpose of the test which he seeks to apply to them. Poetical compositions such as these could hardly have preserved their musical cadence and other beauties, if they had been subjected to revision by a hand other than that of the author. There would, therefore, be strong ground for thinking that they were in their entirety Luke's productions if peculiarities of his style could be clearly pointed out in them. On examination, however, we find that, with the possible exception of v. 55 in the *Magnificat*, and in the closely corresponding verse (70) in the *Benedictus*—the two verses which might most easily have been inserted—all the expressions and words may be illustrated from the LXX., and are such as any writer who had steeped himself in the language and thought of the LXX. might have used<sup>3</sup>. It is true that the

<sup>1</sup> *Lucas der Arzt*, p. 150 ff., Eng. trans. p. 215 ff.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. as to passages in the Gospel, B. Weiss, *Die Quellen d. Lukas Evs.* p. 195 ff. See also below, p. 256, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> On p. 140 ff. (Eng. trans. p. 199 ff.) Harnack places in parallel columns (a) the text of the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus*; (b) the verses of the LXX. most closely parallel, out of which, he says, those two psalms were compiled; (c) annotations commenting upon expressions characteristic of the Lucan writings. Several of these expressions do not indeed occur in the LXX. parallels given in the second column, but are very common in other parts of the LXX., and are equally illustrative of a desire on the part of the author of the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus* to imitate the diction of the Greek Old Testament.

influence of the LXX. is noticeable in other parts of the Lucan writings. But this is only one characteristic of the Lucan style, and it is one which he may well have shared with other early Christians and with educated Hellenistic Jews. While then, it may be allowed that the third evangelist *might* himself have written the hymns in Luke i. and ii., it does not appear that their style is unquestionably distinctive of him. And in the character of their Messianic expectation there is a strong reason for thinking that they cannot be his. It would have been difficult even for a Jewish-Christian, and well-nigh impossible for a Gentile, such as the author of the Lucan writings probably was, and indeed must have been if he was Luke, the companion of St Paul, to have placed himself at, and adhered so consistently to, a point of view which preceded the Passion and the Resurrection. It is not reasonable to suppose that in that generation an effort of historical imagination, such as this would have required, would have been made, when, moreover, the prevailing view of prophecy and its fulfilment would have rendered it natural for some indication to have been given of what had actually come to pass.

It is more difficult to decide whether the narrative generally in Lk i. and ii. was composed by the evangelist out of traditions which he had collected, or was received by him in a written form. On the whole the latter seems the most probable on account of the accuracy displayed in regard to Jewish customs and ideas, and the space devoted to the history of the infancy of the Baptist, and to tracing its connexion with that of Jesus, matters which would be likely to attract special interest in Jewish-Christian circles<sup>1</sup>.

But the important question remains:—to what extent has the original document been edited? It will be generally felt that the notice of the decree of Augustus has probably been, at least, amplified by the evangelist. Various other touches may with more or less probability be attributed to his hand, which need not be mentioned here. The view, however, that the source gave no indication of the Miraculous Conception must be briefly considered. The mention, it is held, of "the

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Feine, *ib.* pp. 13—33.

parents" (ii. 27, 41, 43) of Jesus and of "his father" and "his mother" (ii. 33, 48), and the description of "their astonishment at the extraordinary destiny predicted for their child" (ii. 33) shew that the evangelist is here working up material into which the idea of the supernatural birth had not yet penetrated<sup>1</sup>. It is pointed out also that stress is laid at ii. 4, and by the genealogy (iii. 23 ff.), on the Davidic descent of Joseph, while nothing is said as to Mary's being of David's house and that her cousinship to Elizabeth indicates rather that she belonged to that of Aaron.

I am directly concerned here only with the theory that the Miraculous Conception has been introduced through the revision of the original narrative. It does not appear to me that this can be worked out in an intelligible manner so as to accord with the literary phenomena as a whole. It is true that the Miraculous Conception is expressly referred to only in i. 34, 35. But no simple expedient, such as that of treating these verses as an interpolation, would meet the case. Throughout these two chapters there is a carefully constructed parallelism between the birth and infancy and early years of the Baptist and of Jesus. The angelic prediction of the birth of Jesus (i. 34, 35) corresponds with that of John (i. 8 ff.); the prophecies on the occasion of the Presentation of Jesus in the Temple (ii. 22 ff.) correspond with those at the circumcision of John (i. 59 ff.) and so forth. Thus the Miraculous Conception seems to be a necessary stone in the structure; it is hard to see what could have stood in the place of it. The birth of John was out of the ordinary course of nature, and the whole purport of the narrative seems to require that the birth of the Messiah should be more wonderful still.

As regards the alleged traces of an older representation of the facts, which I have referred to above, it may, I think, fairly be said that the astonishment of Joseph and Mary at the predictions of Simeon and Anna might have been portrayed by a writer who did not reflect that there was anything inconsistent between it and the knowledge of the mystery of the Incarnation; also that the claim of Jesus to be of the

<sup>1</sup> H. J. Holtzmann, *Hand-Com.* on Lk ii. 33.

family of David may have been understood to rest on His *adoption* by Joseph, and that He is spoken of as the son of the latter, because He passed for this among men. I am well aware that these explanations must labour under the suspicion of being devised to support an orthodox conclusion, even though the immediate question is simply that of the integrity of a document. But it should be remembered that some explanation of the kind must in any case be required in order to account for the fact that the evangelist, after recording the Miraculous Conception, has afterwards brought himself to write down those expressions which are thought to be incompatible with belief in it.

(2) I pass to the matter peculiar to Luke which is included in his two chief insertions. It may be well that I should refer first to Wendt's view that the greater part of this matter was actually contained in the Logian document used by both the first and third evangelists. Now it is conceivable that a few of the pieces which Luke alone gives may have come from the common source and that their absence from St Matthew is to be accounted for by the fact that equivalent matter is related in that Gospel. For instance if Lk xii. 35—38 ("Let your loins be girded about" etc.) was contained in it, our first evangelist might have passed it over on the ground that in the parable of the Ten Virgins, which he proposed to give, the same idea is more fully worked out. He may also have left out some Sayings by oversight, or because they did not fit conveniently into his plan. But it is impossible that he should inadvertently have omitted so much of the Lord's Teaching which actually lay before him; and no plausible reasons can for the most part be given for his having done it intentionally. We may conclude therefore that the matter in question was not contained in the common Greek Logian source, and that either (a) our third evangelist himself collected it, and combined it with that derived from this source and from his Marcan document; or (b) it had been already combined with the common Greek Logian source in the document used by our evangelist.

The latter alternative is adopted by Weizsäcker in his



memorable *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte* (p. 205 ff.); and Feine, as we have seen, is on the same side<sup>1</sup>. It is the view of the principal source of the Logian matter in St Luke which will be maintained in the following pages.

I would direct attention first to the many close connexions between successive paragraphs in this portion of St Luke; e.g. "as He spake" (xi. 37); "meanwhile" (xii. 1). There are other instances at xi. 27, 53; xii. 13; xiii. 1, 31; xvi. 14. Now it should be observed that in parallels with St Mark, our third evangelist is careful not to create connexions in time which he did not find in his source. He does not take the juxtaposition of narratives to imply immediate sequence in time as our first evangelist often does<sup>2</sup>. On the contrary, three times at least he has employed phrases which seem expressly designed to shew that this is *not* to be inferred. (Cp. Mk ii. 1 with Lk v. 17; Mk iii. 1 with Lk vi. 6; Mk iii. 13 with Lk vi. 12<sup>3</sup>.) Further, where he has introduced sections into the Marcan context, or changed the order, he has generally<sup>4</sup> been careful to refrain from suggesting a close temporal connexion. Plainly none is indicated at v. 1 and 12. Again, the insertions at iv. 16 and v. 1 follow references to periods of activity not to particular events; while the Crossing of the lake at Lk viii. 22 ff., which does *not* as in St Mark immediately follow the Teaching by parables, is said to have happened "on one of the days." From Luke's procedure in regard to his Marcan document in this respect we may surely learn how he would

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 222. So also Soltau, *Unsere Evangelien*, p. 47, etc. He denotes the expanded Logian collection used in the third Gospel by the letters A B.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 53 (*j*).

<sup>3</sup> Mk ii. 13 and Lk v. 27 might, I think, be added to these; but some may be of opinion that *μετὰ ταῦτα* here in Lk is not less ambiguous than Mk's *πάλιν*.

I may take this opportunity of observing that if *δευτερο-πρώτω* at Lk vi. 1 is genuine, a description so unusual, and to us unintelligible, and so precise must have been due to some tradition; but probably in fact the reading is corrupt.

<sup>4</sup> The only clear exception, so far as I am aware, is that by the statement at Lk iv. 31, that Jesus "came down to Capernaum" after His rejection at Nazareth, and by then relating according to the order in St Mark incidents of the opening of the Ministry of Jesus in Capernaum, His visit to Nazareth is brought before these. I think there may also have been some dislocation, in spite of a close sequence in one of his sources, near the point where, soon after the end of his second chief insertion, he rejoins the Synoptic outline. See below, p. 238.

be likely to treat another document. It is, therefore, probable that the expressions, of which (as we have seen) there are many in his longest insertion into the Synoptic outline, closely connecting the times when pieces of instruction were given, were found by the evangelist in his source, not invented by him. And as considerable masses of matter are thus connected the presumption is raised that in the main this portion of his Gospel has been taken from the same source; for of course the mere absence of close connexions in the case of other passages does not of itself prove that they did not stand in the source as they do in our Gospel.

Whether these more loosely connected pieces are severally to be regarded as additions by the evangelist, or not, must depend upon an examination in detail of their style and subject-matter. In the story of the sinful woman in the house of Simon the Pharisee (vii. 36—50), the short piece about the women who ministered to Jesus (viii. 1—3) and the parable of the Good Samaritan (x. 29—37) the Lucan form of the sentences and vocabulary are so strongly marked that here, one feels, the evangelist must be telling the story in his own words. The same holds (though perhaps somewhat less clearly) of the account of the Ten Lepers (xvii. 11—19). I doubt whether there are any others in the two chief insertions which should be classed with these<sup>1</sup>.

What has been said above as to links of time does not affect the question whether other touches in the introductions to pieces of instruction may not proceed from the hand of the evangelist. When, for instance, some precepts are said to have been spoken to the multitude<sup>2</sup>, others to the disciples<sup>3</sup>, others to the Pharisees<sup>4</sup>, it is possible that the evangelist may himself have conjectured the persons addressed from the nature of the subject-matter. Other instances might be given in which he may not improbably have turned to account hints in his source, or have used his own imagination. In particular, we ought no doubt to attribute to him some at least of the allusions to the journeyings of Jesus and His disciples. In the first insertion we have a reference of

<sup>1</sup> See the Additional Note, p. 276 ff., esp. pp. 298—9, 300, 304 f.

<sup>2</sup> xii. 54; xiv. 25.    <sup>3</sup> xii. 1, 22; xvi. 1; xvii. 1.    <sup>4</sup> xiv. 3; xv. 2, 3.

this kind at viii. 1, and there is a series of them in the second, greater insertion at ix. 51, 57; x. 38; xiii. 22; xiv. 25; xvii. 11. By this device he was able without greatly altering the substance and arrangement of his document, consisting (as it did) mainly of Sayings and Discourses, to transform it into a narrative of travel, and so to fit it for inclusion in a work of history. The allusions to changes of place could be, and in all probability were, introduced at points where there was in the source a convenient break in the sense, so that it was natural to suppose that the Teaching which followed was spoken on a different occasion and in different surroundings from that which preceded. And doubtless this manner of presenting the subject-matter commended itself to him as the true one. Jesus had, according to the testimony of his Marcan document, spent much time in journeying from place to place. And the Collection of Discourses lent itself to this mode of treatment, inasmuch as its warnings of sufferings and prophecies of the End of the Age, which were no doubt uttered in the latter part of Christ's Ministry, stood in the document after the Teaching of wider application.

As regards the connexion of thought between successive sections, it is in some instances clear. (See especially xii. 13—15, 16—21, 22 ff.) In others it is difficult to say whether a connexion is intended; and if this is assumed, then what precisely the connexion of ideas is. (E.g. xvii. 1—4, 5, 6, 7—10.) But there are also passages in which individual Sayings appear to have been grouped together because they all bore upon a particular subject, though they do not give a connected view of the subject, and were probably not spoken on the same occasion. (E.g. see the Sayings on light, xi. 33—36, discussed above, p. 91; and those on the use of wealth, xvi. 10—13, added after the special moral of the parable of the Unjust Steward.) In the arrangement in these different cases we may see the hand of a compiler, but that compiler might almost equally well be either our evangelist himself, or someone whose work he is using. We will not, therefore, dwell any longer upon them here.

I pass to certain well-known and interesting features of Luke's peculiar matter. And first, it includes several parables,

and these parables have a character of their own. They differ in subject alike from those which Luke has in common with both the other Synoptics, or with St Matthew, and from those peculiar to the latter. The theme of all these is the Kingdom of God, the manner of its progress, the attitude of various classes of men to it, the day of its final triumph. On the contrary the parables peculiar to the third Gospel contain strictly speaking no reference to the Kingdom of God. In most of them this is plain; they teach moral and spiritual lessons, applicable under all circumstances. In two of them, indeed, viz. the Barren Fig-tree and the Importunate Widow, the certainty of a righteous judgment to come is insisted on; but the future event is not connected with the specific conception of the Kingdom of God which we find elsewhere in the Gospels, and the main consideration in each case is the practical inference to be drawn by individuals from the expectation.

Again, the parables peculiar to St Luke differ from the others in regard to their form and imagery. With one exception—that of the Barren Fig-tree—they do not bring before us Nature, or Man in his relations with Nature, as so many of the others do. They are concerned with human emotions and motives, inner debates and actions, which are vividly described; they are in fact short tales of human life. Even in the exception to which I have alluded, the conversation of the proprietor and the gardener forms a large and significant part of the parable. Once more, no subsequent, separate interpretation could be required, or asked for, in the case of these parables. They bear their moral on the face of them, and in several instances it is driven home by an emphatic saying at the conclusion.

Different kinds of parables spoken by Christ, as well as different parts of His Teaching more generally, may have had a special interest and attraction for particular individuals or portions of the Church, and so may have been separately collected and preserved. But it is also not unlikely, as I have had occasion to observe in my last chapter, that there may have been a tendency on the part of some who rendered parables from the Aramaic, or repeated them orally, or com-

mitted them to writing, to work out more fully the original idea. To one or other of these causes, or partly to one and partly to another, the fact that the parables peculiar to the third Gospel are of a special type must be attributed. But the question remains whether the selection, or moulding, was due to the evangelist himself, or was connected with an earlier stage in the history of their transmission.

It has been held by some that the evangelist's powers of description and delicate perception of various traits of human character are to be seen in these parables. The idea is attractive in some respects; but the characteristics of the Lucan style are with one exception, that of the Good Samaritan, to which reference has already been made, not specially noticeable in them. And the difference of style in the rest is the more noteworthy by contrast, and renders it probable that the evangelist has derived them from a document.

We have still to consider certain points in regard to the ethical temper alike of the parables and of other parts of the matter peculiar to St Luke. The place occupied therein by Teaching on the subject of poverty and riches, and the tone and character of that Teaching, have frequently been commented on. We have already had occasion to discuss the special form of the Beatitudes in St Luke, which refer to the external condition of poverty. Again, in the denunciation of the Pharisees, much of which at all events was derived from the common Logian source, Luke has a Saying, not found elsewhere, on purification through almsgiving (xi. 41). Yet again, in a passage which has for the most part an exceedingly close parallel in St Matthew, we have a portion of a Saying peculiar to St Luke in which Jesus bids His disciples sell their worldly possessions and give the money so obtained in alms, and so (this seems to be implied) win heavenly treasure (Lk xii. 33 *a*). Once more, in a passage on the doom which was about to fall on Jerusalem, most of which seems to have been known to the first evangelist and to have been worked up also in the eschatological discourse in St Mark, a special application is made in St Luke of the thought that there may be an unwise attachment to the things of this world (xvii. 31—33). We have besides, in independent contexts,

a Saying enjoining renunciation of worldly goods (xiv. 33); an exhortation to entertain the poor (xiv. 12—14); the parable of the Unjust Steward, with the Sayings on the employment of wealth which follow it (xvi. 1—13); the warning against covetousness and the parable of the Rich Fool (xii. 13—21); the first portion of the parable of the Rich man and Lazarus (xvi. 19—26).

We shall do well, I think, to refrain from applying the term "Ebionism" to this teaching, even as a brief description, between inverted commas. To do so may well be extremely misleading, in view of our ignorance as to what was precisely the Ebionite conception of the religious value of poverty, or how far different beliefs supposed to be Ebionite were commonly associated in the same minds.

For the purpose of carefully examining and estimating the significance of the Teaching now before us we may arrange it according to its subject-matter as follows. In addition to (a) the *Beatitudes* in Lk vi. 20 ff., the peculiar form of which we have had occasion to consider in an earlier chapter, we have (b) *injunctions to renounce worldly possessions* (xii. 33, 34; xiv. 33): (c) *exhortations of a less drastic kind to almsgiving* (xi. 41; xiv. 12—14; xvi. 1—13): (d) *warnings against covetousness and indifference to the needs of others* (xii. 13—21; xvi. 19—26).

I have urged that the form of the Beatitudes in St Luke is probably closer to the original than that in St Matthew, and that, if taken in connexion with the circumstances in which they were spoken, they are neither morally unsound nor inconsistent with the spirit of Christ<sup>1</sup>, and I believe this to be true also of the remainder of the Teaching now before us. The injunctions to part altogether with worldly possessions were spoken to disciples, or those who contemplated becoming disciples, of Jesus. They are strictly parallel to the concluding words addressed to the rich man in the incident related in all the Synoptics (Mk x. 17—21; Mt. xix. 16—21; Lk xviii. 18—21).

The modern Western mind finds it peculiarly hard to admit the reasonableness of a voluntary poverty, and is

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 106 ff.

consequently disposed to resist the idea that these Sayings in their literal sense can be part of the Teaching of Jesus. I will make one or two remarks on this point later on. But the difficulty of appreciating aright the Sayings in question may be increased from our not entering readily into the associations which the word "disciples" had. For us the calling to be disciples of Jesus appears to be inseparable from that of being members of a world-wide society. But, in the days of which the Gospels speak, discipleship to Jesus suggested a comparison with discipleship to other Masters, each of whom had his little body of adherents. Jesus placed before those who offered to become His disciples, how much more would be required of them in the way of the sacrifice of other interests than was demanded by other teachers. It was through the men who were prepared to make this sacrifice that the Christian faith and law won their place among mankind. And doubtless He could but desire to have many such disciples; the greater the number of them, the better must it have been for the progress of His work. But it must not be inferred that in the view of Jesus the multitudes who were not fitted to become His disciples were excluded thereby from all participation in the blessings of the Kingdom of God.

I pass to the Sayings and the Parables relating to almsgiving more generally.

The insistence on the duty of almsgiving was characteristic of Jewish teaching; the one new point, perhaps, is the thought that almsgiving is the true means of sanctifying food and purifying the utensils employed in connexion therewith, and the contrast with the Pharisaic ceremonial ablutions that is herein implied (xi. 41). The prospect of obtaining heavenly treasure in place of the earthly that is bestowed on the poor is, it will be observed, employed as a motive. The fact that we meet with this Teaching in a Gospel by one who has left us another book, more than half of which is occupied with the labours of St Paul and with doing him honour, should help us to see it in a right light. This Christian, who could dwell with so much sympathy upon the career of St Paul, was not frightened by the idea that men might be encouraged

to perform good works here by the hope of a reward hereafter. And indeed it is probable that St Paul himself would not have been so. For how, we may well ask, does the Teaching in question differ from the principle which the Apostle himself applies to almsgiving: "he that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly and he that soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully<sup>1</sup>." There appears then to be no good ground for thinking that there is anything necessarily sectarian in the Sayings above referred to.

In the parable of the Rich Fool there is nothing that need detain us, and there ought not to be, as it seems to me, in that of Lazarus and Dives, where the principal lesson is essentially the same. It has been said, however, by not a few who, to say plainly what I think, ought to have more perception both literary and moral, that in this parable the rich is condemned solely because he is rich and the beggar blessed hereafter solely because of the miseries he has endured here. Evidently the parable does not say this in so many words; is there any reason for holding that it is implied? Surely the selfish absorption of the rich man in his own pleasure, and his indifference to misery that lay so near at hand, could not be more vividly portrayed; and what sins could be more heinous? For these he is condemned. And the warning as to what such an one has to expect is enforced by a forecast of one of those great reversals in human lots which the future has in store. We are not told that Lazarus had been a saint when on earth; we are shewn him then as the rich man saw him; the rich man afterwards awakes to the fact which he might have realised all along, that the beggar is a "son of Abraham," or, as we Christians might rather say, a child of the heavenly Father and a brother of Jesus Christ. No doubt if the parable had been addressed to a congregation of beggars, there were warnings suited to their own case which should have been added; but for the rich, and for the multitudes of ordinary men who, though not rich, were striving to be so, or who at least had formed an altogether false estimate of the value of riches, it contained nothing but salutary instruction. And if the

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. ix. 6. Cp. also Gal. vi. 6, 7.



explanations and saving clauses had been added which would have prevented it from offering any points of vantage for the strictures of prosaic minds, or minds possessed by the dogmatic standards of later times, among modern critics, it would have lost much of its perfection of form and its impressiveness.

There is then no good ground for thinking that any of this Teaching on the subject of poverty and riches which we have been considering was wrongly attributed to Jesus. At the same time the fact that it has been recorded where it is, and not elsewhere, is clearly significant and deserves our careful attention. The idea that the evangelist himself collected it cannot be at once dismissed. It was congenial to him, as is evident from the manner in which he dwells in the Acts upon the readiness displayed among the early believers at Jerusalem in parting with their worldly goods and bestowing them upon those who were in need<sup>1</sup>. Indeed voluntary poverty at that day attracted the interest and sympathy even of heathen philosophers and persons of culture, though no doubt it continued in most cases to be merely a sentiment. It is evident that Josephus expected to awaken the admiration of his Gentile readers by his account of the Essenes<sup>2</sup> as an instance of the practical realisation among the Jews of a recognised ideal.

Nevertheless, it would be specially natural that the Teaching in the third Gospel which we are now considering should have been preserved among Jewish, and more particularly Palestinian, Christians. It was in harmony with the ideas in which they had been bred before they became Christians. Moreover, the consolations it afforded would be cherished among them owing to the poverty of the believers in Judaea, in regard to which there is not a little evidence. This view is confirmed by the language of the Epistle of St James, which (whether it was by James, the head of the Church in Jerusalem, or not) is no doubt Palestinian. It is also easiest to suppose that, if the Teaching in question was peculiarly treasured in Palestine it was also committed to writing there, and that in this way it reached the evangelist. We should have expected that, if he had himself collected it, there

<sup>1</sup> Acts ii. 44, 45; iv. 32—37.      <sup>2</sup> *Ant.* xviii. 1. § 18 ff.; *B. J.* ii. 8. § 119 ff.

would have been more signs of his own hand in it, and that it would have been more largely intermingled with Teaching of other kinds. Thus, taken in conjunction with the marks of close connexion between paragraphs<sup>1</sup>, which are specially noticeable in some of the parts of Luke's greater insertion in which this Teaching is contained, the character of this Teaching may be most reasonably viewed as an indication that the evangelist derived it from a document, while it indicates Palestine as the birthplace of that document.

But the Parables, Sayings and incidents<sup>2</sup>, which illustrate the compassion of Jesus for publicans and sinners, are a feature of the peculiar matter in the third Gospel no less marked than the Teaching on the subject of poverty and wealth. Can we suppose the evangelist to have derived them from the same source? If to any minds there seems to be a difficulty in doing so, I think it is due partly to an idea of the spirit of the Jewish Christians, for which there is no good ground; partly to its not having been noticed that in the Teaching and the narratives now in question the primary reference is strictly to fallen members of the race with whom God had made a special covenant, and that stress is laid upon this fact as a reason for seeking to restore them. Even the Judaizers with whom St Paul came into conflict could hardly have urged any *theoretical* objection against this, though we should imagine that it was not a work which would have attracted their sympathy to any great degree. But we can well believe that to the early Jewish-Christian community generally, however prejudiced they may have been against the admission of Gentiles without circumcision, however disinclined to consort even with Samaritans when converted to the new faith, the recovery of "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" was a dearly cherished object. And this would be in keeping, rather than the reverse, with their poverty and mutual charity, and with the opposition to the Pharisees which there is also reason to attribute to them.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 228.

<sup>2</sup> Of peculiar incidents there are two, the Anointing of the feet of Jesus by a sinful woman in the house of Simon the Pharisee (vii. 36—50), and the story of Zacchaeus (xix. 1—10). The latter of these falls outside the limits of the second chief insertion, but it is convenient to allude to it in the present connexion.

(3) It remains only that before summing up as to Luke's sources, I should touch briefly upon the pieces lying outside the two principal insertions. The account of the Visit to Nazareth (iv. 16—30) is largely taken up with an address on the unbelief of its inhabitants, which would have found a suitable place in the Collection of Discourses elsewhere used by the evangelist. The narrative with which it was connected may there have been slighter, some points having been supplied by Luke from the Marcan parallel. The account of the miracle of the Draught of fishes and the Call of the first disciples (v. 1—11) was probably supplied by Luke himself from tradition<sup>1</sup>.

Turning now to the closing part of the history, we have the account of Zacchaeus (xix. 1—10) occurring a little after the end of the second chief insertion. This story has already come before us as one of the passages peculiar to St Luke which illustrate the attitude of Jesus to publicans and sinners; but I must now refer to it again for another reason.

There appears to have been some disturbance of the original order of the sections here, where the end of the Logian document is woven into the Synoptic outline. The parable of the Minae and the words by which it is introduced at v. 11 do not fit naturally with the story of Zacchaeus and the Saying with which it is concluded; whereas they would follow suitably after the passage (xviii. 31—34) which precedes the account of the entry into Jericho. And on the other hand, the story of Zacchaeus might well have stood after the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, and might have been transferred to its present place either from some association of Zacchaeus with Jericho in tradition, or perception of the fitness of connecting him with that place of commerce.

It is noteworthy also, that in the section on the Request of the sons of Zebedee, most of which is omitted by Luke, but which in St Mark immediately precedes the entry into Jericho, there is one passage to which there is a parallel in Luke's account of the Last Supper. He derived, I believe, the discourse-matter (xxii. 24—38) or much of it, which he

<sup>1</sup> See Additional Note, p. 296 f.

has given us in his narrative of what took place in the Upper Chamber, from his Logian document; and it formed a fitting close to it, in that the prospect was here held out to the disciples of meeting their Lord again in His Kingdom and of reigning with Him.

The other pieces peculiar to the third Gospel in the narrative of the Passion appear to have been additions by the evangelist himself. In two of the most considerable of them, the account of Jesus before Herod (xxiii. 5—12) and of the Penitent Thief (xxiii. 39—43), the Lucan style is specially evident<sup>1</sup>. It seems to me probable that ch. xxiv. also was the evangelist's own composition<sup>2</sup>.

It appears, then, as the result of the foregoing investigation, that for his account of the Ministry of Jesus our third evangelist used, besides the original (or approximately the original) Gospel by Mark, one other principal source, namely, an expanded form of that original Greek Logian document, the contents of which were ascertained in Chapter II. With a copy of the latter as a foundation, a good deal of other matter was embodied, somewhere in Palestine. In Jerusalem itself there may well have been throughout the latter half of the first century A.D. a body of Jewish-Christians, returned Hellenists and others, to whom it was more natural to speak and write in Greek than in Aramaic, or who were at least capable of using Greek. And the employment of that language would be suggested by the feeling that a writing in Greek would command wider influence. If Jerusalem did not supply the required conditions, there were undoubtedly other cities of Palestine in which they must have existed.

The additional matter may have been derived to some extent from the Aramaic Collection of Logia, which had not been fully rendered before. But besides this it comprises many parables, which corresponded (there is no reason to doubt) with Aramaic originals, but which had been told orally and in greater or less degree shaped anew, before they were committed to writing. Some of the few incidents added may also have been first current as traditions in the community where the document was produced.

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.* p. 306 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 308 f.

This document has supplied the greater part of the non-Marcian matter in the Gospel from the beginning of the Synoptic outline onwards. And it is natural to conjecture that the peculiarities of the third Gospel, in passages which have on the whole close parallels, are in some instances due to it, e.g. part of the preaching of the Baptist (Lk iii. 10—14), the order of the last two temptations in the wilderness (Lk iv. 5—12), and a portion of the account of the Centurion's servant (Lk vii. 4—6*a* and 10). Most of the matter from it has been given in two portions, Lk vi. 17—viii. 3 and Lk ix. 51—xviii. 14. But just as some of the earlier sections of the document have been introduced into the Synoptic outline before the first of these two insertions, so likewise a few have been given after the second of them.

The evangelist himself has added a few passages, gathered by him probably from oral tradition. In particular the accounts of incidents in the history of the Passion and Appearance of the Risen Christ, peculiar to this Gospel, owe (it would seem) their written form to him. This being so, and as the rest of the narrative of the Passion, though differing a good deal from the Marcan in arrangement, may well have been founded upon it<sup>1</sup>, there is no reason for thinking that another document was used.

Our third evangelist had besides a narrative of the Birth and Infancy of John the Baptist and of Jesus, which was composed in Palestine, but which was probably a separate writing, not part of the expanded Logian document.

We have now to inquire who the evangelist was.

### *The Authorship of the Third Gospel.*

The belief that the author of this Gospel was Luke, the companion of St Paul, who is referred to three times in Epistles of the New Testament, may with great probability be traced back, at least as far as to the time of Justin Martyr<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 165 f., 288 f.

<sup>2</sup> In a passage (*Dial.* c. 103) in which he appears clearly to have a statement of our third Gospel in view, he refers to the records of the life of Christ as "by the Apostles and those who followed them."

We shall be concerned now with testing this belief, which we have exceptional opportunities of doing owing to the circumstance that our third Gospel has a sequel in the New Testament, professedly by the same writer, which treats of the history of the Church in the Apostolic Age. More than half of this writing is occupied with the work and journeys of St Paul, and the first person plural is used in certain passages called for convenience the "we"-sections. May we not, then, suppose that the writer who composed the work as a whole was himself in the company of St Paul during parts of his missionary career? This seems a natural inference. But it is contended that the contents of the book are in part such as could not have proceeded from a companion of St Paul. And this must be allowed to be up to the present time the preponderant critical opinion, at least in Germany, although a powerful advocate of the Lucan authorship has quite recently appeared in the person of Harnack<sup>1</sup>.

Two admissions are almost universally made, and a statement of them will clear the ground for the further discussion of the subject. (1) It is allowed that, as the dedication of the Acts implies, this work and the third Gospel have the same author. The evidence of style and vocabulary in passages like the introductions to the two books, and also in many places where sources that have been employed have been revised, leave (it is felt) no doubt of this. (2) It is not disputed that in the "we"-sections the use of the first person is to be traced to one who was a companion of St Paul in some of his travels. The directness and vividness of the narrative in the contexts in question, which are generally recognised, are inconsistent with forgery. And, moreover, it is impossible to think that the "we," if it was fictitious, would have been introduced only to such a limited extent and so abruptly. But it is maintained that the author of the whole work has in these places, and possibly in some other parts of his account of St Paul, made use of a record by such a companion, who may most reasonably on the ground of tradition be supposed to have been Luke, just as

<sup>1</sup> *Lukas der Arzt der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte*, 1906, Eng. trans. *Luke the Physician*.

in his Gospel, and it may be in the Acts, he has used other sources, as well as information orally given to him.

We must presently inquire whether the phraseology of the "we"-sections does not point decisively to their having been written by the author of the Acts and of the third Gospel himself. But we will first examine the grounds of objection to this identification which seem most to deserve attention. They are found partly in discrepancies between the account in the Acts of St Paul's life and teaching and the facts related by him in his own Epistles, as well as the general view which we there obtain of him; partly also in statements in the Acts referring to the same series of events as the "we"-sections do, but which cannot (it is held), on account of their intrinsic character, proceed from the companion of St Paul who uses the first person in those sections.

Now it does not seem to have been sufficiently considered that the difficulties of accounting for discrepancies between the Acts and Pauline Epistles may, if the former work was written about 100 A.D., the earliest time to which it is referred by those who deny the Lucan authorship, be as great as, or greater than, if it was written, say, about A.D. 80 by one who had been a companion of St Paul. The discrepancies as to matters of fact relate almost exclusively to portions of the Apostle's life when the writer of the "we"-sections does not seem to have been with him. His recollection of what the Apostle had told him in regard to these times might not have been clear and accurate in all respects, and there might have been many facts of which he had never heard him speak. We may also well believe that he would have had no collection of St Paul's Epistles at hand, that he may never have seen those of them which were written when he was not one of his companions, that to procure copies would not have been easy, and that, considering himself to be sufficiently well-informed for the purpose he had in view, he would have thought it unnecessary to do so. On the contrary, it is probable that at the end of the first, or beginning of the second, century, copies of St Paul's Epistles were to be found in the chief Greek-speaking churches<sup>1</sup>;

<sup>1</sup> Polycarp, *ad Phil.* XIII., regarding the Epistles of Ignatius, shews that the idea of making a collection of the letters of an eminent member of the Church was

and a writer at that time, in composing a narrative concerned largely with St Paul, would be anxious to make use of them, all the more because he was dependent upon documents for his information to a greater extent than a former companion of the Apostle would have been. Such a writer might fail to enter into St Paul's spirit and to represent rightly his aims and principles; but he would avoid contradicting him on definite points, and he would probably have reproduced some of his statements more closely than any passages in the Acts do. It might have been expected, for instance, that such a writer would have followed the First Epistle to the Thessalonians in respect to the mission of Timothy to that Church, instead of describing the course followed by St Paul's companions when he escaped from Beroea in a way that does not harmonise therewith<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, the memory of a companion of St Paul, who was writing a good many years after the events, might well be somewhat vague as to the movements of other companions of St Paul of which he had heard only by word of mouth. Again, one who had read the catalogue which the Apostle gives in 2 Cor. xi of the persecutions he had endured would have been likely to make some use of it, and there are occasions mentioned in the Acts in connexion with which some of them might naturally have been assumed to have happened. But it is evident from the Apostle's own language that he referred with extreme reluctance to these personal sufferings<sup>2</sup>, and even one who had been much in his company might never have heard him dwell upon them.

Similar considerations apply in the case of some at least of the differences between chh. i. and ii. of the Epistle to the Galatians and the Acts. The difficulty of accounting for them is not diminished, but increased, if the authorship of the latter work is attributed, not to a companion of St Paul's later years such as Luke, but to a man of the next generation. And we can in reality quite well understand that Luke might never have known, or might have forgotten, the fact of Paul's

a familiar one, while the parallels in Polycarp's own epistle with many of the Pauline Epistles shews that he must have possessed a more or less complete collection of them.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. 1 Thess. iii. 1 ff. and A. xvii. 14 ff.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 1; xii. 1, 11.



visit to Arabia after his conversion, and the length of the period that intervened before he went up from Damascus to Jerusalem. Even, indeed, if he knew of the former he might not have thought it necessary to refer to it. Again, it would not be strange that, partly from drawing a little on his imagination with a view to more vivid description, partly through defect of memory and the silence of the Apostle himself, partly through relying on information received from other quarters, which may not have been accurate in all respects, he should have represented the circumstances of St Paul's visits to Jerusalem more or less differently.

It may, perhaps, be thought that Luke must have been too well-informed to have introduced a purely fictitious visit to Jerusalem, as many on the ground of St Paul's language at Gal. ii. 1 hold that mentioned in Acts xi. 30 to be. I am not sure of this, but it also appears to me that St Paul's words are unfairly pressed when they are made to exclude the possibility of a brief visit in which he had no intercourse with Apostles, and did not become generally known to the disciples in Judaea, as would be probable in the circumstances described in Acts xii. The fact of such a visit as this would not have affected his argument, and he might therefore without real untruthfulness have passed it over.

A companion of St Paul, however, must have known the Apostle's methods, his ordinary procedure in his evangelistic work, and the principles of his teaching. If there should be any real conflict in regard to these between the Acts and what we learn from St Paul's Epistles, it must weigh heavily against the claim that the former is by Luke. Now according to the account in Acts xv. of the conference at Jerusalem at which it was decided that circumcision should not be imposed upon believers in Christ from among the Gentiles, it was at the same time agreed that certain requirements should also be made of them; and in the description of a journey of Paul and Silas shortly after this through Syria, Cilicia and South Galatia, it is said that "as they went on their way through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, which had been ordained of the apostles and elders that were at Jerusalem" (Acts xvi. 4). On the other hand, in the account which St Paul gives in Gal. ii. of the compact made at

Jerusalem in respect to the Gentiles, there is no reference to these decrees, and he declares that he and Barnabas were desired only to "remember the poor." Moreover, when writing to the Corinthians<sup>1</sup> on one of the points with which those decrees dealt, that of "meats offered to idols," he makes no reference to them.

In comparing these statements it should first be observed that from the Acts it does not appear that any pledge was exacted from Paul and Barnabas in respect to the communication of the decrees. Two representatives of the Church at Jerusalem were sent with them, and it would obviously be specially their duty to deliver the letter. We can well believe also that St Paul, even if the form of the decrees did not commend itself to him, may have thought it wisest to raise no objection, and may have been willing to accept their imposition as a compromise, and to take part in the delivery of the letter; and yet that afterwards when the Judaizers were causing still more serious mischief in those very Churches, and magnifying the authority of the Church at Jerusalem with a view to destroying the significance of the Gospel committed to him, he should have felt perfectly justified in remaining silent about any injunctions of that Church, and in insisting that he had come out of the conference on the question of the Gentiles as free as he went into it. So also in extending his labours to the evangelisation of fresh places, and in the care of Churches in which the Jewish element was probably far smaller than in those first founded, which were nearer to Palestine, he may naturally have felt under no obligation to refer to the decrees of the Church at Jerusalem and have considered that to do so would be misleading, and that it was preferable to argue the question of abstinence from food offered to idols on its own merits, when it became a pressing one in a Church like that of Corinth.

The author of the Acts mentions Paul in connexion with the delivery of the decrees only at xvi. 4<sup>2</sup>. He puts, however,

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. viii. 1 ff.

<sup>2</sup> It might well be urged that the writer would not have contented himself with this one reference, if his purpose was to shew that St Paul worked in harmony with the older Apostles, and if he allowed himself to draw inferences accordingly as to what St Paul must have done.

a reference to them into the mouth of James in xxi. 25; and he could hardly have done this without explanation, if he felt that they had been commonly disregarded. But it is not necessary to assume that the observance of the rules in question could have spread only in consequence of the formal command of the Church at Jerusalem. Among the early converts to Christianity there were probably in many places some who, having first been proselytes to Judaism, had already observed them, and would naturally continue to do so. From them the rules may have been learned. They would also have commended themselves as a means of facilitating union between different elements in the Church. With this object, which he had so much at heart, St Paul himself may have promoted the observance of them. There would be no reason why he should not do so, provided that they were not made a substitute for spiritual religion, or insisted on in such a way as to make them a barrier to the reception of the Gospel.

The practice attributed to St Paul of first addressing himself to the Jews in the places which he visited on his missionary journeys, and to the Gentiles only after the Jews had rejected his message<sup>1</sup>, is also cited as a mark of unauthenticity. But the fact that the Apostolate of the Gentiles had been specially assigned to him, and that of the Circumcision to prominent members of the Twelve, would not surely preclude him, in the absence of the latter, from preaching to Jews of the Dispersion. There can be little doubt that St Paul himself must have recognised that in consequence of God's covenant with Israel in the past it was fitting that they should have the first offer of the salvation which had been foretold. And there were practical reasons of the strongest kind for approaching them first. They were prepared to understand the Gospel in a way that the Gentiles could not be. And if it had been preached first to the latter this would have made its reception far harder for the Jews. Moreover the account in one of the "we"-sections of the course followed by St Paul at Philippi confirms the statements in other parts of the Acts as to what he did in other

<sup>1</sup> See Acts xiii. 5, 14 ff.; xiv. 1 ff.; xvii. 1 ff., 17; xviii. 1 ff.; xxviii. 17 ff.

places. Here the Jews and proselytes were not, it would seem, numerous or rich enough to have a synagogue. But they had a "proseuche"—a place of prayer—by the river-side, and the first step taken by the Apostle after his arrival is to seek it out on the Sabbath day, and to speak to the few women gathered there<sup>1</sup>. It is indeed alleged that the "work of evangelisation among the heathen is in the Acts made to depend upon its failure among the Jews." The only ground, so far as I know, that there can be for this assertion, lies in such words as those at Acts xiii. 46, "It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you. Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo we turn to the Gentiles<sup>2</sup>." But to make rhetorical expressions of this kind imply that if the Gospel had not been rejected by the Jews it would never have been proclaimed to the Gentiles is to press their meaning unfairly; and in any case they do not imply this more than do the Apostle's assertion in the Epistle to the Romans that "by their fall salvation is come to the Gentiles<sup>3</sup>."

Further, it is said that in the speech in the Synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia, given in Acts xiii, St Paul's master-thoughts are lacking and that he could not have delivered it. If so, it could no doubt hardly have been attributed to him by one who was for a considerable time, though at a later period, his companion. For although the composition of the speeches in the Acts may be largely the work of the author himself, he might, if he had often heard the Apostle, be expected to know both his manner and the points on which he would be likely to dwell. But is the address in question one such as St Paul would have been unlikely to have made? It would have been natural for him, in speaking for the first time to a body of Jews, to commence with a line of thought to which they were accustomed, and so to lead up to a moderate statement of the new truth which he had to communicate, in so far as it directly affected themselves (*vv.* 38, 39). The instinct of any skilful orator, not to say of a man of such unusual

<sup>1</sup> Acts xvi. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. also xviii. 6 and xxviii. 25—28.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. xi. 11. See also the whole argument of that chapter.

tact and many-sided sympathy as St Paul's Epistles shew him to have been, would have suggested such a method. Indeed, I would urge that in this speech, that to the ordinary heathen at Lystra, and to the cultivated heathen of Athens, and to the crowd at Jerusalem from the Castle-stairs, the author of the Acts shews, by the adaptation of the arguments to each case, that, whether he gives in substance what was actually spoken or not, he has at least truly caught and represented a characteristic feature of the Apostle's preaching.

Let us now turn to the representation given us in the Acts of St Peter's relation to the question of the Admission of the Gentiles. I would remind the reader that the point which we have here to consider is not whether the account in the Acts of Peter's experiences, and of his appreciation of their significance, can be reconciled with what is related in the Epistle to the Galatians as to his conduct, and with the view generally of the history of the question of the admission of the Gentiles which we obtain from this and St Paul's other Epistles; but simply whether the divergence is of such a kind that we cannot imagine the account in the Acts to have proceeded from a disciple of St Paul. That the writer of the Acts should, if he knew of Peter's want of courage at Antioch, have passed it over in silence, can hardly be thought strange. But he may not even have known of it, if (as is probable) he had not seen the Epistle to the Galatians. It would be a grave mistake to regard this Epistle as representing St Paul's normal attitude to the elder Apostles. Though he referred to his differences from them in writing to Churches to which he had to prove his own independent commission, and the firmness with which he had adhered and was prepared still to adhere to the Gospel which he had received, it would have been utterly alien to his character to dwell upon those differences when it was unnecessary to do so. He may never have alluded again to Peter's inconsistent conduct at Antioch. Now, I am not sure that even if Luke knew of this incident it would have prevented him from believing the narrative of the revelation to Peter on the subject of the admission of the Gentiles, and from giving it prominence in his own work; but at all events if

he did not know of that incident, he would not have been troubled with a sense of the incongruity between different parts of Peter's conduct.

It seems, indeed, to be thought by some that the writer of Acts has obscured the uniqueness of St Paul's part in the evangelisation of the Gentiles, through giving the place he has done to St Peter's preaching to Cornelius. If he had perceived any danger of this, a true disciple of St Paul would still not have been deterred by it. He would have felt that it was the cause that mattered, and not the reputation of any man, even the dearest and most esteemed. And nothing could be more likely to further the cause in many quarters than St Peter's testimony. But, further, it is not implied in the Acts that Peter changed in any way his course of work after his visit to Cornelius. It had lain, and it continued to lie, among his own countrymen. Whereas St Paul's call to deliver a message which was for all men without distinction<sup>1</sup>, and his labours in obedience thereto, are the theme of the whole work. No doubt we obtain a more sharply defined and vivid impression of St Paul's aims and teaching and character from his own letters than we do from the Acts. But it is quite conceivable that even in the representation of one who had been much with the Apostle there should have been this difference, either in consequence of influences under which he had subsequently come, or of his own intellectual temper<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> ix. 15, 16; xxii. 14, 15, 21; xxvi. 16—18.

<sup>2</sup> Although in the Acts there may be some softening of the lines of difference between St Peter and St Paul, and although the purpose of exhibiting a certain parallelism between the careers of the two Apostles is more or less apparent, Jülicher surely exaggerates greatly when he writes that "the author has only one scheme for the activities in which the Apostolic office is fulfilled (nur ein Schema für die Bestätigungen apostolischer Gewalt), possesses only one ideal of an Apostle, according to which he delineates Paul and Peter alike" (*Einleit.* 6th ed. p. 398, Eng. trans. p. 438). In point of fact there are strongly marked differences both in the circumstances of their lives and in their teaching. Peter's little tour in Palestine (Acts ix. 32 ff.) bears no comparison with Paul's journeys, nor does the single reference to the feeling of the Jews which encouraged Herod after he had slain James to take measures against Peter (xii. 3, 11) with their repeated acts of bitter hostility in many places to Paul (ix. 23; xiii. 45, 50; xiv. 2—5, 19; xvii. 5, 13; xviii. 12; xix. 33; xx. 3, 19; xxi. 27; xxii. 22 f.; xxiii. 12 f.; xxiv. 5 f.), and the suspicions felt in regard to him even by those Jerusalemite Jews who believed in Jesus (xxi. 20, 21). Again, the teaching connected with the admission

There are some other passages in which the improbability (real or supposed) of the writer's having been a companion of St Paul is (as I have indicated at the commencement of this discussion) of a different kind from that in the foregoing. The chief is the account of the conversion of the jailor at Philippi. This narrative lacks that convincing fitness in details which is frequently a note of first-hand information. And yet if the writer who came with St Paul from Troas and who describes the first part of his stay at Philippi, when he was certainly in his company, remained there (as is generally assumed) till the Apostle left the place, or it may be longer, he must have heard particulars as to the night of his imprisonment on the very next day; and even if (as B. Weiss has suggested)<sup>1</sup> he returned to Troas during the "many days" referred to in xvi. 18, he must, one would think, subsequently have learned what happened soon after he departed, either from St Paul himself, or from some other member of his little band.

But after all, is it inconceivable that one who had had these opportunities for knowing the facts should have written the narrative in the Acts? The coincidence itself between the earthquake and the imprisonment of the Apostle cannot be reckoned impossible, and it is not strange that it should have led to the conversion of the jailor. The difficulties lie in some of the physical effects attributed to the earthquake, and in a certain unnaturalness in one or two of the remarks of the jailor. But even a companion of St Paul might, in relating the story twenty-five or thirty years after the events, have used his imagination as to these points, and not have done so altogether happily. As regards the physical phenomena more particularly he might easily in that age have gone wrong.

