https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

A SURVEY OF THE SYNOPTIC QUESTION.

V. NEW HYPOTHESES (continued).

WE have as yet done little more than cross the threshold of the treasure-house into which we are conducted by Dr. Resch. Something has been said very inadequately of his attempt, which runs parallel to Prof. Marshall's, to get back to an Aramaic original lying behind the various Greek versions of evangelical sayings current in the early centuries. This however, though of course an important feature in his book, is hardly that which is most distinctive about it. Mr. Marshall operates chiefly with the canonical text; it is characteristic of Dr. Resch that he takes a wider range. His present work, it must be remembered, is only an instalment. It is to be followed by another, dealing in like manner with extra-canonical sayings.[1] When the two books are complete, they will form an enormous repertory of sayings rightly or wrongly attributed to Christ. It is not surprising that these researches should have occupied, as we are told, five and twenty years. We are reminded in some measure of the thirty years spent by the Cambridge editors over the monumental work which appeared about the same time as the Revised Version of the New Testament. Dr. Resch too has a most substantial result to show for his labours. They bear the marks of prolonged study, as well as of diligence in collecting. The work which he now offers to the world, although it has evidently grown under his hand, is thoroughly *digested* work. Unlike much which issues from the German press, it is arranged with admirable clearness and method. The

---

[1] The title which it is to bear is *Extra-canonical Parallels to the Gospels.* See the " Selbstanzeige " in *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1889, col. 369 ff.

passages are brought together in such a way that I should expect the book to be of considerable use even to a reader who was not acquainted with German. New devices of printing are tried—perhaps to an excess—in the shape of different kinds of underlining, the object of which is to enable the reader to catch the salient points more readily. And the notes on the collected passages present combinations which, although often, as I cannot but think, questionable, are also not seldom such as could only come from prolonged study in view of a dominant idea. The idea is naturally at times too dominant, and the author too sanguine as to the correctness of his own results ; but that is only one aspect of the enthusiasm which has carried him through a task which must have been wearisome in proportion to its magnitude.

I will endeavour to state summarily the conclusions at which Dr. Resch arrives ; I will then quote a few of what seem to me characteristic specimens of his method and of the kind of evidence which he adduces ; and, lastly, I will give some account of the work which I mentioned at the outset of these papers by a younger scholar, Bousset, who has applied principles similar to those of Dr. Resch to the examination in particular of the writings of Justin Martyr.

We have seen that Dr. Resch starts from the " Two-Document " hypothesis. He too believes in the Petrine Memoirs and the Matthæan *Logia*. With the former of these two documents he does not deal directly. He gives it however to be understood that he does not regard it as identical with our present St. Mark. He takes that indeed to be the oldest of the canonical Gospels, but he treats it as, at the same time, a composite work made up from the *Logia* as well as the Petrine Notes ; and he is prepared to go further than even Dr. Weiss himself in the extent to which he believes that the substance of the *Logia* has

entered into the composition of the Gospel. The wider question he does not pursue beyond this point. The main object of his book is to contribute to the history of the *Logia*.

This work of the Apostle St. Matthew is of course regarded as having been originally written in Hebrew. The Hebrew text however, as Papias says, found many translators. These different versions circulated to a greater or less extent; and although it was only natural that those adopted in our canonical Gospels should hold the field, still the others were not entirely suppressed. Traces of these, Dr. Resch thinks, may be found in the New Testament itself. To no less than thirty-eight distinct sayings he finds parallels or allusions in St. Paul, to seven in St. Peter, five in St. James, seven in the Apocalypse, and three in the Acts.[1] I imagine that this is in all probability the most doubtful portion of the book; and the lists will in any case need considerable reduction. Passing on to the patristic literature, we come to that vast collection of material which has been already mentioned. As to the history of these quotations and allusions Dr. Resch observes greater caution. He will not say that they are all taken directly from the original *Logia*; but I gather that he is prepared to affirm this direct dependence of the final editor of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, whom he identifies with the editor of the forged *Ignatian Letters*; and he also believes it to be probable in the case of some of the earliest Christian writings; in other works and in the various readings of certain authorities, notably Codex Bezæ, he sees at least the influence of the oldest form of the *Logia*.