The only other passage of this kind to which it will be necessary for me, I think, to refer, is the account of St Paul's

of Cornelius does not approach to the intensity and doctrinal fulness of the passages regarding the call of Paul (p. 249, n. 1). And while Peter declares that remission of sins, which the prophets had taught men to expect as a blessing of the Messianic times, is pledged "in the name of" Jesus, no mention of "justification" is attributed to him as it is to Paul at xiii. 39; or of the peculiar efficacy of Christ's death, as to Paul at xx. 28.

<sup>1</sup> *Textkritik d. Apostelgeschichte, in loc.*

interview with the heads of the Jewish community in Rome, three days after he reached the city (xxviii. 17 f.). As to his practice of addressing himself first to the Jews in the places he visited I have already spoken<sup>1</sup>, and I need not repeat what I have there urged. But in the present instance it is, no doubt, strange that the existence of a Christian Church in Rome, to which St Paul had himself written an Epistle, should be ignored. It is also somewhat surprising that the representatives of the Jews should have declared that they had neither received letters from Judaea concerning Paul, nor any bad report from anyone coming thence.

As regards the former point it may be observed that the writer of the Acts could not when he penned this passage have been ignorant or forgetful of the fact that there were Christian believers in Rome, even if he was not the author of the diary of travel; for he had in that case only just before copied from that document the statement that the brethren from Rome had come to meet St Paul at Appii Forum and the Three Taverns (*v.* 15). As to the other point which I have mentioned we are scarcely in a position to say whether it is improbable, owing to our ignorance of the extent to which there was at this time organised intercommunication between the Jews of the Dispersion and the chiefs of the nation in Jerusalem. But even if the statement was not in point of fact made by the Roman Jews, this would not prove that a writer who had come with St Paul to Rome could not have attributed it to them, when, a good many years later, he recalled the scene to his memory, or pictured it if he was not actually present.

I have considered difficulties in the supposition that the author of the Acts was a companion of St Paul which arise directly out of this assumption itself of association with the Apostle. Improbabilities in the earlier part of the Acts cannot bear on the question of authorship in the same way. It is indeed clear that the companion of St Paul who wrote the "we"-sections must in the course of his journeys have had many opportunities of obtaining good information about the early days of the Church, and if he was the author likewise

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 246 f.



of the preface to the third Gospel he was not the man to neglect those opportunities. Moreover, if he was "Luke the beloved physician" (Col. iv. 14), he could have learned not a little from Mark, when both were together in the Apostle's company at Rome (cp. *ib. v. 10* and Philem. *vv. 23, 24*). Nevertheless, matter of an unauthentic kind regarding that early period might also in later years have come into his hands, and he might not have had a sufficiently broad and intimate knowledge to lead him to reject it. Consequently it cannot be easy to say what a man who had had the advantages just described above might, or might not, have been expected to write. We know too little as to the stages in the development of Christian faith and institutions, reached in successive decades of the first century, to enable us to decide either what it would have been natural for such a man to assume, or what statements must be true or false, accurate or inaccurate<sup>1</sup>.

There is, however, one point on which it may be right for me to make a few remarks—the representation in the Acts of the "speaking with tongues." The account in Acts ii. "rests," it is said "on a serious misunderstanding of the expression 'to speak with tongues,' such as could not possibly befall a contemporary of those who spoke with tongues<sup>2</sup>." And although there is no reference to "divers languages" on the other occasions where "speaking with tongues" is mentioned in the Acts, it is contended<sup>3</sup>—especially on the ground of St Peter's words with regard to Cornelius and his

<sup>1</sup> Jülicher (*ib. p. 396*, Eng. trans. p. 435) remarks that the author of Acts "knew only organised communities" and refers to the fact that Paul and Barnabas on their return-journey through South Galatia are said to have "appointed for them elders in every church," in imitation of the Church at Jerusalem. But wherever, as probably in this region, there was a considerable Jewish element in the Christian communities, if not elsewhere, it would be natural that the institution of elders should be speedily introduced, and natural also that Paul and Barnabas should see to its introduction and set apart the individuals selected. In the same connexion Jülicher also refers to the quasi-sacramental character attributed to the laying on of hands in the Acts. But there is no reason why this symbolic action should not have been very early adopted as an accompaniment to the invocation of the Spirit.

<sup>2</sup> Jülicher, *ib. p. 402*, Eng. trans. p. 442.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., by Clemen, *Paulus*, p. 214, n. 1.

company, "God gave unto them the like gift as he did also unto us" (xi. 18)—that in all cases the writer has before his mind the same conception of the "tongues," which contrasted strongly with those ecstatic utterances, intelligible only to those who had a special gift of interpreting them spiritually, of which we read in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. But in the first place, "the like gift" (*τὴν ἴσην δωρεάν*) at xi. 17 is primarily the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (cp. v. 16 and xv. 8), and to insist that the writer must have supposed the evidence of the Spirit's presence to have been always of precisely the same kind is to press the words too far. Further, I find it impossible to believe that at the end of the first, or beginning of the second, century the memory of instances of "speaking with tongues" had so entirely passed away that the author of the Acts, if he wrote as late as this, could have been wholly at fault as to the character of the "tongues."

But I would especially urge that the speaking with tongues on the Day of Pentecost may from the account in the Acts be seen to have been even as a physical phenomenon far more like that referred to by St Paul than—in consequence, probably, of the influence of the traditional idea that the gift described was intended to equip the Apostles for their evangelistic work—has commonly been supposed. The whole incident is in accord with the principle laid down by St Paul that "tongues are for a sign<sup>1</sup>." They were not even on that day used for the direct instruction of men in the new faith. The gift was bestowed not on the Twelve separately, but on the whole congregation assembled, and was exhibited even before the crowd of people had gathered to listen. The meaning of the marvel is afterwards explained by Peter in the language, evidently, which he ordinarily spoke. But most expressive of all are the words of the bystanders: "we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God." To "speak the wonderful works of God"—*λαλεῖν τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Acts ii. 11)—means, in entire accord with the language of the Old Testament<sup>2</sup>, *to praise Him*. So too in Acts x. 46 we read "they heard them speaking with

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Ps. ix. 1.

tongues and magnifying God" (*μεγαλυνόντων τὸν Θεόν*). The essential character and purpose of the speaking with tongues are here brought out more clearly than in St Paul's allusions, though in a way fully in harmony therewith<sup>1</sup>, and manifestly true to life. They were a form of praise prompted by ecstatic joy<sup>2</sup>. The only feature that was peculiar on the Day of Pentecost was that Jews and proselytes coming from divers countries distinguished expressions from the various languages with which they were severally familiar mingling in the praises of the body of believers. And it would not be difficult to suggest even a natural explanation of this. Devout expressions which they had at some time or other heard, but which in ordinary circumstances they would have been quite unable to recall or to utter, and which (it may be) they did not themselves fully understand, might well have been brought to the lips of those in such an ecstatic state. It is a remarkable fact that something of the same kind seems to have happened in connexion with the Irvingite manifestations<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, the presence of men from different countries might itself, by the laws of association or of suggestion, contribute to this result.

This view, then, that the character of portions of the Acts is incompatible with the supposition that the work as a whole was by a companion of St Paul appears to rest on very insufficient grounds. Those who have asserted this incompatibility have been led to do so, I believe, partly from not making sufficient allowance for the weakness of human memory and the incompleteness and often inaccuracy even of good human testimony; partly from not recognising duly the many-sidedness of St Paul's character, his magnanimity and the breadth of his sympathies, or realising how varied and constantly shifting must have been the aspects of such a movement as that for the inclusion of the Gentiles, and of the controversies to which it gave rise. Excessive confidence

<sup>1</sup> Cp. 1 Cor. xiv. 14—19.

<sup>2</sup> The signs of ecstasy are indicated in Acts ii. 13.

<sup>3</sup> See quotation in Stanley, *Ep. to Cor.* (3rd ed.), p. 254. St Paul himself seems to have conceived "the tongues" as in part the language of strange races of men. See 1 Cor. xiii. 1, and cp. *ib.* xiv. 10.

has also been placed in the class of considerations known as "Higher Criticism," a confidence which places the critic at the mercy of his own limitations, whatever they may be, and is too likely to make him the victim even of his own ingenuity. Criticism of this kind has its place, and it is an important one, and often when the contentions originally put forward in its name prove to be unsound, it leads to a deeper understanding of the period. It has found a fitting subject in the authorship of the Acts; but the discussion has not been foreclosed by the arguments it has advanced, as many critics seem to have thought. On the contrary, we may be glad to turn to an inquiry of a "drier" kind, which is here open to us, that is, one where the result is less likely to be affected by our own prepossessions, or lack of insight. Where our information is so scanty as it is in many respects in regard to the early history of the Church, and it is so hard to place ourselves truly at the point of view of the actors, we ought, as a matter of common prudence, to make full use of every kind of evidence that is available. In the present instance the fact that there are a style, vocabulary, and phraseology which are acknowledged to belong to the writer by whom the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles were composed, suggests that we should endeavour to ascertain whether the use of characteristic words and expressions in the "we"-sections is such as to shew that the same man was the author of them, or at most simply their reviser. It is a serious blot upon the criticism of the Acts during the past twenty years, as well as earlier, that so little attention has been given to this question. By a few writers it has been examined and the conclusion has been reached that the former of the two alternatives just indicated is clearly the true one<sup>1</sup>; but for the most part Criticism has paid no heed. Now, however, that a historian and critic of Harnack's eminence and of his independent theological position has come to the same conclusion<sup>2</sup>, it will scarcely be possible that the

<sup>1</sup> See Klostermann, *Vindiciae Lucanae*, 1866; also an article by the present writer in the *Expositor* for 1893, p. 336 ff.; and Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 1899, p. 148 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See *Lukas der Arzt*, p. 19 ff.

importance of the evidence afforded by a comparison between portions of the travel-diary and the remainder of the "Lucan" writings should any longer be ignored<sup>1</sup>.

The amount of characteristic words and phrases varies greatly in different parts of the "Lucan" writings. It is greatest in the latter half of the Acts generally, less in the first half, least of all in the third Gospel, taken as a whole. But in the last-named it is further to be observed that they occur especially at places where we might expect the author to write in his own style, as for example in sentences that are of the nature of introductions to, or comments upon, narratives that he has taken from his Marcan source, or in additions to, or substitutions for, what he there found, which he may not improbably have derived from oral tradition and thus have been freer to express in his own form. But where he has used his document for the substance of a narrative he has in the main adhered to its form there. His alterations are confined for the most part to little changes of construction, affecting a clause or two, which render the connexion of the sentences more smooth, and to the removal of some solecisms. In one or two instances he has rearranged a narrative, and has consequently been led to write in his own manner for two or three sentences. Lk v. 17—19 is the most considerable clear example. Possibly, as I have myself suggested, he has in describing the time spent by Jesus in the high-priest's house and the trial in the morning by the Sanhedrin, recast a longer passage of his Marcan document without help from any other source, again largely with a view to better arrangement. But these are isolated examples, and the motive which led to free remoulding here, the desire for a more logical order, could not apply in the case of the "we"-sections. Yet *throughout* these sections the "Lucan" characteristics abound to an extent unsurpassed in any part of the Lucan writings ;

<sup>1</sup> Schürer (*Theol. Literaturz.* 1906, no. 14) has stated, perhaps as fully as could be expected in a short review, his reasons for being unconvinced by Harnack; in no. 16 of the same journal Harnack replied. C. F. G. Heinrici (*Der literarische Charakter der neutestamentlichen Schriften*, 1908, p. 91) alludes to this interesting discussion, and gives his own opinion decidedly, as on Harnack's side. It is to be regretted that Loisy, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, I. p. 74 f., should have dismissed so curtly Harnack's argument.

they enter into the warp and woof of the passages, and they are of very various kinds—linguistic and such as are not merely linguistic—words and expressions that belong to his special vocabulary, sentences and clauses moulded in the same manner as others in different parts of his writings, habitual points of view, favourite thoughts of an ethical and religious kind. These together produce an impression which is quite distinctive, and there is nothing in the practice of the author of the Acts and third Gospel, where we know him to have made use of a document, which would justify the supposition that he would have revised what another had written to the extent required in order to produce such a result<sup>1</sup>.

Schürer, indeed, suggests that the "we"-sections proceeded from a writer whose style was similar to that of the author of the work as a whole, and that this circumstance together with revision by the latter accounts for the features of these sections as we have them. But the combination of these two suppositions does not seem to meet the case. For, in the first place, such a similarity of style between two writers as could reasonably be assumed, could not have extended to more than a few of the points mentioned. And, further, the two forms of explanation are not in reality fitted to supplement each other. For in proportion as the author found a style similar to his own in the document he was using, he would feel no need of revising it.

Others have contended that it is not according to the manner of the author of the Acts to be so concise as these sections are. There are, it may be pointed out, other passages which are similar in this respect<sup>2</sup>, but the same travel-document may conceivably have been used here, although the first person plural does not occur in them. Even if we assume this there does not seem to be much force in the objection. The character of what the author had to relate would fully account for this difference. All writers are apt to be affected in a point of this kind by their subject-matter, and one so

<sup>1</sup> See Additional Note, pp. 276 ff., 312 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See xiii. 4—6a, 13, 14; xiv. 24—28; xvi. 40 and xvii. 1; xvii. 14, 15; xviii. 21—23; xix. 1; xx. 1—3.

versatile as unquestionably the author of the third Gospel and the Acts was would be specially likely to be so.

The evidence which has been referred to in the last few pages should of course be examined in detail by anyone who would satisfy himself as to its value<sup>1</sup>. In an Additional Note to the present chapter I have provided my readers with the means of estimating its strength. I would here add that its force seems to me fully sufficient in the absence (as I believe) of any good arguments which countervail it, to establish the conclusion that a companion of St Paul was the author of the Acts and of the third Gospel.

But the place of the "we"-sections in the general structure of the latter part of the Acts should also be considered. The introduction of the first person plural at xvi. 10; xx. 5; and xxvii. 1, is abrupt. But it ought not (I think) to be more difficult, and to many it will seem easier, to understand, the writer's having failed to notice this change, if he was giving his own reminiscences, than if he at these points turned to a diary by another person. Further the abruptness itself would not have seemed so great to those for whom he wrote in the first instance as it does to us, if they knew (even many of them personally) the man whose book they were reading; and we may assume this to have been the case, since plainly he does not either in the Acts, considered as a whole, or in the third Gospel, attempt to personate anyone for the sake of gaining credence, and he could therefore have had no motive for concealing his authorship. It is to be observed also that the "we"-sections are firmly embedded in their contexts. There are no breaks in the narrative at the points

<sup>1</sup> Klostermann treats of Acts xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16. In my article in the *Expositor* referred to above, I endeavoured to exhibit in tabular form that supplied by Acts xvi. 10—17. Hawkins has given tables relating to all the sections. But there is much that may be said in the form of a commentary on the passages, which cannot be shewn conveniently in the form of tables. Harnack in *Lukas der Arzt*, p. 28 ff. has commented on xvi. 10—17 and xxviii. 1—16. In an appendix to the present chapter I have given a commentary on the first three of them which I have had by me in the main as I give it, and used in teaching, for many years, but to which in preparing it for publication I have added a few points taken from others. I have also (pp. 276—90) investigated the third evangelist's revision of his Marcan document, with a view to determining the extent to which he might have revised in other cases.

at which the first person begins and ceases to be employed. And there are connecting links of a different kind which are of greater interest. At ch. xix. 21, we are told of the Apostle's purpose, near the close of his long sojourn at Ephesus, first to pass through Macedonia and Achaia, and then to visit Jerusalem and subsequently Rome. In the history from this point onward we are shewn how this plan was carried out, and the great end which the Apostle had in view achieved, but not in the way that could have been humanly expected or desired. He goes up to Jerusalem under inward constraint (Acts xx. 22), in spite of his own presentiment and the warnings of others as to the dangers which he will encounter there. Nevertheless he escapes from the Jews and finds his way to Rome, but only as a prisoner, and after nearly losing his life at sea. This providential ordering of events is traced no less in the "we"-sections than in other parts of the concluding chapters of the Acts<sup>1</sup>.

Another leading purpose in the latter half of the Acts, the signs of which are still more widely extended, is that of shewing that there was no real breach of Christian fellowship between St Paul on the one hand and the true leaders of the Church at Jerusalem and their genuine following on the other, and that the latter thankfully recognised the success which had crowned his missionary labours. Too much has sometimes been made of this intention of the author, and wholly unjustifiable inferences have been drawn from it. But there can be little doubt that he did wish to shew that these friendly relations were maintained. Now we have one clear illustration of this desire in the account, related in the first person plural, of the manner in which the Apostle and his companions were received by "the brethren at Jerusalem" (xxi. 17), as well as in the immediate sequel (*vv.* 23—26).

These are some of the links of connexion between different passages which cannot be well explained except on the supposition that the latter half of the Acts as a whole proceeds from one hand, and this the hand of one who during part of the time in question was in the Apostle's company.

Another consideration which makes for the same con-

<sup>1</sup> Cp. especially xxi. 1, 4, 10—14, with xx. 22, 23, 37, 38, and xxvii. 23, 24.



clusion is the accurate knowledge of localities and institutions which characterises especially the latter half of the Acts<sup>1</sup>. But it is difficult to suppose that the author of so large a portion of the book, which evidently forms a necessary part of the plan of the whole work, can be any other than the author of the whole, and consequently of the third Gospel likewise.

There are two other lines of argument bearing on the authorship of the third Gospel and the Acts into which linguistic considerations enter, one of them to the effect that the author was a physician, the other that he was acquainted with the writings of Josephus. The special significance of the former conclusion lies in its agreement with St Paul's reference to "Luke the beloved physician" (Col. iv. 14). The second conclusion is, on the contrary, unfavourable to the "Lucan" authorship, at least if, as is frequently the case, the writer is supposed to have been acquainted with all the works of Josephus, or indeed with any besides the earliest of them, the *Jewish War*. This was completed before the death of the emperor Vespasian, which took place in A.D. 79. The author of the third Gospel may quite well have read it previously to composing his own work, if we place the latter about A.D. 80, and we shall presently see grounds for thinking that it cannot have been written much earlier. This date is in nowise inconsistent with the supposition that he was the companion of St Paul, who joined the Apostle at Troas circ. A.D. 50. He may then have been, it is indeed probable that he was, a young man, say of 20—25; so that in A.D. 80 he would have been fifty years of age, or a little more. If, however, he was acquainted with the *Antiquities* of Josephus, he must have been between sixty-five to seventy when he wrote, if with *Contra Apionem* older still, and if with the

<sup>1</sup> Readers of Sir William Ramsay's works, *The Church and the Empire* and *St Paul the Traveller*, know how he insists on the truth and vividness of the narrative in this respect. He appears sometimes to exaggerate the importance of particular points. But the testimony of such an able and skilled archaeologist, who has studied on the spot, as to the impression produced on him, must carry great weight apart from the details he mentions. Moreover some of the correspondences to which he has drawn attention are of a striking character.

*Autobiography* over seventy. Clearly it is not probable that he would have deferred writing till so late in life.

It is not surprising, then, that we should find the two theses above mentioned (namely, that the author of the "Lucan" writings was a physician, and that he was acquainted with the works of Josephus) supported by different writers; and yet, as I have implied, the character of the evidence and the considerations urged are in no small degree similar. It will be well, therefore, that the student should mentally compare the processes of thought in the two cases.

W. K. Hobart led the way in a careful examination of the correspondence between Greek medical writers and the author of the "Lucan" writings in the use of technical terms and in style and vocabulary generally, and he did his work so fully that he left little to be done by later writers in the way of the collection of evidence, as distinguished from the effort to judge of the value of different parts of it. He claims to have proved that the author of the "Gospel according to St Luke and the Acts of the Apostles was a medical man<sup>1</sup>." He arranges the evidence under two heads: (1) the particularity of the descriptions of diseases and of cures in the third Gospel and the Acts, and the employment therein of terms of a more or less technical character, (2) the use of words and phrases, even in regard to matters non-medical, which would readily occur to a medical man because they were those which he frequently employed in his profession, or was familiar with in his medical books.

Let me say at once that there are very few of the instances which have been amassed under this latter head to which I find it possible to attribute any weight at all. Hobart observes that "in using words to which he had become habituated through professional training, St Luke would not be singular, for the Greek medical writers, also, when dealing with unprofessional subjects, shew a leaning to the use of

<sup>1</sup> *The Medical Language of St Luke*, 1882. Some other writers who have treated or referred to the subject, and have arrived at the same result, are: Light-foot, article on "Acts," in 2nd ed. of Smith's *Dict. of Bible*, p. 31, col. 2; Plummer, *St Luke*, pp. lxiii—lxvi; Chase, *The Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles*, 1902, p. 13 f.; A. Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt*, 1906, p. 122 ff., Eng. trans. p. 175 ff.

words to which they were accustomed in their professional language. But most, if not indeed all, the words and expressions referred to were in use in the Greek literature of the classical or a later period; and the fact that the medical writers were men of education is a sufficient explanation of their having employed them; and so far as the same words were also applied by them in special senses in connexion with their own profession the transference had most often been from the general to the technical meaning, not *vice versa*.

The command shewn by the author of the "Lucan" writings of a vocabulary common to the medical and other Greek writers may, then, most reasonably be put to the account of that general Greek culture which, almost alone among the New Testament writers, he possessed.

The other class of instances, the terms used in describing diseases and cures, deserves much more attention. The cogency of the proof here may be doubted, first on the ground that a writer with a turn for observation and description and some interest in things medical, might well have written as the author of the third Gospel and the Acts does in these cases, without ever having gone through a course of medical study, or practised as a physician. Secondly, it may also be asked whether a physician would not, in writing of miracles, even while he regarded them as such, have expressed himself still more characteristically. I have no doubt that a modern physician would, and I think that so too would an ancient one, if he had approached their consideration primarily from a medical point of view. But it seems to me probable that one who in former years had had some medical knowledge, but whose main interest in the miracles could no longer be in any sense a scientific one, and who was writing a narrative intended simply to set forth to general readers the facts as to that New Faith and its spread among men, to the progress of which he had come to be wholly devoted, might not improbably shew signs of early training agreeing with what we notice in the "Lucan" writings<sup>1</sup>. To that extent I believe

<sup>1</sup> The chief items of evidence are singled out with critical discrimination, and compactly and clearly arranged, by Harnack, *ib.* To this statement I would

the case for medical language in the "Lucan" writings to be made out, but no further. This view of the evidence may seem to afford a precarious basis for any inference. Here, however, comes in the fact of the reference in the Epistle to the Colossians and the testimony of tradition. In the circumstance that it should be possible to maintain even so much as I have stated in respect to the medical character of a writer, whom there is reason for regarding as a companion of St Paul, there would have been ground for identifying him with that companion whom the Apostle himself speaks of as a physician. And then, over and above this, we find the works in question assigned traditionally to the same man, although the medical traits do not seem to have been ever noticed before the nineteenth century. In these coincidences we have, it seems to me, a substantial argument for the authorship by Luke.

I turn to the question whether the author of the "Lucan" writings was acquainted with the works of Josephus. The main object of the following discussion will be to examine with some care the alleged evidence that he knew works later than the *History of the Jewish War*. In the course of it, however, some parallels in the "Lucan" writings with the last-named work will come before us; and I will also, at the conclusion of it, refer to a few others.

A work by M. Krenkel<sup>1</sup> occupies in connexion with this subject a position somewhat similar to that of Hobart in connexion with the one which we have just been considering. Krenkel, indeed, had more predecessors, including some critics of great eminence, who had treated of some salient points in articles of no great length<sup>2</sup>. But he has discussed the arguments previously used and has also made it his aim to carry refer my readers. Dr Harnack speaks more confidently as to the inference to be drawn than I have done.

<sup>1</sup> *Josephus und Lucas*, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> The following more especially may be named on the side of the influence of Josephus on the N. T. writer; H. Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Theol.* 1873, pp. 85—93, and *ib.* 1877, pp. 535—49; Keim, *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, Bd. 1, pp. 1—27 (he only maintains acquaintance with the *Jewish War* and the *Antiquities*), 1878. On the other side we have E. Schürer (*Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Theol.*, 1876, pp. 574—82, a reply to Holtzmann's first article). His opinion is manifestly impartial because he does not attribute the third Gospel and Acts to Luke.

out a systematic and thorough comparison of the works of the Jewish and the New Testament writer. He believes that he has added largely to the body of evidence proving the influence of the former upon the style and contents of the latter, and it may certainly be allowed that he has provided us fully with the materials for forming a judgment. So far as I am aware no considerable contribution to the discussion of the subject has been made since. We may then fix our attention mainly on Krenkel's work. It may be added that he tries not to be a special pleader, and yet his reasoning is far from satisfactory.

The evidence adduced may be most conveniently considered under the following three heads: (1) vocabulary and style; (2) incidents in the third Gospel or the Acts which, it is supposed, were invented by the writer in consequence of what he had read in Josephus; (3) notices of historical personages, or events.

(1) Krenkel gives us lists of words and expressions which no New Testament writer employs besides the author of the third Gospel and the Acts, but which do occur in the works of Josephus, or in these and the LXX.; and these lists are of considerable length. But the circumstance that other New Testament writers do not use them is entirely beside the purpose, because the author of the "Lucan" writings is distinguished among them by his command of literary Greek. Such a comparison as Krenkel makes is valueless apart from an examination of the use of the same words and phrases in the Greek literature of the time. We cannot indeed say that the author of the "Lucan" writings had read this or that other Greek work; but we may at least feel absolutely certain that he had not obtained his facility of expression solely from a knowledge of the works of Josephus. He could not have made that use of them which is attributed to him, if he had not been independently a man of culture. The passages of the New Testament writer are often, I venture to say, far superior as literature to those of the Jewish historian with which they are compared.

The author of the "Lucan" writings and Josephus were in any case nearly contemporaries. They had received the

same kind of literary instruction, must have read to some extent the same works and have had the same literary models placed before them, and have been wont to hear rhetoricians lecture, and public speakers make orations, much after the same manner. Josephus himself only began to compose works in Greek in his later life, and he obtained assistance in doing so. He was not a man of an original mind, and in Greek composition more particularly he would necessarily seek to imitate standard examples; and certainly he was not himself a writer who would be chosen for imitation. Further, the author of the "Lucan" writings and Josephus were both historians and both wrote about things Jewish. If all this is borne in mind it must be evident that even a large amount of similarity between them in style and diction may prove nothing as to the dependence of one writer upon the other. Unfortunately it is not possible to ascertain so fully and directly as we should like to do, whether their common features in these respects are not due simply to general conditions which affected them both, because we possess only very scanty remains from an extensive Greek literature produced in the first and second centuries of our era. But even such evidence as is available and may be readily examined appears to me abundantly sufficient to shew that this view is by far the most probable. I may mention that somewhat more than two-thirds of the words given as used "in the Lucan writings and those of Josephus, but not in the LXX.<sup>1</sup>" are used in Polybius, many of them repeatedly, as may be seen from Schweighaeuser's index to Polybius; and this in spite of the facts that the extent of the writings of Polybius which have come down to us is only about two-thirds of that of the works of Josephus; that Polybius wrote more than two centuries earlier instead of being a man of the same generation; and that, although he too wrote history, the subjects dealt with by him were not related to those of the New Testament writer in the way that some of those treated by Josephus were. In addition to this it is to be observed that some of the words given by Krenkel in another list as "occurring

<sup>1</sup> pp. 304—9.

neither in the LXX. nor in Josephus but solely in Luke<sup>1</sup> are found in Polybius<sup>2</sup>.

So far I have referred chiefly to vocabulary; but similar remarks may be made as to constructions, phrases, ideas and the manner of expressing them. The preface to the third Gospel bears some resemblance to the introductory sentences of Josephus' *Jewish War*, and it also contains various expressions which occur in the early chapters of *Contra Apionem*. As I have already said, I should feel no difficulty so far as dates are concerned in allowing that our third evangelist had imitated the introduction of the *Jewish War*; I simply do not think there is any ground for assuming it because it seems to me probable that if we had several more of the compositions of the time we should find that both writers began their works in a manner that was not unusual. We have in point of fact an example in the opening words of the treatise of Dioscorides, *περὶ ὕλης ἰατρικῆς*<sup>3</sup>, though naturally here there are those differences which arose from his work not being concerned with history. Dioscorides probably wrote later than either the evangelist or Josephus; but it would not, I imagine, generally be thought necessary to assume that the medical writer was influenced by either of them. As regards the phrases and words of the preface which are found also in *Contra Apionem*, I. cc. 1—11, they are all such as it was perfectly natural to use in each case in connexion with the subject in hand, and which other writers use when they have the same thoughts to express. Whether quite as many similarities of this kind with Luke's preface occur within the same space in any other writer I do not know. The other passages that I have come across in which a historical writer speaks of his sources of information and

<sup>1</sup> pp. 310—12.

<sup>2</sup> It may also be mentioned that a little more than a third of the words given by Krenkel as common to Luke and Josephus occur among the words on which Hobart comments as common to Luke and the little group of medical writers with whom he is concerned; and this although the subjects on which they write are so different.

On the resemblances here under consideration cp. Godet on Lk i. 4 (3rd ed. i. p. 92).

<sup>3</sup> They may be seen in Plummer's *St Luke*, p. 5 f.

his aim are much briefer than the portion of *Contra Apionem* referred to, the whole of which is an introduction having for its subject the writing of history, and a comparison between his own works and those of others. This greater length and fulness of treatment itself explains the larger number of common expressions in this context<sup>1</sup>.

(2) I pass to suggestions for his narratives which the author of the third Gospel and the Acts is alleged to have derived from Josephus. It is implied in some cases that he was led in this way to invent a whole incident. That he would have been capable of this I do not believe; it appears to me incompatible with his character and the aim which he had in his writings. Without, however, pressing this objection, I will examine briefly some of the principal parallelisms in question. The account of Jesus in the temple at the age of twelve, given in Lk ii. 46, 47, has been held by some to have been taken from a passage in the *Autobiography* of Josephus about his own boyhood<sup>2</sup>. It cannot, however, be denied that there is a moderation of statement in the evangelist's narrative which compares very favourably

<sup>1</sup> With Lk i. 1, ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν the following words are compared from *Contra Ap.* i. c. 1, § 13: οἱ μέντοι τὰς ἱστορίας ἐπιχειρήσαντες συγγράφειν παρ' αὐτοῖς. But Polyb. II. 37 affords even a better parallel, ἐπεὶ γὰρ οὐ τινὰς πράξεις, καθάπερ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν... ἀναγράφειν ἐπιχειρήκαμεν.

With Lk *ib.* v. 3, ἔδοξε κάμοι παρηκολουθηκῶτα ἀνωθεν πάσων ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι the following sentence from *Contra Ap.* i. c. 10, §§ 53—5 is compared: δεῖ τὸν ἄλλοις παράδοσιν πράξεων ἀληθινῶν ὑπισχυνοῦμενον αὐτὸν ἐπίστασθαι ταύτας πρότερον ἀκριβῶς ἢ παρηκολουθηκῶτα τοῖς γεγυῶσιν ἢ παρὰ τῶν εἰδῶτων πυρθανόμενον. But compare also Polyb. III. 32, παρακολουθῆσαι σαφῶς ταῖς μὲν κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν... πράξεσιν. This is closer, since in *Contra Ap.* above παρακολουθεῖν is used of actual presence at the occurrences. Even *Contra Ap.* i. c. 23, § 218, which is also adduced by Krenkel, is not so close as the passage of Polybius. Other similar examples of the use of παρακολουθεῖν could be given.

Instances of the use of all the other words and phrases to which Krenkel points as occurring both in *Contra Ap.* i. cc. 1—10 and Lk i. 1—4, might be adduced from other writers; some of those he notes are quite common. See *γενόμενος αὐτόπτης* at Polyb. I. 46, § 4; cp. also Polyb. IV. 38, § 12. In the immediate context of the passage first quoted (Polyb. II. 37) note ἐξ ἀρχῆς which Krenkel adduces from Josephus as meaning the same as Luke's ἀπ' ἀρχῆς; and in the same context in Polybius note also τὰς ἐξῆς πράξεις διεξιόντες as similar to Luke's καθεξῆς, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *Josephī Vita*, c. 2.



with the bragging tone, and doubtless very much exaggerated description, of Josephus. A writer who followed another in a matter of this kind would usually be disposed to claim for his own hero as much as he found claimed for another. Our evangelist, if he had Josephus in view, has at least resisted this temptation. Josephus writes, "when I was about fourteen years old, I was praised by all for my love of learning, and the chief priests and chief men of the city continually came together in order to learn from me some more accurate knowledge concerning the things of the law." Luke says simply that Jesus "was found in the temple, sitting in the midst of the teachers, both hearing them and asking them questions; and all that heard him were amazed at his understanding and his answers." In truth the little that is common to the two must in all probability have had its counterpart in the life of many a promising Jewish boy<sup>1</sup>.

I pass to an incident related in the *History of the Jewish War*<sup>2</sup>. Titus, we are told, on passing near Jerusalem, at a time subsequent to the siege, grieved over the scene of desolation which presented itself to his view and cursed the rebellion that had led to this vengeance being taken on the city. There is here certainly a parallel with the account in Lk xix. 41—44 of Jesus weeping over Jerusalem. But the coincidences of language are not remarkable; and the Gospel-narrative is so far superior in compactness and vividness of description and in musical cadence and sublimity, that it seems superfluous to imagine that the evangelist can have needed the stimulus of having read Josephus. Moreover, if he had framed this scene in the life of Christ upon this model we might have expected to find some indication, however unintended, that he was conscious of the dramatic contrast presented by the two.

Again, it is related by Josephus that when Alexander the Great was considering, before he left Macedonia, how he should conquer Asia, he had a dream in which one appeared to him—in a garb whereby he afterwards recognised that he was a messenger of the God of Israel—and bade him cross

<sup>1</sup> That which is distinctive in the Gospel-story is of course the saying at v. 49.

<sup>2</sup> VII. 5. §§ 112, 113.

over, offering to lead his army and to deliver to him the empire of the Persians<sup>1</sup>. We are forcibly reminded of St Paul's vision at Troas<sup>2</sup> when a man of Macedonia summoned him across the same strait in the opposite direction that he might conquer Europe, not by the sword but the power of the Cross. Here, however, it should be observed that the reference to the Apostle's vision is virtually part of the first of the "we"-sections, which makes it very difficult to suppose that it was suggested by acquaintance with a passage in the *Antiquities* of Josephus. Further, the story in regard to Alexander was probably derived by Josephus himself from some earlier source, from which the writer of the Acts may be held to have learnt it, if it is necessary to suppose that he knew it.

I turn to some cases in which the dependence alleged is of a more limited kind; where, namely, it is supposed that the New Testament writer, in describing events which he knew or believed to be as to their main substance historical, has introduced touches suggested to him by narratives in Josephus which seemed to him to picture situations or circumstances that were more or less similar. There could be no great objection to admitting the possibility of this. Many, however, of the alleged instances are not even plausible<sup>3</sup>. It was not necessary that Luke should have read what Josephus has written in the *Jewish War* (II. 20. §§ 580—582) as to the importance of soldiers conducting themselves aright towards the inhabitants of a country which is the theatre of war, or in his *Life* (c. 47, § 244) as to the injunctions which he laid upon his own soldiers to "be content with the supplies furnished them and not to indulge in looting," in order to realise that soldiers on service in a subject land might usefully be warned in regard to points such as these (Lk iii. 14). Nor did he need to be acquainted with an account of a man led to execution in *Ant.* XIX. 1. § 24, in order that he might know that a crowd would be likely to follow on such an occasion (Lk xxiii. 27); or with a description in *Ant.* IV. viii. § 320, of women "beating their foreheads" when Moses spoke of his approaching end,

<sup>1</sup> *Ant.* xi. 8. §§ 331—5.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xvi. 8—10.

<sup>3</sup> For the four next mentioned see Krenkel, pp. 103, 140 f., 109.

in order that he might be led to speak of women wailing and lamenting and "beating their breasts" at the Crucifixion of Jesus (Lk *ib.* and *v.* 48). The parallels between Lk x. 17 and *Ant.* XII. 2. § 57, and between Acts x. 12 and *Contra Ap.* II. 8, besides being trivial might well be due to acquaintance with the sources of Josephus instead of with Josephus himself.

There are a few points of similarity between speeches in the Acts and in Josephus which seem at first sight somewhat more deserving of attention. The most striking, I think, are those between passages in St Paul's Address to the Ephesian presbyters at Miletus in Acts xx., and in a speech of Agrippa to the Jews given in the *Jewish War*, II. 16. § 345 ff.<sup>1</sup> But again in the *Jewish War*, VI. 2. § 96, Josephus refers to an occasion when from outside the walls of Jerusalem he addressed those within the city, "speaking in Hebrew" (*ἑβραϊζων*), and after hearing his opening remarks the people were dejected and silent. In VII. 5. § 127 of the same work he describes Vespasian "making the sign for silence and when there was quiet" standing up. The sign for silence was a motion with the hand; it is referred to *Ant.* VIII. 11. § 276 (*τῇ χειρὶ κατασεύσας τὸ πλῆθος...γενομένης δὲ σιωπῆς ἤρξατο λέγειν*). In the *Life*, c. 29, he refers in these terms to another occasion when he himself spoke: *σιγῆς οὖν παρὰ πάντων γενομένης, ἄνδρες, εἶπον, ὁμόφυλοι θανεῖν μὲν, εἰ δίκαιόν ἐστιν, οὐ παραιτούμαι*. It is interesting to compare the reference in the first of these passages to the employment of Hebrew with Acts xxi. 40. The phrases in the various passages as to the procuring of silence and the mode of doing so were probably common. The clause *θανεῖν μὲν*, etc., with which Acts xxv. 11 *a* agrees so closely, may seem to be more distinctive, yet we have here, it would seem, a customary form of rhetorical appeal<sup>2</sup>.

In considering the significance of the parallelisms which

<sup>1</sup> With Acts xx. 20 and 26 compare *ψῆθον δεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πάντας ὑμᾶς συναγαγὼν εἰπεῖν ἃ νομίζω συμφέρειν* (*B. J.* II. 16. § 346); and *μαρτύρομαι δὲ ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμῶν τὰ ἅγια καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πάτριδα τὴν κοινὴν, ὡς οὐδὲν τῶν σωτηρίων ὑμῖν καθυψηκάμην, ὑμεῖς δὲ βουλευσάμενοι μὲν τὰ δέοντα κοινὴν σὺν ἐμοὶ τὴν εἰρήνην ἔχετε, προαχθέντες δὲ τοῖς θυμοῖς χωρὶς ἐμοῦ κινδυνεύετε* (*ib.* § 401). Also compare *οἶδα μὲν οὖν*, etc. (*ib.* § 348) with Acts v. 29.

<sup>2</sup> See examples in Wetstein *Nov. Test. ad loc.* E.g., Dion. Halic. v. 29, *τὸν μὲν οὖν θάνατον...οὐ παραιτούμαι*.

have been here mentioned and of any others like them, it should ever be remembered that circumstances more or less similar often recur in history and various human lives, and that in relating them different writers may often use independently the same, or similar, words and phrases. We have an example in the account by Josephus in his *Life*, c. 3, of his being shipwrecked on a voyage to Rome, and that of St Paul's shipwreck. As the latter occurs in a portion of the Acts which is most commonly admitted to be by a companion of the Apostle, he would be a bold critic who would venture to attribute the correspondence in the incidents and details here to the influence of Josephus. But warning has not been taken from this instance as it should.

(3) I turn to notices of persons and events belonging to general history. Here, if anywhere, it might have been expected that the New Testament writer would have used the works of the Jewish historian, if he was acquainted with them. But for the most part there is no sign of it. We do not find particular statements as to public officials, the years of the reigns of emperors and the like, in the third Gospel and the Acts which correspond closely in form or matter with statements in Josephus. Even if there were such, it would be open to us to assume that they had been derived not from the latter, but from some of the previous writers whom (it would seem) he himself largely reproduced<sup>1</sup>. But the information which the author of the "Lucan" writings shews on such subjects was no greater than must have been, one would think, frequently possessed, or than could at least easily have been obtained by one residing in any of the great cities of the empire, through conversation with persons of experience and education, Jewish and Gentile.

Krenkel<sup>2</sup> appeals to the freedom with which our third evangelist has treated St Mark in order to explain likewise his relation to Josephus. But there is no analogy between the two cases. The departures from St Mark are in the way of improvements of the style, or of the addition or substitution of other pieces of tradition; whereas Josephus

<sup>1</sup> See Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volk.* 1. p. 80 ff., Eng. trans. 1. p. 85 ff.

<sup>2</sup> p. 11 ff.

should have been followed with exactness as to facts of history for which he was the authority. The writer of the third Gospel and the Acts was quite historian enough to understand this.

Much has been made of an instance in which an error—or what is probably an error—on the part of the author of the Acts may be explained as due to a careless reading and inaccurate remembrance of a passage of the *Antiquities* (xx. 5. § 1). Here the appearance of Theudas in the governorship of Fadus is referred to, and after him *the sons of Judas of Galilee* are mentioned, and this gives occasion to a notice of the father. In the Acts (v. 36 f.) we have Theudas represented as preceding in time Judas of Galilee himself, who “arose in the days of the taxing.” It is supposed that the writer recollected that Theudas was named at the beginning of the passage, but confused Judas with his sons. With Schürer<sup>1</sup>, I think it unlikely that the author of Acts should have been so careless; but be this as it may, the possibility that his error arose in some other way cannot be excluded. There may, for example, have been a similar passage in some earlier work used by Josephus and known to the author of the Acts in which Theudas and Judas and his sons were referred to in the same order.

In replying to Schürer’s criticisms on this and other points<sup>2</sup> Holtzmann was led to allow that “the reading of the works of Josephus already lay behind our author” (Luke) “when he came to the composition of his own works, and can never, to speak generally, have been very thorough and careful. He had just looked through Josephus, nothing more<sup>3</sup>.” This certainly is all that can reasonably be claimed. Krenkel’s argument to shew that the author of the third

<sup>1</sup> Schürer’s conclusion is that “either Luke had taken no notice of Josephus at all, or subsequently to his reading he proceeded to forget all about it.” *Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Theol.* 1876, p. 582.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 263, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> “Statt dessen lag jene Lectüre, als unser Verfasser zur Abfassung seiner Werke schritt, bereits hinter ihm, und sehr tiefdringend und genau konnte sie überhaupt niemals gewesen sein. Er hatte eben im Josephus sich umgesehen (vgl. meiner Aufsatz, S. 89), weiter nichts” (“Noch einmal Lucas und Josephus,” *Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Theol.* 1877, p. 536).

Gospel and the Acts had obtained many suggestions for his own works, and had largely drawn his vocabulary, from the writings of the Jewish historian, has been seen to be inconclusive, and it presupposes such an acquaintance with those writings as he evidently, from his notices of facts of general history, did not possess. But further it appears to me impossible to prove, or to render probable, those vague reminiscences for which Holtzmann contends by means simply of such evidence as is adduced. Since no more is attributed to him, it is implied that the evidence is somewhat slight. Moreover the consideration is overlooked that other explanations of the various items of it are possible. The parallelisms need to be more numerous and more distinctive than they are in reality, to establish a case for the particular explanation that is suggested. Failing this, it would be necessary that there should be some fact rendering it independently probable that the author of the third Gospel and the Acts should have known the works of Josephus in question, like St Paul's reference to a physician among his companions which lends meaning to the signs of medical knowledge in our author. In the absence of any such coincidence in the case now before us, there is not sufficient force in the argument to enable it to resist any substantial reasons on the other side. It is not capable of shaking our conclusion that the author of the third Gospel and the Acts was a companion of St Paul, and should not prevent us from assuming whatever else is most probable on that supposition. We may, therefore, dismiss the idea that he had read the *Antiquities* and *Contra Apionem* and *Autobiography* of Josephus; but the question whether he knew the *Jewish War* is deserving of some further consideration.

The indications of acquaintance with this work which have so far come before us are, I think, slightly stronger than those alleged in regard to the others; there are besides a few parallelisms with it of a different character which I proceed to note. The language in regard to the siege of Jerusalem in Lk xix. 43, and xxi. 20, agrees well with the description of it by Josephus. Certainly Luke might have learned the facts about the siege from many quarters, but it would be

natural that he should have read with deep interest Josephus' account when it appeared. Further his statement as to the position of Emmaus in Lk xxiv. 13, may be compared with that in Josephus, *B. J.* VII. 6. § 217<sup>1</sup>; and also Luke's use of Ἐλαιῶν, Olivet, as a name for the Mount of Olives at Acts i. 12, and possibly also at Lk xix. 29, xxi. 37, with passages in Josephus where this form of name may be intended<sup>2</sup>. The correspondence in regard to Emmaus is not exact, and as to "Olivet" is uncertain; nevertheless these resemblances are not to be classed with those phrases which may probably have been used often in the literature of the time.

Let us now in conclusion turn back to the opening sentences of the third Gospel, and view them in the light of the results which we have obtained through the inquiries in this and earlier chapters. The stress laid by Luke upon the testimony of those who "from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," and upon his having himself "traced the course of all things accurately from the first," is remarkable in one who, as we have seen, has compiled his own record mainly from written accounts which preceded it. Evidently men still looked back to the oral teaching of the first disciples as the ground of their confidence in the facts of the Gospel, and the authority of any document was measured by its agreement therewith.

Luke implies that he is prepared to authenticate all that he has himself written in his book as satisfying this test. He does not refer to having made use of documents, because he felt that he could go behind them. It is true that, as has often been pointed out, the words of Luke's preface need not

<sup>1</sup> The words in Josephus, *l.c.*, are χωρίον ἔδωκεν εἰς κατοίκησιν, ὃ καλεῖται μὲν Ἀμμαοῦς, ἀπέχει δὲ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων σταδίου τριάκοντα. This is the text as given by Niese, which is evidently right. He mentions one Codex where ἐξήκοντα is read; no doubt this was a change introduced by a Christian copyist to bring the statement into accord with Luke.

<sup>2</sup> At Acts i. 12 we have ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος, which is of course quite plain; but at Lk xix. 29 and xxi. 37 it is doubtful whether we have the genitive or an accusative in apposition, πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον ἐλαιῶν or ἐλαιῶν—of olives, or Olivet—and the passages in Josephus (*B. J.* II. 13. § 262; v. 2. § 70; *Ant.* XX. 8. § 169) are similarly ambiguous. Niese takes the word as the genitive.

necessarily be taken to mean that the writer had himself been in immediate contact with the eyewitnesses. But plainly this is not excluded; while their statements might also be known from the reports of many who had been their constant hearers. Probably both means of information are here intended, though the second perhaps more than the first. Luke, when he visited Jerusalem in Paul's company saw and heard James, "the Lord's brother," and possibly other members of the earliest body of disciples; and both during his stay in Palestine at this time, and after it, and to some extent also before, in different parts of the world, he must have had not a few opportunities of holding intimate converse with and questioning those who had learnt from them.

The third Gospel may have been written as late as A.D. 80, but (as I have already said)<sup>1</sup> it is not probable that it was written much later than this, if Luke was the author. That it cannot have been composed much earlier appears from its expressions in regard to the doom of Jerusalem, when compared with those in St Mark<sup>2</sup>. The fact that Luke is more explicit than a source which he has used in the context and in other places is here the decisive consideration. If we had only Luke's language on the subject, it might be open to us to suppose that the references to the siege were instances of genuine prediction; but it seems clear that interpretation after the event must here have been intermingled with the original prophecy, when we turn to the vaguer terms of the earlier record, which in the main Luke has followed. One expression peculiar to him (Lk xxi. 24) brings vividly before us the period of suffering for the Jewish nation which commenced *after the* taking of Jerusalem, and no speedy termination of it appears to be contemplated. This suggests that some little time has already elapsed since that event.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 260.

<sup>2</sup> Lk xxi. 20 = Mk xiii. 14. Cp. also Lk xix. 43.



## ADDITIONAL NOTE TO CHAPTER IV.

THE EMPLOYMENT OF CHARACTERISTICS OF STYLE, VOCABULARY AND THOUGHT IN DIFFERENT PORTIONS OF THE "LUCAN" WRITINGS AS A MEANS OF DETERMINING THE ORIGIN OF THOSE PORTIONS SEVERALLY.

In addition to the books dealing directly with the authorship of the "we"-sections in Acts, mentioned on p. 255, the following works of a more general kind will be found useful in the study of the Lucan style and vocabulary: Lekebusch, *Die Composition und Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte von neuem untersucht*, 1854; J. Friedrich, *Das Lukas-evangelium und die Apostelgeschichte, Werke desselben Verfassers*; Th. Vogel, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil*, 1899.

Help may also be derived from works on the Grammar of the New Testament, especially that of Blass (references to him in the following pages are to the Eng. trans. of his Grammar by H. St J. Thackeray, 1898), and the treatises of J. Viteau: *Étude sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament. Le verbe: Syntaxe des propositions*, and *Étude sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament comparé avec celui des Septante: Sujet, complément et attribut*, in *Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études*, 114.

I have stated the number of times that particular words occur in the Lucan writings, etc., in accordance with the concordance of W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, which is based on the texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers. But textual differences are not of great moment for our present purpose, since our conclusions can only be obtained from a broad view of Lucan peculiarities, and this remains unaffected by such differences.

Different writings of the New Testament alone are here compared, and when, after enumerating the number of times that a word occurs in various writings contained in it, I add "not elsewhere," I mean "not elsewhere in N.T."

Since the examination of the passages does not follow throughout their order in the Gospel, the following table is subjoined for convenience of reference.

	Page		Page
Lk i. and ii.	291—5	Lk xiv. 1—24, 28—33	302 f.
„ iv. 16—30	295 f.	„ xv.	303
„ iv. 31—44	279—81	„ xvi. 1—13, 19—31	304
„ v. 1—11	296—7	„ xvii. 7—19	304 f.
„ v. 12—26	281—3	„ xviii. 1—14	305
„ vii. 11—17	297	„ xix. 1—28, 41—44	305 f.
„ vii. 36—50	298 f.	„ xxii. 14—38	306
„ viii. 1—3	299	„ xxii. 39—xxiii. 56	287—90
„ viii. 22—56	283—6	„ xxiii. 5—12, 14, 15, 39—43	306—8
„ ix. 51—56, 61, 62	299	„ xxiv. 13—end	308 f.
„ x. 1, 17—20, 29—42	299 f.	Acts xvi. 9—18	314—8
„ xi. 1, 5—8, 27, 28	300 f.	„ xx. 4—16	318—20
„ xii. 13—21, 49, 50	301	„ xxi. 1—18	320—2
„ xiii. 1—17, 22, 31—33	301 f.		

In Chapter II, in connexion with the subject of the reconstruction of the Logian document, I endeavoured to estimate the amount of difference between Mt. and Lk which we ought to be prepared for, in passages independently reproduced in both from the same document, no longer extant, by considering the differences between them in their parallels to Mk. Similarly a study of the alterations made by our third evangelist in his Marcan document, and also, so far as they can be ascertained, in his Logian document, should enable us the better to judge how far “Lucan” characteristics which we may observe in other passages are merely signs that the general author of the third Gospel and Acts has revised some written source, or can be taken as evidence that the composition was wholly due to him.

I should weary most of my readers past their endurance, were I for the purpose in view to conduct them here through an examination of all the portions of St Luke which are parallel with St Mark; and many points would be found to recur again and again. I will content myself with the treatment in detail of a few passages by way of example, and with some general statements in regard to the remainder, based on my own investigation of the evidence. I will then pass on to consider the bearing of the results obtained upon the two subjects of inquiry that have come before us in this chapter, to which they are applicable, that, namely, of the source, or sources, of the peculiar matter in Luke, and that as to the identity of the author of the “we”-sections in the Acts with the author of the whole work and of the third Gospel.

## I.

*Luke's revision of his Marcan document.*

It must be premised that of the instances in which Luke appears to have altered the constructions, or the phraseology, of his Marcan document, not all should be reckoned as specially characteristic of him. We must obtain our standard for what is characteristic from the survey of a broader field. If we take the words and turns of phrase peculiar to Luke in passages parallel with Mark, and inquire what the usage of the New Testament is in regard to them, this will shew which are likely to have been characteristic of Luke among the writers of Christian documents in the first century as a class. And then from the nature and number of such characteristic expressions in Luke's Marcan parallels we may get a notion of the nature and number of those which would probably be noticeable in other passages taken by the same writer from a written source.

It will be important for us to distinguish between Luke's treatment of descriptions of scenes and incidents in his source and its reports of spoken words. He is wont to reproduce the latter, as I have already had occasion to observe in an earlier chapter, with a far higher degree of verbal exactness than the former, and consequently it is in the former, the descriptive portions, that his own characteristics of style and vocabulary and point of view appear most largely. We will therefore fix our attention upon sections which are either wholly descriptive, or in which the descriptive element is considerable. Some from the early part of the Gospel will serve our purpose well.

One remark of a general kind I will make before entering upon the review of particular passages. We shall find that even in the descriptive matter the Lucan characteristics are very unequally distributed. While adhering closely on the whole to Mark's narrative, Luke seems here and there to have drawn inferences from what he read, to have formed his own idea of the circumstances and incidents, and then to have told the facts as he conceived them. Or again the special interest which he felt in the subject-matter, and the belief that he could improve the presentation of it, have moved him to add various touches or to rearrange the account. Or, once more, some little piece of additional information which he possessed, or a different mode of telling a story to which he had become accustomed, has exercised an influence upon him. Sentences in which Luke shews more than his average amount of independence of the form of Mark's narrative, owing to one or other of the causes just mentioned, occur especially at the beginnings of sections, or at the conclusions,

where, for instance, he depicts the effects of a miracle; but sometimes also in other parts. As might be expected, it is in these sentences, where on the whole the divergence from Mark is most considerable, that the Lucan characteristics are found in greatest number.

We will begin our examination at the point where Luke rejoins the Marcan sequence after his narrative of the Visit of Jesus to Nazareth.

Lk iv. 31—37 = Mk i. 21—28. The motives for the few small changes which Luke has made in this section of Mark can easily be divined. The only points which could, if we had not the Marcan parallel, attract attention as characteristic are:—*v.* 31, the description of Capernaum as πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, which is evidently intended for readers who did not know Palestine, and would most naturally proceed, also, from a writer who himself was a stranger to it: *v.* 33, πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου (in place of the usual πνεῦμα, or δαιμόνιον, ἀκάθαρτον). Luke distinguishes the spirit from the organism in which it works and the special form of its manifestation; cp. xiii. 11, πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας, and A. xvi. 16, πνεῦμα πύθωνα, a Pytho-spirit. Similarly the references in Lk and A. to the πνεῦμα, the personal centre, in human beings, are peculiarly frequent; cp. i. 80; viii. 55; ix. 55; A. vi. 10; vii. 59; xvii. 16.

*v.* 36. ἐξουσία καὶ δυνάμει: the same combination occurs at ix. 1, and similar ones at i. 17, and at A. iii. 12; iv. 7; vi. 8; x. 38. δύναμις is coupled with δόξα in Mt. xxiv. 30, and Mk xiii. 26, as also at Lk xxi. 27.

Lk iv. 38—41 = Mk i. 29—34. The following expressions and words may clearly be reckoned characteristic:—

*v.* 38. συνεχομένη πυρετῶ μεγάλη: cp. the closely similar phrase at A. xxviii. 8, πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίῳ συνεχόμενον (see on the two expressions, Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt*, pp. 123 f., 127, Eng. trans. pp. 176, 182). There is reason, also, to think that the use of μεγάλη in connexion with fever has even a technical force (see Hobart, p. 4).—συνέχειν and συνέχεσθαι are used with special frequency in Lk and A., though only in the two passages here referred to in regard to bodily plagues. For this application cp. Mt. iv. 24.

The substitution of ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς for Mk's more neutral λέγουσιν, etc., should, I think, also be noticed. "They questioned Him about her." It is just the expression which would be used in the case of a physician who had been called in, or who had happened to enter a house where there was a sick person. At this early point

in the history, when Jesus was just beginning to shew His power as a healer, it is eminently suitable.

v. 39. *ἐφίσταναι*: 7 times in Lk, 11 in A., besides only once in 1 Th. and twice in 2 Tim.—*παραχρήμα*: 10 times in Lk, 6 in A., besides only at Mt. xxi. 19, 20; of the 10 times in Lk, 7 are in descriptions of cures. In four of these it is used in place of Mk's *εὐθύς*, but in the present passage there is no word to correspond in Mk, and although in the cure of the woman with the issue the suddenness is noted by Mk, Luke lays stress upon it (Lk viii. 44 *ῥ*, which = Mk v. 29, is followed by v. 47 *ῥ*). *παραχρήμα* is also used of a cure related only in Lk at xiii. 13, and of one described at A. iii. 7. The suddenness of the cures seems to have impressed Luke as a man interested in things medical.

v. 40. *ἅπαντες*. *πᾶς* and *ἅπας* occur with special frequency in Lk and A., cp. Friedrich, p. 6. Luke is fond of the thought that *all* are stirred, etc. (though of course it is not confined to him, e.g. see Mk i. 27, 28). Similarly we may note the phrase: *ἐνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἐπιτιθεῖς*. Cp. esp. the individuality of the gift of the Spirit at A. ii. 3, and of the admonition at A. xx. 31. *εἰς ἕκαστος* in masc. is used twice in Lk, five times in A., once in Mt. and five times by St Paul, and the neut. once in A., once in 1 Cor.

v. 41. *ἐάν*: twice in Lk, seven times in A., two in rest of N.T.

Lk iv. 42—44 = Mk i. 35—39. Luke has recast to a considerable extent the opening part of the Marcan section. (Lk v. 42 = Mk v. 35—37.) Special points:—v. 42. *γενομένης ἡμέρας*: the gen. absol. though not uncommon in the other N.T. writings is used with special frequency by Luke.—*ἕως* is used (as here) of coming up to, as far as, a spot or person, at ii. 15; iv. 29, 42; A. ix. 38; xi. 19, 22; xvii. 15; xxiii. 23; besides only at Mt. xxvi. 58 and Mk xiv. 54, and in the poetic expressions Mt. xxiv. 27, 31; Mk xiii. 27. *κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι*. The gen. of infin. dependent not on a preposition, but either on a verb (as here), or on a noun (e.g. A. xxvii. 20), "has an extensive range in Paul and still more in Luke; it is found to a limited extent in Mt. and Mk, but is wholly, or almost wholly, absent from the other N.T. writers." Blass, p. 234. It is to be added that the use of the infin. with the art. in dependence upon a preposition belongs chiefly in N.T. to the writings of Luke and Paul. *ib.* p. 233. Cp. Lekebusch, p. 75, and Friedrich, p. 36, no. 271. The use of *πορεύεσθαι* twice in this verse should also be noticed. Although of course not an uncommon word it occurs in Lk and A. with unusual frequency. v. 43. *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, middle, is

very common in Lk and A. and in the Pauline Epp., for "preaching the Gospel," and is used elsewhere only once, viz. at 1 Pet. i. 12. (The act. is used twice in Apoc., and the passive once in Mt., in a Logian passage, Mt. xi. 5 = Lk vii. 22; also at Lk xvi. 16, and a few passages in Gal., Heb. and 1 Pet.) The good news proclaimed is further defined not infrequently by the addition of a noun in the accus. The persons to whom the message is delivered are placed in dat. in St Paul's Epp., with one exception; and so also by Luke in the present passage and at i. 19; ii. 10; and A. viii. 35. But at Lk iii. 18 and A. viii. 25, 40; xiii. 32; xiv. 15, 21; xvi. 10; and also at Gal. i. 9, and 1 Pet. i. 12 the person or persons, place or places "evangelised" are in accus. The former is in accordance with Attic usage (cp. Blass, p. 89); the latter was probably a technical form of expression, as it were, which had grown up among Christian missionaries. Apoc. x. 7 may also be compared, though the verb, besides being in the act., has a more ordinary meaning. *v.* 44. ἦν κηρύσσων: the periphrasis of εἰμί with participle for the finite verb is specially common in Lk and A. See Lekebusch, p. 76; Friedrich, p. 12, no. 14 k.

Luke's account of the Call of Simon and two other disciples (Lk v. 1—11) is largely at least independent of Mk; we may pass on, therefore, to

Lk v. 12—16 = Mk i. 40—45. The account of the miracle,—including the request of the leper, some words of Christ, and also the descriptive matter in which these are embedded (12 c, 13, 14),—is given almost exactly in the language of Mk, and there is nothing characteristic about the two or three little differences. But in Luke's introduction to the incident (12 a, b) and description of the consequences of the miracle (*vv.* 15, 16) there are several points to be noted. *v.* 12. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι...καὶ ἰδοῦ: the impersonal ἐγένετο in a clause containing a note of time (a Hebraism = 'הָיָה, which is pleonastic according to our ideas, since the note of time might be connected with the principal verb) is specially common in Lk. We find it with καὶ ἰδοῦ in *apodosis* in present verse and at xxiv. 4, and also at Mt. ix. 10; with καὶ αὐτός in *apodosis*, eight times in Lk (v. 1, 17; viii. 1, 22; ix. 51; xiv. 1; xvii. 11; xxiv. 15), and not elsewhere; followed by a finite verb, but without καὶ, 22 times in Lk, 5 in Mt. (only in the formula with which discourses are concluded, vii. 28; xi. 1; xiii. 53; xix. 1; xxvi. 1), twice in Mk. When followed by an infin. and accus., as it is five times in Lk, 14 in A., and once in Mk,

it need not be regarded as impers. It should be observed that this more defensible construction is the only one of those here referred to which occurs in A.—*ἐν τῷ εἶναι*: *ἐν τῷ* with infin. occurs with special frequency in Lk, also at A. ix. 3 and xix. 1. Cp. above iv. 42 n.—*ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων*: cp. *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν*, xiii. 10 and *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν*, v. 17, etc.—Again, the particularity of the description of the man's physical condition, *πλήρης λέπρας*, is noticeable.—*δέομαι* occurs eight times in Lk, seven in A., and six in Pauline Epp., once in Mt. v. 15. *διέρχασθαι* occurs 10 times in Lk, 20 in A., 10 in rest of N.T.—*θεραπεύειν*, or *θεραπεύεσθαι*, is also followed as here by *ἀπό* at Lk vi. 18, vii. 21 and viii. 2, but not elsewhere.—*ἀσθένεια* is used specifically for sickness four times in Lk and at A. xxviii. 9; also once in Mt. and twice in Jn, and perhaps in 2 Cor. xi., xii. and Gal. iv. 13. v. 16. The use of *αὐτός*, as an equivalent for *ὅς* or *ὅστις*, is characteristic of Lk, A., and St Paul's Epp. See Viteau, p. 51. In Lk and A. *οὗτος* also is similarly used (*Ib.*); for *ἦν* with participle see iv. 44 n. Lastly, Luke is fond of representing Jesus as praying (cp. iii. 21; vi. 12; ix. 18, 28, 29; xi. 1).

Lk v. 17—26 = Mk ii. 1—12. With a view probably to more orderly narration Luke has stated at the beginning of this narrative (v. 17) that there were scribes present, which Mark does not mention till v. 6, and he has also amplified and heightened the description. Moreover, he has a good deal altered the form, though not the substance, of the account of the bringing of the paralytic into the presence of Jesus (vv. 18, 19 = Mk vv. 2—4). In these three vv. of Luke's section (17—19) there are several Lucan characteristics. v. 17. *καὶ ἐγένετο...καὶ αὐτός*: see above, v. 12 n.—*ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν*: the same phrase is used again at viii. 22 and xx. 1; cp. also above, v. 12 n. For *ἦν διδάσκων, ἦσαν καθήμενοι, ἦσαν ἐλληλυθότες*, see above, iv. 44 n. For the conception of the power of the Lord being present in and working through Jesus, cp. the account of His withdrawing into the wilderness after His baptism, *ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Πνεύματος* (iv. 14).—*ἴασθαι* in midd. or pass. occurs 11 times in Lk, and eight altogether in the other Gospels, four times in A. and three in rest of N.T.; the noun *ἴασις* at xiii. 32 and A. iv. 22, 30. v. 18. *παρὰλελυμένος*: here and at v. 24; so also at A. viii. 7; ix. 33. Mt. and Mk use only *παρὰλυτικός*, which is nowhere used by Lk.—*ἐνώπιον* is used nowhere in Mt. or Mk and once only in Jn; it occurs 24 times in Lk and 13 in A. It is frequently used, however, by Paul and most of all in Apoc. v. 19. *μὴ εὐρόντες*, etc.: cp. the use of *εὐρίσκειν* at xix. 48, and A. iv. 21, and see Friedrich, p. 11 (14 i). Note also the two

participial clauses, each of some length, having no conjunction between them, but both connected with the same verb. Friedrich remarks upon the commonness of this construction in Lk and A. and gives Lk iv. 20 and A. xii. 4, 25, as instances, p. 37, no. 272. The sentences in question are well-balanced because the action expressed in one of the participles is in thought most closely connected with the verb, in the order of time or for some other reason, and the one which is so connected is placed nearest it, while a slight pause between the two clauses is thus naturally suggested.

*vv.* 20—24. There is nothing here to note excepting, in *v.* 24, *παραλελυμένῳ* (commented on above, *v.* 18) and *πορεύου*. The latter is also used in dismissing those healed, or who have asked a question, at vii. 50; viii. 48; x. 37; xvii. 14; in Jn at iv. 50; xx. 17; and in *Peric. de adult.* (viii. 11). For Luke's fondness for the word see iv. 42 *n.*

*vv.* 25, 26. *παραχρῆμα*: see iv. 39 *n.*; *ἐνώπιον*: see *v.* 18 *n.*—Note a fresh phrase for the man's bed, shewing an aversion to the repeated use of the same word.—For the trait that the man who was healed glorified God cp. xiii. 13; xvii. 15; xviii. 43. The acknowledgment of God's glory by the people which is called forth by the sight of miracles is noticed in Mk ii. 12 = Mt. ix. 8 = Lk v. 26; Mk vii. 37 = Mt. xv. 31. But in Lk we have also ii. 20; vii. 16; ix. 43; xviii. 43; xix. 37.—*παράδοξα* does not occur elsewhere, but its use here illustrates the richer and more literary character, relatively to other N.T. writings, of Luke's vocabulary.

I will pass over the next few sections of Luke which are parallel to Mark, down to his first considerable insertion, and also after it the parable of the Sower, and the piece about the mother and brethren of Jesus coming to Him. In some of these sections the element of reported words is large, and here (as I have said) we meet with few Lucan characteristics. But even those of them which are mainly or wholly descriptive, as well as the descriptive parts of the rest, belong to the class of Luke's less revised parallels with Mark. The three sections following upon the last that I have indicated will repay study.

Lk viii. 22—25 = Mk iv. 35—41. In this account of a storm on the lake there are several points to be noted. *v.* 22. *ἐγένετο δὲ...καὶ αὐτός*, see *v.* 12 *n.*—*ἐν μιᾷ τῆς ἡμέρας*. (*Ib.*)—*διέρχασθαι* occurs 10 times in Lk, 20 in A., once in Mt., twice each in Mk and Jn, 5 times in Epp. of St Paul, and once in Heb.—*λίμνη* (also in *v.* 23), the lake of Galilee, as at *v.* 1, 2 and viii. 33. Mt., Mk and Jn always use *θάλασσα* in regard to it, which Lk nowhere does.—*ἀνάγεσθαι*, with the



meaning "to put to sea," is used only in the Lucan writings, viz. here and 13 times in A. (cp. A. xvi. 11 n., p. 315). Similarly *κατάγειν* of "bringing a boat to land," and *κατάγεσθαι*, of "coming into port," see Lk v. 11, and A. xxvii. 3 and xxviii. 12. v. 23. We have seen that in the Healing of the paralytic (Lk v. 17 f.), Luke states at the outset that scribes, etc., were present instead of waiting to refer to them, as Mark does, when their murmurings have to be mentioned; so here he states that Jesus had fallen asleep, before the moment comes at which He is awaked, and in this way greatly improves the description. In the clause which he is thus led to introduce he uses the gen. absol., which is far commoner with him than in many N.T. writings; he uses also the word *ἀφύπνωσεν*, which occurs nowhere else, but which is significant as illustrating his employment of compounds, sometimes (as in the present instance) very felicitously.—*κινδυνεύειν*, twice in A., also at 1 Cor. xv. 30.

v. 24. *ἐπιστάτα*: peculiar to Lk; it occurs at v. 5; viii. 45; ix. 33, 49; xvii. 13.—*παύεσθαι*, three times in Lk, six in A., six in Epp.

In addition to the points which have already been commented on, we may notice Luke's remarkably lifelike reference to the sudden descent of the squall—*κατέβη*; his use of *τὸ ἕδωρ* (v. 24, 25), suggestive of the *volume* of the water, which is so impressive at sea, especially in a storm; and of *ὁ κλύδων*, describing the surging of the billows. Again, *συνεπληροῦντο*—both the choice of the word, and the impf. tense, and the transference to the crew and passengers of what really applied to the boat—is more expressive than Mk's *ὥστε ἡδὴ γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον* (*συνεπληροῦσθαι* is used also at Lk ix. 51 and A. ii. 1).

Lk viii. 26—39 = Mk v. 1—20. v. 26. *καταπλεῖν*: here only, but cp. Lk's use of *κατάγειν* (see above viii. 22 n.) and *κατέρχεσθαι* (see A. xxi. 3 n., p. 320).—*ἥτις*: the relative of indefinite reference is often used in N.T. in connexion with some definite person or thing, especially in the Lucan writings. See Blass, p. 173. For his defining the locality cp. Lk iv. 31 n. v. 27. *ἱκανός*: 9 times in Lk, 18 in A., 3 each in Mt. and Mk, once in Ro. and 5 in 1 and 2 Cor., and once in 2 Tim. The contrast, however, is still more striking in regard to the use of the word in the idiomatic meaning "considerable" applied to quantity. It has this meaning in Lk in all cases but three—two of which exceptions occur in contexts parallel to Mk (and Mt.)—and in all cases in A., whereas in the remainder of N.T. it is used in this sense only at Mt. xxviii. 12, Ro. xv. 23, and 1 Cor. xi. 30. v. 28. *δεῖσθαι* (also

at *v.* 38): see *v.* 12 *n.* *v.* 29. συναρπάζειν: three times in A. (though not applied to demoniacal possession); not elsewhere.—φυλάσσειν, or φυλάσσεσθαι, is used in the same literal sense as here at Lk ii. 8; xi. 21; A. xii. 4; xxii. 20; xxiii. 35; xxviii. 16; not elsewhere.—τὰ δεσμά, neut. instead of masc., is found at A. xvi. 26; xx. 23; not in any other writer. *v.* 30. Luke uses ἐστίν, ἦν, etc., τίνι with special frequency to express possession. Cp. Blass, p. 111 f. It is especially common in regard to having some relative, a child, sister, etc. So far as I have observed the only close parallel in this respect is at Ro. ix. 9 in a quotation. For his defining the locality cp. Lk iv. 31 *n.* *v.* 33. λιμνή: see viii. 22 *n.* *vv.* 34 and 35. τὸ γεγονός is twice used; the second time it is also used in the parallel in Mk; for it cp. Lk viii. 56; xxiv. 12; A. iv. 21; v. 7; xiii. 12. παρὰ τ. πόδας: "Lk five times, A. six; in rest of N.T., except at Mt. xv. 30, it is expressed by πρὸς τοὺς πόδας, etc.; only Luke speaks of sitting at someone's feet in order to learn." Friedrich, p. 38. The formation of substantives out of the neut. of participles as in classical Greek is much commoner in Lk and A. than in the rest of N.T., cp. Friedrich, p. 142. *v.* 37. ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος: see iv. 40 *n.*—συνέχεσθαι, see iv. 38 *n.*—ὑποστρέφειν (also in *vv.* 39 and 40): 21 times in Lk, 10 in A.; besides only 3 times in Epp. and at Mk xiv. 40.

Lk viii. 40—56 = Mk v. 21—43. *v.* 40. For the def. art. with inf. governed by prep. here and *v.* 42 *β*, see iv. 42 *n.*—ἀποδέχεσθαι: twice in Lk, five times in A., not elsewhere.—πάντες, see iv. 40 *n.*—προσδοκᾶν: Lk six times, A. five, Mt. two, 2 Pet. three. *v.* 41. For καὶ οὗτος, as also for καὶ αὐτή at *v.* 42; see Lk v. 16 *n.*—ᾧ ὄνομα: Luke in introducing the name of a person or a place, which he could not assume that his readers would know, employs some expression such as "by name," or "called," far more regularly than other N.T. writers do, and his phrases of this kind differ from theirs. That used here occurs 5 times in Lk, once in A., not elsewhere, while ὀνόματι occurs 7 times in Lk, 22 in A., twice only in rest of N.T., viz. at Mk v. 22, and Mt. xxvii. 32. For other expressions see xxii. 47 *a.*—ὑπάρχειν: Lk 15, A. 25; rest of N.T. 20, including instances of neut. part. used as subst. (Lk 8, A. 1, rest of N.T. 5).—παρὰ τ. ποδ.: see viii. 35 *n.* *v.* 42. μονογενῆς: cp. vii. 12; ix. 38.—ἦν αὐτῷ: see viii. 30 *n.* *v.* 43 *β*. This touch is an example of Luke's interest in things medical.—ἦτις: see viii. 26 *n.* *v.* 44. παραχρῆμα (here and *vv.* 47 and 55): see iv. 39 *n.* *v.* 45. ἐπιστάτα: see viii. 24 *n.*—συνέχειν: see iv. 38 *n.* *v.* 47: observe the arrangement and structure of the clauses—ἰᾶσθαι: see v. 17 *n.*—ἐνώπιον: see v. 18 *n.* For ἐνώπιον τ. λαοῦ cp. ἐναντίον τ. λαοῦ, xx. 26,

and *ἐνώπιον τ. πλήθους* A. vi. 5; xix. 9. *υ. 48. πορεύου*; see iv. 42 *υ.* and v. 24 *υ.* *υ. 52. κόπτεσθαι* governing acc., cp. xxiii. 27. *υ. 55. διατάσσειν*: four times in Lk, five in A., six in Pauline Epp., once in Mt. *υ. 56. τὸ γεγονός*: see viii. 34 *υ.*

The remainder of the sections of Luke parallel with Mark down to the entry of the Upper Chamber for the Last Supper would be found on examination to illustrate the same features as regards the appearance of Lucan characteristics. In a certain number of verses Luke describes the circumstances more or less in his own way, and (as might be expected) his own characteristic forms of expression and remarks occur here most thickly. These verses are found chiefly at the beginnings or conclusions of the several narratives; they are especially the following: ix. 6; 10 and 11; 18 *a*; 29; xviii. 35 and 36; xix. 47 and 48; xx. 23; and in a somewhat less degree, ix. 1 and 2; 7; xx. 1; xxii. 1 and 2. There are also one or two instances in other parts, e.g. ix. 32 and 33 *a*. The Lucan characteristics are markedly less common in the rest of the descriptive portions of these sections, and in the words of Jesus and even of disciples and others they are for the most part more scanty still. Nowhere in the portion of the Gospel of which I am now speaking are they more numerous than in the passages where I have set forth the evidence; and on the whole they are far less so, owing to the circumstance that Sayings and discourses form a larger element. The Apocalyptic discourse, and to a certain extent also the parables, are exceptions as regards the closeness with which Luke follows Mark in reproducing Christ's words, as I have had occasion to observe in an earlier chapter<sup>1</sup>.

The concluding portion of Luke's Gospel from the beginning of the account of the Last Supper onwards, while it corresponds with St Mark as to the principal events treated, differs widely from it in certain respects. The account of the Last Supper, and indeed of the whole time spent in the Upper Chamber (xxii. 14—38) is, in the main at least, plainly an independent one, and the sending of Jesus to Herod (xxiii. 8—15), the words addressed by Jesus to the women who followed Him to Calvary (27—31), the words "Father, forgive them" (34 *a*), the incident of the penitent thief (*υυ.* 39—43), the cry, "Father, into Thy hands" (*υ.* 46), are peculiar to Luke. Again, the appearances of the Risen Christ which are recorded (xxiv.) are mainly different, and contain statements hard to reconcile with a statement in Mark. We will inquire hereafter what light is thrown

<sup>1</sup> See p. 73 f.

upon the question of the origin of these portions by their style and vocabulary. It is evident that for the moment we should not concern ourselves with them, because our immediate object is to observe how far Luke altered that which he actually derived from Mark. But we shall do well to examine the remainder of Luke's narrative of the last hours of Jesus, with a view to deciding whether it can have been based upon Mark, and to learning what more we can as to Luke's practice in regard to the revision of his documents.

Lk xxii. 39—46 = Mk xiv. 26, 32—42. *v.* 39. ἐπορεύθη: see iv. 42 *n.*—κατὰ τὸ ἔθος: cp. i. 9 and ii. 42 and see Friedrich, p. 13, no. 20; also κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον at ii. 27. *v.* 40 *b.* The same Saying occurs again *v.* 46, where it is parallel to Mark. Luke has Sayings about temptation peculiar to him at viii. 13 and xxii. 28. *v.* 41. ἀποσπᾶσθαι ἀπό: for the same phrase (verb in middle) see A. xxi. 1. It is used there also of a painful departure.—τιθέναι τὰ γόνατα: peculiar to Lk and A., cp. A. vii. 60; ix. 40; xx. 36; xxi. 5. St Paul always writes κάμπτειν τὰ γόνατα, and this latter expression is used in Lxx. (1 Chr. xxix. 30; 1 Es. viii. 73; Is. xlv. 23; Dan. vi. 10; 3 Mc. ii. 1). We have also κλίνειν ἐπὶ τὰ γόνατα at 2 Es. ix. 5.

(*vv.* 43, 44 are probably not genuine.) Luke passes over the contents of Mk *vv.* 38—42, perhaps because the words with which he concludes make a fitting transition to the next scene, while the extended account in Mark involves some repetitions.

Lk xxii. 47—53 = Mk xiv. 43—49. *v.* 47. ὁ λεγόμενος: on the use by Luke of expressions like this with proper names that may be supposed to be unfamiliar cp. viii. 41 *n.* The particular expression used here is, however, less common in the Lucan writings than in Mt. and Jn. It does occur at Lk xxii. 1, and A. iii. 2 and vi. 9; but Luke far more frequently has καλούμενος which is not used in the other Gospels.—ἐγγίξεν: see below vii. 11 *n.* Lk omits the explanation (Mk *v.* 44), that the salutation of Jesus by Judas was a signal which had been agreed upon. The expostulation of Jesus, and the question of those standing round Him as to whether they should defend Him, both of which Luke alone has, might have been imagined by him. But it can hardly have been simply Luke's own inference that when the ear of the High-Priest's servant had been struck off Jesus healed the wound (though Luke alone relates this). Probably therefore in this whole passage (*vv.* 48—51), he is relying partly on another account besides Mark's. *v.* 49. τὸ ἐσόμενον: see viii. 34 *n.* *v.* 50. τὸ δεξιόν: cp. vi. 6, where similarly it is stated that a man's right hand was

withered. *v.* 51. *ἐάν*: see *iv.* 41 *n.*—*ἰάσθαι*: see *v.* 17 *n.* *v.* 52. *παραγίνεσθαι*: 8 times in Lk and 20 in A., 8 in remainder of N.T.—*στρατηγοί*: here, at *v.* 4, and three times in A. of certain officers of the temple; in A. xvi. of city officials at Philippi; not elsewhere. *v.* 53. *ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους*: cp. *ἐξουσία τοῦ Σατανᾶ*, A. xxvi. 18.

Lk xxii. 54—62 = Mk xiv. 53 *a*, 54, 66—72. For differences of arrangement between Mark and Luke in their narratives of Peter's fall see p. 165 f. On the whole Luke keeps close to Mark in his narrative of what took place. The only differences of fact are that whereas Mark states that the maid who had originally said that Peter was a follower of Jesus repeated the charge, Luke represents it as having been made the second time by a man; and again that he speaks of it as made once more by yet another man, in place of by the bystanders generally, as it was according to Mark. The following verbal points may be noted:—*v.* 55. In completing the description of the scene of Peter's trial, he uses (in gen. absol.) the word *περιάπτειν* in sense of "kindling"; *ἄπτειν* is used in this sense at viii. 16; xi. 33; xv. 8; and A. xxviii. 2; not elsewhere. *ἀνάπτειν* at Lk xii. 49 and Jas iii. 5. *v.* 56. *ἀτενίζειν*: twice in Lk, 10 times in A., twice in 2 Cor. *v.* 59. *διαστάσης ὡσεὶ ὄρας μιάς*: *διστάναι* is used besides only at xxiv. 51 and A. xxvii. 28,—in the last two places of an interval of space.—*δύσχυρίζετο*; cp. A. xii. 15; it is not found elsewhere. *v.* 60. *παραχρήμα*: see *iv.* 39 *n.*

Lk xxii. 63—65 = Mk xiv. 65. Luke confines the mockery in the High-Priest's house expressly to the attendants. *v.* 63. *οἱ ἄνδρες*: the word *ἀνὴρ* occurs with considerably greater frequency in Lk than in the other Gospels, and is used more often still in A.—*συνέχευ*: see *iv.* 38 *n.*

Lk xxii. 66—xxiii. 1 = Mk xv. 1. For some of the differences between Mark and Luke in regard to the trials of Jesus see p. 166. In giving an account of the morning trial Luke seems to have had in mind, and to have made use of, what Mark relates in regard to the trial in the night. He passes over, however, the incident of the false witnesses, though the words which he has retained at *v.* 71 would have derived force from the mention of it. *v.* 69. *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*: five times in Lk, and at A. xviii. 6; besides only at 2 Cor. v. 16, and Jn viii. 11 (in the *Peric. de adult.*). *ἀπ' ἄρτι*, which occurs three times in Mt., twice in Jn and once in Apoc., is not used by Lk—xxiii. 1. *ἅπαν*: see *iv.* 40 *n.*

Lk xxiii. 2—4, 13, 16—25 = Mk xv. 2—15. *v.* 2. *εὑρίσκειν*: here and *v.* 4: see *v.* 19 *n.*—*διαστρέφοντα*: cp. A. xiii. 8, 10.—*φόρους*

Καίσαρι δίδοναι: cp. xx. 22; the only other passage in which φόρος is used is Ro. xiii. 6, 7. In Mk (and Mt.) this charge is not referred to, but it is implied in Jn xix. 12, 15. *v.* 4. αἴτιον: here and *vv.* 14 and 22, also at A. xix. 40; elsewhere, both in other writers and in A., αἰτία is used in similar connexions. *v.* 13. συνακαλεῖσθαι: the mid. occurs twice and the act. twice in Lk; the mid. twice and the act. once in A.; the act. once in Mk. *v.* 18. πανπληθεί: cp. *v.* 1.—*v.* 21. ἐπιφωνεῖν occurs three times in A., not elsewhere. *v.* 23. ἐπικεῖσθαι: in same sense as here, at *v.* 1 and A. xxvii. 20 and also at 1 Cor. ix. 16, its force elsewhere is somewhat different. *v.* 25. τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν: Luke emphasises the responsibility of the leaders of the Jewish people. Similarly it may be from a desire to make light of the fault of the Romans relatively to that of the Jews, that while he has dwelt on the mockery of Jesus by the officers of the chief-priests and of Herod with his soldiers, he has made no reference to that by Roman soldiers described Mk xv. 16—20. He alludes, however, to an act of mockery by the latter during the time that Jesus was hanging on the Cross (*v.* 36).

Lk xxiii. 26, 32, 35—38, 44, 45, 47—49 = Mk xv. 20 *b*—41. In describing the procession to Calvary Luke mentions the two malefactors, much as at the beginning of the narrative in *v.* 17 *f.* he states who were present. He is then able in the next verse to refer to their crucifixion more concisely than Mk does. He passes over at this point the title over the Cross of Jesus. It may have been accidentally omitted here in consequence of his additions; but he finds a suitable place later on at which to mention it, *viz.*, in connexion with the taunts of the chief-priests in regard to the kingship of Jesus; and the derisive intention of the title is thus made apparent. The only discrepancy from Mark (apart from his giving a different version of the last cry of Jesus) is in regard to the offering of the ὄξος, and this is but a slight one.

*v.* 26. ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι: five times in Lk, seven in A., three in Heb., twice in 2 Tim., once each in Mt. and Mk. *v.* 32. ἀναρεθῆναι: ἀναρεῖν occurs twice in Lk, 19 times in A., once each in Mt., 2 Th., Heb. *v.* 33. τὸν καλούμενον: see Lk xxii. 47 *n.* *v.* 35. Luke distinguishes the action of the crowd, who simply gazed, from that of the rulers. At *v.* 48 he again refers to the crowd, describing their sympathy and profound emotion at the death of Jesus.—ἐκμυκτριάζειν: also at xvi. 14.—ὁ ἐκλεκτός: cp. ὁ ἐκλεγμένος at ix. 35. There is plainly a reference to Isa. xlii. 1 (LXX.). This epithet is not applied to Christ in the other Gospels, nor, indeed, is the title

used—directly as a title—in the remainder of N.T. *v.* 45. *τ. ἡλίον ἐκλείποντος*: *ἐκλείπειν* is used besides only at Lk xvi. 9; xxii. 32 and Heb. i. 12; neither time with the present application. This use of it, though not occurring elsewhere, nevertheless illustrates Luke's command of literary Greek. Note also the gen. abs.—*ἐσχίσθη μέσον*: cp. *ἐλάκησεν μέσος* at A. i. 18. *v.* 46. *φωνήσας φωνῇ*: the use of the verb and cognate noun is specially common in Lk and A.; see Lekebusch, p. 76, or Winer, § 54, 3. Cp. with the present passage Lk i. 42; ix. 14; A. v. 28; xvi. 28; xxviii. 10. *v.* 47. *τὸ γερόμενον*: see viii. 34 *n.*—*ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεόν*: see *v.* 25 *n.* *v.* 48. *συν- παραγερόμενοι*: for *παραγίνεσθαι* see xxii. 52 *n.* *σὺν* in composition is specially common in Lk and A. I have counted 52 words, chiefly verbs, compounded with *σὺν* which occur only, or most frequently, in these two books. Such words are, however, still more common in the Pauline Epp. I have counted 63 occurring only, or most frequently, there. *v.* 49. *οἱ γνωστοί*: also Lk ii. 44, not elsewhere.

Lk xxiii. 50—56 = Mk xv. 42—47. *v.* 50. *καὶ ἰδὸν ἀνὴρ*: a characteristic beginning, cp. *v.* 12, 18, etc.; A. viii. 27; x. 30, etc.—*ὄνοματι*: see viii. 41 *n.*—*v.* 51. *οὗτος* (again *v.* 52, where it is used also in parallel in Mt.): see *v.* 16 *n.*—*συνκατατεθειμένος*: here only, but *κατατιθέναι* (though not with the same special reference) is used A. xxiv. 27; xxv. 9, and not elsewhere.—*βουλῇ*: twice in Lk, seven times in A., twice in Pauline Epp., once in Heb. *v.* 53. *λαξευτῶ*: the substitution of this word for Mk's more cumbersome expression illustrates his command of Greek. *v.* 55. *κατακολουθεῖν*: besides only at A. xvi. 17.—*αἵτινες*: see viii. 26 *n.* *v.* 56. *ὑποστρέφειν*: see viii. 39 *n.*

At this point the parallelism with St Mark ends. In the portions of the narrative of the Passion which we have been considering, i.e., those which correspond in substance with Mark's account, the phenomena as regards the appearance of Lucan characteristics are much the same as in earlier parts of the Gospel, both as to their amount and the unequal degree to which different verses are marked by them. There is less composition by the evangelist himself than one might have expected in view of the extent to which he has rearranged the subject-matter, and the adjustments which are usually rendered necessary by the introduction of additional matter.

II.

*Luke's peculiar matter.*

Bearing in mind what we have learned from our study of Luke's revision of his Marcan document, let us proceed to examine the Lucan characteristics in Luke's peculiar matter with a view to determining the nature of the source, or sources, of different parts of it. The main question to be answered is whether it, or this or that piece of it, was derived from a document, or from oral information of some kind. We know what to expect in the former case. If Lucan features are found to be still more prominent, it will be an indication that the source was oral; since commonly there would be more opportunity for the evangelist to impress his own style upon that which he was the first to write down, and more probability of his doing so, than when he was using a document. On the other hand, there may not always be equally good ground for inferring a documentary source from the scantiness of Lucan characteristics. For the evangelist might have preserved to a considerable extent a style and vocabulary that were not specially his own in committing to writing what he had received in the form of tradition, or oral information, if it had been told him with fulness and precision, and remembered by him accurately. Further some of the pieces that will come before us are short, while at the same time each has to be judged by the evidence supplied in it separately. From these causes the test of style is not perfectly adapted to the purpose to which I propose now to apply it. Nevertheless the results obtained by these means are worthy of consideration.

Lk i. 5—ii. 52. The impersonal *ἐγένετο* occurs in these chapters at i. 8, 23, 59; ii. 1, 6, 15, 46; also *καὶ in apodosis* after *καὶ ὅτε in protasi* at ii. 21, and after *καὶ ἰδοὺ* at ii. 25. We have noted these Hebraisms as Lucan characteristics (see v. 12 n.), but it may be questioned whether they should be so regarded in the portion of the third Gospel now under consideration. Here they occur in a narrative which is Hebraic, and moulded on the LXX., throughout, and their use is consequently not very surprising. Luke may have been led to use the expressions in question partly from his own familiarity with the LXX., partly from his having become accustomed to them in copying this document at the beginning. Much the same may be said of *ἐνώπιον* (i. 15, 17, 19, 75)—for Luke's use of which in general see v. 18 n.—*ἐναντίον* (v. 6), and *ἐναντι* (v. 8). But these words, occurring in such phrases as *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, are common



in the LXX. The same is true of ὁ ὑψιστος, occurring at i. 32, 35, 76, and also vi. 35, and A. vii. 48. We also have ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὑψιστος at Lk viii. 28 and A. xvi. 17; also at Mk v. 7 and Heb. vii. 1. Where the origin of a passage is uncertain and is the subject of inquiry, there may naturally be some doubt as to whether particular expressions in it should be regarded as significant in one way or another. In the present case parallelisms with the LXX. suggest a special ground for caution. The influence of that version may well have been felt by some other early Christian writer besides Luke, and even more strongly than it was by him. This consideration should be borne in mind in connexion with one or two of the "Lucan" characteristics which follow as well as in those already noticed.

i. 5. ὀνόματι: also ὄ, or ἦ, ὄνομα, vv. 26, 27, and ii. 25; see viii. 41 n. For the phrase in 5 b, τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς, see below. i. 6. πορεύεσθαι: also at v. 39 and ii. 3, 41; see iv. 42 n. But the word is also exceedingly common in LXX.; with the present v. cp. (e.g.) Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 1, οἱ πορευόμενοι ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου. v. 7. εἶναι with dat. to express possession: see viii. 30 n.—καθότι occurs also at xix. 9, and four times in A., not elsewhere. v. 8. ἐν τῷ with inf. (also at ii. 27): see iv. 42 n. and v. 12 n. v. 9. κατὰ τὸ ζῆλος: see xxii. 39 n. v. 10. πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος: see iv. 40 n. The subst. verb with partic. occurs again vv. 20, 21, 22; ii. 26; on it see iv. 44 n. v. 11. ὥφθη δὲ αὐτῷ: This periphrasis—the passive verb with the dative—is common in Lk and A. in describing supernatural appearances. Cp. of angels, xxii. 43; A. vii. 35; xvi. 9; also in regard to appearances of the Risen Christ, Lk xxiv. 34; A. ix. 17; xiii. 31; xxvi. 16. For this last use cp. 1 Cor. xv. 5, 6, 7, 8 and 1 Tim. iii. 16. Cp. also A. ii. 3 (of the appearance of fiery tongues) and vii. 2 (of the Lord's appearing to Abraham). In Mt. and Mk we have similar expressions in regard to Moses and Elias at the Transfiguration. In the remainder of N.T. we have only Apoc. xi. 19; xii. 1, 3. See on the phrase, Winer, § 31, 10.—ἐστώς: for the perf. part. of ἵστημι and its compounds we find always in Lk and A. the short form ἐστώς, except at Lk i. 19. v. 12. φόβος ἐπέπεσεν, cp. A. xix. 17:—ἐπιπίπτει occurs twice in Lk, eight times in A., four times in remainder of N.T. v. 19. εὐαγγελίζεσθαι: for its extensive use in Lk and A. see iv. 43 n. In the present v., however, and at ii. 10 its meaning seems to be simply that of 'bringing good news' as in O.T., not specifically that of bringing the news of 'salvation,' as in the rest of N.T. v. 20. ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας

occurs again at xvii. 27; ἄχρι in phrases defining the time up to which is specially common in Lk and A.; cp. εὖς τῆς ἡμέρας A. i. 22.—ἀνθ' ὧν occurs also Lk xii. 3; xix. 44; A. xii. 23; and once in Pauline Epp.—οἷτινες: see viii. 26 n. v. 22. ὀπτασία, occurs xxiv. 23 and A. xxvi. 19; also once in 2 Cor. v. 23. πύμπλημι: eight times in Lk i. and ii., five in remainder of Lk, nine in A., twice in Mt. v. 28. χαριτοῦν, used besides only Eph. i. 6, but the use of χάρις (see v. 30) may be compared. v. 30. χάρις is also used ii. 40 and 52, and at 5 other places in Lk and 17 in A., 3 in Jn, not in Mt. or Mk. In the Gospel and in the first part of A. (ii. 47; iv. 33; vi. 8; vii. 10, 46) it has not the specific sense in which it is used in the Pauline Epp., etc., and for the most part in the latter part of the Acts (xi. 23, etc. except xxv. 3 and 9; perhaps also one or two of the references to the grace of God, e.g. xiv. 26, may be general). v. 35. ἐπέρχεσθαι: 3 times in Lk, 4 in A., twice besides in N.T. v. 41. σκιρτᾶν, also at v. 44; it occurs besides only at vi. 23 (Logian passage). v. 45. Neut. partic. used as substantive; see viii. 34 n., and for this use of participles of λαλεῖν, cp. ii. 33 and A. xvi. 14. v. 56. ὑποστρέφειν: see viii. 37 n. v. 57. The gen. of infin., cp. other examples at ii. 6, 21, 24, 27, and see iv. 42 n. With the words here, however, and ii. 6, cp. Gen. xxv. 24—ἐπληρώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν. v. 61. συγγένεια, twice in A. vii., but one of these is a quotation. v. 62. Neut. sing. prefixed to an indirect interrogative sentence—"rarely except in the Lucan writings," Blass, p. 158. Cp. ix. 46, xxii. 23. v. 64. παραχρήμα: see iv. 39 n. v. 65. διαλαλεῖν, occurs also at vi. 11. v. 66. ἔθεντο, etc.: cp. ix. 44; xxi. 14. v. 80. ἀνάδειξις: cp. ἀναδεικνύειν, Lk x. 1 and A. i. 24. ii. 2. ἡγεμονεύειν: cp. iii. 1, where ἡγεμονία is also used. v. 4. ἦτις: see viii. 26 n. v. 8. φυλάσσοντες φυλακάς (also v. 9 ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον): see xxiii. 46 n. v. 9 (as also v. 38): ἐφιστάται: see iv. 39 n. For its use in describing angelic appearances cp. ii. 9, and A. xii. 7, and an appearance of the Lord, xxiii. 11.—περιλάμπειν, cp. A. xxvi. 13. v. 13. ἐξαίφνης: twice each in Lk and A., besides only once in Mk.—αἰνεῖν: Lk 4, A. 2, twice besides. v. 15. τὸ ῥῆμα, cp. A. x. 37 for the use of the word with this meaning. It is, however, a Hebraism. v. 16. σπεύσαντες, cp. xix. 5, 6, where the partic. is used in a precisely similar manner; σπεύδειν is also used twice in A., and once in 2 Pet.—ἀνεύραν: cp. A. xxi. 4, where it is used in a precisely similar manner.—συνβάλλειν occurs also at xiv. 31 and A. iv. 15; xvii. 18; xviii. 27; xx. 14; not elsewhere. In none of these is the meaning precisely the same as here; the

nearest is A. iv. 15. *v.* 25. εὐλαβής: also three times in A., not elsewhere. *v.* 35. ἀντιλέγειν: also at xx. 27, and three times in A., always of opposition to the truth; it occurs besides once in Jn and three times in Pauline Epp.—διέρχασθαι: see viii. 22 *n.* *v.* 37. ἀφιστάναι: four times in Lk, six in A., three in Pauline Epp., and once in Heb. *v.* 38. αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, this phrase (with or without the prep. ἐν prefixed) is peculiar to Lk. It occurs in all parts:—at xx. 19 in a Marcan context; at x. 21; xii. 12, in Logian contexts; in the verse now before us, and at xiii. 31 and xxiv. 33 in passages that are peculiar; also A. xvi. 18 and xxii. 13. Mt. on the other hand has ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ several times, and Mk and Apoc. each once, and Lk has this phrase at vii. 21. *v.* 44. οἱ γνωστοί: see xxiii. 49 *n.*—ἀναζητεῖν, also at A. xi. 25, not elsewhere. *v.* 48. δδυνασθαι: three times in Lk, once in A., not elsewhere. *v.* 49. τί ὅτι: cp. A. v. 4, 9. *v.* 51. διατηρεῖν: also at A. xv. 29, not elsewhere. *v.* 52. ἡλικία, used of stature also at xix. 3 and at Eph. iv. 13.