Before going on to this second and, on the whole, weightier part of Dr. Resch's researches, let me first give an example or two of the part relating specially to St. Paul. One of the strongest arguments in favour of St. Paul's use

[1] These are his own estimation in *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1889. col. 371.

of a written Gospel seems to me to be that which turns on
1 Corinthians xi. 18, 19.   In speaking of the disorders at
the *agapæ*, St. Paul says : " I hear that there are divisions
(σχίσματα) among you ; and in part I believe it.   For there
must be also factions (heresies, αἱρέσεις) among you, that
they which are approved may be made manifest among
you."   Why must there be these σχίσματα and αἱρέσεις?
Dr. Resch would say because of a distinct prediction to
that effect by the Lord.   He quotes four patristic parallels,
of which two expressly and the third perhaps probably,
refer to such a prediction.   The first is from Justin,
Against Trypho, c. xxxv. : " For He said, Many shall come
in My name, clad without in sheep-skins, but within they
are ravening wolves ; and, There shall be σχίσματα καὶ
αἱρέσεις."   The next is from a work of which Dr. Resch,
for the first time, makes considerable use—the so called
Didascalia, published by Bunsen in the *Analecta Ante-
Nicæna*, with a reconstruction of the original Greek by
De Lagarde.   This work, which dates from the latter half
of the third century, has, " as, also our Lord and Saviour
said, There shall be heresies and schisms."   And further, a
quotation in the *Clementine Homilies* contains at least one,
if not both, of these words : " For there shall be, as the
Lord said, false apostles, false prophets, αἱρέσεις, φιλαρχίαι."
Dr. Resch recognises σχίσματα behind φιλαρχίαι.   He
thinks that they are only different renderings of the same
word in Aramaic.   In any case, I think it is proved that
the saying was current as a saying of Christ, and also
that it was referred to by St. Paul.   The points for which
the proof would be less cogent would be (1) that it came
from a written Gospel ; (2) that that Gospel was the
Logia, or one of the foundation documents of our present
Gospels.

For another of these floating sayings, " Whereinsoever I
shall find you, therein will I judge you," Dr. Resch quotes

sixteen examples from the most varied sources. And one of these, it is true, Justin, *Against Trypho,* c. xlvii., expressly attributes it to our Lord. But the *Vita S. Antonii,* (at the end of the fourth century) as expressly refers it to the prophet Ezekiel; and Elias Cretensis (in the eighth century) also quotes it as spoken by one of the prophets. I therefore think it more probable that it was taken originally from some apocryphal work which bore the name of Ezekiel, and that Justin refers it to Christ by a slip of memory, aided by the tendency which was already in force to give a specifically Christian interpretation to all parts alike of the Old Testament. But in any case it seems to me forced to find, as Dr. Resch does, any reference to the saying in St. Paul—either in 1 Thessalonians v. 4 or in Philippians iii. 12, where the only possible connexion lies through the single word καταλαβεῖν. Here and elsewhere Dr. Resch has found mystical meanings and references in St. Paul that I cannot believe to be tenable.

Widest spread of all the traditional sayings ascribed to our Lord is that well known one, Show yourselves approved money-changers (γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι). On this Dr. Resch has surpassed himself. He has collected no less than sixty-nine examples of its occurrence in patristic writings : and these examples are classified in such a way as to represent with great clearness what he conceives to have been the history of the saying.

The patristic applications of it bring out clearly the sense in which it was understood by the early Church. It was not taken as having any connexion with the parable of the talents ; the idea attached to it is not that of *banking,* or the payment of interest upon capital, but simply that of *money-changing* and the testing of coin as bad or good. There is thus a natural point of contact with a passage like 1 Thessalonians v. 21, 22, "Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good; abstain from

every appearance or form of evil" (ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους[1] πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε); and this, or language equivalent to it, is constantly quoted in connexion with γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι. Dr. Resch thinks that they were originally a single saying, spoken by our Lord Himself in Aramaic, and that St. Paul is quoting the latter part of the saying; while other divergent forms of it are due to varieties of rendering from the Hebrew. The proof of this series of propositions I confess seems to me imperfect. It is true that the sayings are combined, not quite certainly by Clement of Alexandria, but clearly by Pamphilus in his Apology for Origen, by Cyril of Jerusalem, several times by St. Basil, and in the homily on St. Matthew attributed to St. Athanasias; but in the two places quoted from Origen there is a distinct though slight break between the sayings. It is true also that the saying, " Show yourselves approved money-changers," is referred expressly to our Lord, if not by Origen, yet by the *Clementine Homilies*, the anonymous *Vita S. Syncleticæ*, Jerome, and Socrates; but there is no clear proof that it came from the *Logia*, and no direct evidence that the Pauline phrases had the same origin. It seems to me quite as probable that this language of St. Paul was used by some early writer to explain the other saying; and that the two came to adhere together, and were quoted by later writers as a single saying. The early writer in question may have been either Clement or Origen. But the force of association is very strong: when two passages fit together so easily and naturally as these do, a little impulse only would be required to fuse them in common speech.