Several of the instances which have been here mentioned are not remarkably distinctive ones. In number and character conjointly they do not appear to exceed what might be expected if Luke was the reviser, not the author, of the narrative. Moreover there are other particulars which are unfavourable to the supposition that he was the author. I proceed to notice these.

i. 5 *b.* καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Ἐλεισάβητ, and similarly *v.* 27 *b.* This formula resembles Jn i. 6; iii. 1; xviii. 10. Elsewhere in Lk and A. we have in such cases always an adverbial or relative clause—ὀνόματι, or ᾧ ὄνομα. There are examples of these in the same two *vv.* here in which we have the unwonted expressions. In like manner we sometimes find in those sections of Luke which are parallel with Mk that he alters a word or phrase once, but not twice. *v.* 9. ἔλαχε τοῦ: at A. i. 17 λαγχάνειν governs the acc. not the gen. *v.* 19. παρεστηκώς: in every other passage of Lk and A. in which the perf. part. of ἵστημι, or one of its compounds, is used the form is ἐστώς. *v.* 20. ἔση σιωπῶν: σιγᾶν is rather more common with Lk than σιωπᾶν. *v.* 39. εἰς τὴν ὄρεινῃν: the high table-land forming most of the Eastern part of Judaea is not likely to have been referred to in this way by any but a Palestinian writer. It is even contrary to Luke's usual manner to have introduced such a topographical term without any explanation, or apologetic expression. *Ib.* πόλιν Ἰουδα: the only other instance of the use of this form in N.T. is in the quotation in Mt. ii. 6. At i. 65 we read ἐν ὄλῃ τῇ ὄρεινῃ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, which looks like Luke's adaptation of the language of his source.

ii. 11. Χριστὸς Κύριος and *v.* 26, Χριστὸς Κυρίου, are unique in N.T. ii. 23, 24, 29, νόμος κυρίου: elsewhere, as at ii. 22, Luke speaks of "the Law," or "the Law of Moses" (the latter at xxiv. 44, and A. xiii. 39; xv. 5; xxviii. 23), and this was the most natural description for a Gentile Christian, a disciple of St Paul, to give of it.

The last expressions noted are plainly such as we might expect from a Jewish Christian. There are others also (e.g., ii. 25, προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, and Simeon's words εἰς πᾶσιν, etc., ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ) which betoken such an origin, as do also the tone of, and knowledge of Jewish institutions displayed in, the whole narrative.

I pass to two narratives which correspond to narratives in St Mark but are yet largely independent.

Lk iv. 16—30 (cp. Mk vi. 1—6 a). *v.* 16. τεθραμμένος: the word seems to be carefully chosen with reference to the statements in ii. 1 ff. and 51, 52.—κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ, cp. A. xvii. 2 for the phrase and for the act; his use of κατὰ τὸ ἔθος may also be compared; see xxii. 39 *n.*—ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων, οἱ τοῦ σαββάτου, cp. xiii. 14, 16; xiv. 5; A. xiii. 14; xvi. 13. This periphrasis is not used elsewhere; Jn xix. 31 is somewhat similar but not really the same. Cp. ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς (A. ii. 1; xx. 6); ἡμέρα τ. ἀζύμων (Lk xxii. 7; A. xii. 3; xx. 6); neither elsewhere. *v.* 17 a. ἐπιδιδόναι, six times in Lk, twice in A., twice in Mt., not elsewhere.—τοῦ προφ. Ἰσαίου: "prophet" is likewise placed before the proper name at A. ii. 16, viii. 28, not elsewhere. 17 b—19 (A citation). *v.* 20. ἀτενίζειν: see xxii. 56 *n.*; for εἰμί with partic. see iv. 43 *n.* *v.* 21. Luke lays great stress on the fulfilment of prophecy. Cp. ix. 31; xxi. 22 f.; xxiv. 44; A. i. 16; iii. 18; xiii. 27, in all which places the same word πληροῦν is used. Cp. also Lk xii. 50; xviii. 31; xxii. 37; and A. xiii. 29, where τελεῖν is used.—ἐν τοῖς ὦσιν: for similar expressions, emphasising the act of hearing, cp. ix. 44, and A. xi. 22; xxviii. 27 (this last is in a quotation made also Mt. xiii. 15). *v.* 22. τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος: for the phrase cp. A. xx. 32; on χάρις see i. 30 *n.*—ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ: as Luke dwells on the organ of hearing (cp. *v.* 21), so he does on that of speech in solemn references to the utterances of prophets, etc. Cp. esp. Lk i. 70; xxi. 15; A. i. 16; iii. 18, 21; iv. 25; viii. 35. In the other Gospels the only near parallel is Mt. xiii. 35 (a quotation from O.T.). With the last clause of *v.* 22 cp. Mt. xiii. 55 and Mk vi. 3,

and see p. 142. *v.* 23. πάντως: also three times in A. The words peculiar to Lk are a taunt commonly addressed to physicians which is applied to the failure of Christ's ministry of healing in His own home.—*παραβολή*: not elsewhere in N. T., as here, "a proverb." Cp. 1 Sam. x. 12, and Ez. xii. 22; xviii. 2. Its connexion with *v.* 24 is of a kind which suggests compilation. *v.* 24=Mk. vi. 4, somewhat abbreviated; *δεκτός*, also at iv. 19 and A. x. 35 and twice in Pauline Epp. *vv.* 25—27. There do not seem to be any Lucan characteristics in these verses; on the contrary, the reference to a Jewish tradition as to the length of the famine in the reign of Ahab (cp. Jas. v. 17), and the phrase ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, in *vv.* 25, 26, are suggestive of a Jewish Christian source. *v.* 28. Cp. A. xix. 28, γενόμενοι πλήρεις θυμοῦ: on use of *πίμπλημι* see i. 23. *v.* 29. ἕως ὄφρῦος: see iv. 42 *n.* *v.* 30. διελθών: see v. 12 *n.*—ἐπορεύετο: see iv. 42 *n.*

It would seem that in this section Luke has amplified Mark's account of the Visit to Nazareth by additions from another which contained more of the words of Jesus, and which probably also lay before him in a written form. In combining the two he has, in the narrative portions, written with a good deal of freedom, so that several points illustrative of his own mental habits appear there; at the same time he has brought in parts of two of Mark's sentences.

Lk v. 1—11 (cp. Mk i. 16—20). Luke's narrative is mainly concerned with Simon; Andrew is not mentioned, and the place of the sons of Zebedee is subordinate. In these respects, and in various other details, as well as in the account of the miracle, its independence of Mark is apparent. There are also but few coincident expressions in the two. The reference, however, to the sons of Zebedee may be due to the Marcan parallel. The following words, etc., may be noticed.

*v.* 1. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ...καὶ αὐτός: see v. 12 *n.* and iv. 42 *n.*—ἐπικεῖσθαι: see xxiii. 23 *n.*—ἦν ἑστώς: see iv. 43 *n.* and i. 11 *n.*—λίμνην: see viii. 22 *n.* *v.* 3. ἐπαναγαγεῖν: also in *v.* 11, καταγαγόντες: see Lk viii. 22 *n.* *v.* 4. παύεσθαι: three times in Lk, six in A., six in Epp.; in four of the passages in A. it is followed as here by a participle describing speaking, teaching, etc.—χαλᾶν, three times in A., only once each in Mk and 2 Cor. *v.* 5. ἐπιστάτα: see viii. 24 *n.* *v.* 9. θάμβος: also at iv. 36 and A. iii. 10. *v.* 10. κοινωνοί: instead of repeating μέτοχοι, he used another word for variety.

Participles are effectively used in 2 *b*, 5 *b*, 7 *a*, 11. In the last *v.* there are two participial clauses in the same tense, one following

the other without a conjunction, but the sentence reads well, because there is a natural order of succession in the three acts expressed by the two participles and the finite verb, and perhaps also for other reasons which might be pointed out. There are, also, throughout the section, signs of care in the placing of words with a view to right emphasis. The narrative bears a resemblance to that related Jn xxi. 4, in regard to the Risen Lord. It appears to me most probable that Luke derived it from oral tradition.

We now come to the sections peculiar to Luke included in his two chief insertions into the Synoptic Outline. For the most part I shall refrain from any expression of opinion as to the origin of the several sections till the whole series has been reviewed. I will however call attention in passing to the few pieces in which there seems to be specially strong reason for thinking that the composition is by the evangelist.

Lk vii. 11—17. *καὶ ἐγένετο*: see v. 12 *n.*—*ἐν τῷ ἔξῃς*, cp. *ἐν τῷ καθ' ἑξῆς* at viii. 1. For Luke's use of *τῇ ἔξῃς* and other similar words see xx. 15 *n.* and A. xxi. 1 *n.* *ἡμέρα* is understood after *τῇ ἔξῃς* and it is actually added at ix. 37. With the reading *τῷ* we should probably supply *χρόνῳ*; the connexion in time which is intended is not then quite so close; cp. R.V. "soon afterwards."—*ἐπορεύθη*: see iv. 42 *n.*—*καλουμένην*: see xxii. 47 *n.* v. 12. *ὡς δὲ ἤγγισεν*: Luke is fond of picturing the *approach* to a place or a person. Besides Lk xix. 29 = Mk xi. 1 = Mt. xxi. 1, we have (in addition to the present passage) Lk xv. 1, 25; xviii. 35, 40; xix. 37, 41; xxii. 47; xxiv. 15, 28; A. ix. 3; x. 9; xxi. 33; xxii. 6; xxiii. 15.—*καὶ ἰδοὺ in apodosis* (here after *ὡς*); see v. 12 *n.*, and also cp. vii. 37; xiii. 11; xix. 2; A. i. 10.—*μονογενῆς*: see viii. 42 *n.*—*τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ*: see viii. 30 *n.*—*ικανός*: see viii. 27 *n.* v. 13. *ὁ Κύριος*: this title is applied to Jesus in the Christian manner several times in Luke's two chief insertions (vii. 13; x. 1, 39; xi. 39; xvii. 5, 6; xviii. 6), and also twice later in his Gospel (xxii. 61; xxiv. 34); and several times in A. (v. 14; ix. 1, 17, etc.); also several times in Jn (iv. 1; xi. 2, xiii. 13); but not in Mk or in Mt. At Mk v. 19 God is meant, and at Mk xi. 3 = Mt. xxi. 3 = Lk xiv. 31, it is virtually equivalent to "our master." v. 16. Cp. v. 25 *n.*—*ἐπισκέπτεσθαι*, used of God three times in Lk and once in A.; with the present verse cp. esp. i. 68.—*λαός* here is used specifically of Israel. v. 17. *Ἰουδαία*, probably here, as at xxiii. 5, and vi. 17, the whole land inhabited by Jews, as also at i. 5 and at xxiv. 19. In Mt. and Mk it refers always to the actual province of Judæa.

vii. 36—50. *v.* 36 *a*, cp. the form and words in xviii. 18 *a*. *v.* 36 *b*. *κατεκλίθη: κατακλίνεσθαι* (mid.) is used three times in pieces of peculiar matter in Lk, viz. here, and at xiv. 8 and xxiv. 30. The act. is used at ix. 14. The word does not occur elsewhere in N.T. *v.* 37 *a*. *καὶ ἰδοὺ...καί:* see *v.* 12 *n.*—*ἦτις:* see viii. 26 *n.* *vv.* 37, 38. A long but admirably constructed sentence, such as no N.T. writer save the author of Lk and A. has shewn himself capable of composing, unless perhaps the author of Ep. to Heb., but as that is not narrative it is difficult to draw a comparison. The first half of this sentence consists of no less than four participial clauses, but as there is no conjunction between the first two, or between the last two, this half itself at once and naturally falls into two sub-divisions. In the latter half of the sentence we have again four clauses, this time each containing a finite verb. The parallelism between the first and second is well marked by *τοῖς δάκρυσιν* in an emphatic position at the beginning of the first clause and *ταῖς θριξίν* in the corresponding position in the second. The four clauses follow one another with rhythmic strokes, exquisitely expressive at once of the ardour and the orderliness of the woman's action.—*παρὰ τ. πόδας:* see viii. 35 *n.*—*βρέχειν* (*vv.* 38 and 44), again at xvii. 29, but also once each in Mt. and Apoc. and twice in Jas. v. 17. *v.* 40 *b*. Notice the arrangement of the words. *v.* 41. *εἶναι* with dat. to express possession: see viii. 30 *n.*—*χρεοφειλέτης:* also at xvi. 5, which likewise belongs to the peculiar matter. At Mt. xviii. 24 we have *ὀφειλέτης* in a parable. At Lk xiii. 4 also *ὀφειλέτης*, but man's relation to God is there directly in question (not under a figure). *v.* 42. *μὴ ἐχ. δὲ αὐτῶν ἀποδοῦναι;* cp. *οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναι* at xiv. 14.—*ἐχαρίσατο: χαρίζεσθαι* (mid.): three times in Lk, three in A.; in pass. at A. iii. 14; besides only in Pauline Epp. The construction *χαρίζεσθαι τινὰ τινί* is used at A. xxv. 11, 16, and xxvii. 24, not elsewhere (see Klostermann, *l.c.*, on the last passage). *v.* 43. *ὑπολαμβάνειν;* in same sense at A. ii. 15; in other senses at Lk x. 30; A. i. 9, and 3 Jn 8.—*ὀρθῶς*, three times in Lk, once in Mk.—*ἔκρινας: κρίνειν* is used, as here, nine times in A. of decisions which do not involve condemnation or acquittal, as also a few times in Pauline Epp. Cp. *ἐπικρίνειν* at xxiii. 24. See below, A. xvi. 15 *n.* *vv.* 44—47. Note the antithetical clauses. *v.* 48. *οἱ συνακαίμενοι: σύν* in composition, see xxiii. 48 *n.* *v.* 50. The words *ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε, πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην* occur also at viii. 48, where they are parallel to Mk v. 34, except that Mk has *ὑπάγε* instead of *πορεύου*. For the use of the latter word see iv. 42 *n.* The first half of the sentence occurs also Lk xviii. 42 = Mk x. 52, and Lk xvii. 19.

On p. 310 I have named the above narrative as one that was composed by the evangelist himself on the basis of oral tradition.

viii. 1—3. *v. 1.* καὶ ἐγένετο...καί: see *v. 12 n.* and *17 n.*—ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς: see *vii. 11 n.*—διοδεύειν, also at *A. xvii. 1.*—ὀδεύειν at *Lk. x. 33*; συνοδεύειν, *A. ix. 7*; neither elsewhere.—κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην: κατὰ *sensu distributivo* is commoner in *Lk* and *A.* than in other parts of *N.T.*—εὐαγγελίζεσθαι: see *Lk. iv. 43 n. v. 2.* τεθεραπευμένοι ἀπό: see *v. 15 n.*—πνευμάτων πονηρῶν: we have πνεῦμα with the epithet πονηρόν also at *vii. 21* and *A. xix. 12, 13, 15, 16*; also πνεύματα πονηρότερα at *Mt. xii. 4 = Lk. xi. 26* (*Logian document*).—ἀσθενειῶν: see *v. 15 n.*—καλουμένη: see *xxii. 47. v. 3.* αἵτινες: see *Lk. viii. 26 n.*—τὰ ὑπάρχοντα: eight times in *Lk* and once in *A.*, also three times in *Mt.* and once each in *1 Cor.* and *Heb.*; followed by *dat.* only here and at *A. iv. 32.*

There are many Lucan characteristics in this short passage. The evangelist has here worked in with his reference to the journeying of Jesus an interesting piece of information regarding some of His female disciples, derived probably from an oral source.

ix. 51—56. *v. 51.* ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ...καὶ αὐτός: see *v. 12 n., iv. 42 n.*—ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας: the same phrase (saving *sing.* for *pl.*) occurs at *A. ii. 1*; *cp.* also συμπτελεσθῆναι similarly applied at *Lk. iv. 2* and *A. xxi. 27*, not elsewhere; συμπληροῦσθαι is used besides only at *Lk. viii. 23*, in a different connexion.—ἀνάλημψις occurs only here, but ἀναλαμβάνειν is used of the Ascension, *A. i. 2, 11, 22*, and also *Mk. xvi. 19* (later ending); στηρίζειν, also at *xvi. 26*; *xxii. 32*; common in *Pauline Epp.* *cp.* πρὸ προσώπου at *x. 1. v. 52.* ἀποστέλλειν ἀγγέλους: *cp.* *Mal. iii. 1*, quoted at *Mt. xi. 10* and *Lk. vii. 27*. The messengers of John are called ἄγγελοι at *Lk. vii. 24. v. 53.* ἦν πορευόμενον.—πορεύεσθαι is used four times in these six *vv.*, *cp.* *Lk. iv. 42 n.* and *44 n.*

ix. 61, 62. *v. 61.* ἀποτάσσεσθαι, also at *xiv. 33* in a saying, likewise peculiar to Luke, giving very similar teaching to that in the present context, also at *A. xviii. 18, 21*, and once each in *Mk* and *2 Cor.* *v. 62.* εὐθετος is used again in Luke's form of a saying from the *Logian document*, at *xiv. 35*, which follows the saying referred to under the last verse; besides only at *Heb. vi. 7.*

x. 1, 17—20. *v. 1.* ἀναδείκνυμι: at *A. i. 24*, not elsewhere.—πρὸ προσώπου: *cp.* *ix. 52. v. 17.* ὑποστρέφειν: see *viii. 37 n. v. 19.* ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν: see *iv. 42 n.*—ἡ δύναμις τοῦ ἐχθροῦ: this may be contrasted with ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Πνεύματος or τοῦ Κυρίου, *iv. 14*; *v. 17.*



x. 29—37. *v.* 29. *δικαιοῦν ἑαυτόν*: cp. same phrase at xvi. 15, and cp. xviii. 14. *v.* 30. *ὑπολαβών*: see vii. 43 *n.*—*περιπίπτει*, also at A. xxvii. 41, and at Jas. i. 2.—*πληγὰς ἐπιθέτες*: see the same phrase at A. xvi. 23. *v.* 31. *κατὰ συγκυρίαν* does not occur elsewhere, but is a phrase in Luke's manner; *συγκυρεῖν* is used three times in the LXX., and *συγκύρημα* at 1 K. xx. 25, according to one reading. *v.* 32. *κατά* with a noun of locality in acc. is found also at viii. 39 and xv. 14, and frequently in A. The other Gospels do not afford examples of it. *v.* 33. *ὀδεῶν*: see viii. 1 *n.* *v.* 34. *τραύματα*, not elsewhere, but *τραυματίζειν* is used Lk xx. 12 and A. xix. 16, and not elsewhere.—*ἐπιβιβάζειν* is used in exactly the same way at xix. 35 and A. xxiii. 24, and not elsewhere. In the latter case also *κτήνη* occurs in the context.—*ἐπιμελεῖσθαι*: cp. *ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν*, A. xxvii. 3.—*ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον*: this phrase occurs besides A. iv. 5, not elsewhere; *αὔριον* is also commoner in Lk and A. than in remainder of N.T. *v.* 35. *ἐπανερχεσθαι*: also at xix. 15, not elsewhere. *v.* 37. *ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετὰ*: cp. i. 58.—*πορεύου*: see iv. 42 *n.*

The literary style of the whole piece is admirable. Among other excellences note the three participial clauses in *v.* 30, and their arrangement, the first two being joined by a conjunction and placed before the verb, and the third, of which the action coincides with that of the verb, placed after it. Moreover, as this last clause describes the condition in which the wounded traveller was left, it forms an impressive ending to the sentence. The combination of variety with repetition in *v.* 32, as compared with *v.* 31, should also be noted; and again, the expressive compound words—*ἀντιπαρήλθεν*—*ἐπιχέων*—*ἐκβαλῶν*—*προσδαπανήσης*—*ἐπανερχεσθαι*.

The structure of the sentences and the vocabulary in this parable justify us in attributing it, so far as its literary form is concerned, to our evangelist.

x. 38—42. *v.* 38. *ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι*: see v. 12 *n.*, iv. 42 *n.*; *αὐτός*, v. 16 *n.*—*γεννῆ δέ τις ὀνόματι*, etc., cp. A. xvi. 14, and see Lk viii. 41 *n.*—*ὑποδέχεσθαι*: also at xix. 6; A. xvii. 7; once besides at Jas. ii. 25. *v.* 39. *τῆδε ἦν*, etc.: see viii. 30 *n.*—*καλουμένη*: see xxii. 47 *n.* *v.* 40. *ἐπιστώσα*: see iv. 39 *n.* *vv.* 41, 42. A lesson as to the unimportance of material things.—*ἦτις*: see viii. 26 *n.* The compounds *παρακαθεσθεῖσα* and *συναντιλάβηται* should perhaps be noticed.—*ἀφαιρέσθαι*, cp. xvi. 3.

xi. 1, 5—8. *v.* 1. *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ...:* see v. 12 *n.*—*εἶπέν τις*: Luke, in the matter peculiar to him, attributes questions or remarks to an individual, rather more commonly than Mk and Mt. do, who

frequently represent the disciples collectively, or a body of Pharisees, etc., as putting a question, etc. There are, however, instances of this kind also in Luke's peculiar matter; see xiii. 1, 31.—ὡς ἐπαύσατο: see v. 4 n.—On Luke's fondness for representing Jesus as praying, see v. 16 n. v. 5. τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν: this formula in appealing to human analogies—a question, the answer to which is plainly indicated—occurred in the common Logian document (Lk xi. 11 = Mt. vii. 9; Lk xii. 25 = Mt. vi. 27), and we find it also in another piece which may not have been taken directly from that document, but which was in substance common to Mt. and Lk, viz., Lk xiv. 5 = Mt. xii. 11. But it is also used several times in passages peculiar to Lk, viz., in addition to the present one, at xiv. 28, 31; xv. 4 (cp. Mt. xviii. 12), 8; xvi. 11, 12; xvii. 3. Lk vii. 47, and xii. 42 (= Mt. xxiv. 45), though they are different, may also be compared. v. 6. παρεγένετο: cp. Lk xxii. 52 n. v. 7. κόπους παρέχειν, also at xviii. 5. The thought in the comparison here is very similar to that in xviii. 1—6.

xi. 27, 28. v. 27. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ: see v. 12 n.—ἐπαίρειν, of lifting up the voice only here and at A. ii. 14; xiv. 11; xxii. 22. Similarly αἶρειν φωνήν at xvii. 13 and A. iv. 24, not elsewhere. For the exclamation cp. Lk xxiii. 29. v. 28. μενοῦν does not occur elsewhere at the beginning of a clause, but is found as the second word at Lk iii. 18, and several times in A.; also in the present ending of Mk (xvi. 19), also at Jn xix. 24, and xx. 30.

xii. 13—21. v. 13. εἶπεν δέ τις: see xi. 1 n. v. 15. φυλάσσεσθε ἀπό occurs only here; at xx. 46 = Mk xii. 38, Luke has changed Mk's βλέπετε ἀπό into προσέχετε ἀπό, and he has the latter expression also at xii. 1. v. 19. εὐφραίνεσθαι occurs four times in the parable of the Prodigal Son and once in that of Dives and Lazarus (i.e. other parables comprised in Luke's peculiar matter), twice in A., three times in Pauline Epp., three in Apoc.—ἀπαιτεῖν, also at vi. 30.

xii. 47 and 48. Nothing to note.

xii. 49, 50. v. 49. ἀνήθθη: see xxii. 55 n. v. 50. βάπτισμα βαπτισθῆναι: see xxiii. 46 n.—συνέχομαι: see iv. 38 n.—ἕως οὗ is used by Luke here and at xiii. 8; xxii. 16; all belonging to his peculiar matter; ἕως οὗ at xiii. 21 (Logian); and at xv. 8; xxii. 18; xxiv. 49, all three peculiar to him; in A. always ἕως οὗ. Mt. has ἕως οὗ at v. 25, elsewhere ἕως οὗ. Jn each expression once.—τελεσθῆ: see ix. 51 n.

xiii. 1—5. v. 1. ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ: cp. ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, Lk ii. 38 n. v. 2 and 4. παρὰ πάντας: cp. xviii. 14.

xiii. 6—9. v. 8. ἕως οὗ: see v. 50 n.

xiii. 10—17. *v.* 10. ἦν διδάσκων: see Lk iv. 44 *n.*—ἐν μιᾷ τ. συναγωγῶν: cp. v. 12 *n.* *v.* 11. καὶ ἰδοὺ...καὶ: see v. 12 *n.*—πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας: see Lk iv. 33 *n.* and v. 15 *n.*—ἦν συγκύπτουσα: see Lk iv. 44 *n.* Note the precise description of the woman's physical condition—συγκύπτουσα...μη...ἀνακύψαι εἰς τὸ παντελές. For ἀνακύψαι cp. Lk xxi. 28, and for εἰς τὸ παντ. Heb. vii. 25. *v.* 12. προσφωνεῖν, four times in Lk, twice in A., once in Mt. (xi. 16 = Lk vii. 32, taken from the Logian document). *v.* 13. ἀπολύειν is used here only of deliverance from a disease or infirmity; λύειν at *v.* 16 below and at Mk vii. 35.—παραχρήμα: see iv. 39 *n.*—ἀνορθοῦν, also at A. xv. 16 and Heb. xii. 12. *v.* 14. τῇ ἡμ. τ. σαβ.: see Lk iv. 16 *n.* *v.* 16. θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ: for this designation cp. xix. 9; it is also implied in xvi. 22—24. *v.* 17 *b.* For this termination and for ἐδόξ. τ. θ. at *v.* 13 see v. 25 *n.*

xiii. 22. Cp. viii. 1 and ix. 6. διαπορεύεσθαι: also at vi. 1 and xviii. 36 and A. xvi. 4; besides only Ro. xv. 24.—κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας: cp. viii. 1 *n.*

xiii. 31—33. *v.* 31. ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ: see ii. 38 *n.* *v.* 32. For the stress laid on the work of healing in this saying cp. ix. 1.—*ταῖς*, also used A. iv. 22, 30.—ἀποτελεῖν occurs besides only Jas. i. 15, but for the idea of a solemn work to be accomplished cp. πληροῦν at ix. 31.—αὔριον: see x. 34 *n.*—τελειοῦμαι, cp. A. xx. 24; but for the idea see esp. Heb. ii. 10; v. 9; vii. 28. *v.* 33. τῇ ἐχομένῃ: cp. A. xx. 15 *n.* below.

xiv. 1—6. *v.* 1. ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ...καὶ αὐτοί: see v. 12 *n.*—ἦσαν with part., see iv. 44 *n.*—παρατηρεῖν used three times in Lk, once in A., once each in Mk and Ep. to Gal.—ὕδρωπικός: the precise description of a disease; the word does not occur elsewhere. *v.* 3. νομικός, used five times by Luke in Logian contexts (vii. 30; x. 25; xi. 45, 46, 52), but nowhere in parallels to Mk: when Mk uses γραμματεῖς Luke reproduces it. In A. also he uses the latter word four times and νομικός never. This word must, therefore, in all probability have been derived from his Logian source. Mt. has it at xxii. 35 = Lk x. 25, from the Logian document, see p. 88 *f.*—ἡσυχάζειν: also at Lk xxiii. 56, and twice in A.; once in 1 Th.; the nearest in force to the present passage is A. xxi. 14.—ἐπιλαβόμενος: ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, 5 times in Lk, 7 in A.; once each in Mt. and Mk; twice each in 1 Tim. and Heb.—ἀνασπᾶν, also at A. xi. 10.—ἐν ἡμέρ. τ. σαβ.: see iv. 16 *n.*; possibly introduced here as a variation for σαββάτω, which has been left standing at *v.* 1 and 3.

xiv. 7—11. *v.* 7. ἐπέχων is used similarly at A. iii. 5; and

1 Tim. iv. 16 ; in other senses at A. xix. 22 ; Phil. ii. 16. *v.* 8. κατακλιθῆς : see vii. 36 *n.* *v.* 10. ἵνα...ἐρεῖ : there is only one other instance in Lk of ἵνα followed by fut. indic., viz., at xx. 10.

xiv. 12—24. *v.* 13. δοχὴν ποιεῖν : also at v. 29. *v.* 14. οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναι : cp. vii. 42. *v.* 21. παραγεγόμενος : see Lk xxii. 52 *n.*—ταχέως, or ταχύ, is used, in a manner which may be compared to some extent with Mark's use of εὐθύς, in two other pieces belonging to Lk's peculiar matter, viz., xv. 22 and xvi. 6, but not elsewhere in Lk. It is so used also at Mt. v. 25 ; xxviii. 7, 8 ; Mk ix. 39.

xiv. 28—33. *v.* 28. τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν : see xi. 5 *n.* *v.* 31. συνβυλεῖν : see Lk ii. 19 *n.* ; the connotation of the word at A. xvii. 18 is nearest to the present passage. *v.* 32. πρεσβεία, also at xix. 14, in a parable largely peculiar to Lk.—τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην, this phrase is used again at xix. 42. With ἐρωτᾷ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην cp. A. xii. 20. *v.* 33. ἀποτάσσεται : see ix. 61 *n.*—τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν : see viii. 3 *n.* ; for the gist of the Saying cp. xii. 33.

xv. 1, 2. *v.* 1. ἦσαν ἐγγίζοντες : see Lk iv. 44 *n.* and vii. 12 *n.* *v.* 2. διαγογγύζειν, likewise at xix. 7, in a passage which is to be compared also for the occasion to which it relates.

xv. 3—7. (Cp. as similar in substance, Mt. xviii. 12—14.) *v.* 4. τίς ἄνθρωπος, etc. : see xi. 5 *n.* *v.* 6, 7. Cp. the endings of the three parables of this chapter, shewing modelling common to all.—συνκαλεῖν is used 4 times in Lk, 3 in A., once in Mk ; συναίρειν, also (below) at *v.* 9 and Lk i. 58 ; 4 times in Epp. of St Paul.—δίκαιος is used in a wholly favourable (but Jewish) sense at i. 6 ; xiv. 14 ; xxiii. 47, 50 ; A. x. 22. It is used with a touch of irony—directed, however, against those who claimed the title without conforming to the (Jewish) ideal of the character, not against that ideal itself—both in the present passage and at xviii. 9, as also at v. 32 = Mk ii. 17.

xv. 8—10. *v.* 8. τίς γυνή : see xi. 5 *n.*—δραχμή : except in this parable the only reference to this coin in N.T. is the mention of δίδραγμα at Mt. xvii. 24. The value of the drachm in Syria in 1st cent. A.D. appears to have been about the same as a denarius, which is the coin most often mentioned in all the Gospels.—ἄπει : see xxii. 55 *n.*—ἐπιμελῶς : see x. 34 *n.* *v.* 10. ἐνώπιον : see v. 18 *n.*

xv. 11—32. *v.* 13. μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας : cp. almost exactly the same expression at A. i. 5 ; see, however, also Jn ii. 12.—εἰς χώραν μακράν : cp. xix. 12. *v.* 14. κατὰ, with acc. of place : cp. x. 32 *n.* *v.* 15. πορευθεῖς : see Lk iv. 42 *n.*—κολλᾶσθαι, similarly used five times in A.—πολίτης, also at xix. 14 and A. xxi. 39, and in a quotation from LXX. at Heb. viii. 11. *v.* 18. ἐνώπιον : see v. 18 *n.*

v. 20 b. ἐπέπεσεν, etc.: cp. A. xx. 37. v. 22. ταχύ: see xiv. 21 n. v. 23. φέρετε τὸν μόσχον: except in the present instance Luke avoids using φέρειν in regard to human beings (if in a condition to walk) and animals;—for A. xiv. 13 should hardly be reckoned an exception, seeing that στέμματα is combined there with ταύρους and is the word nearest to the verb, and plainly ἄγειν would have been even more unsuitable in regard to it than φέρειν in regard to ταύρους.—εὐφρανθῶμεν: see xii. 19 n. v. 25. ἤγγισεν τῇ οἰκίᾳ: see vii. 12 n. v. 26. πυνθάνεσθαι occurs twice in Lk, seven times in A., once each in Mt. and Jn. At Lk xviii. 36 it is followed by τί εἶη τοῦτο, at A. xxi. 33 by τίς εἶη, and in three other places by τίς, or cases of it. In Mt. and Jn the constructions are different. v. 27. ἀπολαμβάνειν: five times in Lk, three in Paul's Epp., once each in Mk and 2 Jn. v. 29. παρέρχεσθαι: cp. the similar use of this word at Lk xi. 42 (= Mt. xxiii. 23), where it is peculiar to Luke's form of a Logian saying.

xvi. 1—13. The word οἰκονόμος used in this parable is used also by Luke in a Logian passage, xii. 42 = Mt. xxiv. 45, where δοῦλος appears in Mt. οἰκονόμος does not occur elsewhere in the Gospels. v. 3. ἐπαιτεῖν: also at xviii. 35, in the parallel to which in Mk x. 46, we have προσαίτης.—ἀφαιρέται: cp. x. 42, there pass., here mid. v. 5. ἓνα ἕκαστον: see iv. 40 n.—χρεοφειλέτης: see vii. 41 n. v. 8. οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας: cp. κριτῆς τ. ἀδικίας at xviii. 6.—ὑπὲρ after compar., not elsewhere. v. 9. ἐκλείπειν: cp. xxii. 32 and in quotation from LXX. at Heb. i. 12.

xvi. 19—31. v. 19. ἐνδιδύσκειν is used in the act. at Mk xv. 17.—εὐφραίνεσθαι: see xii. 19 n. v. 20. ὀνόματι: see Lk viii. 41 n. v. 23. ὑπάρχων: see viii. 41 n.—ὀδυνῶμαι: see ii. 48 n. v. 25. ἀπέλαβες: see xv. 27 n.—παρακαλεῖται: for this sense of παρακαλεῖσθαι, where the comforting proceeds from circumstances, not from any words that are spoken, cp. A. xx. 12. But we find it also at Mt. v. 4; 2 Cor. i. 6, etc. v. 26. ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις: cp. xxiv. 21.—διαβαίνειν, also at A. xvi. 9, and Heb. xi. 29. v. 28. διαμαρτύρεσθαι: nine times in A., three in Pastoral Epp., once each in 1 Th. and Heb.

xvii. 7—10. v. 7. τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν, etc.: see xi. 5 n. v. 9. μὴ ἔχει χάριν: for χάρις see i. 30 n. The phrase ἔχειν χάριν τίνι occurs only in present passage, but Lk vi. 32, 33, 34, may be compared.—τὰ διαταχθέντα: see viii. 34 n. and 55 n.

xvii. 11—19. v. 11. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ...καὶ αὐτός: see v. 12 n.—πορεύεσθαι here and at v. 14; see iv. 42 n.—διήρχετο: see v. 15 n. v. 12. With λεπροὶ ἄνδρες (λεπρός used as an adj.) we may compare v. 12, ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας. v. 13. αἶρειν φωνήν: cp.

A. iv. 24, and see Lk xi. 27 on *ἐπαίρειν φωνήν*.—*ἐπιστάτα*: see viii. 24 *n.* *vv.* 15, 16. In this sentence finite verbs and participles are skilfully intermingled and balanced. *v.* 15. *ἰάσθαι*: see *v.* 17 *n.*—*ὑποστρέφειν*, here and *v.* 18; see Lk viii. 39 *n.*—*δοξάζων τ. θ.*: see *v.* 25 *n.* *v.* 16. *παρὰ τοὺς πόδας*: see viii. 35 *n.* *v.* 19. See vii. 50 *n.*

From the style of this narrative we may conclude that the evangelist himself composed it, deriving the substance of it from oral tradition.

xviii. 1—8. *v.* 5. *παρέχειν κόπον*: cp. xi. 7. *v.* 8. *ἄρα*, also A. viii. 30, and Gal. ii. 17.

xviii. 9—14. *v.* 9. *πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς*: the same phrase occurs at 2 Cor. i. 9.—*δίκαιοι*: cp. xv. 7 *n.*—*ἐξουθενεῖν*, also at xxiii. 11 and A. iv. 11, eight times in St Paul's Epp.—*τοὺς λοιπούς*: cp. viii. 10. *v.* 11. *σταθεῖς* is similarly used at xviii. 40 and xix. 8 and four times in A. *v.* 12. *κτᾶσθαι*, also at xxi. 19, and three times in A., once each in Mt. and 1 Th. *v.* 13. *ἑστώς*: see i. 11 *n.* *v.* 14. *δικαιοῦσθαι*: see x. 29 *n.*—*παρ' ἐκείνον*: cp. the use of *παρὰ* at xiii. 2, 4.

xix. 1—10. *v.* 2. *καὶ ἰδοὺ...καὶ αὐτός*: see *v.* 12 *n.* and vii. 12 *n.*—*ὄνοματι καλούμενος*: see xxii. 47 *n.*—*ἡλικία*: see ii. 52 *n.* *vv.* 5, 6. *σπεύσας*: see ii. 16 *n.* *v.* 6. *ὑπέδέξατο*: see x. 38 *n.* *v.* 7. *πάντες*: see iv. 40 *n.*—*διαγογγύζειν*: see xv. 2 *n.*—*καταλύσαι*: in sense, to lodge, also at ix. 12 and not elsewhere. *v.* 8. *σταθεῖς*: see xviii. 11 *n.*—*τῶν ὑπαρχόντων*: see viii. 41 *n.*—*συκοφαντεῖν*, cp. Lk iii. 14. *v.* 9. *σωτηρία*: cp. i. 69.—*καθότι*: see i. 7 *n.*—*υἱὸς Ἀβρ.*: see xiii. 16 *n.*

xix. 11—28. *v.* 11. *προστίθημι*: more frequent in Lk and A. than elsewhere, but there is no instance exactly parallel to this one. For an explanation of the occasion by the evangelist cp. Lk xviii. 9, etc.—*παραχρήμα*: see iv. 39 *n.*—*ἀνοφαίν.*: cp. A. xxi. 3. The error of the disciples here is one against which Luke himself has sought to guard, xxi. 9, 24. *v.* 12. *εὐγενής*: cp. A. xvii. 11 and 1 Cor. i. 26.—*χώρα μακράν*: see xv. 13.—*ὑποστρέφειν*: see viii. 39 *n.* *v.* 14. *πολίτης*: see xv. 15 *n.*—*πρεσβεία*: see xiv. 32. *v.* 15. *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ...καὶ*: see *v.* 12 *n.* (not here as usually at beginning of a section).—*ἐπανέρχεσθαι*, also at x. 35. *v.* 16. *παρεγένετο*: see Lk xxii. 52 *n.* *v.* 14 is an insertion which has nothing to do with the rest of the parable. *v.* 27. *πλήν*: Luke has this word at the beginning of sentences many times in Logian and peculiar matter; once besides at beginning of a *clause* at Lk xxii. 42 = Mt. xxvi. 39.

xix. 41—44. *v.* 41. *καὶ ὡς ἤγγισεν*: cp. *v.* 29, and see vii. 12 *n.* *v.* 42. *τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην*: cp. xiv. 32. *v.* 43. Cp. Luke's alteration at xxi. 20 of the language of Mk xiii. 14. The present

passage describes the siege of Jerusalem with even greater precision.—*συνέξουσιν*: see iv. 38 *n.* v. 44. *ἀνθ' ὧν*: see i. 20 *n.*—*ἐπισκοπῆς*: the nearest parallel in regard to the use of this subst. is at 1 Pet. ii. 12; but the verb *ἐπισκέπτεσθαι* is used of Divine visitations three times in Lk and once in A., not elsewhere.

The evangelist probably took this incident from oral tradition and moulded the words of Christ to a certain extent in accordance with the events.

xxii. 14—38. For the structure of this passage and a comparison between it and the corresponding account in Mk see pp. 163—5. Cp. also p. 238 *f.* v. 14. *ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα*: cp. the solemn use of *ἔρχεται* (or *ἐλήλυθεν*) *ἡ ὥρα* in Jn.—*οἱ ἀπόστολοι*: this description of the Twelve is also used at ix. 10; xvii. 5; xxiv. 10 and several times in A., not in Mt. or Jn, and once only in Mk (vi. 30). v. 15. *ἐπιθυμῶ ἐπεθύμ.*: see Lk xxiii. 46 *n.*—*ἔως ὅτου*: see xii. 50 *n.*—*πληροῦσθαι*: ix. 51 *n.* v. 17. *διαμερίζεσθαι*, also at xxiii. 34, and once each in Mt., Mk and Jn (quotation) in relating the incident to which the last-named passage in Lk also refers. v. 21. *πλὴν*: see xix. 27 *n.* v. 22. *κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμένον*: cp. esp. A. ii. 23; *δρίζειν* is used five times in A. and once each in Rom. and Heb. For neut. part. used as subst. see Lk viii. 34 *n.*, and for similar phrase see xvii. 10 and iv. 16; A. xvii. 2.—*πορεύεται*: see iv. 42 *n.*—*πλὴν οὐαί*: cp. vi. 24. *οὐαί* followed by dat. is Logian; there are, however, two instances in Mk, one each in 1 Cor. and Jud. and two in Apoc. v. 23. *τὸ τίς*, etc.: see i. 62 *n.* v. 29. *διατίθεσθαι*, also at A. iii. 25 and four times in Heb., cp. *διαθήκη* at v. 20. v. 30. *καθήσεσθε*: for the fut. here appended to a verb in conj. with *ἵνα* see Blass, p. 212, and cp. A. xxi. 24 (if *ἐνρήσονται* is read there). v. 32. *ἐδεήθη*: see v. 12 *n.*—*ἐκλείπειν*: cp. xvi. 9 *n.*—*στηρίζειν*: see ix. 51 *n.* v. 33. *ἔτοιμός εἰμι*: cp. A. xxiii. 15, 21; *γίνεσθε ἔτοιμοι*. Lk xii. 40 (= Mt. xxiv. 44) is very similar. v. 35. *βαλλάντιον*: four times in Lk. v. 37. *τελεσθῆναι*: see ix. 51 *n.* v. 38. *ικανόν*: for the meaning here, the nearest parallels seem to be afforded by A. xvii. 9 and Mk xv. 15.

xxiii. 5—12, 14, 15. v. 5. Cp. the charge against Paul, A. xxiv. 5; and for the description of the region over which the preaching of Jesus extended cp. A. x. 37. *vv.* 6 and 7. Notice the use of participles in these *vv.*—*ἐξουσία*, there is no exact parallel to the use of this word here; but Lk xii. 11; xx. 20; A. ix. 14; xxvi. 10, 12, are closely similar. Cp. also Ro. xiii. 1; Tit. iii. 1.—*ἀναπέμπειν*: used three times in this context and in a precisely similar application

at A. xxv. 21. The word is used once besides, viz. at Philem. 11. v. 8. ἦν γὰρ θέλων, periphrasis for finite verb, see Lk iv. 44 n.—ἐξ ἱκανῶν χρόνων: see Lk viii. 27 n. With the present passage cp. especially xx. 9.—σημείον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γινόμενον. For other examples of this rather remarkable use of γίνεσθαι in regard to miracles, see A. iv. 16, 30; v. 12; viii. 13; xiv. 3; also Lk iv. 23. It is confined to Lk and A. v. 9. ἐν λόγους ἱκανοῖς: see again Lk viii. 27 n. v. 10. εὐτόνος, besides only at A. xviii. 28. v. 11. This sentence, which contains three participial clauses, is skilfully balanced; the two first clauses are united, and the third (περιβαλὼν ἐσθήτα, etc.) is thus thrown more closely into connexion with ἀπέπεμφεν;—led away in this attire Jesus still bears the marks of the mockery with Him. It may be noted also that ἐμπαίξας carries us a step further than ἐξουθενήσας. For the use of the latter word see xviii. 9 n. v. 12. προὔπαρχειν: besides only at A. viii. 9.—ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ: this phrase occurs besides only at xxiv. 13; but cp. Luke's use of αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, see ii. 38 n. v. 14. ἀνακρίνειν: used four times in A. as here in a technical sense, of a magistrate conducting a judicial examination and once in a more general sense. It is likewise used in a general sense in 1 Cor. and it does not occur elsewhere in N.T.—αἴτιον: also at vv. 4 and 22; in all three instances with the meaning "ground for an accusation, or punishment." It occurs besides at A. xix. 40; there, however, in a slightly different sense. v. 15. ἀπέπεμφεν: see v. 11.—οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ: cp. A. xxiii. 29; xxv. 11, 25; xxvi. 31; also Lk xxiii. 41.

This account of the appearance of Jesus before Herod bears strong marks of having been indited by the evangelist himself. The matter is, also, of a kind which he might well have obtained from information orally given to him. In connexion with it we may notice the reference to Herod, A. iv. 27, and the incident peculiar to the third Gospel at xiii. 31.

xxiii. 39—43. v. 39. κρεμάννυμι, used of crucifixion as here at A. v. 30, and x. 39; besides only at Gal. iii. 13 (in a quotation from Deut. xxi. 23).—κακούργος occurs in N.T. only in this passage and at 2 Tim. ii. 9, but it is a common word in Greek literature. Note the compactness of the phrase εἰς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων. v. 40. ἀποκριθεὶς...ἐπιτιμῶν...ἔφη. The clause is not overloaded by the two participles; a slight pause after ἕτερος is naturally suggested, because the second participle belongs more closely to the verb by reason of being in the present, as well as by its position.—κρίμα, *sensu forensi*, cp. Lk xxiv. 20. v. 41. ἡμεῖς μὲν...οὗτος δέ: see Blass,



*N.T. Gram.* p. 266 f., "The correlation of μέν and δέ, which is so essentially characteristic of the classical Greek style, is very largely reduced in the N.T....it only occurs with any frequency in Acts, Hebrews (1 Peter) and some of the Pauline Epistles."—ἀξια γὰρ ὧν, etc.: see xxiii. 15 n. A contrast is also directly suggested with the case of Jesus as stated there by Pilate.—ἀπολαμβάνεσθαι is similarly used in five other places in Lk, and three only in the remainder of N.T.—ἀποπον, used twice in A., viz. xxv. 5 and xxviii. 6, in the former of these precisely as here. It is used also at 2 Thess. iii. 2 rather differently.—There is nothing that bears on the question now before us in the few words addressed by the penitent to Jesus and by Jesus to the penitent in vv. 42, 43.

The foregoing account bears marks of having been put into a written form by our evangelist.

xxiv. 1—12. v. 4. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ...καὶ ἰδοῦ: see v. 12 n. and iv. 42 n.—ἄνδρες: see xxii. 63 n.—ἐπέστησαν: see iv. 39 n. and cp. ii. 9. v. 5. ἔμφοβος, also at v. 37. It is used twice in A., once besides in Apoc. v. 7. For the construction cp. v. 44. v. 8. Cp. A. xi. 16. v. 9. ὑποστρέψασαι, see Lk viii. 37 n. v. 10. A curiously bad construction.—οἱ ἀπόστολοι: see xxii. 14 n.

xxiv. 13—43. v. 13. ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ: see xxiii. 12 n.—ἦσαν πορευόμενοι: see iv. 42 n., 44 n.—ἀπέχουσαν σταδίου ἐξήκοντα ἀπό: cp. οὐ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος ἀπό, at vii. 6.—ἡ ὄνομα: see viii. 41 n. vv. 14, 15. ὀμιλεῖν, also at A. xx. 11, and xxiv. 26; not elsewhere. v. 15. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ...καὶ αὐτός: see v. 12 n.; and iv. 42 n., and cp. esp. xvii. 11.—ἐγγίστας: see vii. 12.—συνπορεύεσθαι, used three times in Lk, and once in Mk in a slightly different application. v. 17. ἀντιβάλλετε: the word is not elsewhere used, but it may be noted as an expressive compound. Cp. συνβάλλειν with a similar meaning at Lk ii. 19; A. iv. 15. v. 18. ὀνόματι: see viii. 41 n. v. 19. τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ: on τὰ περὶ τίνος see Lekebusch, p. 77. Cp. v. 27; xxii. 37; and A. i. 3; viii. 12, etc.—δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ: cp. A. vii. 22.—ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ...λαοῦ: cp. i. 8; xx. 26; on λαός see vii. 16. v. 20. εἰς κρίμα θανάτου: see xxiii. 40 n.—οἱ ἄρχοντες: cp. xxiii. 13, etc. v. 21. ὁ μέλλων λυτρωθῆναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ: cp. i. 68 and ii. 38, where the noun λύτρωσις is used.—ἄγει: cp. A. xix. 38. v. 22. ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς, cp. A. viii. 11.—ὄρθριναί: this epithet applied to persons who are up with the dawn is literary. The subst. ὄρθρος is used Lk xxiv. 1 and A. v. 21.—ὄπτασιαν: see i. 22 n. The construction of the sentence contained in vv. 22, 23 should be noticed. v. 25. βραδείς τοῦ πιστεύειν: see Blass, p. 235 ff. v. 26. ἴδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν: cp.

v. 46 and A. iii. 18; xvii. 3; the same phrase exactly does not occur elsewhere. v. 27. *διερμηνεύειν*; used also at A. ix. 36 and four times in 1 Cor.—*τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ*, see v. 19 n. v. 28. *ἤγγισαν*: see vii. 12.—*πορεύεσθαι* (bis): see iv. 42 n. v. 29. *παραβιάζεσθαι*: besides only at A. xvi. 15.—*ἑσπέρα*: besides only twice in A.—*κέκλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα*: see nearly the same phrase at Lk ix. 12.—*τοῦ μείναι*: see iv. 42 n. v. 30. *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ...εὐλόγησεν*: see v. 12 n.—*ἐπιδίδουαι*: used in a Logian passage, Mt. vii. 9, 10 = Lk xi. 11, 12, but also three other times in Lk and twice in A. v. 31. *διανοίγειν*: used metaphorically here and at v. 45, and A. xvi. 14, of the heart or mind; also of the Scriptures at v. 32 and A. xvii. 3; not elsewhere metaphorically. The former application may have been suggested by 2 Macc. i. 4. Cp. also, though not quite so close, Hos. ii. 15. v. 32. *καιομένη ἦν*: see Lk iv. 44 n. v. 33. *αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ*: see ii. 38 n.—*ἀθροίζειν*: here only, but *συναθροίζειν* twice in A., not elsewhere.—*τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς: οἱ σὺν τινι* or *τισιν* is an idiom used many times in Lk and A., once in Mk and once in Ep. to Ro. v. 34. *ᾤφθη Σίμωνι*: see Lk i. 11 n. v. 35. *ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου*: the breaking of bread in the Christian assemblies is referred to A. ii. 42, 46; xx. 7, and perhaps xxvii. 35. v. 37. *ποιεῖσθαι*: the word occurs besides only at Lk xxi. 9.—*ἔμβοβοι*: see v. 5 n. v. 38. *ἀναβαίνειν*: *sensu tropico*, as also at A. vii. 23 and 1 Cor. ii. 9; in both these instances, however, the preposition after *ἀναβαίνειν* is *ἐπί*. v. 42. *ἐπέδωκαν*: see v. 30 n. v. 44. Cp. v. 7. v. 45. *δύνησεν τὸν νοῦν*: see v. 31 n.—*τοῦ συνίεναι*: see iv. 42 n. v. 46. *παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν*: see v. 26 n. v. 47 a. *κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν*: cp. A. ii. 38.—*vv. 47 b and 48. εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, —ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ: ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων*: cp. A. i. 8 b. v. 49. Cp. A. i. 4 and 8 a. v. 51. *διέστη*: see xxii. 59 n. v. 52. *ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ*: cp. A. i. 12. v. 53. *διὰ παντός*: used also A. ii. 25 (in quotation from Ps. xvi.) and x. 2.

It seems most probable that the evangelist himself committed to writing these traditions in regard to appearances of the risen Christ contained in his concluding chapter. Throughout there are many of his characteristic expressions and the closing verses are closely connected with and parallel to the opening passage of the Acts.

We have now completed our examination of the style and vocabulary of the Peculiar Matter in St Luke. Nine sections have been noted whose literary form should in all probability be attributed solely to the author himself of the third Gospel and Acts. They

are, *the Call of the first disciples* (v. 1—11); *the Anointing by a sinful woman in the house of Simon the Pharisee* (vii. 36—50); the passage containing a reference to *the women who followed Jesus as He journeyed and ministered to Him* (viii. 1—3); *the parable of the Good Samaritan* (x. 29—37); *the Ten Lepers* (xvii. 11—19); *the Lament over Jerusalem as He was entering it* (xix. 41—44); *Pilate's sending Jesus to Herod* (xxiii. 5—12, 14, 15); the account of *the Penitent Thief* (xxiii. 39—43); the *Appearances of the Risen Christ* (xxiv.). For the rest the stylistic phenomena seem to be compatible with, and to a certain extent to favour, the view that our evangelist used a document. There are, it is true, Lucan characteristics in every section, but not more than in the sections of the third Gospel which are parallel with Mark; and they appear in the same manner as in these sections. They are to be noticed especially in the introductions to the successive sections. E.g.—as in the sections derived from Mark—we meet again and again with the formula *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ*, etc. In the words of Jesus and of others there are but few Lucan characteristics. A good many of the expressions noted above as such have not much force. I have mentioned them lest any indication that ought to be taken into account should be omitted. In estimating the significance of Lucan traits, we ought also to consider whether on the one hand they could have arisen through some slight change made in another's record, or on the other their introduction must have affected the whole, or a considerable part of, a sentence. E.g., at Lk xxii. 23, 24, we have questions with the neut. art. prefixed (*τὸ τίς*, etc.), which is decidedly "Lucan." But all that was necessary in order to produce this "Lucan" feature was that the neut. art. should be inserted, which we see to have been actually what has happened at Lk ix. 46 = Mk ix. 34.

In one or two instances, especially the account of Mary and Martha, the verses in which there are several "Lucan" characteristics bulk somewhat large relatively to the whole; but they are the introductory verses and their comparative prominence is largely due to the brevity of the sections in question. The two sections in which, apart from the nine enumerated above, the "Lucan" traits are most numerous are accounts of cures (xiii. 10—17; xiv. 1—6); but this is in accord with what we have noticed in some of Luke's parallels with Mark.

Thus far we have observed only that in the majority of the sections the signs of our evangelist's hand are not more noticeable than we might expect them to be in passages which he had taken

from a document and revised. But some evidence of the use of a document which is of a more positive kind, even if it is not very distinct or abundant, is also to be found in expressions belonging especially to Luke's peculiar matter, or which connect it with Logian passages in the form in which he seems to have known them. It is necessary to proceed with caution here. The fact that the same or closely similar expressions occur in two or more neighbouring passages of the peculiar matter, and not at all, or but rarely, elsewhere, is not necessarily to be taken as a sign of a style different from the evangelist's. Certainly no stress can be laid on the use of *χρεοφειλέτης* at vii. 41 and xvi. 5, which might easily have been substituted for *δφειλέτης* by the evangelist in each passage, because it happened to be running in his mind; or upon the use of *διεγόγγυζον* at xv. 2 and xix. 7, each time in words of description; or upon the use of the words *ἀποτάσσεσθαι* and *εἶθετος* in teaching about renunciation at ix. 61, 62 and xiv. 33, 35, in both which passages a saying on the subject of renunciation may have been present to the mind of the evangelist in a form familiar to him.

The following instances are somewhat more deserving of attention because the expressions in question seem to belong more closely to the structure of the passages where they occur:—*κόπον παρέχειν* at xi. 7 and xviii. 5.—*παρά*, signifying "in comparison with" in *παρὰ πάντας* at xiii. 2 and 4 and *παρ' ἐκείνον* at xviii. 14.—*κατακλίεσθαι*, xiv. 8, and also vii. 36 (where see note) and xxiv. 30.—*ταχέως* at xiv. 21 (where see note), xv. 22 and xvi. 6.—*προσβεία* at xiv. 32 and xix. 14.—*ἐκλείπειν* at xvi. 9 (where see note) and xxii. 32.

Still more worthy of consideration are the following:—*ἔως ὅτου*, xii. 50 (where see note), xiii. 8; xxii. 16.—*φέρετε*, xv. 23 (where see note), the use of *δίκαιος* in various passages with a Jewish connotation, see note at xv. 7; cp. also *δικαιοῦν ἐάντων* at x. 29; xvi. 15; xviii. 14 (though as to the associations of this phrase there may be more doubt).—*ὁ λαός* specifically of the chosen nation at vii. 16 (where see note), and probably at xxiv. 19.—*υἱός*, and *θυγατήρ*, *Ἄβραάμ*, xiii. 16 (where see note); xix. 9; and cp. xvi. 24 f.—The common moulding of the parables in c. xv., especially as to their endings: the reference to good cheer expressed by the same word *εὐφραίνεσθαι* in the three parables of the Rich Fool (xii. 19, where see note), of the Prodigal Son (xv. 23 ff.), and of Dives and Lazarus (xvi. 19); the similar expressions *οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας* at xvi. 8, and *κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας* at xviii. 6; the use of *οἰκονόμος* at xvi. 1 compared with its use also at xii. 42, where Mt. in his parallel (xxiv. 45), derived from the Logian

document, has δούλος; the use several times at the commencement of the parables peculiar to Lk of the formula τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν which occurs once in a Logian passage common to Mt., see note at xi. 5.—The use of νομικός by Luke solely at xiv. 3 (where see note) and in several Logian contexts, in one of which only Mt. has it (xxii. 35).

The use of ἴνα by Luke seems also to be of some significance in connexion with the question of his use of a source, or sources, for his peculiar matter. I have refrained from referring to it before, because it is only on a comparison of this matter as a whole with other parts of his writings, that the differences in his practice in this respect can appear to be significant. In the Acts this particle occurs only 12 times,—i.e., much less frequently in proportion than in any other N.T. writing, and very much less so than in most,—and is for the most part not employed in an unclassical way. Turning to the third Gospel, we find that in Marcan sections Luke (except at viii. 12; ix. 45; xx. 14) has used it only where Mark has it; and further that he has several times avoided using it where Mark does; while in another place (viii. 32) he so turns the sentence as to make the use of ἴνα less strange than it is in Mk. There are also a few instances in Logian passages, in two of which (Lk vi. 31 = Mt. vii. 12; and Lk vii. 6 = Mt. viii. 8) the use of ἴνα is, while in four others (iv. 3; vi. 34; xi. 33, 50) it may be, derived from the source. When, therefore, we find ἴνα occurring 22 times in the peculiar matter in the third Gospel (viz. twice in chaps. i. and ii., and 20 times in the peculiar passages subsequent to them), i.e., nearly half as many times again as in the whole of the Acts, one cannot but suspect that several of the instances, at least, were due to Luke's finding them in a source in which the particle was used more largely than he would of his own mind have been disposed to use it.

### III.

#### *The authorship of the "we"-sections in the Acts.*

The question to which we now pass is a far simpler one than that with which we have been occupied under the preceding heading. There can be no doubt that if the "we"-sections in the Acts were not composed by the author of the whole work, he must have taken them from a document by some other writer; so that we have to ask only whether the "Lucan" characteristics in those sections are, or are not, more numerous and significant than is compatible

with the latter supposition. That is to say, we have not here to consider how far his style might have been affected by the form of pieces of information orally imparted to him, a case in regard to which we have no standard whereby to judge.

Again, as was observed above, in inquiring into the origin of the peculiar matter in St Luke, or at all events of many of its sections, we have to judge each section, brief as most of them are, on its own merits, because comparatively few of them are connected with one another so closely that the decision which we come to with respect to one must necessarily carry others with it. There is in point of fact a probability that, if the evangelist has used a document, he may have inserted some passages into it, and if so we desire to know which they are, as well as to ascertain how far the view that in other parts he is using a document is confirmed by indications of style. But in estimating the significance of a small number of characteristics occurring in a short passage the differences of value of various alleged characteristics, which may be very great, must clearly be a matter of great importance. On the contrary, we are able to compare the "we"-sections broadly with Luke's Marcan parallels. Differences that there are in the weight that should be attributed to the various characteristics, and mistakes that we may make in particular instances, may be expected to balance one another on the two sides of the comparison; as also will the varying lengths of verses be likely to do, if we take the proportion of characteristics to verses.

Even so errors must be allowed for, and if the preponderance of characteristics on the side of the "we"-sections were not considerable, we should not be justified in drawing a conclusion therefrom in favour of the view that the reviser of Mark is here himself the author. But the preponderance is great, and the manner in which the characteristics are distributed in the two cases highly significant. Lucan traits appear in verse after verse throughout the "we"-sections; there is nothing that can compare with this in Luke's parallels with Mark. In nearly all the verses of the "we"-sections they equal, while in many of them they clearly exceed<sup>1</sup> in number and distinctiveness those in the verses where they are most noticeable in sections corresponding to Mark—verses, it must be borne in mind, which are, if not wholly, yet in great part the composition of the author of the third Gospel himself.

<sup>1</sup> This is true of every verse (except, perhaps, *v.* 18) of the first of the "we"-sections; also of *vv.* 7, 9, 11, 15 in the second of them.

It is also to be observed that in one of the narratives in St Mark which, as we have seen, the third evangelist most revised, that concerning a storm on the Lake of Galilee (Lk viii. 22—25 = Mk iv. 35—41), his vivid realisation of the scene and his correct use of language in describing it, make strongly for his identity with the companion of St Paul on more than one of his voyages who has given us the account of the shipwreck in the 27th chapter.

We will proceed to examine the first three of those sections in detail.

(1) Acts xvi. 9—18.

v. 9. *ὄραμα*: twice in "we"-sections (A. xvi. 9, 10), nine (or eight) times in remainder of Acts (vii. 31; ix. 10, 12 (?); x. 3, 17, 19; xi. 5; xii. 9; xviii. 9); once in remainder of N.T. (Mt. xvii. 19).—*τῷ Παύλῳ ὡφθῆ*: for this periphrasis in describing supernatural appearances see Lk i. 11 *n.*—*διὰ νυκτός*: "in the night," while the night lasted. The phrase occurs three times in the remainder of Acts (v. 19; xvii. 10; xxiii. 31 and at Lk v. 5), not elsewhere in N.T.; *δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα* at A. i. 3 is analogous. *διὰ* is also used with words expressive of time, to express that the whole of an interval has been passed through, A. xxiv. 17; xxvii. 5; Gal. ii. 1.—*ἀνὴρ Μακεδῶν τις*: on the frequency of the use of *ἀνὴρ* in Lk and A. see Lk xxii. 63. Such a use of *τις* also as that here is specially common in Lk and A., e.g. Lk i. 5 and vii. 2, etc.—*ἦν ἐστῶς*: on the periphrasis of *εἰμί* with participle for finite verb see Lk iv. 44 *n.* Notice also the characteristic accumulation of participles.—*ἐστῶς*: see Lk i. 11 *n.*—*διαβάς*: *διαβαίνειν* occurs also at Lk xvi. 26, besides only at Heb. xi. 29. Verbs compounded with prepositions are decidedly more common in the Lucan writings than in N.T. generally. Instances should be considered not only separately, but as belonging to a class. There will be several to be noticed in the "we"-sections. Note also the emphatic position given to the participle here.

v. 10. *ὡς*, as conjunction, especially in temporal signification, is remarkably frequent in Lk and A. In Mt. it does not occur at all as conjunction. In Mk twice only as conjunction and there not temporal. In Pauline Epp. some eleven times as conjunction, only three times temporal, and with addition of *ἄν*. Next after Lucan writings it is most frequent in Jn, but in two or three instances here the use is peculiar (*ὡς* = *ἕως* or nearly so). This Gospel also has *ὡς οὖν* several times. *ὡς δέ* occurs eight times in the "we"-sections, 20 in remainder of Acts (v. 24; vii. 23; viii. 36; ix. 23; x. 7, 17, 25;

xiii. 25, 29; xiv. 5, etc.); besides twice in Lk and six times in Jn.—On *δραμα* see *v.* 9; for the phrase *δραμα εἶδεν* cp. x. 17; xi. 5; see also xii. 9.—*συνβιβάζειν*, followed by *ὅτι*, occurs in A. ix. 22, in closely allied sense to that here. In A. xix. 33 the word is difficult to interpret. It is found besides four times in Pauline Epp., in all cases in different senses and construction from the two first named in Acts. Two other compounds of *βιβάζειν* occur only in Lk and A., viz. *ἐπιβιβάζειν* at Lk x. 34; xix. 35 and A. xxiii. 24; and *ἐνβιβάζειν* at A. xxvii. 6; we have also *προβιβάζειν* at A. xix. 33, and in passive at Mt. xiv. 8.—*εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, middle, and with persons to be evangelized in acc. See Lk iv. 43 *n.*—*προσκέκληται*: *προσκαλεῖσθαι* is used besides of a call from God only at A. ii. 39 and xiii. 2. At the latter place there is a specially close parallel to the present passage.

*v.* 11. With the form of the sentence here—*ἀναχθέντες ἀπὸ Τρωάδος εὐθυδρομήσαμεν εἰς Σαμοθράκην...κἀκεῖθεν εἰς Φ.*—cp. that in the account of Paul's first missionary journey (xiii. 4):—*ἐκπεμφθέντες...κατῆλθον εἰς Σελευκίαν, ἐκεῖθεν τε...εἰς Κύπρον* (Klostermann, p. 60).—*ἀνάγεσθαι* in sense "embark" is found 11 times in "we"-sections, twice in remainder of Acts (xiii. 13; xx. 3) and Lk viii. 22; not elsewhere in N.T. Cp. *κατάγεσθαι* at xxvii. 3, and xxviii. 12, and *κατάγειν* (of bringing a boat to land) at Lk v. 11.—*εὐθυδρομεῖν*: here and at xxi. 1. In each case he is writing of a voyage and this accounts for its being used in these two places and not elsewhere; but it is the sort of composite form that the author of Lk and A. is fond of.—*τῇ ἐπιούσῃ*: three times in "we"-sections; twice in remainder of A. (vii. 26; xxiii. 11); not elsewhere. Cp. also other words by the use of which he obtains variety: *τῇ ἐπαύριον* (see on xx. 7 below) and *τῇ ἑτέρᾳ* (xx. 15 and xxvii. 3).

*v.* 12. *κἀκεῖθεν*: five times in "we"-sections; three in remainder of A. (vii. 4; xiii. 21; xiv. 26), once in Lk (xi. 53), once besides, in Mk ix. 30.—*ἦτις*: see Lk viii. 26 *n.*—With the description of the *status* of Philippi cp. the reference to the officers there, *v.* 35, and references to institutions, political divisions, etc., elsewhere, xiii. 7, 8, 12 (the *ἀνθύπατος*), xvii. 6 (the *πολιτάρχαι*), xix. 31, 35, 38 (the various officials at Ephesus). See also the designations, etc., at Lk iii. 1, which shew, whether they are right or wrong, a certain tendency of mind like that which led to the mention of contemporary rulers.—*ἦμεν...διατρίβοντες*: for *εἰμί* with partic. see Lk iv. 44 *n.*—*διατρίβειν*: twice in "we"-sections, each time with period in accus.; the word is used six times in remainder of A. (four with the same construction, viz. at xiv. 3, 28; xxv. 6, 14; the other two are A. xii. 19; xv. 35).



The word is only used twice besides (Jn iii. 22 ; xi. 54), neither time with the same construction.—For *ἡμέρας τινάς* cp. A. x. 48 ; xv. 36 ; xxiv. 24 ; also *ἡμέραι ἱκαναί* (A. ix. 23, 43 ; xviii. 18 ; xxvii. 7), and *χρόνον ἱκανόν* or *χρόνους ἱκανούς* (Lk xx. 9 ; xxiii. 8 ; A. viii. 11 ; xiv. 3 ; xxvii. 9). Cp. also phrase in Lk, *ἐν μιᾷ τ. ἡμ.* (Lk v. 17 ; viii. 22 ; xx. 1).

v. 13. *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων* or *τοῦ σαββάτου* : for this periphrasis see Lk iv. 16 *n.*—*οὐ* is commoner in A. and Lk than in rest of N.T. It occurs four times in the "we"-sections, five times in remainder of A. (i. 13 ; ii. 2 ; vii. 29 ; xii. 12 ; xxv. 10), five times in Lk, six in Pauline Epp., three in Mt., once in Heb. and Apoc. ; not in Mk or Jn. In the N.T. generally, apart from the Lucan writings, *ὅπου* is the commoner word. In Lk this word is used five times, but in four of them it is taken from the Logian and in the fifth from the Marcan source. In A. it is used twice only.—*νομίζειν* : six times in remainder of A. (vii. 25 ; viii. 20 ; xiv. 19, etc.), twice in Lk, six times in remainder of N.T. (viz. three in Mt. and three in Pauline Epp.). The construction, accusative with infinitive, is used at Lk ii. 44, and in three of the other places in Acts, and also in the three in Pauline Epp. In Mt. we have each time *ὅτι*, as also at A. xxi. 29.—*προσευχή*, only here and at v. 16 in sense "place of prayer."—*συνέρχεσθαι* : twice in "we"-sections, 15 times in remainder of A. in all parts, twice in Lk, 13 times in rest of N.T., of which seven are in 1 Cor. For close parallels with use in present place see A. i. 21 ; x. 27. For a distinction in the "Lucan" use of *συνέρχεσθαι* and *συνάγεσθαι* see xx. 7 *n.*

v. 14. *ὄνοματι* : see Lk viii. 41 *n.* and xxii. 47 *n.*—*πόλις* *Θνατείρων*. Note *πόλις* without definite article in apposition with name of city, and placed before it. So also once besides in "we"-sections, xxvii. 8. Also Lk ii. 4 and A. xi. 5 ; not elsewhere.—*σεβομένη τὸν θεόν* : this participle, with or without *τὸν θεόν*, virtually denoting what the rabbis called "proselytes of the gate," occurs in five passages of the remainder of A., not elsewhere.—*ἧς ὁ κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν*. Note the emphatic position of *ὁ κύριος* as one instance among very many that could be given of the care with which words are placed both in the "we"-sections and other parts of the Lucan writings.—*διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν* : for *διανοίγειν* used metaphorically see Lk xxiv. 31 *n.*—*προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις* : see close parallel at A. viii. 6. Cp. also xxviii. 24. Also for *τὰ λαλούμενα* see xiii. 45 and Lk ii. 33 ; and cp. *τὰ λελαλημένα*, Lk i. 45 ; *τὰ λαληθέντα*, Lk ii. 18. In other parts of N.T. we have *τὸ λαλούμενον* at 1 Cor. xiv. 9 and

τὰ λαληθησόμενα at Heb. iii. 5. Also see Lk viii. 34 *n.* for the use of neut. participles as substantives.

*v.* 15. ὁ οἶκος, "household." Cp. A. x. 2; xi. 14; xvi. 31; xviii. 8. It occurs likewise in 1 Cor. i. 16 and a few times in 1 and 2 Timothy. In particular observe that the participation of the household of Cornelius in his religious devotion (x. 2), and the blessing granted him (xi. 14), of that of the jailor in the promise to him (xvi. 31), and of that of Crispus in his faith in Jesus (xviii. 8), are mentioned in like manner.—κεκρίκατε: for κρίνειν used of decisions which do not involve condemnation or acquittal cp. Lk vii. 43 *n.* It is so used in "we"-sections at xx. 16 and xxvii. 1, as well as in the present passage, and some six times in other parts of A.—μένειν, in sense "stay": Lk viii. 27; ix. 4; x. 7; xix. 5; xxiv. 29; A. ix. 43; xxviii. 16, 30 (cp. Friedrich, p. 20). There are, however, instances also in other N.T. writings, especially in Jn.—"παρεκάλεσεν λέγουσα: cp. παρεκάλει λέγων, ii. 40. For παρακαλεῖν, as here, without an object, cp. in the 'we'-sections, xxi. 12 and xxvii. 33, and in the remainder of A. ix. 38; xiii. 42; xiv. 22; xix. 31; xxiv. 4" (Harnack).—παραβιάζεσθαι: cp. Lk xxiv. 29, where the use is very similar; the word does not occur elsewhere. In connexion with the notice of Lydia observe that devout women are referred to also at Lk viii. 1—3 and xxiii. 55, and at A. xiii. 50; xvii. 34.

*v.* 16. ἐγένετο δέ... ὑπαντήσαι: see Lk v. 12 *n.*—Notice also generally the skilful construction of the sentence.—πνεῦμα πύθωνα: see Lk iv. 33 *n.* On ἦτις see above, *v.* 12.—ἐργασίαν πολλήν παρέχεν: at A. xix. 24 we have almost exactly the same phrase. ἐργασία occurs three times besides in Acts (xvi. 19; xix. 24, 25); also once in Lk; once besides in Eph. iv. 19. παρέχεν occurs twice in "we"-sections, three times in remainder of later chapters, four in Luke, five in Pauline Epp., and in a saying common to Mt and Mk.—τοῖς κυρίοις: "Similarly at Lk xix. 33 it is noticed with curious precision that the colt had more than one owner" (Harnack).

*v.* 17. κατακολυθεῖν: besides only at Lk xxiii. 55.—ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὕψιστος, also at Lk viii. 28, Mk v. 7 and Heb. vii. 1; ὁ ὕψιστος is used by itself four times in Lk and at A. vii. 48, not elsewhere in N.T.—καταγγέλλειν: 10 times in remainder of A. (all parts), seven in Pauline Epp.; not elsewhere in N.T.—ὁδὸν σωτηρίας: ὁδός, as designation of Christian faith and practice; eight times in remainder of A. (ix. 2; xviii. 25, 26, etc.). σωτηρία occurs once in Jn and not at all in Mt. and Mk; in the "Lucan" writings ten times (Harnack).

*v.* 18. ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας: "Ad temporis spatium significandum

in N.T. a solo Luca ἐπί c. acc. adhibetur," Klostermann, p. 53, on xxvii. 20. Cp. A. xiii. 31; xvii. 2; xix. 8, etc.—*διαπονηθείς*, also at A. iv. 2.—*παραγγέλλειν*: 11 times in A., four in Lk, twice each in Mt. and Mk, five in Tim., and seven in remaining Pauline Epp.—*αὐτῇ τῇ ὄρα*: an expression peculiar to Lk and A. See Lk ii. 28 n.

## (2) Acts xx. 4—16.

v. 5. *μένειν*: used transitively (see Blass, p. 87), besides in N.T. only at v. 23; but see Isa. viii. 17; 2 Macc. vii. 30.

v. 6. *ἐκπλεῖν*: besides only A. xv. 39 and xviii. 18.—*οὐ*: see xvi. 13 n.—*διετρίψαμεν ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ*: see xvi. 12 n. We have two instances in this verse of the numeral being placed after the subst. This is vastly more frequent in the "Lucan" writings than elsewhere.

v. 7. *συνηγμένων ἡμῶν*, and next verse, *οὗ ἡμεν συνηγμένοι*: the author of Acts lays special stress on the *assembling* of Christians for worship, etc. Cp. iv. 31; xi. 26; xiii. 44; xiv. 27; xv. 30; in all which the word *συνάγεσθαι* is used. It is used besides with the same connotation only at Mt. xviii. 20 and 1 Cor. v. 4. We have also *συνέρχεσθαι* several times in 1 Cor. xi. and xiv., of Christians coming together. It may be worth while to notice that in Lk and A. *συνέρχεσθαι* is used only of gatherings more generally, including the case of Jews or proselytes coming together to worship (xvi. 18 and perhaps x. 27), while for Christian worship he uses a word which implies that they do not come together solely of their own mind. In R.V. (and in A.V. at v. 8) it is suitably translated by "gathered together."—*κλάσαι ἄρτον*: for references in Lk and A. to the "breaking of bread" in the Christian assemblies see Lk xxiv. 35 n.—*διαλέγεσθαι*: twice in present section, eight times in remainder of A. (xvii. 2, 17; xviii. 4, 19; xix. 8, 9; xxiv. 12, 25). Besides only Mk ix. 34; Heb. xii. 5; Jude 9—all three with a somewhat different connotation from the foregoing.—*μέλλειν*: followed by an infin. and expressing what a conscious agent *intends* to do, is specially common in all parts of A., though found also, but much less frequently, elsewhere. See A. iii. 3; v. 35; xii. 6; xvi. 27; xvii. 31; xx. 3; xxi. 37; xxii. 26; xxiii. 3, 15, 20; xxv. 4; xxvi. 2. In the "we"-sections here and at v. 13 (bis) and xxvii. 30.—*ἐπαύριον*: twice in "we"-sections, eight times in remainder of A. (x. 9, 23, 24, etc.); seven besides in N.T., five of which are in Jn. See further xvi. 11 n.—*ἔξειμι*: twice in "we"-sections; also at A. xiii. 42 and xvii. 15, not elsewhere in N.T.—*μεσονύκτιον*: also at A. xvi. 25 and Lk xi. 5; once besides (Mk xiii. 35).

v. 8. *ικανός*: see Lk viii. 27 *n.* It is used four times in "we"-sections.—*ὑπερφῶν*: also at A. i. 13; ix. 37, 39; not elsewhere in N.T., though it is common in LXX. and in Classical Greek. At Mk xiv. 15 the word is *ἀνάγαιον*, and in his parallel passage, Luke has reproduced it (xxii. 12); *ἀνάγαιον* occurs nowhere else, and may have been formed by Mark on model of *κατάγαιον*.—*ἡμεν συνηγμένοι*: see xx. 7 *n.*

v. 9. *νεανίας* is used besides only at A. vii. 58; xxiii. 17 and perhaps xxiii. 18, where another reading is *νεανίσκος*. *νεανίσκος* occurs a few times both in Lk and A. and in remainder of N.T. The two words seem to be used even in Classical Greek to describe much the same age; both words are used in LXX.—*ὄνοματι*: see Lk viii. 41 *n.*—*καταφέρεσθαι*: twice in this verse; besides only in active at A. xxv. 7; xxvi. 10. Note the skilful combination of repetition with variation in *κατενεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου* as compared with *καταφερόμενος ὕπνω βαθεῖ*. The process is thus kept before our eyes and yet monotony avoided.—*διαλεγόμενον*: see v. 7 above.—*ἐπὶ πλείον*, also at A. iv. 17; xxiv. 4; besides only 2 Tim. ii. 16; iii. 9. Cp. *ἐφ' ἱκανόν* at v. 11.

v. 10. *ἐπιπίπτειν*: six or five times in remainder of A. (viii. 16; x. 44; xi. 15, etc.), twice in Lk. Besides only four times (Mk iii. 10; Jn xiii. 25; Ro. xv. 3 (in a quotation from LXX.); Apoc. xi. 11).—*συνπεριλαμβάνειν*: here only in N.T., but Classical and once in LXX., and a word such as author of Lk and A. might be expected to use. For Luke's use of words compounded with *σύν* see Lk xxiii. 48 *n.*

v. 11. *κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον*: see Lk xxiv. 35 *n.*—*γευσόμενος*: used in the same idiomatic manner as here for "to take nourishment," "to eat" (cp. Fr. "gouter") at x. 10 and xxiii. 14; not elsewhere in N.T.—*ἐφ' ἱκανόν*: cp. *ἐπὶ πλείον* at v. 9 and on the use of *ικανός* in Lk and A. see Lk viii. 27 *n.*—*ὀμιλήσας*: *ὀμιλεῖν* is used also at xxiv. 26, and twice in Lk; not elsewhere in N.T.—*οὕτως ἐξήλθεν*: cp. xxviii. 14 (a "we"-section) and xvii. 32, 33.

v. 12. *οὐ μετρίως*: the negative with an adverb or adjective of number, degree, or quality, i.e. the figure called "litotes," is very common in the Lucan writings. Cp. *οὐκ ὀλίγος* at A. xxvii. 20. In the rest of N.T. it is found chiefly in the Pauline Epp.

v. 13. *ἀνήχθημεν*: see xvi. 11.—*ἀναλαμβάνειν*: twice in "we"-sections, six times in remainder of A., four in Pauline Epp., and once in the last twelve verses of Mk.—*διατάσσεσθαι* or *διατάσσειν*: four times in remainder of A. (vii. 44; xviii. 2, etc.), four times in Lk, four times in 1 Cor., and twice in other Pauline Epp.; also at Mt.

xi. 1. Used in middle here and at A. vii. 44, also at 1 Cor. vii. 17; xi. 34 and Tit. i. 5.

v. 14. *συνβάλλειν*: see Lk ii. 19 n.—*ἀναλαμβάνειν*: see v. 13 n.

v. 15. *κάκειθεν*: see xvi. 12 n.—*ἀποπλεῖν*: twice in "we"-sections, also at A. xiii. 4; xiv. 26.—*τῇ ἐπιούσῃ*: see xvi. 11 n.—*τῇ ἐτέρᾳ*: here and at xxvii. 3.—*τῇ ἐχομένῃ*, "next day": so Lk xiii. 33. Cp. also A. xiii. 44; xxi. 26. *ἐχόμενος* is used for "neighbouring," "connected," Mk i. 38; Heb. vi. 9. Like the two last mentioned it is one of the various expressions for the next day used by the writer to avoid monotony. Cp. also *τῇ ἐπαύριον* (see on xx. 7), and *τῇ ἐξῆς* or *τῇ ἐξῆς ἡμέρᾳ* (see on A. xxi. 1). By the variety of the expressions the writer avoids monotony. Cp. Klostermann, p. 49 f. Attention is also suitably directed by Klostermann to the successive notes of time in a series of events told in xxiii. 31—xxiv. 24.—*καταντᾶν*: four times in "we"-sections, and five besides in latter part of A., four in the Pauline Epp.—*παραβάλλειν*: only here, but worthy of note as a nautical term.

v. 16. *κεκρίκει*: see xvi. 15 n.—*παραπλεῖν*: here only, but see v. 15 on *ἀποπλεῖν*.—*χρονοτριβεῖν*: here only, but cp. *διατριβεῖν* with accusative of time; see xvi. 12 n.—*σπεύδειν*, also at A. xxii. 18 and three times in Lk; once only besides in N.T. (2 Pet. iii. 12).—*τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς*: see xvi. 13 n.—*εἶη*. Optative is far commoner in Lucan writings than elsewhere in N.T. Cp. Friedrich, p. 36 (No. 268).

### (3) Acts xxi. 1—18.

v. 1. For *ὡς δέ* see xvi. 10 n.; and for *ἐγένετο* followed by infinitive see Lk v. 12 n.—*ἀναχθῆναι*: see xvi. 11 n.—*ἀποσπᾶσθαι ἀπό*: cp. Lk xxii. 41 n.—*εὐθδρομ.*: see xvi. 11 n.—*τῇ ἐξῆς*: also at Lk ix. 37; A. xxv. 17; xxvii. 18; at Lk vii. 11 we have *τῷ ἐξῆς*. For similar expressions see xx. 15 n.—*κάκειθεν*: see xvi. 12 n.

v. 2. *ἐπιβαίνειν*: in quotation at Mt. xxi. 5, besides only in A., viz. three times in "we"-sections, twice in remainder of latter chapters.—*ἀνήχθημεν*: see xvi. 11 n.

v. 3. *ἀναφαίνεσθαι*: "sensu nautico" here only; in a different sense at Lk xix. 11. *κατέρχεσθαι*: 3 times in "we"-sections, 9 in remainder of A. (viii. 5; ix. 32; xi. 27; xii. 19, etc.), and twice in Lk; once only besides in N.T. (Jas. iii. 15). It is used of coming from the sea into a port, here and at xxvii. 5, like *κατάγεσθαι* at xxvii. 3; xxviii. 12. Cp. *καταγαγόντες τὰ πλοῖα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν* at Lk v. 11.—*ἐκέισε*: also at xxii. 5, not elsewhere in N.T.—*ἦν ἀποφορτιζόμενον τὸν γόμον*: nautical; *ἀποφορτιζέσθαι* occurs here only.

v. 4. ἀνευρίσκειν: used at Lk ii. 16 in precisely similar sense, not elsewhere.—ἐπιμένειν: four times in "we"-sections, two or three times in remainder of A., nine in the Pauline Epp. and once in the *Pericope de adultera*. For the construction, the relative referring to an accusative some way back in the preceding clause, cp. A. xxiii. 33. See Klostermann, p. 60.—ἡμέρας ἑπτά: see xx. 6 n.—Ἱεροσόλυμα is used again in this section at v. 15, but Ἱερουσαλήμ at 11, 12, 13.

v. 5. ἐγένετο, followed by infin., see Lk v. 12 n.—προπέμπειν: also at A. xv. 3 and xx. 38, and five times in Pauline Epp., and at 3 Jn 6.—θέντες...προσευξάμενοι: here two participles are combined without a conjunction because the action described in the former is clearly prior to that in the latter. Cp. xiv. 23 χειροτονήσαντες...προσευξάμενοι...παρέθετο (Klostermann, p. 60).—τιθέναι τὰ γόνατα: peculiar to Lk and A. See Lk xxii. 41 n.

v. 6. ὑποστρέφειν: see Lk viii. 37 n.

v. 7. πλοῦς: three times in "we"-sections, not elsewhere.—καταντῶν: see xx. 15 n.

v. 8. τῇ ἐπαύριον: see xx. 7 n.

v. 9. τούτῳ ἦσαν θυγατέρες τέσσαρες: see Lk viii. 30 n. and A. xx. 6 n.

v. 10. ἐπιμενόντων: see v. 4 n. above.—κατέρχασθαι: see v. 3 n.—ὄνοματι: see Lk viii. 41 n.—ἡμέρας πλείους: cp. A. xiii. 31.

v. 11. ἐλθὼν καὶ ἄρας τὴν ζώνην τοῦ Παύλου, δῆσας...εἶπεν. Here there are three participles; between the two first only is there a conjunction; the third is more closely united with the verb, and the action described in it is thus brought into relief. Cp. xii. 19 and xvi. 27 (Klostermann, p. 60).

v. 12. παρεκαλοῦμεν...τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν: see Lk iv. 42 n.—ἐντόπιος: here only, but cp. τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐκείνοις at xvi. 3, and τὰ περὶ τὸν τόπον ἐκείνον at xviii. 7.

v. 13. With οὐ μόνον δεθῆναι ἀλλὰ ἀποθανεῖν...ἐπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος, cp. v. 41 and ix. 16; xv. 26. There are no other parallels so close; the nearest are 2 Cor. xii. 10; Phil. i. 29.—The title "the Lord Jesus" (without "Christ" added) occurs in all parts of the Acts, 13 times in all, including this one in the "we"-sections; the full title (with the addition of "Christ") occurs four times (one of them in the "we"-sections). "The Lord Jesus" is also very common in the Epp. of St Paul; but "the Lord Jesus Christ" even more so. The expression "the Name of the Lord Jesus," found here in the "we"-sections, occurs three times in the Acts outside of those sections (viii. 16; xix. 5, 13). In the rest of N.T. we meet with it only at 1 Cor. v. 4 and vi. 11.

v. 14. *πειθομένον: πείθεσθαι* (pass. or midd. "to be persuaded," i.e. "to believe" or "to obey"); twice in "we"-sections, seven times in remainder of A., twice in Lk, 11 times in Epp.—*ἡσυχάζειν*: also at A. xi. 18 and twice in Lk, besides only once in N.T., at 1 Thess. iv. 11.

v. 15. *ἐπισκευάζεσθαι*: only here, but cp. *ἀνασκευάζειν* at A. xv. 24.

v. 16. *ξενίζεσθαι*: twice in "we"-sections, five times in remainder of A.; once (viz. at xvii. 20) in sense "strange," in all other cases of hospitality. In this latter sense once in Heb.; in the other sense, twice in 1 Pet.

v. 17. *ἀποδέχεσθαι*: twice in "we"-sections; also at A. ii. 41; xviii. 27; xxiv. 3; twice in Lk; not elsewhere in N.T.

v. 18. *τῇ ἐπιούσῃ*: see xx. 15 n.—*εἰσιέναι*: also at A. iii. 3 and xxi. 26; besides in N.T. only at Heb. ix. 6.—*παραγίνεσθαι*: see Lk xxii. 52 n.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MATTHEW.

SOME points of great importance in regard to the composition of the Gospel which stands first in our New Testament have already been decided through the preceding examination of the relations of the Synoptic Gospels and inquiry as to their common sources. We have seen that its account of the public Ministry of Jesus and His Passion has been largely compiled from St Mark and another document containing especially the Teaching of Jesus, both which lay before our first evangelist in Greek. The evangelist has skilfully combined the matter taken by him from the two documents which have just been mentioned. With the brief summary of the Baptist's preaching in St Mark and with accounts, most of them brief, of the Teaching of Jesus occurring at various points in that Gospel, he has united pieces from his other, his Logian, document, which could be assumed to have been spoken on the same occasions, or which bore upon the same topics. Where he found no piece of Teaching, however brief, in St Mark that could form, as it were, a point of attachment for a discourse taken from the other document, he was naturally influenced, in selecting a position for the latter, by his own view of the subject of which he was treating, regarded as a whole. Thus in the case of, perhaps, the most important of all his insertions into the Marcan outline, the so-called "Sermon on the Mount," his object in placing it where he has done seems to have been to give from the outset a great example of the Teaching of Jesus, before passing in the sequel to illustrations of the other side of His two-fold activity, His deeds of mercy, some of which have been brought in here for that purpose from later positions in the Marcan order. Again, the address suggested by the Message of the Baptist from prison, which he took from his Logian



document, is not linked to any passage in St Mark, even to the slight extent that the "Sermon on the Mount" is<sup>1</sup>, but it holds a significant position in his own narrative. He has, also, brought together passages from different parts of his Logian document, and he has besides, as we shall see when we examine closely the pieces of continuous instruction in this Gospel, probably inserted into them some Sayings not derived from either of the two sources so far mentioned. He has thus gathered up nearly the whole of the Teaching of Jesus which he has recorded in eight discourses, each of which has a distinct purpose.

A little still remains to be added here with regard to the form of these two principal documents, which were known to the author of our Greek St Matthew, and concerning his use of them. Some questions relating to other sources that he may have had, especially for matter that is peculiar to him, must then be considered, and the characteristics of this Gospel as a whole must be described.

1. First, it will be well to say a few words as to those narratives in which our first evangelist is more concise than St Mark and omits some details contained in the latter. The most striking instances are the Cures of the Paralytic (Mt. ix. 1—8 = Mk ii. 1—12), and of the Gerasene daemoniac (Mt. viii. 28—34 = Mk v. 1—20), the Raising of Jairus' daughter (Mt. ix. 18—26 = Mk v. 22—43), the Cure of the Epileptic boy (Mt. xvii. 14—20 = Mk ix. 14—29); but there are others in which there is the same difference between the parallels in the two Gospels though it is less marked.

It is contended both by Zahn and B. Weiss that in these passages our first evangelist has gone back to the original source, and that this source was used by Mark also, though he has amplified it with various details which he probably derived from Simon Peter. Moreover, J. Weiss maintains that in the explanation of the phenomena in question these theories score a notable success. He himself suggests a modification of B. Weiss' theory as regards the origin of Mark's accounts, but adheres to the point that our first evangelist reproduces those of another document in these places<sup>2</sup>. I have urged

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 79 f.

<sup>2</sup> See *Das ält. Ev.* pp. 156 f., 198.

various objections already against the views both of Zahn and of B. Weiss as to the relations of St Mark and St Matthew to a common source and to one another<sup>1</sup>; and if those objections are valid their hypotheses are not available in the class of cases now before us. But further it should be borne in mind, that all the three writers named admit that our first evangelist knew St Mark and used it in the composition of his Gospel. It is therefore hardly open to them to lay stress, as they do, upon the strangeness of the omissions of our first evangelist, as a reason for supposing that he was here using another source. There would be force in the argument that is founded on his omissions, if in his Gospel generally he had been independent of St Mark. But as this is not pretended, it must still be needful to ask why in the particular passages in question he refrained from making use of information of an interesting kind contained in a document which was familiar to him.