There is one important factor on the whole of this

---

[1] Dr. Resch quotes from Hesychius (εἶδος νομίσματος) in proof that εἶδος meant specially "a kind of coin." The Latin rendering is *species*, from which we get our " specie"; but I am not sure that the process by which this use is arrived at is really parallel.

group of questions which I do not think that Dr. Resch has borne sufficiently in mind ; that is; the influence which one writer exercised upon another, and the extent to which some particular form of quotation may have been simply passed on from hand to hand. It will not be necessary to remind the reader to what an extent the ancients were in the habit of writing out the words of their pre-decessors with acknowledgment or, far more often, with-out it. This applies in particular to the repeating of the same quotations.

I have in my mind an instance where this practice of theirs is of considerable importance. One of the most marked among the early quotations from the Gospels is a passage in the epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, which appears to be taken from the Sermon on the Mount. I am glad now, on looking back to my book, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 62 ff., to see that I treated this passage with a good deal of reserve. Perhaps I may be allowed to quote the whole of this discussion, defective as it is in one important particular, partly because I think it will appear that the caution which I then observed has been justified, and partly as an example of the way in which the bringing in of new evidence is apt to alter the balance of reasoning. The passage discussed is also in more ways than one typical.

MATT. v. 7 ; vi. 14 ; vii. 12, 2.	CLEM. ROM., *Ad Cor.*, c. xiii.	LUKE vi. 36, 37, 31, 38, 37, 38.
	[Especially remembering the word of the Lord Jesus which He spake ; . . . for thus He said :]	
v. 7. Blessed are the pitiful : for they shall be pitied.	Pity ye, that ye may be pitied :	vi. 36. Be ye merci-ful, etc.

MATT. v. 7; vi. 14; vii. 12, 2.	CLEM. ROM. Ad Cor., c. xiii.	LUKE vi. 36, 37, 31, 38, 37, 38.
vi. 14. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, etc.	forgive, that it may be forgiven unto you.	vi. 37. Acquit, and ye shall be acquitted.
vii. 12. All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye unto them.	As ye do, so shall it be done unto you:	vi. 31. And as ye would that they should do unto you, do ye also unto them likewise.
	as ye give, so shall it be given unto you :	vi. 38. Give, and it shall be given unto you.
vii. 2. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged:	as ye judge, so shall it be judged unto you: as ye are kind, so shall kindness be shown unto you:	vi. 37. And judge not, and ye shall not be judged.
and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you.	with what measure ye mete, with it shall it be measured unto you.	vi. 38. For with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you again.

---

v. 7. μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται.	ἐλεεῖτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε.	vi. 36. γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, κ.τ.λ.
vi. 14. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθ. τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν.	ἀφίετε ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν.	vi. 37. ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.
vii. 12. πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἀνθ. οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.	ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	vi. 31. καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθ., καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.
		vi. 38. δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.
vii. 2. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε,	ὡς δίδοτε οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν. ὡς κρίνετε οὕτως κριθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν· ᾧ	vi. 37. καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε.
καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	vi. 38. τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ᾧ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