We are thus thrown back upon the adoption of one or other of the two simpler suppositions *either* that the traits wanting in St Matthew were not contained in the Marcan document known to our first evangelist, *or* that he purposely omitted them with a view to brevity. I have already noticed instances in which Luke agrees with our first evangelist in omissions, and I have suggested that in some of them these two evangelists represent the original form of the Marcan document more truly than our St Mark does. But for the most part the omissions of the first evangelist in his sections parallel with St Mark appear to be due to his having aimed at that greater conciseness which we observe. The compression has been produced by the avoidance of redundant expressions, as well as by the actual omission of picturesque details; and while it is more or less noticeable in many passages, it is most considerable where Mark's mode of narration afforded the fullest opportunity for it. Moreover, it is surely natural, and in point of fact extremely common, that a writer who is making use of a document should in doing so abbreviate it, especially if he has a good deal of matter to add from other sources. Further, we ought not to assume that whatever seems significant to us must have seemed so in another age. The vivid touches in Mark's

<sup>1</sup> pp. 38 ff., 109 ff., 139 f.

narratives are prized by us as indications that his informant was an eye-witness. They had not the same importance for our first evangelist because the authenticity of the record was either not in question, or, in so far as it was, would not have been defended on this ground.

The narratives and other pieces of matter contained in St Mark which have not been *in substance* included in St Matthew are very few in number, and in regard to most of them there appears to be no reason for suggesting, nor so far as I am aware has it been suggested, that their omission points to their having been absent from the copy of St Mark which the evangelist used. The healing of a daemonic by Jesus in a synagogue at the opening of His Ministry is related in St Mark and also in St Luke. It may have been passed over by our first evangelist through mere inadvertence, when he rearranged the account of the early part of Christ's work. It may also have seemed to him that it was not such a striking example, as many others that he gave, of the wonder-working power of Jesus. Its significance in St Mark lies in its being the first recorded. Two other miracles placed in St Mark in the latter part of the Galilean Ministry, the healing of a deaf and dumb man (Mk vii. 32—35) and of a blind man (Mk viii. 22—26), are not mentioned in St Matthew, at least in the context where they occur in St Mark. But there appears to be a reference to the same pair of miracles, perhaps taken from a different source, at an earlier point in St Matthew<sup>1</sup>, and the evangelist may himself have identified them with the two related in St Mark, and may consequently have passed these over when he came to them in that Gospel. It is possible also, since the two narratives in question have not been reproduced in St Luke, that they were inserted into a later copy of St Mark than either our first or our third evangelist used.

In addition to these miracles three incidents recorded in St Mark are wanting in St Matthew: the question of the disciples respecting the man whom they had seen casting out devils in Christ's name, though he was not one of their own band (Mk ix. 38—40), the widow and her two mites (Mk xii.

<sup>1</sup> Mt. ix. 27—31 and 32—34.

41—44), and the presence at the arrest of Jesus of a young man who fled leaving behind him the garment in which he had wrapped himself (Mk xiv. 51, 52). The two first are of peculiar interest, and Luke has given them both. The explanation of their absence from St Matthew may perhaps be that they are preceded in St Mark by short accounts of addresses by Jesus which our first evangelist has greatly expanded by combining therewith matter from another source, or other sources. Through the occupation of his mind with this other matter, his attention may have been turned away from the two incidents referred to. He may also have thought that the first of them might encourage those who falsely pretended to work miracles in Christ's Name, a class against whom he has in another place (Mt. vii. 22) introduced a warning which is not elsewhere recorded. The incident of the young man who fled leaving his garment behind him is wanting in St Luke as well as in St Matthew. In all probability both evangelists omitted it as being unimportant.

One parable in St Mark, that of the Seed growing secretly (Mk iv. 26—29), is not reproduced in St Matthew in the same shape; but it is virtually included in that of the Tares which in the corresponding context takes its place. Once more, the question of the disciples after the exorcism of the spirit possessing the epileptic boy—"Why could we not cast it out?"—is followed in St Mark and St Matthew by different Sayings, that in the former having no parallel elsewhere in the Gospels. That in St Matthew may have been substituted for it by the evangelist.

2. In discussing the source of the Sayings common to St Matthew and St Luke, I took the pieces of common matter for the most part in the order in which they occur in the latter Gospel. Some facts, however, in regard to the structure of the Matthaean discourses incidentally came before us. But it will be well for me, I think, now to review these discourses in a consecutive manner. An opportunity will, also, thus be afforded for touching on points which I have not had occasion to deal with before.

(i) From an examination of the discourse on the *Character of the heirs of the Kingdom* and of the *Denunciation*

of the Pharisees and Scribes and the comparison of parallels in St Luke, and to a limited extent in the second instance also in St Mark, we were led to the conclusion that in these two instances we have in St Matthew fuller versions of corresponding discourses in the Aramaic original than the other Gospels give us<sup>1</sup>, though a little other matter has also been embodied. In the case of the former of these I observed that, as it was so suitable for general edification, the fuller version might have been at first circulated separately. But this would be unlikely in the case of the other piece on the Scribes and Pharisees; and it is therefore simplest to suppose that in a translation of the Aramaic Collection of Logia, which in the parts in question gave only an abbreviated rendering, more extended renderings were afterwards substituted with the direct intention of making the document a better representative of the original. I shall assume that the early translation of the Aramaic Logia, which, as we saw in ch. iv., received some additions before it came into the hands of Luke, had been altered in the different manner which has now been described before passing into the hands of the author of our first Gospel.

The discourse on the Character of the heirs of the Kingdom in St Matthew is made up almost wholly of the discourse on this theme as it stood in this revised document, together with passages taken from later parts of this document which had remained unaltered<sup>2</sup>. As regards differences between the two versions of the discourse, I have already argued that in the Beatitudes Luke's more meagre rendering is the more literal, but that the rendering in St Matthew, though more of the nature of a paraphrase, gives the real purport of the teaching of Jesus in a way to be more correctly apprehended by persons not familiar with the circumstances in which He actually spoke<sup>3</sup>. The passage certainly belonging to the original discourse in which, next to that containing the Beatitudes, the differences between the two versions are most significant, is that occurring near the end on knowing the tree by its fruit. This figure is in Lk vi. 43—45 used generally of human conduct and character. In Mt. vii.

<sup>1</sup> pp. 80 ff., 92, 335 f.

<sup>2</sup> See Analysis, pp. 123, 124.

<sup>3</sup> p. 106 ff.

15—20 it is specifically applied to false prophets. This form is probably later than the other. It is in accord with the prominence given in this Gospel to the expectation of the Judgement, in the period preceding which there would be many false prophets<sup>1</sup>. Possibly also trouble had already been experienced from men of this kind.

There are only very few Sayings in this discourse with regard to the source of which I have felt it necessary to express doubt. I would leave it an open question whether the Saying at Mt. vi. 14, 15 is, like vi. 1—8 and 16—18, part of the full rendering of the discourse in the Aramaic document, or has been introduced at this point by our evangelist, who may have become acquainted with it in some other way, e.g. from having it in Mk xi. 25, and may have been reminded of it by one of the petitions of the Lord's Prayer which he had decided to insert here<sup>2</sup>; though I incline to this latter alternative. Stronger reasons, as it seems to me, are given above<sup>3</sup> for thinking that Mt. vi. 24 and vii. 13, 14, 22, 23 (the four verses to be taken together) were not derived from the Logian document. There is a parallel to the latter four verses at Lk xiii. 24—27. The differences in the imagery employed, according to the two evangelists, have been pointed out<sup>4</sup>. Some other differences between them, which are doctrinally and historically important, will come before us presently<sup>5</sup>. I would here only draw attention to the reference in *v.* 22 to those who falsely prophesied and worked miracles in Christ's name. This probably led the evangelist to weave in this piece here in connexion with the other about false prophets (*vv.* 15—20).

(ii) After a series of narratives in chh. viii. and ix. we have in ch. x. 5—42, the *Address to the Twelve concerning their Mission*<sup>6</sup>. This discourse is almost wholly made up of Sayings to which there are parallels in St Luke or St Mark. There are passages which come ultimately from the common Greek Logian document<sup>7</sup>. There is also a Saying at Mt. x. 39, to

<sup>1</sup> See Mt. xxiv. 11, 24. There is a parallel in Mk only to the latter. See also Mt. vii. 22. In Lk they are not mentioned in connexion with the last times.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 83 n.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 98 f.

<sup>4</sup> See *ib.*

<sup>5</sup> See below, p. 352.

<sup>6</sup> See Analysis, p. 124 f.

<sup>7</sup> In these passages the most important differences are to be found in Mt. x. 32, 33=Lk xii. 8, 9. On these, see below, p. 352.

which Luke has a parallel at xvii. 33; but the reference which the latter gives to it makes it improbable that he can have taken it from the same source, and consequently it becomes doubtful whether the common source contained it<sup>1</sup>.

The brief summary of the Charge to the Twelve in Mk vi. 8—11 has also been used in the Matthaean discourse on their Mission, and a passage has been embodied in it which we find in the Apocalyptic discourse in Mk xiii. 9—13, but which probably also reached the author of St Matthew independently<sup>2</sup>. Sayings from Mk ix. 37 and 41 have also been introduced. In connexion with the last two Sayings we have a sentence in *v.* 41, occurring in St Matthew only, which may best be regarded as an expansion of the former of them.

There are however—one at the opening of the discourse and another somewhat later in it—two sayings peculiar to St Matthew which require special attention: that in which the disciples are bidden ‘not to depart into the way of the Gentiles or to enter a city of the Samaritans,’ and again, ‘when persecuted in one city to flee to another, because they would not have gone through the cities of Israel before the Coming of the Son of Man<sup>3</sup>.’ These Sayings cannot have been added by the author of the Gospel. One who recorded the commission to preach to the Gentiles which closes his Gospel (Mt. xxviii. 18—20), and who was living when that work among the Gentiles was in progress, might have kept the Sayings at Mt. x. 5 and 6 and 23 in the contexts in which he found them, because he did not wish to tamper with his document; but it is almost inconceivable that he should have introduced them, in defiance of facts with which he was himself familiar. Moreover, these instructions could only have been addressed to Jewish Christians of Palestine. In spite, however, of their emanating from the original home of Christianity, it is difficult in view of other Sayings of Jesus and the general tenor of His Teaching to believe that they accurately represent the Mind of the Master.

(iii) We come next to the discourse of Jesus on *the*

<sup>1</sup> See p. 98.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 116.

<sup>3</sup> x. 6 and 23.

*Message of John from prison* (Mt. xi.)<sup>1</sup>. In addition to passages derived from the common Greek Logian source, we have here only a Saying on the epoch-making character of John's work which the evangelist has very suitably placed in this connexion<sup>2</sup>, and a saying of remarkable beauty peculiar to this Gospel, which the evangelist has placed at the end, though its connexion with what precedes is not close. Whether it ultimately came from the Aramaic Collection we cannot say.

(iv) *Christ's reply to the charge that He was acting in collusion with Satan and to the demand for a sign* (Mt. xii. 22—45)<sup>3</sup>. The greater part of this address comes from the common Greek Logian source; but portions of the parallel account in St Mark have been interwoven in the earlier part. One piece has also been inserted by the evangelist, on speech as an indication of character, in which the figure of a tree and its fruit is employed. This, so far as the figure is concerned, forms a doublet with a passage in the discourse on the Character of the heirs of the Kingdom where it is in its original context<sup>4</sup>. It is not likely that the evangelist would have used the same matter twice over in compiling two different discourses. Probably, therefore, besides having it in his Logian document, in the position I have indicated, he knew it in some other way as a separate fragment. But it is curious that it is closer to the parallel in St Luke here where it does not, than where it does, stand in a corresponding context.

(v) Next in order we come to the parables in Mt. xiii.; but it will be best to speak of these later in connexion with the other parables in this Gospel.

(vi) I pass to the discourse on *Offences* (Mt. xviii.)<sup>5</sup>; it contains some sayings peculiar to this Gospel, which raise questions of special interest. The figure of the lost sheep, found also in Lk xv., is preceded and followed in St Matthew by Sayings on the reverence for and care of "the little ones"

<sup>1</sup> See Analysis, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> Mt. xi. 12—15. Owing to the form and position of the corresponding Saying in Lk xvi. 16, it must be considered doubtful whether it was included in the common Greek Logian source. See p. 99.

<sup>3</sup> See Analysis, p. 125 f.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 328.

<sup>5</sup> See Analysis, p. 127 f.



which give it a different application to that which it has in St Luke. Further, the Saying concerning 'the angels of the little ones, who are ever in the immediate Presence of God' suggests an idea different from any that we have elsewhere in the New Testament. Nevertheless, it should be observed that there are references also at the ends of the parables of the Lost Sheep, and of the Lost Drachma, in Lk xv., to "joy in heaven," and "joy in the presence of the angels of God." This is an indication that the whole piece (Mt. xviii. 10—14) may have been derived ultimately from the same tradition as Luke's parable, though it had acquired a different form in transmission. It must be added that the Matthaean employment of the figure is less suitable than the Lucan. For "the little ones," whether children or child-like believers are thereby intended, had not been lost and did not need to be recovered. There was the duty only of taking care that they should not be lost. It would seem as if in this instance the original application of the figure to publicans and sinners, truly preserved in St Luke, had in some Jewish-Christian circles been found larger than they could fully rise to, and that they had sought to restrict the lesson to the case of the behaviour that was due to those members of their body to whom special tenderness was due.

Another piece which attracts attention in this discourse is that in vv. 16—20: *If he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church; and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and publican. Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.*

The term "church" (ἐκκλησία) occurs in the Gospels only at this place and in the words to Simon Peter recorded at Mt. xvi. 18, which will presently be considered. In the

present passage the term is evidently used only of a particular assembly, of which both the offending and the offended brethren should be members. The constitution and discipline of such a body which are here suggested correspond with those of synagogues among the Jews. The use in a Greek work of the term *ἐκκλησία* with reference to the Christian community in a particular place involved but a slight, if any, adaptation of the original conception for the benefit of Gentile Christians.

The direction to appeal to the Church with a view to the making up of differences leads on (*v.* 18) to an assurance of the Divine authority belonging to the decisions of the Church (i.e. in the present passage each local Christian assembly), in connexion with which part of the promise addressed to Simon Peter (*xvi.* 18) is repeated. A similar Saying is also found in *Jn* *xx.* 23. Finally, in *vv.* 19, 20 we have a saying which seems most directly to refer to prayer, and to have been introduced here because the assurance as to the effectualness of joint acts of prayer by Christians was suggested by that as to the validity of other joint Christian acts. With Christ's promise of His presence here the last words of this Gospel (*xxviii.* 20) are to be compared; while with the whole Saying about the privileges of Christian prayer (*vv.* 19, 20) we may compare *Jn* *xiv.* 13, 14; *xvi.* 23. It is not unimportant that this encouragement to offer prayer in Christ's Name and promise of His presence were given to the disciples according to St John on the eve of His departure, and that the latter promise was according to St Matthew made again after His resurrection, while the parallel in St John to the Saying concerning the authority of their acts of discipline is likewise connected with the time after the Resurrection.

The want of clear connexion between various parts of this discourse must now be considered. The groundwork of it was supplied by *Mk* *ix.* 34—50, the latter portion of which (*vv.* 41—50) was, I have contended in *ch.* III., an addition to Mark's own work<sup>1</sup>. The reasons there alleged for this view were that it is not after the manner of the author of the rest of the Gospel to give such a collection of Sayings, and that

<sup>1</sup> See p. 161.

Luke has not reproduced the passage. But it might have been added that the associations of ideas through which successive Sayings appear to have been brought together are of a kind to suggest that we have here the work of an editor and amplifier of the Gospel rather than of the original author of it<sup>1</sup>. In using this section of St Mark our first evangelist has through certain omissions<sup>2</sup> got rid, intentionally or not, of one abrupt transition. "Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me," is now followed immediately by "But whoso shall cause one of these little ones which believe on me to stumble," etc., which makes an appropriate antithesis. On the other hand, the fact that the substitution of childlike believers for actual children has not been prepared for, which must strike the attentive reader even in St Mark, has thus been made much more apparent.

The additions in St Matthew have caused new complications. At *v.* 3 another lesson drawn from children is inserted, connected with an incident which is recorded later in Mark (*x.* 15). It is suitable enough to the present context, indeed more obviously suitable than the one originally belonging here; but the circumstance that it is a distinct one and that the other, also, is retained renders the sequence of thought more difficult<sup>3</sup>. At *v.* 7 (or perhaps I should say *v.* 6) he

<sup>1</sup> In Mk *v.* 41 it is assumed that even a very simple act of kindness done to a disciple of Christ, may imply that Christ is acknowledged. This seems to be most closely connected with the saying in *v.* 37 *f.*; but it might be held to have a certain amount of connexion, also, with *vv.* 39, 40, since here also the acknowledgement of Christ in an unexpected quarter is in question. In *v.* 42 the mention of the "little ones that believe" takes back our thoughts to *vv.* 36 and 37 *a.*, and "offending" may be regarded as the opposite of "receiving" them. But it has not been made clear that "such children" in *v.* 37 *a.* means "childlike believers"; and the man who 'did not follow with the disciples' can hardly have been intended for an example of them, as some have supposed.

At *v.* 43 we have still the word *σκανδαλίζειν*; but the stumbling-block is one which may be caused to a man himself by a member of his own, not one which he may place in the way of a "little one."

<sup>2</sup> He has placed Mk ix. 37 *b.* and 41 in the Mission Address (see p. 330); and has passed over the incident in Mk ix. 38—40 altogether.

<sup>3</sup> The connexion of Mk ix. *vv.* 36, 37 with *vv.* 34, 35 would seem to be that a man whose mind is full of questions of pre-eminence will not "receive a child"—he is indifferent to, and contemptuous of, that which is lowly; and further that all human differences of rank should for the follower of Christ be swallowed up in the thought of *mission* from Christ and from the Father.

begins to interweave a little piece on causing offences from his Logian document, to which there is a close parallel in Lk xvii. 1—4. But then we have, just as in Mk ix. 43, the abrupt transition from causing offence to others, to the offence that one of one's own corrupted members may cause to oneself; and the passage from St Mark on this subject is given, though skilfully compressed (Mt. *vv.* 8, 9 = Mk ix. 43—47). The insertion after this of a piece for the most part peculiar to St Matthew, on which I have commented, takes us back to the subject of regard for the little ones. Next a verse taken from the passage of the Logian document on Offences directs that an offending brother is to be reprov'd privately, evidently as the best way to prevent harm arising. It is followed by a piece peculiar to this Gospel, opening with instructions as to the course to be pursued if the offender proves obdurate, which is a side-issue, and leads on to the subject of the authority of the Christian Society and the effectualness of joint acts of Christian prayer. After this the broken thread is resumed in one more Saying taken from the Logian passage, on the compassionate treatment of offenders; and finally our evangelist appends the parable of the Unmerciful servant.

This is the most composite of all the Matthaean discourses. In addition to much from a passage on Offences in St Mark and a Saying from another context in that Gospel, and a passage from the Logian document used by our first evangelist, which was found in the same, or approximately the same, form in the Logian document used by Luke, it contains a not inconsiderable amount of peculiar matter, which was not in all probability derived by the evangelist from his Logian document, and part of which itself bears marks of a compiler's hand.

(vii) I have already suggested that the greater part (down to *v.* 36) of the discourse *Concerning the Scribes and Pharisees*<sup>1</sup> in Mt. xxiii. is a fuller version of a passage of the Aramaic collection of Sayings of which we have in Lk xi. 39—52 an abridged representation<sup>2</sup>. The whole discourse is

<sup>1</sup> See Analysis, p. 127 f.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 84, 92, 328.

well-connected and continuous, and various expressions in the Sayings peculiar to our first Gospel—"The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat," "Be not ye called Rabbi," etc., as well as the tone and character of the discourse generally, recall in the most forcible manner the circumstances under which the Teaching must have been given. Two verses (6 and 7) have been taken from, or their form has been influenced by, the brief summary in Mk xii. 38—40 (see *vv.* 38, 39); and another (*v.* 11) has possibly come from Mk ix. 35, though it may also have stood in the Logian document, or have been known to our evangelist independently of either source.

At the end of the discourse we have the Apostrophe to Jerusalem to which there is a close parallel in Lk xiii. 34, 35 though in a different context. I have suggested another connexion for it in the original Greek Logian document<sup>1</sup>.

(viii) Mt. xxiv., xxv. The author of St Matthew has reproduced in substance the whole of the *Discourse on the Last Things* in Mk xiii., and except in one short passage (Mt. *vv.* 9—14, Mk *vv.* 9—13), has not changed the order of Mark's sentences<sup>2</sup> and has preserved to a large extent the actual words. He has interwoven, however, several verses from the Discourse on the Last Things which he doubtless found in his Logian document and which is given approximately in the same form in Lk xvii. 22—37. Further at *v.* 42, by the exhortation to watch at the conclusion of the discourse in St Mark, he is reminded (see *v.* 42) of a similar exhortation occurring earlier in his Logian source (Mt. xxiv. 43—51 = Lk xii. 39, 40, 42—46), and he introduces this in place of part of the Marcan passage to the same effect.

He adds parables more or less peculiar to this Gospel, and a description of the Last Judgement, to all of which I shall recur in the next section, to which I now pass, on the *Parables* in St Matthew.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> With a trifling exception near the end, where Mk *vv.* 33, 34 are omitted at the place where they stand in that Gospel because they are represented in the parable of the Servants given soon afterwards.

3. The fact that the parables in our first and third Gospels are to so great an extent different, while the precepts of Jesus are in large measure the same, points, as I have already observed<sup>1</sup>, to the parables having been collected separately from the other Teaching, and to their having been treated with greater freedom where in substance they are the same. We have now to examine those in St Matthew more closely than we have done hitherto. Ten parables in St Matthew—namely, those of the Mustard plant and the Leaven common to this Gospel and to St Luke, and the former also to St Mark, together with five that are wholly<sup>2</sup>, and three that are to a considerable extent<sup>3</sup>, peculiar—are introduced with the formula, “The Kingdom of heaven is likened” or “is like” or, in one case, “shall be likened unto”<sup>4</sup>. The only other parables which this Gospel contains are two common to all three Gospels (those of the Sower and the Vine-dressers), one peculiar to St Matthew, the Two Sons, and one largely peculiar, the Talents. Moreover, as regards the last it is to be observed that although the formula referred to above is not used it is plain from the manner in which it begins, “for like as,” and the preceding context that the subject to which it relates is the “Kingdom of heaven”<sup>5</sup>; while in the interpretation of the parable of the Sower we have in St Matthew (xiii. 19) the phrase “the word of the kingdom”—“of the kingdom” being peculiar to this Gospel.

As everyone who has read the Gospels with attention knows, the expression “the Kingdom of heaven” (or literally “of the heavens”) is used only in St Matthew and is very common there<sup>6</sup>, being frequently used where in parallels in St Mark or St Luke we find the expression “Kingdom of

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 100, 231 f.

<sup>2</sup> The Hid treasure, the Pearl-merchant, the Drag-net, the Unmerciful servant, and the Labourers’ hire.

<sup>3</sup> The Wheat and the Tares, the Marriage-feast for the King’s son and the Ten Virgins.

<sup>4</sup> There is no great difference between the two first expressions; *ὁμοιωθή* is simply the aor. of emphasis. The special shade of meaning in *ὁμοιωθήσεται* (Mt. xxv. 1) is obvious.

<sup>5</sup> Mt. xxv. 14.

<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* is used only four times in Mt., viz. at xii. 28, at xix. 24 (in a parallel to Mk), and at xxi. 31 and 43.

God," as for instance in the parables of the Mustard plant and the Leaven. There can be little doubt that "Kingdom of heaven" means virtually the same as "Kingdom of God," and that the former expression is employed instead of the latter in accordance with Jewish feelings of reverence<sup>1</sup>. In many of the Sayings in which it stands in St Matthew it is probably the literal rendering of the Aramaic. At the same time it is possible that the evangelist himself, or other Greek-speaking Christians, having become accustomed to it through such literal renderings, had extended its use.

It is a more important point that this subject—the expectation of the kingdom of heaven (or of God)—and its character should be so copiously illustrated by parables in this Gospel. The significance of this element, and of the form of certain of the parables, and of the prominence in them of particular aspects of the general theme, must now be considered. That the subject of the Kingdom of God and of the expectation of its coming held a central place in the Teaching of Jesus is apparent from all the Gospels. And that in setting forth the nature of this kingdom and of the manner of its progress He employed parables is attested by the two parables of the Mustard plant and the Leaven, which (as we have seen)<sup>2</sup> were probably contained in the early Greek Logian document rendered from the Aramaic. The parable of the Seed growing secretly (in Mk iv. 26—29) in part resembles these two in the lesson it teaches, while it also points on to the day of harvest and of reaping. It is doubtful, I have said, whether this parable was contained in the original document by Mark<sup>3</sup>, but although added somewhat later it may have been derived from a trustworthy source. The parables of the Hid treasure and the Pearl-merchant resemble in their brief pithy form those of the Leaven and the Mustard plant, and their lesson that men must be prepared to sacrifice all their possessions for the sake of the Kingdom of God is expressly enjoined repeatedly by Jesus, without figure, in His teaching. (E.g. Mk x. 23—27 taken with the incident preceding.) The parables of the Unmerciful servant and of the Labourers'

<sup>1</sup> See Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 75 ff., Eng. trans. p. 91 ff.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 96 and 104.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 154.

hire set forth the principles on which the fixed Divine award on human conduct and work shall be made, but it cannot be inferred from them that the Messiah is regarded as the Judge. There is, however, in the latter of these a point of a different kind to be noted. The lesson of this parable seems clearly to be that the first band of disciples must not regard themselves as superior to those who were called later. All would enjoy the same inheritance.

It will be convenient to notice at this point the parable of the Two Sons (xxi. 28—32). It is interesting from the strong resemblance it bears to the type of parable characteristic of Luke's Gospel<sup>1</sup>, both in the subject of comparison—ordinary human conduct—and in the appeal made to common human judgement:—*What think ye?.....Whether of the twain did the will of his father?*

It remains to speak of four other parables. The Wheat and the Tares (Mt. xiii. 24—30) resembles that of the Seed growing secretly (Mk iv. 26—29), and might have had the latter for its foundation, the sowing of the tares by the enemy and the order to wait till the time of the harvest for their destruction being added. Moreover an interpretation of the parable is given and attributed to Jesus, foretelling the execution of judgement "in the end of the world" by "the Son of Man" Who "shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire." For the closest parallels to this language we must turn to other passages in this same Gospel<sup>2</sup>. Again, the parable of the Marriage feast (Mt. xxii. 1—14) must be compared with that of the Great feast in Lk xiv. 15—24. The resemblance between them, though not close as to language or all points of detail, is such that a common original must lie behind them. The most important differences are that we have in St Matthew "a certain king which made a marriage feast for his son" in place of "a certain man made a great supper," and again "servants," in the plural, in place of the one servant in St Luke, by whom

<sup>1</sup> See p. 231.

<sup>2</sup> P. Mt. xvi. 27, 28=Mk viii. 38, ix. 1; and see below, pp. 341, 351 ff.



Jesus Himself, as the Servant of Jehovah, may be intended. Further, in Mt. *v.* 11 ff. the case of the man who was not clad in a wedding garment is added, probably in order to shew that though the persons first invited had been excluded and punished on account of their indifference, and a wide invitation had been given to others in their place, the conditions for admission were still rigorous. The expressions "the outer darkness" and "wailing and gnashing of teeth" are also characteristic of this Gospel<sup>1</sup>. I do not think it can be denied that it is easier to suppose that the special features in St Matthew were added to the original form, than that the original form contained them and was stripped of them, so as to give the form that we find in St Luke.

I pass to the parable of the Ten Virgins (Mt. xxv. 1—13). In Lk xii. 35—37 the example of servants waiting for their master when he shall return from the wedding is employed to urge the disciples to watchfulness. The figure is carried no further, but is woven into the exhortation. In St Matthew, on the other hand, we have a full-grown parable. Two classes are indicated (just as in the Wheat and the Tares), and the conduct of each, and the admission of the one class into, and the exclusion of the other from, the kingdom by the bridegroom himself at his return are described. Were we to consider this figurative language in St Luke and this parable in St Matthew alone we might perhaps regard the former as a kind of abstract of the latter, due to reminiscence of it. But in view of the relations between parables in St Matthew and St Mark, and St Matthew and St Luke, in the two instances before considered, the inverse relation must, I think, be held to be more probable, i.e. that the Matthaean parable of the Ten Virgins is an amplification of a figure such as that used in St Luke.

Once more in the parable of the Talents in Mt. xxv. 14—30, and the Minae in Lk xix. 11—27 we have the same main idea differently worked out. The points of difference theologically speaking are not on the whole so marked; still we note in Mt. *v.* 30 the imagery respecting the fate of the ungodly as in the conclusion of the parable of the Marriage feast.

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 353.

It will be convenient to consider at this point the description of the Last Judgement in Mt. xxv. 31—46. This is not a parable, though some of the language is symbolical. It is rather a representation of the Great Day in the style of the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, and in particular of the portion of the Book of Enoch called the *Book of the Three Similitudes* (Enoch, chh. 37—69). In regard both to its general form and many points in the representation it has no parallels in the other Gospels. The descriptions which there come nearest to it are those which, with evident reference to Daniel vii. 13, 14, speak of the Coming of the Son of Man in clouds, as also of His “sitting at the right hand of power<sup>1</sup>.” St Matthew likewise has those descriptions of the Coming of the Son of Man; but in the passage now before us we are further told that “then shall he sit on the throne of his glory,” and in the sequel He is represented as the Judge in a final judgement upon all the nations<sup>2</sup>. The description of “the Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory” is found also at Mt. xix. 28, but not elsewhere in the New Testament. It occurs, however, several times in the Book of Enoch in visions of the judgement to be exercised by the Elect One, the Son of Man<sup>3</sup>. Another point which recalls the language of the Book of Enoch, as also of other Apocalypses, is “the eternal fire (mentioned also Mt. xviii. 8, but not in the other Gospels) prepared for the devil and his angels<sup>4</sup>.” The comparison of different classes of men to animals is also in the style of the Apocalypses, though the example for it may have been set by Ezek. xxxiv.

I have alluded to expressions in other parts of St Matthew shewing the same Messianic and eschatological conceptions as those that have come before us in passages treated in the latter part of this section. After we have considered those

<sup>1</sup> See Mk xiii. 26 = Mt. xxiv. 30 f. = Lk xxi. 27; and Mk xiv. 62 = Mt. xxvi. 64 = Lk xxii. 69.

<sup>2</sup> On the subject of a universal judgement by the Son of Man see further below, p. 351.

<sup>3</sup> See Enoch xlv. 3; li. 3; lv. 4; lxi. 8, 9, etc. From some of these passages it appears that the throne of glory upon which the Son of Man is made to sit is that of the Lord of Spirits.

<sup>4</sup> See Enoch x. 4—6, 12, 13; Baruch lvi. 10—13; Jubilees cv.

expressions in their contexts, we may be in a somewhat better position for estimating the significance which these features of this Gospel have in connexion with the question of its composition and authorship. We may, however, I think, say at once that the four last parables which we have here examined and the Apocalyptic representation of the Last Judgement bear marks of a certain development both in form and ideas, relatively to other teaching in the Gospels which is broadly speaking of the same type.

4. We will now proceed to consider *the citations from the Old Testament in St Matthew and especially those peculiar to him, together with matter associated therewith.*

The citations in St Matthew fall into two classes. One class consists of those which appear in the form of comments upon events regarded as already matter of history, being designed to shew that in these events prophecy has been fulfilled<sup>1</sup>. The other class consists of those which are employed by Jesus or by those who ask Him questions<sup>2</sup>. The former are all introduced with the words "in order that what was spoken by the prophet might be fulfilled," or words practically identical with these. In the case of none of the second class is the same formula used, and many of them are not adduced as prophecies. The two instances in this latter class in which the manner of making the citation comes nearest to that in the former class are Mt. xiii. 14, "unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah," and Mt. xv. 7 (copied from Mk vii. 6), "Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you."

<sup>1</sup> Mt. i. 22, 23 (Isa. vii. 14); ii. 5, 6 (Mic. v. 1, 4a); ii. 15 (Hos. xi. 1); ii. 17, 18 (Jer. xxxi. 15); ii. 23; iii. 3 (Isa. xl. 3); iv. 14, 16 (Isa. viii. 23); viii. 17 (Isa. liii. 4); xii. 17—21 (Isa. xlii. 1—4); xiii. 35 (Ps. lxxviii. 2); xxi. 4, 5 (Isa. lxii. 11 and Zech. ix. 9); xxvii. 9, 10 (Zech. xi. 12, 13).

<sup>2</sup> Mt. iv. 4, 6, 7, 10 (Deut. viii. 3; Ps. xci. 11 f.; Deut. vi. 16, 13); ix. 13 and xii. 7 (Hos. vi. 6); xi. 10 (Mal. iii. 1); xiii. 14, 15 (Isa. vi. 9, 10); xv. 7—9 (Isa. xxix. 13); xix. 4, 5 (Gen. i. 27; ii. 24); xix. 7 (Deut. xxiv. 1); xix. 18, 19 (Ex. xx. 12 f.); xxi. 13 (Isa. lvi. 7 and Jer. vii. 11); xxi. 16 (Ps. viii. 3); xxi. 42 (Ps. cxviii. 22 f.); xxii. 24 (Deut. xxv. 5; Gen. xxxviii. 8); xxii. 37 (Deut. vi. 4, 5); xxii. 43, 44 (Ps. cx. 1). I have not included the citations in Mt. v. 21—43, because it is possible that they are not taken directly from the O.T. but from some Jewish exposition, oral or written. Instances of the merely allusive employment of Old Testament words are not here in question; for some of these, see below, p. 345 f.

In other instances we have "It is written," "Have ye not read?" "Have ye never read?" "Moses said." Again, the citations in the former class are with one exception<sup>1</sup> made in St Matthew only, whereas the majority of those in the latter occur also in parallels in St Mark or St Luke. Once more—and this is the most significant difference, though it derives its significance from being combined with the differences before mentioned—the amount of correspondence with the LXX. is far less among those of the first than of the second class. Four of the former—not to mention ii. 23 which cannot be identified with any single passage in the Old Testament<sup>2</sup>—are wholly independent renderings<sup>3</sup>. In five others there are points of similarity with the LXX.—a phrase or two, or a clause in each which is the same, or very like—but they cannot have been derived from it alone. It would seem rather that renderings of these passages other than those of the LXX. have been used, but modified in some cases by reminiscences of that Version; some of the resemblances may be purely accidental<sup>4</sup>. One only agrees accurately with the LXX.<sup>5</sup>, and another nearly so<sup>6</sup>. It may be further mentioned in passing that in one of them (Mt. xxvii. 9) a citation from Zech. xi. 12, 13 is wrongly attributed to Jeremiah. On the other hand in the case of all but one<sup>7</sup> of the citations of the second class, there can be no thought of any other source but the LXX. They are exact, or almost exact, reproductions of it. It appears that our evangelist has followed St Mark and also the source common to himself and

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xl. 3 cited Mt. iii. 3 and also Mk i. 3.

<sup>2</sup> In the formula of introduction here we have *διὰ τῶν προφητῶν* instead of *διὰ τοῦ προφήτου*; it may be intended as an inference from several prophets.

<sup>3</sup> Mt. ii. 6 (Mic. v. 1, 4a); ii. 15 (Hos. xi. 1); viii. 17 (Isa. liii. 4); xxvii. 9. (Zech. xi. 12, 13).

<sup>4</sup> Mt. ii. 18 (Jer. xxxi. 15 [LXX. xxxviii. 15]); iv. 15, 16 (Isa. viii. 23 f. [LXX. ix. 1, 2]); xii. 18—21 (Isa. xlii. 1—4); xiii. 35 (Ps. lxxviii. 2 [LXX. lxxvii. 2]); xxi. 4, 5 (combination of Isa. lxii. 11 and Zech. ix. 9).

<sup>5</sup> Mt. iii. 3 (Isa. xl. 3); the form here may have been influenced by the parallel in Mk i. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Mt. i. 23 (Isa. vii. 14).

<sup>7</sup> This single exception is in Mt. xi. 10 = Lk vii. 27 (Mal. iii. 1) in a Logian passage.

St Luke in quoting the LXX. where they do<sup>1</sup>. Not only so, but in two places, where in St Mark words from the LXX. are allusively brought in, he has substituted express and fuller citations from that version<sup>2</sup>. In two other places also he has brought the language into closer agreement with the LXX., and in one of these he adds another precept in the words of the LXX.<sup>3</sup> Further, in an incident given only in Mt. xxi. 15, 16, the words of Jesus include a citation of Ps. viii. 2, exactly after the LXX., while the application of Hos. vi. 6 by Jesus at Mt. ix. 13 and xii. 7 is nearly so. It is therefore highly improbable that the renderings not after the LXX. in the other group of citations are the evangelist's own; for if he had been able to give, and had preferred to give, an independent translation in those passages, he would surely have done the same in some of those of the second group. He must therefore have owed the former, either to some document, or to their having been traditionally known to him in that form.

Next I would observe that the source from which they were taken cannot have been a collection of Old Testament citations *and nothing more*. It would be unnatural that they should be unaccompanied by references more or less brief, or extended, to the events in which the prophecies were severally fulfilled. And the words by which they are successively introduced—"thus was fulfilled," "this came to pass in order that"—plainly imply it. Consequently *the matter associated with these citations* ought, as I have indicated in defining the present section, to be considered along with them. Both they and it, or much of it, have, it would seem, been taken from a little exposition of the fulfilment of prophecy in the

<sup>1</sup> The only exception is that at Mt. xxii. 37=Mk xii. 30 (Deut. vi. 4, 5), Mt. has *ἐν* three times, which is a literal rendering of the Heb., in place of the *ἐξ* of the LXX. found in Mk.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Mk iv. 12 with Mt. xiii. 14, 15 (Isa. vi. 9, 10); and Mk x. 6, 7, with Mt. xix. 4, 5 (Gen. ii. 24).

<sup>3</sup> In Mt. xix. 18, 19=Mk x. 19, Matthew in place of *μὴ φωνέωσιν*, etc. gives the direct commands with the neut. art. of quotation before each, *τὸ οὐ φωνέωσιν*, etc.; he also adds Lev. xix. 18. In Mt. xxii. 24=Mk xii. 19, where Deut. xxv. 5 and Gen. xxxviii. 8 are combined, *ἐπιγαμβρεύσει* has been suggested to our first evangelist by the latter passage.

Gospel history, somewhat like, though probably briefer than, that which we find afterwards occupying a considerable part of Justin's *First Apology* and of his *Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew*. It might fairly be described, perhaps as a *Catena of fulfilments of prophecy* (though not simply of prophetic passages). It existed originally in Aramaic. Our first evangelist had at his disposal a written translation of it, or else had become familiar with the counterpart of it, orally delivered in Greek. The former is on the whole the more probable, because in oral transmission in Greek the LXX. renderings of the Old Testament passages would probably have been substituted for others to a larger extent than we find to have been the case.

In this little *Exposition*, or *Catena of fulfilments*, so far as we can gather its contents from the use made of it in St Matthew, the treatment of the subject of the Birth and Infancy of the Saviour was specially full (Mt. i. and ii.; see especially i. 23, ii. 6, 18, 23). After this the Mission of the Baptist was touched upon (Mt. iii. 1 ff.); then the preaching of the Good News by Jesus in Galilee (Mt. iv. 12 ff.); the miracles of Jesus were referred to collectively, as exemplifying His compassion (Mt. viii. 16, 17); then His desire to avoid publicity (Mt. xii. 15 ff.); His speaking to the people in parables (Mt. xiii. 34, 35); His triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mt. xxi. 4, 5); the return of the thirty pieces of silver by Judas and the purpose to which they were applied (Mt. xxvii. 3 ff.).

This is the last direct appeal to prophecy which the Gospel contains. Strange to say there are none in connexion with the narratives of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, those great subjects with which the argument from prophecy was in the early Church so largely occupied. It is not likely that such a *Catena* as would seem to have been known to and used by our evangelist passed these by. It is more likely that when the Marcan narrative contained allusive references to prophecy or afforded opportunities for introducing them, our evangelist was satisfied to employ this method, or even from lack of space or for some other reason found it preferable. This is at all events what he has done. He has shewn his own

interest in the fulfilment of prophecy, at least as regards the Crucifixion, simply by adding to the number of the references of this allusive kind, and making the words in one case agree more closely with the LXX.<sup>1</sup>

The most substantial addition here to other records is the narrative of the Birth and Infancy of Jesus. There is, I venture to think, a trace still to be pointed out of the existence of the original of such a narrative in Hebrew or Aramaic, which confirms the inference derived from the phenomena of our Greek Gospel according to St Matthew. I have adduced reasons (vol. I. p. 257 ff.) which appear to me to be sufficient for holding the view that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* contained an account of the Nativity and Infancy which was similar to that in St Matthew, and included some at least of the same quotations from prophecy. If so it is probable that the same account which, through a translation, was used in the composition of St Matthew was also embodied in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, a work dating from the early part of the second century.

The narrative itself in St Matthew is characterised—in contrast with that in St Luke—by the attention bestowed on the part played by Joseph. It may well be that traditions on this subject were preserved among his descendants and kin who (it would seem), or some of whom, up to the close of the first century held a more or less marked place in the Christian community in Palestine<sup>2</sup>. The justification of the conduct

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xxvii. 34, cp. Ps. lxix. 21. In LXX. Ps. lxviii. 22, not in Mk.  
 „ 35 „ „ xxii. 18. „ „ xxi. 19, also in Mk.  
 „ 39 „ „ 7. „ „ 8, also in Mk.  
 „ 43 „ „ 8. „ „ 9, not in Mk.  
 „ 46 „ „ 1. „ „ 2, a little closer to the  
 LXX. than in Mk.  
 „ 48 „ „ lxix. 21. „ „ lxviii. 22, also in Mk.

<sup>2</sup> It is most probable that “the brethren of the Lord” of whom we read at Mk vi. 3 = Mt. xiii. 55 and elsewhere in N.T. were the sons of Joseph by a former marriage. (See Lightfoot, *Dissertation II.* appended to his *Com. on Ep. to Gal.*) One of them, James (Gal. i. 19; A. xii. 17, etc.), was the first head of the Church at Jerusalem. Hegesippus, the Palestinian Christian writer of the second century, also tells a story about the descendants of Jude—another of these “brethren”—who were brought before Domitian and lived till the reign of Trajan (ap. Eus. *H.E.* III. chh. 19, 20 and 32). We learn from the same writer

of Joseph and his care for the Mother and the Child would be matters of peculiar interest to them; and they might take a pardonable pride in tracing their lineage through the sovereigns of Judah from David to the Exile, and possibly after that through the heads of families<sup>1</sup>.

The passages that have been brought before us in this section necessarily raise the question whether portions of the Gospel narrative have been moulded to any extent according to the model of Old Testament predictions. This may be most easily imagined in cases where the addition of some secondary trait would bring a well-authenticated fact into more complete conformity than before with the words of prophecy, as for instance the mention of an ass as well as the foal in the account of the Triumphal Entry (Mt. xxi. 2); or again the gall mingled with the wine as the potion offered to Jesus on the Cross (Mt. xxvii. 34). But it has of course been held that the influence of supposed prophecies upon the narrative has extended much further than merely to instances such as these. I must, however, defer the discussion of this subject till I come to consider broadly the character of the evidence for the Gospel-history in the final division of this work<sup>2</sup>.

5. The source discussed in the last section will seem no

that James "the Lord's brother," was succeeded in the oversight of the Church of Jerusalem by Symeon, a nephew of Joseph, who suffered martyrdom in the reign of Trajan at the age of 120 (*ib. chh.* 11 and 32).

<sup>1</sup> Julius Africanus—who resided in Palestine and wrote about the end of the 2nd century—in the fragment which has reached us of his *Letter to Aristides on the Genealogy of the Saviour in the Gospels* (ap. Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacrae*, II. pp. 228—237), says that the kinsmen of the Lord (οἱ κατὰ σάρκα συγγενεῖς or οἱ δεσπόδουνοι), by whom he doubtless means members of the family referred to in the preceding note, reconstructed their genealogy from tradition and family records so far as they could trace it (*εἰς ὅσον ἐξικνούνητο*), like other Jewish families of illustrious descent did, after Herod had destroyed the genealogies which had been preserved in the temple. The phrase "so far as they could trace it" is no doubt intended to account for obscurities in the subject of the relations of the two genealogies in the first and third Gospels, which Julius Africanus sought to harmonise. It must be admitted that Julius does not attribute the genealogy in St Matthew, as distinguished from that in St Luke, specially to the action of this family. That is purely my conjecture.

<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile I may perhaps be permitted to refer my readers to some remarks in the *Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, p. 357 ff. I adhere in the main to the position there maintained.



doubt to many of my readers to be sufficiently shadowy and uncertain. But I pass now to a certain number of traditions of occurrences, peculiar to this Gospel, with regard to the source of which it seems impossible to make any conjecture at all. They may be, and indeed have the appearance of being, of varying historical value. But as they include the mention of names of persons I do not believe that the evangelist himself invented them, and I have accordingly described them as *traditions*. First, we have the account of John the Baptist's reluctance to baptise Jesus and the answer with which Jesus overcame it (iii. 14, 15). In the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* also, an incident in connexion with the Baptism of Jesus was related, which shewed the sense that it was a strange and unsuitable thing for Jesus to be baptised by John, but here the similarity ends<sup>1</sup>. Next in the account of the call of a publican to follow Jesus, we find *Matthew* (ix. 9) for the name Levi the son of Alphaeus which stands in *St Mark*. The difference between the Gospels is virtually confined to this, but it is of special interest.

Then we have three respecting Simon Peter, viz. *his attempt to walk over the water to meet Jesus* (xiv. 28—32); the special *blessing pronounced on him after his acknowledgement of Jesus as the Christ* (xvi. 17—19); *the question brought by him to Jesus as to the payment of the temple tribute, and the coin for its payment in the mouth of the fish which he was instructed to catch* (xvii. 24—27)<sup>2</sup>.

I will comment only on the words "My church" in the second passage. I have already spoken of the use of the word "church" in another place in this Gospel (xviii. 17),

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Hieronymi *Contra Pelagianos*, iii. 2, "Ecce mater domini et fratres ejus dicebant eo: Joannes baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum; eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: Quid peccavi ut vadem et baptizer ab eo, nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi ignorantia est?"

<sup>2</sup> Peter appears also at Mt. xv. 15 as spokesman for the disciples, where in the parallel in Mk vii. 17 the same request is attributed to the disciples collectively; and again at xviii. 21 as asking a question wanting in the parallel in Lk xvii. 3, 4. The introduction of his name in these places may be due rather to the evangelist's sense of the fitness of things than to a distinct tradition. On the other hand at Mk xi. 21, and xiii. 3, Peter speaks while in the parallels in Mt. (xxi. 20 and xxiv. 3) we have "the disciples."

where it denotes a local body of a kind not widely dissimilar (so far as organisation was concerned) from a Jewish synagogue. In the passage now before us, however, the Universal Church is meant, and to attribute the use of it to Jesus, it may be said, is plainly an anachronism, because (if for no other reason) the conception would have been unintelligible to the Twelve at that time. Now it was no doubt inevitable that the saying in Greek, after the term *ἐκκλησία* had begun to be used of the whole society of Christians, should convey some ideas which could not have been clearly suggested by an Aramaic original of it spoken within the lifetime of Jesus. Nevertheless, the idea which seems sometimes clearly to be intended by the phrase "the congregation of Israel" as used in the Old Testament—that of the people of Israel contemplated as an organic whole, which those actually assembled on any particular occasion, more or less adequately represented—could not be unfamiliar to the disciples of Jesus. It may, I think, justly be maintained, that the comparison of believers in Jesus to the true Israel, and the use in the LXX. of the term *ἐκκλησία*, to convey a more or less ideal conception of the nation as a living unity, helps materially to explain how it was that Christians attained very early to the conception of the Universal Christian Society, and also why they used the term *ἐκκλησία* to express it. But these same ideas would clearly also, within the lifetime of Jesus, have supplied a true guide to the essence of what He meant by such an utterance as that recorded in St Matthew, which we are now considering. By their aid they might gather, if at first only uncertainly and dimly, that in this respect as in others He was "not come to destroy but to fulfil." He would found a spiritual Israel, a corporate unity with common privileges, responsibilities and hopes, bound together and called to act together as the people of God<sup>1</sup>.

It is, however, surely remarkable that a Gospel, in which (as we have seen) special, and perhaps undue, prominence has been given to the element of Jewish eschatological ideas in the Teaching of Jesus, should also contain a passage

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 3 ff.

concerning His Church which is of the most widely different character. This fact may well suggest to us that we ought not to measure the depth and range of the original Teaching by any single representation of it; and that we may misunderstand the purpose of Jesus in the use of language and ideas which belonged specially to His own age and country, if we confine our attention exclusively thereto.

The remainder of the traditions belonging to the class defined at the beginning of this section occur in the latter part of the narrative, from the approach to Jerusalem onwards. The "Mother of the Sons of Zebedee" comes to Jesus with them and proffers a request on their behalf (xx. 20). She is mentioned again in this Gospel among women who followed Jesus from Galilee in order to minister to Him, and who were present at the Crucifixion, and does not appear elsewhere, unless, indeed, she is the same as the Salome named by Mark (xv. 40, cp. Mt. xxvii. 56). After the purging of the temple, it is said that blind and lame persons came to Him there and were healed and that children cried Hosanna (xxi. 14—16)<sup>1</sup>. At the arrest of Jesus solemn words are given with which Jesus restrained one of those with Him who began to resist forcibly (xxvi. 52—54). In the scene of the trial and condemnation, the intervention of Pilate's wife and Pilate's washing his hands, as a sign that he threw the responsibility for the death of Jesus upon the Jews, and their acceptance of it are described (xxvii. 19, 24, 25). The impression produced upon the (Roman) soldiers who watched Him on the Cross (xxvii. 36, 54), the resurrection of departed saints at the time of the death and resurrection of Jesus (xxvii. 52 f.), the guard set by the chief-priests to watch the tomb, their presence at His resurrection, and the false story which the chief-priests bribed them to spread abroad (xxvii. 62—66, xxviii. 2—4 and 11—15) are also related. The conclusion of the story about the guard brings us to a point where we can no longer compare St Mark, but as the earlier part of this story was not derived from that Gospel, neither can the last portion of it be. On the other hand, the lost ending

<sup>1</sup> This passage was referred to in the last section (p. 344) but only in order to distinguish it from those contained in the source there discussed.

of St Mark may not improbably have been the source of most of the remainder. On the assumption, however, that it was, it will still appear in the next section that certain momentous words must in all probability have been added in St Matthew.

6. In some passages of this Gospel in which St Mark has in the main been closely followed, and also in others having parallels in St Luke which were taken directly or ultimately from the same original, there are words and phrases of theological import, which are peculiar. These we proceed now to consider.

In a description of the Future Coming of the Son of Man in Mt. xvi. 27, 28, there is close parallelism with Mk viii. 38, ix. 1, both in substance and in language (as also throughout a considerable passage preceding), with the exception that in St Matthew the clause "and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds" is added, and that we have "with His angels" and "till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," instead of "with the holy angels" and "till they see the kingdom of God come with power." The relations between St Matthew and St Luke are similar as regards the form in which these two Gospels respectively give another Saying bearing on the same subject, which both must have derived immediately or ultimately from a common source (Mt. xix. 28 = Lk xxii. 28—30). We have in St Matthew the words "when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory," but nothing in St Luke that properly corresponds to them. Moreover, the idea of the Judgeship of Christ, which is plainly expressed in the former and implied in the latter of these passages in St Matthew, is not elsewhere set forth in St Mark or St Luke.

We pass to a difference which is chiefly one of terminology; but the same phenomena of relationship between the Gospels are repeated. In the question of the disciples which introduces the Apocalyptic discourse in Mk xiii., and parallels, we have in place of "Tell us...when these things are all about to be accomplished" (Mk xiii. 4) the ampler phrase in Mt. xxiv. 3, "Tell us...what shall be the sign of thy coming (*τῆς σῆς παρουσίας*) and of the end of the world (*συντελείας τοῦ*

αἰῶνος).” The former of these terms—the *parousia*—so common in the Epistles of St Paul, and found also in some other Epistles of the New Testament, occurs besides in the Gospels only in three other verses of St Matthew, viz. xxiv. 27, 37, 39. There is good reason to think that this passage was derived from the Logian source common to the first and third Gospels. There is a parallel in Lk xvii. 24, 26, 27, which agrees closely with the passage just cited from St Matthew, the chief difference being in point of fact the absence of the term *parousia* cited in the latter. The other expression peculiar to St Matthew in the parallel to St Mark above cited—ἡ συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος—occurs besides in the Gospels only in passages peculiar to St Matthew, viz. at xiii. 39, 40, 49 (in the parable of the Wheat and Tares), and at xxviii. 20<sup>1</sup>.

There is a difference more significant than the last, between the first and third Gospels in the Sayings given at Mt. vii. 13, 14, 21—23 = Lk xiii. 23—27, and Mt. x. 32, 33 = Lk xii. 8, 9. Both Gospels have behind them in the latter case the common Greek Logian document; and in the former, if not this, then at least, either the Aramaic Collection of Sayings, or some other common original. Now according to St Matthew Jesus speaks in both passages quite unambiguously of His own action at the Last Day, whereas in Luke’s parallel to the former passage, the reference in the figurative language is unexplained, and in the second there is, in speaking of the future, a change from the first person to the third person (with the Son of Man as subject), and then to an impersonal form. It should be observed that if the form of these Sayings and the connexion in which they are given in St Matthew are correct, Jesus spoke of His Messianic dignity more publicly, and earlier even to the Twelve than we should gather from the other two Synoptics that He did.

In the two Matthaean parallels to St Mark which we have been examining and their contexts there are no signs that another document, or an independent tradition, has in St Matthew been combined with the Marcan record. It is also

<sup>1</sup> At Heb. ix. 26, we have a similar phrase ἐπὶ συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων.

most unlikely that the expressions special to St Matthew upon which I have commented can have been derived from an earlier text of St Mark. A reviser would not have omitted or altered such expressions as these. Moreover the present form of St Mark is in these respects supported by Luke. There can, therefore, be no reasonable doubt that the phrases and words to which reference has been made were introduced by the author of St Matthew in consequence of his own sense of what was fitting. In regard to the parallels between St Matthew and St Luke it is necessary to speak with more caution, because we do not possess the original. Nevertheless, it must seem most natural to give the same account as before of the peculiarities that have been indicated in St Matthew, on the ground both of the analogy of the parallels between St Matthew and St Mark which have been considered, and of the improbability that Luke, or anyone through whom he had obtained his source, would have altered the Sayings in those respects if he had found them standing thus in the source<sup>1</sup>.

The expressions—"The outer darkness" (*τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον*) and "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (*ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων*) have already come before us in parables peculiar to St Matthew<sup>2</sup>. Both occur in Mt. viii. 11, 12. In a parallel to this passage in Lk xiii. 28, 29, the latter of these is used but not the former; but as this is not the only difference between the two Gospels in this passage and the other Sayings with which it is associated, it is possible that the piece had been diversely transmitted to the two evangelists<sup>3</sup>. At Mt. xxiv. 51 = Lk xii. 41, the former Gospel has and the latter, in a parallel otherwise close, has not the words "there shall be weeping," etc.

Another phrase "the day of judgement" should also be noticed. It occurs twice in Mt. xi. 20—24—a passage derived in all probability from the common Greek Logian source—

<sup>1</sup> Luke has altered language which foretold apparently an immediate return of Christ (see p. 275); but the expressions now before us could have caused him no difficulty.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 340.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 98 f.

and also at x. 15 which may have been suggested by the same passage<sup>1</sup>. But there are expressions in the Lucan parallel, x. 12—15 (“in that day” and “the judgement”) which are so similar that it is hard to say whether the revision has been on the one side or the other. The phrase is also used in Mt. xii. 36, a Saying peculiar to this Gospel; it does not occur elsewhere in the Gospels.

I turn to titles bestowed on Jesus. He is addressed as “Son of David” more frequently in St Matthew than in the other Gospels. We note it in two parallels to St Mark where not authorised by the latter—Mt. xv. 22 = Mk vii. 25, 26 *b*; and Mt. xxi. 9 = Mk xi. 9, 10<sup>2</sup>; and again in a Logian context where Luke has not this expression :—Mt. xii. 22, 23 = Lk xi. 14, 15. It occurs also in two passages peculiar to St Matthew :—ix. 27, xxi. 15. The appellation *Κύριε* (the precise connotation of which, however, in different places in the Gospels is rather difficult to determine) is used somewhat more frequently than in the other Synoptics. In Mt. viii. 2 it occurs, but is wanting in Mk i. 40. Luke, however (v. 12), here agrees with the former and there are other coincidences in the same narrative between St Matthew and St Luke, so that both may here be influenced by another document or by tradition<sup>3</sup>. But *Κύριε* is substituted for *διδάσκαλε* in Mt. xvii. 15 = Mk ix. 17 = Lk ix. 38; and added to the Marcan account at Mt. xx. 31 = Mk x. 48 = Lk xviii. 39; and also at Mt. xxvi. 22 = Mk xiv. 19 = Lk xxii. 23. It occurs also a few times in sections peculiar to this Gospel.

Again, Jesus is addressed as the “Son of God” in Mt. xiv. 33, but not in the parallel at Mk vi. 51; and at Mt. xvi. 1, 6, but not in Mk viii. 29. But it appears from the contexts in these two instances that this difference may possibly be due here to another tradition which in St Matthew is combined with the Marcan document. In the account, also, of the mockery of Jesus by passers-by when He was hanging upon the Cross allusions were made, according to St Matthew

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> It should be observed, however, that the words in Mk vi. 10 seem to imply its use.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 148.

(xxvii. 40), to His claim to be the Son of God ; not according to the two other Synoptics. In St Mark, however, they taunt Him with claiming to be "the Christ" (xv. 32) and in St Luke "the Christ of God, the Elect" (xxiii. 35), so that the difference here is but slight, seeing that the name "the Son of God" had a Messianic reference.

The special frequency with which Jesus is represented in this Gospel as speaking of God as "my Father" may also here be mentioned. It is substituted for God, which stands in St Mark, at Mt. xii. 50 = Mk iii. 35, and Mt. xxvi. 29 = Mk xiv. 25; while to the words "for whom it is prepared," in Mk x. 40, "by my Father" is added in Mt. xx. 23. "My Father" or "My Father in heaven" is also used in Sayings that are peculiar to this Gospel at xv. 13; xvi. 17; xviii. 10, 19, 35; xxvi. 53.

It remains to speak of three instances of peculiarity in St Matthew, which are somewhat different from the foregoing. Each is individual, yet a similar explanation should probably be given in the case of all three. The greater fulness of the Matthaean as compared with the Lucan forms of the Lord's Prayer (Mt. vi. 9—13 = Lk xi. 1—4) may reasonably be attributed to very early liturgical usage. In like manner the addition of the words *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* in the account of the Institution of the Eucharist in Mt. xxvi. 28, which is in other respects almost word for word the same as that in Mk xiv. 24, may not improbably have been made under the influence of the Church's teaching, and of the language which it was customary to use at celebrations of the Eucharist.

The injunction at Mt. xxviii. 19, to baptise in the Three-fold Name, which is the remaining one of the instances of peculiarity just referred to, must be discussed at greater length. With regard to this command there is the grave difficulty that no mention is made of it in the account of the commission given to the Apostles at the end of St Luke, and the beginning of Acts, or in the present ending of St Mark; and that uniformly in Acts and St Paul's Epistles we read only of baptising "in the Name of Jesus"; there are no passages to be compared in the remainder of the New



Testament<sup>1</sup>. Much has been said in some quarters concerning the dangers of the argument from silence: and there is, I think, no doubt, that sometimes it has been seriously misused. But each case of silence must be judged on its own merits, and it appears to me that in the present instance the silence must be allowed to be significant.

I have argued that the original ending of Mark's Gospel supplied the *basis* for the closing part of the narrative in St Matthew<sup>2</sup>. But as I have already pointed out, there is strong reason for thinking that the conclusion of the story about the guard that watched the tomb (Mt. xxviii. 11—15) was an insertion into it, and we are not entitled to say that it was the only one. In view of the facts that have come before us in the last few pages, I do not think it can well be denied that if the custom of using the Three-fold Name in baptising had become familiar to the author of this Gospel, it would have seemed to him suitable to add it to the account of the commission to evangelise taken from his source; and on a consideration of all the evidence it appears to me most probable that this is what has happened.

I believe, indeed, that the formula in Mt. xxviii. 19 summed up teaching which Jesus had given not merely after His resurrection but before His death, and was in a sense the natural outcome of the conception of His Messiahship, so that the transition from the use of the Name of Jesus to the Three-fold Name in Christian baptism, when it was made, involved no abrupt and violent change. He who received baptism in the faith that Jesus was the Christ believed also in the Father Who sent Him, and looked for the gift of the Spirit, which spiritually-minded Jews had learnt even from the Old Testament to associate more or less clearly with the Messianic times. All this was necessarily implied when Jews were baptised in the Name of Christ. But it was otherwise when converts began to be made from heathenism. In their case it was necessary to insist on the truth that there is One God, the Father, and also to give instruction respecting the Divine

<sup>1</sup> Acts ii. 38; viii. 16; x. 48; xix. 5; Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. i. 12 ff.; Gal. iii. 27.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 202.

Spirit. There is no need to dwell on the former point, but with regard to the latter it may be worth while to recall that St Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, implies that his reason for explaining to them the doctrine of the Spirit, and of spiritual gifts, is that in the past they had been "led away unto those dumb idols, howsoever they might be led<sup>1</sup>." At first even on their admission into the Church the belief in One God, the Father, and in the Holy Spirit, as well as in Jesus, the Son of God, may have been a matter of mutual understanding, rather than of formal confession on the part of the baptised, and declaration on that of the baptiser. But very soon it must have been felt that it would be well to have this belief definitely expressed at the moment of baptism. Hence, as it seems to me, the employment of the Three-fold Name in baptism arose in connexion with the evangelisation of the heathen; and it is not without significance that in Mt. xxviii. 19, it is closely associated with the charge to "make disciples of all nations." No new truth was thus brought in; but at the same time there had been a development of a thoroughly sound kind. A clearer apprehension of the belief already held was rendered possible, and a fresh starting-point was furnished for earnest thought, and for controversy, in the generations that were to follow<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 1 f.

<sup>2</sup> In an article on "The Lord's Command to baptise" in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for July 1905, Dr Chase (now Bp of Ely) argues that the injunction to baptise in the Three-fold Name was contained in the original ending of St Mark's Gospel and taken thence, and further that the words represent with substantial accuracy what was actually spoken by Jesus. See pp. 482, 508 f. The view that I should take of most of the considerations urged by Dr Chase will be apparent from what I have written above, but there is one point on which it may be well for me to add a few words. He says (p. 508 f.) "If the words which St Matthew puts into our Lord's mouth are regarded as laying down 'a baptismal formula,' then everything depends on their being the *ipsissima verba* of the Lord. But if on the other hand the words are intended to describe what Baptism essentially is, then we may be entirely satisfied if we have reasonable grounds for thinking that they give us the substance, possibly in a condensed form, of what the Lord actually said." And a little later (p. 511) when commenting on Acts xix. 2 ff. "If we put aside the thought of a baptismal formula, no adverse inference can be drawn from the historical notice which follows, 'They were baptised (immersed) into the name of the Lord Jesus.'" I suppose that in suggesting that the words are not to be taken as "a baptismal formula," he

It has to be added that although the integrity of the text in Mt. xxviii. 19, has been accepted by the chief modern editors, it has recently been called in question<sup>1</sup>. If I may quite briefly state the impression made on my own mind by the evidence which has been brought forward in the controversy on this subject, I would say that there is some probability that in a copy or copies, known to Eusebius in the earlier part of his life, the reading "in My Name" stood in place of "baptising them," etc., but that already before this the latter reading must have been common in all parts of the Church; and that further it is barely possible, but most improbable, that the former reading was the original one which had been to a large extent already, and was soon to be completely, ousted by the other<sup>1</sup>. To one holding the view which I have set forth above of the origin of the words in St Matthew which are under consideration, this textual question is chiefly interesting from its bearing on the time when the full baptismal formula began to be used. The general form of the Baptismal Creed in every part of the

means that they may not have been intended for ritual use. It seems to me, however, that the impression naturally to be gathered from these words as well as from "baptising in the name of the Lord Jesus," is that the words "in the name of the Father," etc., or "in the name of the Lord Jesus" would be in some way brought in at the time of baptism. But apart from the question whether the words were designed to be a *ritual* formula, on the face of them they constitute a *doctrinal* formula, and one, moreover, of the kind which in other cases men have been left to frame for themselves from meditating on truths more fully taught.

<sup>1</sup> Mr F. C. Conybeare rejects the clause "baptising them," etc. in Mt. xxviii. 19 as not genuine (see his articles in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1901, p. 275 ff. and the *Hibbert Journal* for October 1902, p. 102 ff., and Prof. Lake has accepted his conclusions (Inaugural Lecture at Leyden, 1904, p. 7 ff.). For replies, see Riggenbach in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, 1903, and the article by Dr Chase mentioned in the last note. (I am indebted to the last-named article for the preceding references.) Dr Chase seems to me to have shewn effectively the weakness of many of Mr Conybeare's arguments. On the other hand, I cannot say that the addition of "in My Name," after "Make disciples of all nations," would be, as Dr Chase holds (p. 488), "absolutely natural" for one who knew the words "baptising them in the Name of the Father," etc., and that he might have included them even if it had been his intention to quote the whole text. The instances of additions in the Western text which Dr Chase gives are not analogous to such a combination as this would make. Further he seems to depreciate too much the value of the Western text.

Church, and its early history so far as we are acquainted with it, as well as other evidence, render it probable in the highest degree that this formula was in common use before the middle of the second century; while if the words in St Matthew belong to the genuine text of that Gospel, it must have been in use in some part of the Church before, or near, the close of the Apostolic Age.

7. In St Matthew more plainly than in either St Mark or St Luke indications are given of the course and issue of the great spiritual drama, which has been wrought out in the Gospel history through the action and interaction of Divine purpose and human perversity. These indications are to be found chiefly in some favourite expressions and a certain number of sayings peculiar to this Gospel, but they suffice to convey to the attentive reader a distinct and strong impression. There were three acts in that drama: (*a*) the Mission of Jesus on earth to the Jewish people as their true king; (*b*) their rejection of Him as a nation; (*c*) the consequent extension of the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles after His resurrection. Each of these is clearly marked.

(*a*) It is evident from all the Gospels that Jesus exercised His Ministry almost solely towards Jews. The scenes of His labours, where nearly all His time is spent, are the distinctively Jewish districts of Palestine<sup>1</sup>. If He shews favour to any individuals not of Jewish race who come before Him, it is expressly treated as an exception. But in St Matthew stress is laid on the fact of this restriction, and it is represented as the result of conscious aim and choice. It did not—to make the remark is, perhaps, almost superfluous—imply of necessity any thought in the mind of Jesus that the Kingdom of God was always to be confined to the Jews. But He was subject in His earthly life to human limitations of time and strength, and on every ground it was meet that salvation should first be offered to the Jews. The actual ordering of the history of this people, the place assigned them among the nations of the earth, gave them a right to expect it. Any other course

<sup>1</sup> Judaea, Galilee and Peraea.

would have been out of harmony with that faithfulness of God, that constancy of character shewn in fidelity to His word, that steadfast adherence to His manifested purpose, which is one great feature of the revelation of the Old Testament. And again, practical wisdom required it, because this people had been in a measure prepared—the truly godly and believing among them were in a very real sense prepared—by their previous moral and spiritual training, to understand and believe the Gospel in a way that others were not. The Mission of Jesus specially to Israel is strikingly set before us almost at the beginning of St Matthew: “it is he that shall save his people—*τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ*—from their sins”; for *λαός* here must signify Israel<sup>1</sup>. Again, at iv. 23, *ἐν τῷ λαῷ*, “among the people,” has the same meaning: “Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people.” That is to say, His works of mercy were wrought in the midst of, and for, Israel. They were proofs that the promised Messianic days had come<sup>2</sup>.

The Sayings contained in St Matthew which confine the Mission of the Apostles of Christ to Israel will be recalled

<sup>1</sup> Mt. i. 21. *λαός* according to its earlier classical usage denotes simply a mass of men, and not, like *δῆμος*, the people as a body-politic. It sometimes, however, denotes “a people,” i.e. all who are called by one name. But it is a rare word in prose.

In the LXX. it is common, (1) sometimes in pl. to denote “peoples” regarded as “nationalities”; (2) specially to denote the people of Israel in contrast with *τὰ ἔθνη*, as a translation of *אֲרָץ* in contrast with *עַמִּים*; (3) also to describe the people in contrast with the priests and Levites, e.g. 1 Es. i. 11.

In N.T. the three meanings of LXX. are approximately represented. We have instances of (1) at Apoc. v. 9; vii. 9, etc. In St Luke we sometimes find (2), e.g. Lk i. 68, 77; ii. 10; ii. 32. But Luke also frequently uses the word for the “common people,” the multitude. He does so several times where in the parallels in Mk and Mt. we have *ὄχλος*. See Lk xx. 6 = Mk xi. 32 = Mt. xxi. 26; Lk xx. 19 = Mk xii. 12 = Mt. xxi. 46; Lk xx. 45 = Mt. xxiii. 1.

In Matthew *λαός* appears nearly always to be used for “the nation,” i.e. “the chosen nation,” Israel. In one case only, Mt. xxvii. 64, is it clearly used for the “common people.”

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Mt. ix. 33; xv. 31. We have a similar thought at Lk vii. 16 (see above, p. 297); but it is not so common in St Luke. At Lk iv. 25, 27, quite a different note is struck, there the limitation of God’s gifts, *even as regards Israel*, is emphasised.

by everyone. It is sufficient to note them in the present connexion. I have already touched on the difficulties which they create through the length of time to which they extend this restriction, and I will recur to this when speaking of the point of view of the author of the Gospel. But, again, in the incident of the Canaanite woman (Mt. xv. 21—28 = Mk vii. 24—30) the declaration of Jesus “I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (v. 24) appears in this Gospel only (Mt. v. 24), and the circumstances in which it was made gave it special point. In the eyes of Jesus many, perhaps the majority, of those who formed the crowds that ordinarily surrounded Him were “lost sheep of the house of Israel” (see Mt. ix. 36 and cp. Mk vi. 34). But doubtless in the borderland between Galilee and the district belonging to Tyre and Sidon, where He was on the occasion now referred to, the population was a mixed one, and comprised not a few Israelites who had become careless as to their religious observances, and indifferent in regard to their national hopes and ideals. These were emphatically “lost sheep of the house of Israel,” and the words of Jesus here may well define in a special manner the purpose which He had in visiting this region. It is, however, also to be observed that while Mark does not clearly say on which side of the borderline between Jewish and non-Jewish territory Jesus was when the Canaanite woman came to Him, and proceeds to tell of a journey through the latter, the author of St Matthew not only omits this journey (which in itself is not strange, since no incidents are recorded in connexion with it), but carefully avoids suggesting that Jesus crossed the border<sup>1</sup>. Similarly at Mt. xvi. 13 = Mk viii. 27, for Mark’s “unto the villages of,” he substitutes the vaguer “unto the parts of,” Caesarea Philippi. And it may be that a little later than this the same thought, namely, that Jesus has not been outside of Galilee, may at Mt. xvii. 22 = Mk ix. 30 have led him to alter Mark’s “And they went forth from thence, and passed through Galilee” into “And while they abode in Galilee<sup>2</sup>.”

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xv. 21—30 = Mk vii. 24—35. In v. 22 Mt. states that the woman “came out from those parts” (those of Tyre and Sidon).

<sup>2</sup> This is the rendering of R.V. for *ἀναστρεφόμενων*. In the mg. of R.V.

(b) The insistence, however, in St Matthew on the prerogatives of the Jews does not proceed from any special tenderness for them, or desire to maintain that those privileges are inalienable. Rather, when we take other traits in conjunction with it, the thought suggested to our minds is that the Jews have had their day of special opportunity, and that it has been brought to a close in consequence of their own conduct. This could hardly be more strikingly shewn than it is by the phrase employed in Mt. viii. 12 in the saying appended to the incident of the believing centurion—"the sons of the kingdom shall be cast out," in place of which we have simply "ye" in Lk xiii. 28, without even a clear indication in the context who were the persons addressed. It may further be observed that at Mt. xiii. 13, the hard-heartedness of those who were by position the chosen people of God is more distinctly brought out than in the parallel at Mk iv. 11, 12, by the substitution of "*because* they seeing see not" for Mark's "*in order that* they may not see," and by the direct quotation from Is. vi. 9, which includes the words, "for this people's heart is waxed gross, etc." Coming to the latter part of the Gospel, we find that special stress is laid upon the responsibility of the heads of the nation for the death of Jesus. Their representative character is indicated in the full phrase used four times in St Matthew, and not elsewhere, in connexion with their hostility to Jesus and with His condemnation, "the chief priests and elders of the nation<sup>1</sup>." In the application of the parable of the Vine-dressers, their doom is pronounced more sternly than in the parallels in the other Synoptics<sup>2</sup>. Again, the Apostrophe to Jerusalem (Mt. xxiii. 37—39) derives special significance in this Gospel from the position given to it, at the conclusion of the Denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees, and from the sequel; for after Jesus

the better supported reading *συστρεφόμενων* is translated "while they were gathering themselves together." This seems to suggest that other disciples besides the Twelve were prepared to accompany Jesus on His journey to Jerusalem.

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xxi. 23; xxvi. 3, 47; xxvii. 1. The various expressions used at Lk xix. 47, etc., do not involve in the same way the idea of their representative position.

<sup>2</sup> See esp. Mt. xxi. 43, 44.

had said, "Lo, your house is left unto you desolate," He immediately departed from the temple for ever (Mt. xxiv. 1). Finally, in a passage peculiar to this Gospel, the Roman governor protests his innocence of the blood of Jesus, and the Jewish nation, so far as it could be formally represented, themselves plainly accept the responsibility (xxvii. 24, 25).

(c) But the privileges which the Jewish nation had forfeited were transferred to others. This is stated in Mk xii. 9; but in Mt. xxi. 41 *b*, the thought is expanded. It is still more interesting to notice that the message which is to be delivered to the Gentiles is described by the same characteristic phrase as that used in regard to the teaching of Jesus among the people of Israel, and which promised the true fulfilment of their national hopes:—"this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony among all nations" (Mt. xxiv. 14)<sup>1</sup>. At length, in the transcendent conclusion, the Lord, when He is himself emancipated from the limitations of the flesh, gives the command "Go ye, make disciples of all the nations," and the promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

It remains that from the facts that have come before us we should gather what we can as to the man who has given us this Gospel, and the time when he wrote; and also form some estimate of its special value relatively to the other Synoptic Gospels.

It is evident from the manner in which Greek sources have been reproduced and combined in it that it cannot be simply a translation of a work in Hebrew or Aramaic. It is also impossible that it can have been composed in Greek by the apostle Matthew himself. Not only would this supposition find no support in ancient views of the Gospel in Greek-speaking Christendom, where writers from Irenaeus onwards, who treat this book as the Gospel according to Matthew, themselves uniformly speak of his having written for Hebrew Christians in their own language; it is also forbidden by the

<sup>1</sup> At the parallel in Mk x i. 10, we have "the gospel."



relation of this Gospel to Mark's. For it is inconceivable that an apostle would have followed so closely the hearer of another apostle, instead of giving his independent testimony as an eye-witness.

It is not surprising that as this Gospel came to be connected with the name of Matthew, one of the Twelve—whatever the grounds for so connecting it may have been—the individuality of the Greek writer, to whom its composition is properly speaking due, should have been lost in that of the apostle, or that, if he was thought of at all, it was simply as a translator. Now, however, that we have learned that his part was certainly a more considerable one than this, it clearly has become desirable, and even necessary, that we should fix our thoughts directly upon him and his work. It is somewhat difficult to know how to describe him. Although his Gospel is made up almost entirely of materials drawn from various sources and chiefly from two documents, one of these being the Gospel according to St Mark, yet to call him simply "the editor" is manifestly inadequate; and again the name "compiler" would, owing to the associations it usually has, not do him justice. I have repeatedly called him "the author," and I believe that—all things being considered—this is the most suitable title for him, because in this Gospel the arrangement of the matter, and various little touches, both of which in large measure proceed from him, have done so much to impart to the whole work its peculiar character and impressiveness.

We have, however, seen reason to believe that the Collection of Utterances of Jesus in their original language, which, it would appear from very early testimony, the apostle Matthew made, and much of which has been preserved in St Luke, is most fully represented in our Greek St Matthew<sup>1</sup>. In another respect also we seem to be brought here more nearly into contact with that original document. That early translation of it which (if I have rightly reasoned) lies at the basis of the documents used severally by Luke and the author of our St Matthew, had, in the case of the document used by

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 82—84, 92, and pp. 328, 335 f.

Luke, been amplified by the insertion of matter not taken from the same Aramaic Collection<sup>1</sup>, whereas in the other case the principal changes had been of a kind to bring the early Greek translation into closer correspondence with the Aramaic original. Thus far we can see more or less solid ground for the name of our Gospel according to Matthew. It is possible that some other portions of the matter contained in this Gospel—as for instance some, if not all, of the additional parables, and the *Catena of fulfilments of prophecy*—may have been derived from his oral teaching, if not, from a document by him. But this is, and must probably ever remain, mere conjecture.

The author of this Gospel had lived in some portion of the Church where he had been in close contact with Jewish-Christian teaching and tradition, largely brought direct from Palestine. Evidence of this has come before us again and again in the foregoing pages; it is not necessary for me to enumerate the instances here. It is possible that he may himself have been a Grecian Jew, and that his familiarity with the Septuagint<sup>2</sup> is to be explained in this way. But whatever he may have been by race, there can be no doubt that in his Gospel he reflects some of the special characteristics of Jewish-Christian thought, while he is at the same time himself evidently free from that spirit of exclusiveness in regard to the Gentiles, which many Jewish Christians shewed. It is not always possible to tell how much is due to himself and how much to his sources, in regard to various traits in this Gospel. The same thoughts and expressions are found alike in clauses added by him to passages taken from his Marcan or Logian source, and in pieces derived from other sources known to us only through this Gospel. It is clearly open to consideration, therefore, whether in the latter case also these traits may not have been introduced by the author's own revising hand. Sometimes they may; but it appears to be on the whole most probable that from those other sources peculiar to him, as well as from the teaching to which he had been accustomed, his mind had

<sup>1</sup> See p. 227 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 343 f.

become impregnated with ideas which influenced him even when he was using his Marcan and Logian documents. We have had an example of this recurrence of the same characteristics in different parts of St Matthew which, as to their main substance, are of different origin, in the case of the special prominence given in this Gospel to the fulfilment of prophecy in the Life and Death of Jesus. The evangelist has used a collection of fulfilments, and he has also in some Marcan contexts, made the allusions to prophecy plainer and fuller than they are in St Mark<sup>1</sup>. We have had another example of the same kind in allusions to the Judgeship of Christ and the Last Things both in certain parables and other pieces peculiar to him, and in Marcan and Logian contexts<sup>2</sup>. I will give one other instance to which I have not hitherto had a convenient opportunity of referring. From his Logian document he has taken the passage on that law which is the true fulfilment of the Old (Mt. v. 17—48 and vii. 12). But he emphasises the same great truth when to the account of an occasion on which the two great commandments of love to God and to our neighbour have been stated (Mt. xxii. 34—39 = Mk xii. 28—31), he adds the striking words “on these two commandments hangeth the whole law and the prophets” (Mt. v. 40); and again when in Mt. xix. 16—19 he supplements the enumeration in Mk x. 17—19 of commandments of the second table of the Decalogue with the law which comprised, and more than comprised, them all.

Features in this Gospel which have come before us, and others which are familiar to every student of the New Testament, render it probable that the evangelist had Jewish readers specially in view<sup>3</sup>. And it was undoubtedly his desire that they should be led to regard Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah Who had been promised them. But he does not

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 342 ff.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 339 ff., 351 ff.

<sup>3</sup> It may be worth while to point out his use of the expression *ἡ ἀγία πόλις*, for Jerusalem, Mt. iv. 5 and xxvii. 53, which occurs besides in the New Testament only at Apoc. xi. 2, for the earthly, and Apoc. xxi. 2, for the heavenly, city. Cp. also *ἐν τόπῳ ἀγίῳ* at Mt. xxiv. 15, where in the parallel at Mk xiii. 14 there is a different phrase. Again, in Mt. xv. 1 ff. (= Mk vii. 1 ff.) the explanation of a Jewish custom given in Mk xv. 2—4 is not reproduced; probably as being unnecessary for the readers intended.

suffer them to suppose that Jesus had come as their Saviour only, and not as the Saviour of the Gentiles. Indeed, he would seem to have had more or less clearly the intention of "justifying the ways of God" in the judgement that had fallen upon them as a nation and the admission of the Gentiles.

We may, I think, rightly feel confident that this Gospel was written before the close of the first century. It is possible that we have indications of its use as early as A.D. 95 in Clement's Epistle; and they become fairly clear and numerous within the first 30 years or so of the second century<sup>1</sup>. Also, the work bears within itself no traces of the thoughts and movements of the beginning of the second century. Some, perhaps, may be inclined to place it before the Destruction of Jerusalem on the ground that in reproducing the Apocalyptic discourse in Mt. xxiv., the evangelist does not seek to give precision to the somewhat vague language regarding the city's doom, or to separate clearly therefrom the return of the Son of Man<sup>2</sup>. But I do not think such reasoning would be sound. The manner in which Luke modifies the language of those predictions is, indeed, a sign that, when he wrote, some few years had elapsed since the Destruction of Jerusalem<sup>3</sup>; but the converse does not hold, that a work in which the expressions of the source were left unaltered must have been composed before that event. On the contrary, to many a writer then, this must have seemed the right thing to do as it would now, and that he need not have felt any fear as to the possibility of the prophecies being fulfilled may be inferred from the way in which they have been viewed by multitudes of Christians during a long succession of generations since. To take another case: we have seen this writer himself including a Saying (Mt. x. 32) manifestly inconsistent with the commission to make disciples of all the nations, to which he himself attaches great significance.

<sup>1</sup> See vol. I. pp. 8, 13, 15, 25 ff., 31, 33, 42—5, 72 f.

<sup>2</sup> Mt. xxiv. 15=Mk xiii. 14. At Mt. xxvi. 64=Mk xiv. 62, he seems to have preserved the text of Proto-Mk. See p. 218.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 275.

It appears to me unlikely that the conditions already existed as early as A.D. 70 which would have rendered the composition of our St Matthew possible. The Gospel of Mark in its original form was not written long before this, and it had undergone some expansion before it came to the hands of the author of our St Matthew<sup>1</sup>. Further, the period during which there existed no satisfactory translation into Greek of the Collection of the Sayings made by the apostle Matthew must have been of some duration, and the disciple who spoke of it as within his recollection lived to the end of the first century or later. But we may find, perhaps, in the consideration that both this Gospel and that by Luke were composed quite independently of each other<sup>2</sup>, our surest means of fixing the date of the former. It is difficult to suppose that the earlier of the two could have remained unknown to the writer of the later one for more than a few years at furthest after its publication, even if he was living in some portion of the Church widely different from that in which the other was produced: or that if he had been acquainted with it, he would have avoided using it. Accordingly, as we have seen reasons for placing the composition of Luke's work *circa* A.D. 80<sup>3</sup>, I am led to the conclusion that the Gospel according to St Matthew was written somewhere near that time. There do not appear to me to be sufficient reasons for giving precedence to either of them. Luke used the original, unamplified work of Mark, and the author of St Matthew the amplified one<sup>4</sup>, but this may have been due to special circumstances. On the whole, also, St Matthew seems to me to shew more signs of theological development, a point of view later in the order of thought. But differences such as there must naturally have been between individuals and portions of the Church at one and the same date in the latter part of the first century would fully account for this.

Of the value of this work, under other than strictly historical aspects, it is not my place here to speak. But what, we must ask, is its value to us as a document relating to the

<sup>1</sup> See p. 152 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 260, 275.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 140 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 326 f.

history of the Life and Work of Jesus? It cannot be denied that the records, which, we have reason to believe, were made by Mark and Luke, come to us with a guarantee which is lacking here. Nevertheless it is to be remembered that it is chiefly through the comparison of this Gospel with the two other Synoptics that we are able to identify a source of information which is not inferior in value to Mark's reminiscences of what Simon Peter related. Further, our anxiety to get back so far as we can to the sources used in our Gospels, which is undoubtedly a matter of the highest importance, must not lead us to undervalue the help towards obtaining a right view of the history which a Christian writer living in the latter part of the first century may afford. He may himself have known personal disciples of Jesus; it is almost certain that he must have known many who had been acquainted with them. The use made by such a one of the documents which had come to his hands; the manner in which he thought it necessary to supplement them; the impression which he had himself formed of the Person and Mission of Jesus from all that he had read and been told, should receive our most careful attention, if we would use fully the means at our disposal for understanding the Gospel history. And it is to be borne in mind that even details which rested on no very sound tradition may, when introduced by such a man, contribute to a total effect which is true. Be it observed, I say only here that it may be so. Whether it is so or not can be ascertained only by a general review of all the evidence as to the rise of the Christian Faith.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE.

SOME REMARKS ON *LES PROCÉDÉS DE RÉDACTION DES TROIS PREMIERS ÉVANGÉLISTES*, BY F. NICOLARDOT, 1908.

Nearly the whole of the foregoing pages were written before my attention was called to the above work, and the portion of them in which I should most naturally have referred to it was already in type before it was published. But having regard to positions which I have myself maintained in regard to the composition of St Mark, I feel that I ought not to close without one or two remarks more particularly on M. Nicolardot's investigation of this subject.

Let me briefly indicate and comment on his plan for ascertaining how our second evangelist dealt with his sources.

(1) First of all, we recognise, he observes, among the written sources used by him those "Discourses" (the Logian document) which were so largely laid under contribution by our first and third evangelists. From the manner in which he has applied Sayings from this source, and the form in which he has reported them, as compared with the fuller and more accurate reproduction in the two other Synoptic Gospels, we can see how he would be prepared to treat other sources also (p. 215 f.). Now I have urged objections to the view that Mark used this document, and they do not seem to me to be seriously weakened by anything that M. Nicolardot has urged in justification of it. He has indeed in some instances suggested motives which, as he thinks, determined Mark to alter Sayings from the form represented in Matthew and Luke into that in which he has given them, and to place them in new connexions. (See 218-9, 234-7, 244 f., 247 f., 258 f., 273, 275 ff., 282 f.) And it is quite possible that these suggested motives may account correctly in those cases for the moulding which the Sayings received, and their placing, either in oral tradition, or at the hands of some one who translated them from the Semitic source, or of the evangelist himself. But there is little, if anything, to shew that the peculiarities in question were due to changes made in the form of the Logian document inferred from Matthew and Luke—in other words that this was the text upon which our second evangelist worked.

The actual basis, in the minds of those who hold it, of the theory that our second evangelist knew, and in a measure used, the same Greek Logian document which supplied our first and third evangelists with much of the discourse-matter found only in them, is a tacit assumption that any Sayings in substance the same, which we meet with, must have come from the same Greek document. And yet if we go back in thought to the period of oral tradition and of the first attempts to frame written records, there will not seem to be any good reason for this supposition. On the contrary, it is most probable that a certain number of (substantially) the same Sayings must have been known in different quarters in different forms and connexions.

(2) From his examination of our second evangelist's (supposed) use of the "Discourses" M. Nicolardot obtains a kind of general authorisation for attributing to him great freedom in his revision of other sources which he employed. But he does not derive therefrom any valuable assistance for the criticism in detail of those sections of the Gospel, i.e. the greater number of them, in which the use of that source cannot be alleged. The considerations put forward by him in regard to these must be judged on their own merits. The signs of editing which he discovers are of the nature of incongruities between different parts of the same context, or traces of some dogmatic, or other, purpose, which would have induced an editor to alter his source in a particular way. I have admitted, and even pointed out, traces of a certain amount of revision in our St Mark; but I do not think it can be proved, or is likely, to have been nearly so extensive as M. Nicolardot supposes. Many of his distinctions between that which must have belonged to the editor and to his source respectively appear to me to be arbitrary, especially in view of the fact that he claims only to be concerned with the last touches bestowed upon the subject-matter. Features, too, which he declares to be incompatible with authorship by a disciple of Simon Peter do not appear to me to be so. I should have been glad to have had M. Nicolardot's work before me when discussing the composition of this Gospel, but I believe that in what I have written I have indicated what my view would be of most of the points which he raises.



## INDEX

- Abbott, E. A.**; his *Clue*, 11 f.; on the Oral Theory, 17 n.
- Alexander, Bp**; 18 n. 1
- Alford**; 18 n. 1
- Aramaic Source of Christ's Teaching**; 13 n. 1, 14 ff., 61 f., 69; its attitude on the subject of the Mosaic Law, 82 n., 108 f.
- Augustine, St**; his theory that Mark used St Matthew, 31
- Baur**; 32
- Beatitudes, The**; comparison of in Mt. and Lk., 106 ff.
- Birt, T.**; 153 n. 1
- Blass, F.**; on characteristics of Lucan style, 276, 280, 281, 284, 285, 306, 307 f. 308.  
Other references, 14 n. 3, 70, 71 n. 1
- Burkitt, F. C.**; on the bearing of miraculous elements in an ancient narrative upon the question of its general credibility, 3 n.; on the Oral Theory, 17 n.; on Matthew's collection of τὰ λόγια, 48 n.; his view that "Q" contained a narrative of the Passion, 49, 76 n., 105 f.; on reconstruction of "Q," 76 n.
- Chase, Bp**; on medical language in the Lucan writings, 261 n.; on the injunction to baptise in the Three-fold Name, 357 n. 2, 358 n.
- Clemen**; 252 n. 3
- Colani**; on the Eschatological Discourse in Mk xiii., 117 n.
- Conybeare, F. C.**; on the text in Mt. xxviii. 19, 358 n.
- Dalman, G.**; 14 n. 6, 15 nn. 1 and 2, 47
- Doublets**; 45 f., 54-60, 188
- Edersheim**; 19 n. 1
- Eichhorn**; 8 n., 9 n. 1, 20
- Enoch, Book of**; similarity between language in, and that in Mt. xxv. 31-46, 341
- Eusebius**; on the text in Mt. xxviii. 19, 358
- Feine**; on the source of the peculiar matter in St Luke, 221 ff., 225 n. 1, 228
- Friedrich, J.**; on the style and vocabulary of the Lucan writings, 276, 280, 281, 282, 285, 287, 317, 320
- Gieseler**; on the Oral Theory, 18 n. 4, 22
- Godet**; 18 n. 1, 266 n. 2
- Griesbach**; his theory of the relations of the Synoptic Gospels, 20, 31, 32, 33, 35 f.
- Grotius**; on the relations of St Matthew and St Mark, 33
- Harnack**; on the bearing of a miraculous element in an ancient narrative upon the question of its general credibility, 3 n. 1; on Textual Criticism, 71 n.; his reconstruction of "Q," 71 n., 75 n. 2, 78 n., 82 n., 105 n. 2, 106 n., 107; on Lk. i. and ii., 223 f.; on the Lucan authorship of the Acts, 241, 255 f., 258 n.; on medical language in the Lucan writings, 261 n., 262 n., 279, 317  
Other references, 6 n., 111 n. 3
- Hawkins, J. C.**; on the Oral Theory, 17 n.; on the style of St Mark as a sign of unity of authorship, 168 n. 3, 204; on the consentient differences of Mt. and Lk from Mk, 207 n.; on the vocabulary of the "we"-sections of Acts, 255 n., 258 n.
- Hebrews, Gospel according to the**; parallels with St Matthew in, 346; on the Baptism of Jesus, 348

- Hegesippus**; on "the brethren of the Lord," 346 n. 2
- Heinrici, C. F. G.**; on the evidence as to the authorship of the Third Gospel and Acts afforded by the "we"-sections of the latter, 256 n.
- Hilgenfeld, A.**; his defence of the priority of St Matthew, 32, 38, 40 f., 42 n.
- Hobart, W. K.**; on medical language in St Luke, 261 f., 266 n. 2, 279
- Hoffmann, R. A.**; 14 n. 4
- Holstein, C.**; his defence of the priority of St Matthew, 32 f.
- Holtzmann, H. J.**; maintains that the Synoptic Question should be limited to the investigation of Greek documents, 9 n. 2; on Ur-Marcus, 43; on the Eschatological Discourse in Mk xiii., 117 n.; his adoption of Simon's theory, 44, 140; on Lk i. and ii., 226; holds that the author of the Lucan writings was acquainted with the works of Josephus, 263 n. 2, 272 f.
- Other references, 14 n. 2, 32 n. 2, 45
- James, Ep. of St**; Sayings of Jesus not cited in, 67
- John, Epp. of**; references to the Teaching of Jesus in, 66 f.
- Jülicher**; on the use, according to St Mark, which Jesus made of parables, 192 f.; on parallelism between the careers of Peter and Paul in Acts, 249 n. 2; on the Church organisation described in Acts, 252 n. 1; on the Gift of Tongues, 252
- Julius Africanus**; on the Lord's kinsmen, 347 n. 1
- Justin Martyr**; probable reference by to Luke's Gospel, 240
- Keim, Th.**; 32, 117 n., 263 n. 2
- Kenyon, F. G.**; 153 n. 1
- Klostermann**; the vocabulary and style of the "we"-sections of Acts, 255 n., 258 n., 298, 315, 317 f., 320, 321
- Krenkel, M.**; his work *Josephus und Lucas*, 263 ff.
- Lachmann**; on the priority of St Mark, 32 n. 2, 44 f., 186 n. 4
- Lake, K.**; on the text in Mt. xxviii. 19, 358 n.
- Lardner**; 31 n. 1
- Lekebusch**; on the style and vocabulary of the Lucan writings, 276, 280, 281, 308
- Lightfoot, Bp**; on medical language in the Lucan writings, 261 n.; on "the Lord's brethren," 346 n. 2
- Logian document, The** (or "Q"); 44 ff.; clues for the reconstruction of, 76 ff.; reconstruction of, 79-109; portions of the Aramaic source were differently rendered into Greek, 47, 69, 78, 82 ff., 92; it did not contain many parables, 100
- See also *Aramaic Source*
- Loisy, A.**; on signs of editing in St Mark, 137 n., 154 n. 1, 170 n. 1; on the evidence as to the authorship of the third Gospel and Acts afforded by the "we"-sections of the latter, 256 n.
- Luke, The Gospel according to St**; the plan on which the principal sources are combined in, 23, 74, 79 f., 86, 91, 100; the omission, or apologetic introduction, by Luke of proper names, 24 n. 2; instances in this Gospel of close resemblance to St Mark in Sayings of Christ, 26 n. 6; view that the evangelist was acquainted with St Matthew 29 f., 140 f.; Mark's Gospel as known to our third evangelist, 43, 150-170, 203; the order of the Logian document more nearly reproduced in this Gospel than in Mt., 75 f., 78 f.; the arrangement of the matter peculiar to it, 94 f.; the preface, 135 ff.; the source or sources of the peculiar matter, 220-240; chh. i. and ii., 223-227; the parables peculiar to this Gospel, 230 ff.; alleged traces of Ebionism in this Gospel, 232 ff.; the compassion of Jesus for publicans and sinners illustrated in it, 237; the authorship, 240 ff.; the ob-

- jections to Lucan authorship which have been founded on features of the Acts, 242-255; the vocabulary and style of the Lucan writings, 255-260, 276-322; medical language in, 260-3; alleged signs of acquaintance with works of Josephus in, 260, 263-274; time of composition, 275
- Mark, The Gospel according to St;** supposed Aramaic, or Hebrew, original of, 8-14, 131; the order in it preserved to a great extent in the two other Synoptics, 24; the priority of, 30 ff.; the revision of in the first and third Gospels, 36 ff., 51-53; consentient differences from in the two others, 38 f., 44, 139-150; the Petrine element in, 39 f., 172, 174 f.; sections of wanting in St Luke, 43, 150 ff.; absence of doublets from, 45 f., 188; the theory that "Q" was used in its composition, 11, 49, 109 ff., 139 f., 147, 324 f., 370 f.; the form of the Teaching of Jesus in this Gospel, 112 ff.; the Eschatological Discourse in, 115-121; three views of the history of its composition between which the choice lies, 137; the form of the work known to Luke, 150-170; style in different parts of, 168 f., 188, 204-6; the author, 172, 180 ff.; alleged traces of Pauline influence in, 172, 175 f.; the theme of this Gospel, 183 f.; the march of events to be traced in it, 184 ff.; notes of authenticity in the narratives, 189 ff.; features which are alleged to be unhistorical, or which present difficulties, 192-200; present and original endings, 200 ff.
- Mark, the hearer of Peter;** 181 ff.
- Marshall, J. T.;** 14 n. 1
- Matthew, The Gospel according to St;** the arrangement therein of the matter taken from different sources, 23 f., 74 f., 79 f., 87, 90 f., 97, 100 f., 122-129, 323 f.; plan of earlier half of narrative of Christ's Ministry, 24, 323 f.; differences from St Mark in Sayings of Christ, 26, 73; the discourses in this Gospel analysed, 122-129; discussed, 72-102, 106-109, 327-336; this Gospel often more concise than Mark in narratives common to both, 324 ff.; parables in this Gospel, 337-340; Teaching concerning the Kingdom of Heaven, 337 f.; eschatology, 338 f., 340, 341 f., 349 f., 351 f.; the representation of the Last Judgment in Mt. xxv. 31 ff., 341; two classes of citations from O.T., 342 ff.; the source of one class, a catena of fulfilments of prophecy, 344 ff.; allusive references to O.T. in this Gospel, 345 f.; a possible source of the narrative of the Birth and Infancy of Jesus, 346 f.; parallels with the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, 346; traditions peculiar to this Gospel, including three connected with Peter, 348 ff.; significant words and phrases added by the evangelist, 351 ff.; titles bestowed on Jesus in this Gospel, 354 f.; the injunction to baptise in the Three-fold Name, 355 ff.; leading ideas in this Gospel, 359-363; the author, 363-366; the time of composition, 367 f.; value as a historical document, 368 f.
- Melito;** his "extracts," 48 n.
- Merx;** 14
- Michaelis, J. D.;** 31 n. 1
- Neubauer;** on the use of Aramaic and of Greek in Palestine, 16 n. 1
- Nicolardot, F.;** 109 n., 170 n., 370 f.
- Niese;** 274 nn. 1, 2
- Oral teaching;** in the primitive Aramaic-speaking Church, 61 f.; among Greek-speaking people, 63; its influence on the form of the Gospels, 130 ff.
- Oral Theory;** different forms of, 17 ff.; discussion of, 17-29
- Papias;** on Mark's record of Peter's preaching, 39 f., 134 f., 172 f., 175, 181 f., 186 f., 191; on Matthew's compilation of "the Logia," 44 f., 47 f., 68 f.
- Parables;** freedom in reproduction of,

- 73 f., 94, 97, 99 f., 231 f.; those peculiar to St Luke, 230 ff.; those peculiar to St Matthew, 337 ff.
- Paul, St;** the references to Sayings of Jesus in his Epistles, 64 ff.; question as to his interest in the facts of the life of Jesus, *ib.*
- Pfeiderer;** on the Eschatological Discourse in Mk xiii., 117 n., 118
- Plummer, A.;** adheres to the Oral Theory, 18 n. 1; on medical language in St Luke, 261 n., 266 n. 3
- Polybius;** vocabulary and phrases in the Lucan writings compared with those of, 265 f., 267 n. 1
- Polycarp;** evidence supplied by as to the collection of St Paul's Epp., 242 n.
- Ramsay, W.;** on the accurate knowledge of localities and institutions displayed in Acts, 260 n.
- Renan;** on the Eschatological Discourse in Mk xiii., 117 n.
- Resch, A.;** his theory as to the effects of diverse translations, 10 f., 47; on the Semitic language in which Christ's teaching was preserved, 14 f.; a follower of B. Weiss, 49 n. 3
- Reuss;** on Luke's omissions of Marcan sections, 150 n. 2
- Riggenbach;** on the text in Mt. xxviii. 19, 358 n.
- Roberts, A.;** his theory as to the use of Greek in Palestine, 16 n.
- Robinson, Armitage;** on the Oral Theory, 17 n.
- Rohrbach;** 202 n. 1
- Salmon;** on the Oral Theory, 17 n.; on the relations of St Matthew and St Mark, 33 n. 1; on the meaning of  $\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\iota\alpha$ , 48 n.
- Another reference, 205
- Sanday;** on critical method, 6 n.; on the Oral Theory, 17 n.
- Schleiermacher;** 44 f., 135
- Schmiedel;** 50, 60
- Schürer;** on the use of Aramaic and of Greek in Palestine, 16 n.; on the evidence as to the authorship of the third Gospel and Acts afforded by the "we"-sections of the latter, 256 n., 257; on the view that the author of the Lucan writings was acquainted with the works of Josephus, 263 n. 2, 272
- Another reference, 271 n. 1
- Schweizer, A.;** 187 n. 2
- Simons, E.;** 30, 140 f.
- Smith, G. A.;** on Mk vi. 45, 157 n.; on the name Gerasenes, 190 n.
- Soden, H. von;** on the compositeness of St Mark, 137 n., 172 f.; criticism of his theory, 178 f., 186 n. 5
- Soltau, W.;** on unity of authorship in St Mark, 168 n. 2; on the source of the peculiar matter in St Luke, 228 n. 1
- Storr, G. C.;** 31
- Swete;** on unity of authorship in St Mark, 168 n. 2; on Mk xi., 1, 190 n.; on the ending of St Mark, 202 n. 2
- Another reference, 157 n.
- Synoptic Gospels;** features of relationship between them, 33 f.
- Synoptic Problem, The;** 2, 33 f., 42, 50
- Teaching of Jesus, The;** given and preserved originally in Aramaic, 14 f.; its transmission, 24 ff., 48 n., 61 f., 72; source of it as recorded in St Mark, 109-114
- Text of Gospels;** differences as to may here be passed over, 70, 74
- Theodosius;** on the house of Mark's mother, 182
- Tübingen School;** 32 f.
- Two-document theory;** 21, 44 ff.
- Ur-Marcus;** the theory that it was longer than our St Mark, 43; recent theories as to the compositeness of St Mark, 170 ff.
- Veit, K.;** 19 n. 1
- Viteau, J.;** 276, 282
- Vogel, Th.;** on the style and vocabulary of the Lucan writings, 276
- Voss, Isaac;** his theory as to the use of Greek in Palestine, 16 n.
- Weiss, B.;** his theory that Mark used

- a document containing both Sayings and discourses and narratives, which was also used by our first and third evangelists, 11, 49, 109, 139 f., 147, 324 f.; on the source of the peculiar matter in St Luke, 221 f.  
Other references, 32 n. 2, 150 n. 1, 187 n. 2, 224 n. 2, 250
- Weiss, J.**; on the compositeness of St Mark, 137 n., 171 f., 174, 175 f., 179 n. 2, 192; his view of the authorship of St Mark, 172, 182; on the combination of monotony in the language of Mark's narratives with variety in the incidents, 189 n. 2; on the termination of St Mark, 200 f.; on parallels to Mk in Mt. which are more concise in the latter, 324  
Other references, 151 n. 2, 202 n. 1
- Weisse, C. H.**; formulates the "two-document" theory, 45; on "doublets," *ib.*  
Another reference, 32 n. 2
- Weizsäcker, C.**; on the formation of the tradition of the Teaching of Jesus, 62 n. 1; on Haggadah and Halachah in the Gospels, 100; on the order in St Mark, 188; on the source of the peculiar matter in St Luke, 227 f.  
Other references, 32 n. 2, 45
- Wellhausen**; supposes an Aramaic original of St Mark, 13; on the relations of "Q" and St Mark, 111 f.; on the influence of oral teaching, 131 n.; on the compositeness of St Mark, 137 n., 138; on the use, according to St Mark, which Jesus made of parables, 193; on the Mission of the Twelve, as described in St Mark, 195; on the termination of St Mark, 200 f., 202 n. 1  
Another reference, 71 n.
- Wendling, E.**; the compositeness of St Mark, 137 n., 138, 151, 155 n. 3, 170 n., 172 f., 177 f., 180
- Wendt, H. H.**; his reconstruction of "Q," 78 n. 1, 82 n., 227; on the Eschatological Discourse in Mk xiii., 117 n.; his adoption of Simons' theory, 140 n. 5  
Other references, 158 n., 179 n. 1
- Wernle, P.**; maintains that the Synoptic Question should be limited to the investigation of Greek documents, 9 n. 2; his reconstruction of "Q," 78 n. 1, 82 n.; on the Eschatological Discourse in Mk xiii., 117 n.; on Luke's omissions of Marcan sections, 151 n. 1; on the consentient differences of Mt. and Lk from Mk, 207 n.
- Westcott**; on the Oral Theory, 17 n., 18, 22 n., 134
- Westcott and Hort**; Harnack on their text, 71 n.; on the ending of St Mark, 202 n. 2
- Wetstein**; 270 n. 2
- Wetzel, G.**; 19, 20
- Wilke, C. G.**; on the priority of St Mark, 32 n. 2
- Winer**; 292
- Wrede**; on injunctions by Jesus to be silent about His miracles, 195 ff.
- Wright, A.**; his Oral Theory, 17 n., 18, 20 ff.
- Zahn**; on the Oral Theory, 28 n. 2; on the relations of St Matthew and St Mark, 32 f., 38 ff., 150 n. 1, 324 f.  
Other references, 153 n. 1, 182 n. 1

TABLE I.

COMPARISON OF THE CONTENTS AND  
ORDER OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

TABLE II.

THE MATTER COMMON TO ST MATTHEW  
AND ST LUKE WHICH IS NOT DERIVED  
FROM ST MARK.

## TABLE I.

### COMPARISON OF THE CONTENTS AND ORDER OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

The sections in each Gospel are given in the actual sequence in which they occur in that Gospel, but spaces are left where—in consequence either of a difference of arrangement in the Gospels severally, or of there being matter in one or in two of them which is not found in the others or the other—the sequence of sections does not correspond. Sometimes it is necessary to choose whether correspondence between one pair, or another pair, of Gospels shall be shewn. The principle on which the choice has been made in such cases is that not more or longer spaces than necessary shall be left. In this way the total amount of correspondence between the Gospels as to order can be most easily seen. Where a section in Mt. or Lk. corresponds in respect to position with one in Mk. the description in Mk. of the subject of the section serves for the other Gospel, or Gospels, also. Where the order does not correspond with that in Mk. a reference is given in brackets. For the parallelism between Mt. and Lk. in respect to matter common to them but not found in Mk., reference has frequently been made in St Matthew's column to the Analyses of the discourses in that Gospel given in pp. 124—9, and in St Luke's column to Table II.

The headings describing passages peculiar to any of the Gospels have been printed in italics. Among the sections thus marked there are a few which are similar to others in point of contents, but yet appear to be derived from a different source proximately, if not ultimately. Further, in passages which have a parallel, or parallels, in one or both of the other Gospels, but which at the same time contain peculiar matter of an interesting character, such matter has frequently been indicated by words in italics placed within brackets.

### PREFATORY MATTER IN ST MATTHEW AND ST LUKE.

ST MATTHEW.		ST LUKE.	
		i. 1—4	<i>Preface</i> ..... i
		„ 5—25	<i>The conception of John the Baptist</i> ..... ii
		„ 26—56	<i>Annunciation to Mary that she shall miraculously conceive the Christ, and her visit to Elisabeth</i> ..... iii
		„ 57—80	<i>Birth and youth of John the Baptist</i> ..... iv
i	<i>Genealogy of Jesus: traced down from Abraham; legal descent from David, through Solomon</i> .....	i. 1—17	
ii	<i>Angel announces miraculous conception of the Christ to Joseph: Isa. vii. 14 (LXX nearly)</i> ..	„ 18—24	
iii	<i>Birth of Jesus in Bethlehem</i> .....	„ 25—ii. 1	
iv	<i>The Magi: Mic. v. 1, 4 a (not LXX) as to place where babe would be found</i> .....	ii. 1—12	
v	<i>Flight into Egypt; Hos. xi. 1 (not LXX)</i> ...	„ 13—15	
vi	<i>The Massacre of the Innocents; Jer. xxxi. 15 (not wholly LXX)</i> .....	„ 16—18	
vii	<i>Return to Nazareth, from Egypt avoiding Judæa. Citation from "the prophets" ...</i>	„ 19—23	
		ii. 1—7	<i>Birth of Jesus in Bethlehem; Joseph and Mary having gone up from Nazareth to be enrolled</i> ..... v
		„ 8—20	<i>Angels announce His birth to the Shepherds</i> ..... vi
		„ 21	<i>His Circumcision</i> .....
		„ 22—38	<i>Presentation in the Temple</i> ..... vii
		„ 39, 40	<i>Return to Nazareth; growth</i> ..... ix
		„ 41—50	<i>Visit to Jerusalem at age of twelve</i> ..... x
		„ 51—52	<i>Subjection to His parents:—growth in wisdom and stature</i> ..... xi

# THE SYNOPTIC OUTLINE.

## ST MATTHEW.

[Where not parallel to Mk. is closely parallel to Lk. Mal. iii. 1 om. here] .....	iii.	1—12
[John shows reluctance to baptize Jesus].....	„	13—17
[Mt. and Lk. much fuller than Mk., and on the whole close to one another. In Mt. the <i>second</i> temptation is to presumption, the <i>third</i> to ambition. Deut. viii. 3 (more fully than in Lk.); Deut. vi. 13; Ps. xci. 11, 12; Deut. vi. 16:—all from LXX, except Deut. vi. 13].....	iv.	1—11
[Removal to Capernaum. Evangelist quotes Is. viii. 23 f. (not wholly LXX)] .....	„	12—17
	„	18—22
[viii. 14—17]		
	„	23
His fame and the gathering of crowds. [Cp. Mk. iii. 7—12, Lk. vi. 17—19].....	„	24, 25

The Sermon on the Mountain .....	v—vii
[For analysis and parallels with Lk. see Analysis, pp. 123—4.]	
Impression made by His preaching. [Cp. Mk. i. 21, 22] .....	vii. 28, 29 viii. 1—4
He heals servant of centurion. [Lk. vii. 1—10, and with vv. 11, 12, cp. Lk. xiii. 28, 29].....	„ 5—13
He heals Peter's mother-in-law and many sick. [Isa. liii. 4 (not LXX)] [Mk. i. 29—34] .....	„ 14—17
He resolves to cross to the Eastern shore of the lake .....	„ 18
Warnings to two who desire to follow Him. [Lk. ix. 57—60] .....	„ 19—22
He crosses, and in the transit stills a storm. He heals <i>two</i> dæmoni-acs in the country of the Gadarenes. [Mk. iv. 35—v. 20]	„ 23—34 ix. 1—8
[Name Matthew is substituted. Jesus applies Hos. vi. 6 (LXX nearly). Cp. xii. 7].....	„ 9—13 „ 14—17
He raises the daughter of a "ruler" and heals a woman who has an issue of blood. [Mk. v. 21—43]	„ 18—26
Opens eyes of <i>two</i> blind men who call Him Son of David. [Cp. xx. 29—34 and parallels there]	„ 27—31
Casts out devil from dumb possessed man. [Cp. xii. 22, 23; Lk. xi. 14] .....	„ 32—34
A missionary tour. [Cp. Mk. i. 38, 39, and vi. 6b and Lk. viii. 1—3]	„ 35
Christ's compassion for the spiritual destitution of the multitude .....	„ 36
'The harvest plenteous.' [Lk. x. 2]	„ 37, 38

## ST MARK.

The mission of the Baptist. Mal. iii. 1 (not LXX). Cp. Mt. xi. 10. Isa. xl. 3 (LXX).....	i.	1—8
Baptism of Jesus .....	„	9—11
His temptation .....	„	12, 13
The beginning of His Ministry in Galilee .....	„	14, 15
Call of first four disciples .....	„	16—20
Impression made by His preaching in the Synagogue at Capernaum .....	„	21, 22
Heals dæmoniac in Synagogue .....	„	23—28
Heals Simon's mother-in-law, and many sick .....	„	29—34
He seeks retirement, but is followed by <i>Simon and others</i> .....	„	35—37
A missionary tour .....	„	38, 39

He cleanses a leper .....	„	40—45
He returns to Capernaum; heals a paralytic .....	ii.	1—12
Calls Levi, in whose house He is entertained .....	„	13—17
Question respecting fasting.....	„	18—22

He returns to Capernaum; heals a paralytic .....	„	17—36
Calls Levi, in whose house He is entertained .....	„	27—32
Question respecting fasting.....	„	33—39

## ST LUKE.

iii. 1—18	[Contains some matter that is peculiar to Lk.]
„ 19, 20	Imprisonment of Baptist. [Cp. Mk. vi. 17, 18]
„ 21, 22	
„ 23—38	Genealogy of Jesus, traced back to Adam; lineal descent from David through Nathan.
iv. 1—13	[The <i>second</i> temptation is to ambition, the third to presumption]
„ 14, 15	
„ 16—30	Visit to Nazareth. [Cp. Mk. vi. 1—6a]
	[Cp. v. 1—11]
„ 31, 32	
„ 33—37	
„ 38—41	
„ 42	[He is sought by <i>the multitudes</i> ]
„ 43, 44	
v. 1—11	Miracle of draught of fishes and call of first disciples. [Cp. Mk. i. 16—20]

„ 33—39 ['The old is good']





ST MATTHEW.

[viii. 18, 23—34]

[ix. 18—26]

[Cp. ix. 35 and xi. 1]  
[x. 1, 5a]  
[x. 5 b ff.]

xiii. 53—58

xiv. 1, 2

„ 3—12

„ 13, 14

„ 15—21

„ 22—34

„ 35, 36

[Peter walks to meet Jesus. The disciples exclaim, 'Thou art the Son of God'].....

[Passage condemning the Pharisees is interposed before the interpretation of the figurative language of the discourse.

With v. 14 cp. Lk. vi. 39].....

['I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel'] ...

xv. 1—20

„ 21—28

„ 29—31

„ 32—38

[Magadan]

„ 39

[Vv. 1 and 4, with xii. 38, 39, form a doublet. Cp. also Lk. xi. 16, 29. With vv. 2, 3, the signs of the times, cp. Lk. xii. 54—57]

xvi. 1—4

„ 5

„ 6

„ 7—12

[Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, &c.] .....

„ 13—20

„ 21—23

[Vv. 24, 25, with x. 37—39, form a doublet. For x. 37, 38, see Lk. xiv. 27; and with x. 39 cp. Lk. xvii. 33. v. 27 represents the Son of Man more distinctly as the Judge than Mk. v. 38 does; there is a closer parallel to the latter at Mt. x. 33, for which see also Lk. xii. 9]

„ 24—27

„ 28

[Jesus touches and reassures the disciples] .....

xvii. 1—8

„ 9—13

For reply in Mk. (v. 29), Mt. (v. 20) substitutes a saying to which there is a parallel at Mt. xxi. 21 (= Mk. xi. 23): a doublet. Cp. also Lk. xvii. 6] .....

„ 14—18

„ 19, 20

ST MARK.

He crosses to the Eastern side of the lake, and in the transit stills a storm. On landing in region of Gerasenes He heals a violent dæmoniac .....

iv. 35—v. 20

He raises Jairus' daughter and heals a woman who has an issue of blood .....

v. 21—43

Visit to Nazareth .....

vi. 1—6a

Missionary journeying .....

„ 6b

The sending forth of the Twelve ...

„ 7

His charge to them .....

„ 8—11

The fulfilment of their mission .....

„ 12, 13

The fame of Jesus disturbs Herod...

„ 14—16

The fate of John the Baptist .....

„ 17—29

An unsuccessful attempt to obtain quiet .....

„ 30—34

The feeding of five thousand .....

„ 35—44

The disciples start to go across to Bethsaida; Jesus walks to them on the sea .....

„ 45—53

When they have crossed to Genesaret, many sick are brought to Him and healed .....

„ 54—56

Ceremonial observances as viewed by the Pharisees and by Christ.

Isa. xxix. 13 (LXX) .....

vii. 1—23

Visit to region of Tyre and Sidon; the Gentile woman's request ...

„ 24—30

Return to Sea of Galilee: a deaf and dumb man healed .....

„ 31—37

The feeding of four thousand.....

viii. 1—9

An instance of Pharisaic perversity and of misapprehension on the part of His disciples:—

Jesus crosses to region of Dalmanutha .....

„ 10

£

The Pharisees tempt Him by demanding a sign from Heaven...

„ 11, 12

In recrossing lake disciples forget to take bread .....

„ 13, 14

Injunction to beware of leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod.....

„ 15

Misunderstanding of the disciples The cure of a blind man at Bethsaida .....

„ 16—21

Disclosures near Cæsarea Philippi:—

„ 22—26

Simon Peter's confession .....

„ 27—30

Jesus foretells His own sufferings and resurrection .....

„ 31—33

Sets forth the self-abnegation required in His disciples, and the future consequences of loyalty and disloyalty to Him now.....

„ 34—38

The near approach of the kingdom .....

ix. 1

The Transfiguration.....

„ 2—8

Conversation of Jesus with the chosen three as they descended from the mountain .....

„ 9—13

The dæmoniac brought by his father Question of the disciples privately why they could not exorcise the evil spirit .....

„ 14—27

„ 28, 29

ST LUKE.

viii. 22—39

„ 40—56

ix. 1, 2

„ 3—5

„ 6

„ 7—9

„ 10, 11

„ 12—17

[Cp. iv. 16—30]  
[Cp. viii. 1]

[For imprisonment cp. iii. 19, 20]

[by crossing to Bethsaida]

[Cp. xi. 37, 38]

[Cp. xi. 16, 29]

[Cp. xii. 1]

[Does not indicate the neighbourhood]

„ 18—21

[Omits Peter's expostulation and Christ's rebuke]

„ 21, 22

„ 23—27

„ 27

„ 28—36

„ 37—43<sup>a</sup>

ST MATTHEW.

xvii. 22, 23

*Request through Peter for tribute to the Temple: the stater in the fish's mouth* .....

„ 24—27  
xviii. 1—4

[Mk. v. 35 has no parallel in Mt. here; for one see Mt. xxiii. 11]

„ 5

[With Mk. vv. 37b and 41 cp. Mt. x. 40, 42]

[For the corresponding discourse in this Gospel, which contains a good deal of peculiar matter as well as parallels with Lk., see Analysis, p. 127] .....

„ 6—35

ST MARK.

Last days in Galilee:—

*He returns through Galilee seeking as far as possible to be unobserved, in view of His approaching sufferings which He again foretells* .....

ix. 30—32

Lessons at Capernaum:—

'Who should be greatest' .....

„ 33—35

Even a child is to be received in

Christ's name .....

„ 36, 37a

And to receive in Christ's name is

to receive in the Father's name

„ 37b

Question concerning one that cast

out devils in the name of Jesus

„ 38—40

Those would be rewarded who

shewed kindness to disciples in

Christ's name .....

„ 41

The avoidance of offences .....

„ 42—50

[Om vv. 44, 46 of text. rec.]

Departs to Peræa .....

x. 1

ST LUKE.

ix. 43b—45 [The course of the journey is not indicated: the prediction is curtailed]

„ 46—48 [With v. 48 (= Mk. vv. 37 and 35b) cp. Lk. xxii. 26: a doublet]

„ 49, 50

[With Mk. v. 42 cp. Lk. xvii. 2, and with v. 50 cp. Lk. xiv. 34]

„ 51—56 He journeys towards Jerusalem: *James and John desire to call down fire on a Samaritan village.*

„ 57—62 Warnings to three who desire to follow Him. For two of them see Mt. viii. 19—22.

x. 1 *Mission of the Seventy.*

„ 2—16 His charge to them. [See Table II.]

„ 17—20 *Return of the Seventy.*

„ 21—24 Thanksgiving that the Father reveals to the simple that which is hidden from the wise: 'Blessed are your eyes.' [Mt. xi. 25—27 and xiii. 16, 17]

„ 25—28 The lawyer's question as to the chief Commandment. [Mt. xxii. 38—40]

„ 29—37 *Parable of the Good Samaritan.*

„ 38—42 *On His journey He comes to a village where He is entertained by Martha, who had also a sister, Mary.*

xi. 1—13 He teaches His disciples to pray. [See Table II.]

„ 14 He casts out devil from a dumb man. [Mt. ix. 32—34 and xii. 22, 23]

„ 15 *Certain from the crowd* accuse Him of casting out devils by Beelzebub. [Cp. Mk. iii. 22]

„ 16 Some demand a sign from heaven.

„ 17—26 The reply of Jesus to the accusation that He was in league with Satan. [Cp. Mk. iii. 23—30; Mt. xii. 25—37]

„ 27, 28 *A woman blesses His mother:* His reply. [Cp. Mk. iii. 31—35]

„ 29—32 Answer to demand for a sign which had been referred to v. 16:—the sign of Jonah. [Cp. Mt. xii. 38—45 and xvi. 1, 4; Mk. viii. 11, 12]

„ 33—36 Sayings on light:—the purpose of a lamp (cp. Mt. v. 15, Mk. iv. 21, Lk. viii. 16); the lamp of the body is the eye (cp. Mt. vi. 22, 23).

„ 37—54 The Pharisees and lawyers charged with their sins *in house of Pharisee.* [See Table II.]

xii. 1—12 Exhortation to His disciples to preach what they have been taught faithfully and without fear. [See Table II.; w. v. 1 cp. Mk. viii. 15, Mt. xvi. 6]

- xii. 13—21 *Answer to the man who asked Him to order his brother to divide his inheritance with him: parable of the rich fool.*
- „ 22—34 Trust God for the necessities of life. [For parallels with Mt. see Table II.]
- „ 35—48 Exhortations to watchfulness. [See *ib.*]
- „ 49—59 Painful aspects of Christ's work, and warnings as to the duty of observing the signs of the times. [See *ib.*]
- xiii. 1—5 *Answer concerning the Galileans whom Pilate outraged.*
- „ 6—9 *Parable of the barren fig-tree.*
- „ 10—17 *He heals a woman having a spirit of infirmity on the Sabbath.* [Cp. xiv. 5 and Mt. xii. 9]
- „ 18—21 *Parable of mustard-plant and leaven.* [Cp. Mt. xiii. 31—33; and for the former, Mk. iv. 31, 32]
- „ 22 *He continues His journey, teaching in the places through which He passes.*
- „ 23—30 *Reply to question, Are there few that be saved? [See Table II.]*
- „ 31—35 *'Herod will kill thee': A prophet cannot perish out of Jerusalem: lament over Jerusalem [for which cp. Mt. xxiii. 37, 38].*
- xiv. 1 *On the Sabbath in the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees:—*
- „ 2—6 *He heals a dropsical man; [Cp. Mt. xii. 9—14; also Lk. xiii. 10—17]*
- „ 7—11 *Bids the guests not to choose the chief places; [Cp. Mt. xxiii. 6a and 12]*

- „ 12—14 *Bids the host invite not the rich but the poor, the maimed, &c.;*
- „ 15—24 *The great feast to which a man, through his servant summons many guests. [Cp. Mt. xxii. 1—14]*
- „ 25—35 *The sacrifices required of disciples, including instances of the importance of counting the cost. [See Table II.]*
- xv. *Parables of lost sheep [cp. Mt. xviii. 12—14], lost piece of money, prodigal son.*
- xvi. 1—12 *The unjust steward.*
- „ 13 *Ye cannot serve God and Mammon. [Cp. Mt. vi. 24]*
- „ 14—18 *The Pharisees and the law of God. [See Table II.]*
- „ 19—31 *Lazarus and Dives.*
- xvii. 1—4 *Beware of offences. [Cp. Mk. ix. 42—50, and see Table II.]*
- „ 5, 6 *The power of faith [cp. Mt. xvii. 20; Mk. xi. 24]*
- „ 7—10 *The duty of servants.*
- „ 11—19 *On His way as He was passing between Samaria and Galilee ten lepers met Him.*
- „ 20—37 *The manner of the coming of the kingdom of God. [For vv. 31 and 23 see also Mk. xiii. 14 and 21, and see Table II.]*
- xviii. 1—14. *Parables of the Importunate Widow and of the Pharisee and Publican.* [Cp. xvi. 18]

Answer on the marriage-law ..... x. 2—12

xix. 1—9

Young children brought to Jesus ... „ 13—16

„ 15—17

[Gen. i. 27 expressly cited and Gen. ii. 24 added (LXX)] .....  
 [There are some eunuchs,] &c. With Mt. v. 9 (= Mk. v. 11) cp. Mt. v. 32: a doublet] .....  
 [Cp. also 62]

xix. 1—9  
 „ 10—12  
 „ 13—15



ST MATTHEW.

xxvi. 26—29

„ 30  
 „ 31—35  
 „ 36—46  
 „ 47—56  
 „ 57  
 „ 58  
 „ 59—66  
 „ 67, 68  
 „ 69—75  
 xxvii. 1

[*Put up thy sword...Thinkest thou that I cannot,* &c.].....

*The fate of Judas: Evangelist quotes Zech. xi. 12, 13 (not LXX): it is ascribed to Jeremiah*.....

[*Intervention of Pilate's wife: 'His blood be upon our heads'*].....

[In regard to the wine offered it is added that it was mingled with gall. (Cp. Ps. lxix. 22, LXX). A Roman guard watches and testifies as well as the centurion. Graves opened].....

[Does not call Joseph a councillor, but says he was rich] .....

*A guard is set over the tomb* .....  
 [The rolling away of the stone by the angel and the terror of the guards] .....

*Jesus Himself meets the women and repeats same message*.....

*The guard silenced by the Chief-priests*.....

*Appearance of Jesus to the disciples on mountain in Galilee: their commission* .....

„ 3—10  
 „ 11—14

„ 15—26  
 „ 27—31a

„ 31b—56

„ 57—60

„ 61

„ 62—66

xxviii. 1—8

„ 9, 10

„ 11—15

„ 16—20

ST MARK.

The Institution of the Eucharist

xiv. 22—25

They go forth to the Mt. of Olives  
 Warning to the disciples, especially Peter. Zech. xiii. 7 (LXX nearly) „ 26  
 The Agony ..... „ 27—31  
 The Arrest of Jesus ..... „ 32—42  
 „ 43—50  
*The young man with a linen cloth...* „ 51, 52  
 Jesus in the hands of the Jewish rulers:—  
 He is taken to the house of the High Priest ..... „ 53  
 Peter follows into the High Priest's house ..... „ 54  
 The trial and condemnation in the night ..... „ 55—64  
 Jesus is mocked and buffeted ..... „ 65  
 Peter's denial of his Master ..... „ 66—72  
 The morning consultation of the Sanhedrim ..... xv. 1

His examination by Pilate ..... „ 2—5

Pilate gives them choice between Jesus and Barabbas ..... „ 6—15  
 Mockery by the Roman soldiers ... „ 16—20a  
 The Crucifixion ..... „ 20b—41

Joseph of Arimathea obtains and buries the body ..... „ 42—46

The women see where the body is laid..... „ 47

The women find the tomb open and receive message from an angel for disciples that Jesus goes before them into Galilee ..... xvi. 1—8

[Summary of several appearances of the Risen Christ ending with the Ascension ..... „ 9—20]

ST LUKE.

xxii. 15—20 *With desire I have desired to eat this passover, &c.*

„ 21—23 Jesus predicts the Betrayal. [Mk. xiv. 18—21]

„ 24—27 Contention as to preeminence. [Cp. Mk. ix. 34, 35, and x. 42—45]

„ 28—30 The promise that the disciples should judge the twelve tribes of Israel. [Cp. Mt. xix. 27—29]

„ 31—34 Warning to Simon: *Satan asked to have you...I made supplication...When thou art converted, &c.* And Simon's answer: *'I am ready,'* &c. [Cp. Mk. xiv. 27—31]

„ 35—38 Addressing the disciples generally, *He contrasts the time of their Mission with the present.*

„ 39

[xxii. 31—34]

„ 40—46 [Jesus *heals the ear* of the High-priest's servant]

„ 47—53

„ 54a

„ 54b and 55  
 „ 56—62 Peter's denial of his Master. [Mk. xiv. 66—72]

„ 63—65

[xxii. 56—62]

„ 66—xxiii. 1. [Description very similar to that in Mk. of previous trial]

xxiii. 2—7

„ 8—12 *Pilate sends Him to Herod. Mockery by Herod's soldiers.*

„ 13—25

„ 26—49 [Lk. adds an address to the women that followed; *'Father, forgive them; the penitent thief; Father, into Thy hands';* and omits *'My God, my God why,'* &c.]

„ 50—54

„ 55, 56

xxiv. 1—12 [Two angels (Peter also visits tomb)]

„ 13—35 *Appearance of Jesus on day of resurrection to two disciples walking to Emmaus;*

„ 36—43 *Also to the assembled disciples in Jerusalem.*

„ 44—49 *The Commission of the disciples.*

„ 50—53 *The Ascension.*

## TABLE II.

### THE MATTER COMMON TO ST MATTHEW AND ST LUKE WHICH IS NOT DERIVED FROM ST MARK.

The order in which this matter occurs in St Luke is here followed.

When the corresponding pieces in St Matthew and St Luke appear to have been derived from the same written Greek record, the descriptive heading is printed in thick type. Where the similarity between the two Gospels is so close as plainly to suggest this, no further mark has been added. But there are also cases where it is probable that the same Greek document has been used to a large extent, though there are differences which may seem at first sight to render it doubtful. Here, too, the headings are given in thick type, but an asterisk has been affixed. An asterisk has also been affixed to a few sayings not printed in thick type, in regard to which (owing to their brevity, or for some other reason) it is not safe from identity of form to infer derivation from the same Greek document.

Some verses and passages have been included merely for the purpose of shewing the connexion in St Luke; they have been placed in brackets.

	Place in St Luke	Place in St Matthew
<b>The preaching of the Baptist:—</b>		
<b>Warning and call to repentance</b> ... ..	iii. 7-9	iii. 7-10
[Application to different classes in response to questions ... ..	„ 10-14]	
[The state of expectation among the people ... ..	„ 15, 16a]	
<b>John contrasts himself with the Christ</b> <sup>1</sup> ... ..	„ 16b, 17	„ 11, 12
<b>The temptation of Jesus</b> * ... ..	iv. 1-13	iv. 1-11a
<b>The discourse on the character of the heirs of the kingdom:—</b>		
The occasion described ... ..	vi. 17-20a	„ 25, v. 1, 2
Who are truly blessed ... ..	„ 20b-26	v. 3-12
Love even of enemies, meekness under injuries ... ..	„ 27-36	„ 39-42, 44-48, vii. 12
Judge not ... ..	„ 37, 38	vii. 1, 2
Can a blind man lead a blind man? ... ..	„ 39	xv. 14
The disciple is not above his master ... ..	„ 40	x. 24, 25a
The mote and the beam* ... ..	„ 41, 42	vii. 3-5
The tree is known by its fruit; mere professions are vain ... ..	„ 43-46	„ 15-21 <sup>2</sup>
The two kinds of hearers ... ..	„ 47-49	„ 24-27
<b>The healing of the centurion's servant</b> <sup>3</sup> ... ..	vii. 1-10	viii. 5-10, 13
<b>The message of the Baptist, Christ's answer, and discourse concerning him</b> ... ..	„ 18-28, 31-35	xi. 2-11, 16-19
<b>The calling of Christ's disciples:—</b>		
<b>Warnings addressed to two men on the subject of following Him</b> ...	ix. 57-60	viii. 19-22
[A third case is added in Luke ... ..	„ 61, 62]	
[The Mission of the Seventy ... ..	x. 1]	
<b>The harvest plenteous, but the labourers few</b> ... ..	„ 2	ix. 37, 38
<b>Directions for the preachers of the Gospel</b> <sup>4</sup> * ... ..	„ 3-12	x. 5a, 7-16
<b>Woe to thee, Chorazin &amp;c.</b> ... ..	„ 12-15	xi. 21-23
He that heareth you &c. ... ..	„ 16	x. 40
[The return of the Seventy ... ..	„ 17-20]	
<b>Thanksgiving that the Father reveals to the simple what is hidden from the wise</b> ... ..	„ 21, 22	xi. 25-27
<b>Blessed are your eyes &amp;c.</b> ... ..	„ 23, 24	xiii. 16, 17
<b>Teaching on prayer:—</b>		
<b>The Lord's Prayer</b> * ... ..	xi. 2-4	vi. 9-13
[An example of successful importunity ... ..	„ 5-8]	
<b>Exhortation to be earnest in prayer</b> ... ..	„ 9-13	vii. 7-11
<b>On casting out a devil Jesus is charged with doing it by the aid of Beelzebub</b> <sup>5</sup> ; a sign is also demanded of Him ... ..	„ 14-16	xii. 22-24, 38
<b>Reply to former charge</b> ... ..	„ 17-23	„ 25-30
<b>The man whom the unclean spirit leaves for a time only</b> ... ..	„ 24-26	„ 43-45
[A woman blesses His Mother ... ..	„ 27, 28]	
<b>Reply as to the demand for a sign</b> ... ..	„ [16], 29-32	„ [38], 39-42
<b>Sayings on light:—</b>		
The purpose of a lamp ... ..	„ 33 <sup>6</sup>	v. 15
<b>The lamp of the body is the eye</b> ... ..	„ 34, 35 [36]	vi. 22, 23

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Mk. i. 7, 8, from which the parallels in Lk. and Mt. are partly derived. There are one or two points also common to Mt. and Lk. in their accounts of the Baptism of Jesus, derived from a non-Markan source; but this episode they took mainly from Mk.

<sup>2</sup> There is a doublet in a different context at Mt. xii. 33-37, which corresponds with Lk. more closely than the present passage, and indeed very closely.

<sup>3</sup> This has been put in thick type on account of the close correspond-

ence between Lk. *vv.* 6b-9 and Mt. *vv.* 8-10. The earlier part of the narrative is different in Lk. in more than one particular.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Mk. vi. 7-11.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Mk. iii. 22-30. Mt. *vv.* 22-28 and 30 are close to Lk. *vv.* 14, 15, 17-20 and 23; Mt. *vv.* 29, 32 to Mk. *vv.* 27-29; Mt. v. 31 resembles Mk. v. 28 in substance, but is closest to Lk. xii. 10; Lk. *vv.* 21, 22 are parallel in substance to Mk. v. 27.

<sup>6</sup> There is a doublet with an additional application at Lk. viii. 16, 17, parallel with Mk. iv. 21.

	Place in St Luke	Place in St Matthew
Denunciation of the Pharisees and Scribes <sup>7</sup> ... ..	xi. 37—52	xxiii. 14, 23, 25—27, 29—36
[The Pharisees vehemently attack Jesus ... ..	„ 53, 54]	
Jesus exhorts His disciples to faithful confession:—		
[Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees which is hypocrisy <sup>8</sup> ... ..	xii. 1]	
<b>Nothing can remain secret; fear not those who can only kill the body;</b>		
<b>I will acknowledge him that acknowledges Me, and deny him that</b>		
<b>denies Me</b> ... ..	„ 2—9	x. 26—33
<b>Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man &amp;c.</b> <sup>9</sup> ... ..	„ 10	xii. 32
Be not anxious as to your answer when arraigned <sup>10</sup> ... ..	„ 11, 12	x. 19, 20
[Warnings against covetousness given to one out of the multitude, and then to the		
multitude generally ... ..	„ 13—21]	
[Instruction again addressed to His disciples:—]		
<b>Trust God for this life, and let your treasure be in heaven</b> ... ..	„ 22—34	vi. 25—34, 19—21
[Watch for the return of the bridegroom ... ..	„ 35—38]	
<b>Watch as you would for the coming of a thief...</b> ... ..	„ 39, 40	xxiv. 43, 44
[Peter interposes a question ... ..	„ 41]	
<b>Who is the prudent steward?</b> ... ..	„ 42—46	„ 45—51
[The punishment for wrongdoing will be greater in the case of the servant who		
has known his Lord's will than in that of one who has not known it ... ..	„ 47, 48]	
[I have come to kindle a fire; I have a baptism to be baptized with ... ..	„ 49, 50]	
<b>I have come to cause divisions*</b> ... ..	„ 51—53	x. 34—36
[He upbraids the multitude with their lack of discernment in regard to the signs of		
the times, and of perception apart from this of that which is right ... ..	„ 54—57]	
It is unwise to defer payment of that which you owe ... ..	„ 58, 59	v. 25, 26
<b>Parables of the mustard plant* and leaven</b> <sup>11</sup> ... ..	xiii. 19—21	xiii. 31—33
[He continues his journey: question as to the number to be saved ... ..	„ 22, 23]	
Strive to enter, though the approach is narrow ... ..	„ 24	vii. 13, 14
False professors will attempt in vain to obtain admission at the last ... ..	„ 25—27	„ 22, 23
There shall be weeping when ye see patriarchs and prophets and many from the		
East and the West &c.* ... ..	„ 28, 29	viii. 11, 12
[There are first who shall be last ... ..	„ 30] <sup>12</sup>	
[Pharisees urge Him to depart on the ground that Herod will kill Him, and He		
replies that a prophet cannot perish out of Jerusalem ... ..	„ 31—33]	
<b>Jerusalem that killest the prophets</b> ... ..	„ 34, 35	xxiii. 37—39
[He is entertained on the Sabbath in the house of a Pharisee ... ..	xiv. 1]	
He defends the working of miracles on the Sabbath by pointing to the care shewn		
for animals on that day <sup>13</sup> ... ..	„ 2—6	xii. 9—12
[Observing the conduct of the guests, He teaches a lesson on] the love of		
preeminence ... ..	„ 7—11	xxiii. 6a, 12
[He bids the host invite the poor to his feasts ... ..	„ 12—14]	
[One of the company says, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom		
of God ... ..	„ 15]	
The kingdom of God likened to a great feast ... ..	„ 16—24	xxii. 1—10
[He addresses the crowds who follow Him on the sacrifices required of disciples ... ..	„ 25]	
<b>The setting aside of human relationships and bearing the Cross*</b> ... ..	„ 26, 27	x. 37, 38
[Illustrations to shew the importance of counting the cost ... ..	„ 28—32]	
[Earthly possessions must be renounced ... ..	„ 33]	
The savour of salt must be preserved <sup>14</sup> ... ..	„ 34, 35	v. 13
The lost sheep ... ..	xv. 3—7	xviii. 12—14
[The unjust steward ... ..	xvi. 1—12]	
It is impossible to serve God and Mammon* ... ..	„ 13	vi. 24
[The Pharisees mock Him for this teaching ... ..	„ 14]	
[His rejoinder:—]		
Ye justify yourselves before men &c. ... ..	„ 15	„ 1 f.
The law and the prophets were until John ... ..	„ 16	xi. 12, 13
The law cannot fail ... ..	„ 17	v. 18
The inviolability of marriage <sup>15</sup> ... ..	„ 18	„ 31, 32
<b>On offences</b> <sup>16</sup> ... ..	xvii. 1—4	xviii. 7, 6, 15, 21, 22
<b>The power of faith</b> <sup>17*</sup> ... ..	„ 5, 6	xvii. 19, 20
<b>The return of the Son of Man</b> <sup>18*</sup> ... ..	„ 22—37	xxiv. 26—28, 37—41, x. 39
The parable of the sums of money given to servants to trade with ... ..	xix. 12—27	xxv. 14—30
<b>Promise to the disciples that they should judge the tribes of Israel</b> ... ..	xxii. 28—30	xix. 28

<sup>7</sup> Cp. Mk. xii. 38—40, to which Lk. xx. 45—47 is parallel.

<sup>8</sup> Cp. Mk. viii. 15, Mt. xvi. 6f.

<sup>9</sup> Cp. Mk. iii. 28, 29. Though, as to the form in which the saying is given, Mt. is very close to Lk., he places it in the same context as the corresponding saying in Mk.

<sup>10</sup> This saying in Mt. forms part of a passage (x. 17—22) to which Mk. xiii. 9—13 closely corresponds, while Mt. xxiv. 9—14 and Lk. xxi. 12—19 also correspond, but not so closely.

<sup>11</sup> The former of these is given also in Mk. iv. 30—32, and its form there has influenced that in Mt. Mt. places both in the context corresponding to that in which the former stands in Mk.

<sup>12</sup> Cp. Mk. x. 31, to which Mt. xix. 30 exactly corresponds; see also Mt. xx. 16.

<sup>13</sup> Cp. also Lk. xiii. 15.

<sup>14</sup> Cp. Mk. ix. 50.

<sup>15</sup> Cp. also Mk. x. 11, 12, Mt. xix. 9.

<sup>16</sup> With Lk. xvii. 2 cp. also Mk. ix. 42.

<sup>17</sup> Cp. Mk. xi. 22, 23, by recollection of which the form of the saying in Mt. has been influenced.

<sup>18</sup> With Lk. xvii. 23 cp. Mk. xiii. 21; and with Lk. xvii. 31 cp. Mk. xiii. 15, 16.



**Cambridge:**

**PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.**

**AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.**