" We are to determine whether this quotation was taken from the canonical Gospels. Let us try to balance the arguments on both sides as fairly as possible. Dr. Lightfoot writes in his note upon the passage as follows : ' As Clement's quotations are often very loose, we need not go beyond the canonical Gospels for the source of this passage. The resemblance to the original is much closer here than it is, for instance, in his account of Rahab above, § 12. The hypothesis therefore that Clement derived the saying from oral tradition, or from some lost Gospel, is not needed.' (1) No doubt it is true that Clement does often quote loosely. The difference of language, taking the parallel clauses one by one, is not greater than would be found in many of his quotations from the Old Testament. (2) Supposing that the order of St. Luke is followed, there will be no greater dislocation than, *e.g.*, in the quotation from Deuteronomy ix. 12-14 and Exodus xxxii. (7, 8), 11, 31, 32, in c. liii ; and the backward order of the quota-tion would have a parallel in *Clem. Hom.* xvi. 13, where the verses Deuteronomy xiii. 1-3, 5, 9 are quoted in the order Deuteronomy xiii. 1-3, 9, 5, 3, and elsewhere. The composition of a passage from different places in the same book, or more often from places in different books, such as would be the case if Clement was following Matthew, frequently occurs in his quotations from the Old Testament. (3) We have no positive evidence of the presence of this passage in any non-extant Gospel. (4) Arguments from the manner of quoting the Old Testament to the manner of quoting the New must always be to a certain extent *a fortiori*, for it is undeniable that the New Testa-ment did not as yet stand upon the same footing of respect and authority as the Old, and the scarcity of MSS. must have made it less accessible. In the case of converts from Judaism, the Old Testament would have been largely committed to [memory in youth, while the knowledge of the New would be only recently acquired. These con-siderations seem to favour the hypothesis that Clement is quoting from our Gospels.

" But, on the other hand, it may be urged, (1) That the parallel adduced by Dr. Lightfoot, the story of Rahab, is not quite in point, because it is narrative, and narrative, both in Clement and the other writers of his time, is dealt with more freely than discourse. (2) The passage before us is also of greater length than is usual in Clement's free quotations. I doubt whether as long a piece of discourse can be found treated with equal freedom, unless it is the two doubtful cases in c. viii. and c. xxix. (3) It will not fail to be noticed that the passage, as it stands in Clement, has a roundness, a compactness, a balance of style, which give it an individual and independent appearance.

" Fusions effected by an unconscious process of thought are, it is true, sometimes marked by this completeness ; still there is a difficulty in

supposing the terse antitheses of the Clementine version to be derived from the fuller, but more lax and disconnected, sayings in our Gospels. (4) It is noticed in *Supernatural Religion* that the particular phrase χρηστεύεσθε has at least a partial parallel in Justin (γίνεσθε χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες), though it has none in the canonical Gospels. This may seem to point to a documentary source no longer extant.

" Doubtless light would be thrown upon the question if we only knew what was the common original of the two Synoptic texts. How do they come to be so like and yet so different as they are ? How do they come to be so strangely broken up ? [1] etc.

The omission in this argument is that it failed to take account of the patristic parallels. Dr. Lightfoot noticed one of these in his first edition only to dismiss it. In his recent edition he adds three more references. His present note runs thus :

" Polycarp, indeed (*Phil.* 2), in much the same words, quotes our Lord as saying ἀφίετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν : ἐλεεῖτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε ; but it can hardly be doubted, from his manner of introducing the quotation (μνημονεύοντες ὧν εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος διδάσκων), that he had this passage of Clement in his mind, and does not quote. independently. See also Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. 18 (p. 476) ἐλεᾶτε, φησίν ὁ Κύριος, κ.τ.λ., where it is quoted almost exactly as here, except that ἐν αὐτῷ is omitted. He betrays no misgiving that he is not quoting directly from the Gospel, when evidently he has taken the words from his namesake the Roman Clement. Comp. *Apost. Const.* ii. 21 ; Ps.-Ign., *Trall.* 8."

Dr. Resch quotes eight examples of the whole or part of the passage. He does not refer at all to the possibility that the later writers may be copying the earlier, but he assumes that all are quoting from a lost text. I confess that in the main I believe him to be right. It is true that the coincidence of phrase with which Polycarp introduces the quotation raises a suspicion that the Roman Clement exercised an influence upon him. It is true also that the Alexandrine Clement was very familiar with the epistle of his Roman namesake, and makes free use of it ; and further, it is true that in one place the citation of his pre-

---

[1] *The Gospels in the Second Century* (1876), p. 63 ff.

decessor is evidently made from memory, as he refers the passage erroneously to Barnabas. Still I do not think that there is any proof that he had his predecessor in mind in the near context of this quotation ; and we should have to believe, not only that he knew his work, but that he knew it better than St. Matthew and St. Luke. That he might conceivably do; but every additional parallel, and every new author brought into the comparison, increases the probability that there is some common text now lost lying behind them. My impression is that none of all Dr. Resch's instances is better for his purpose than this. The passage, as it stands in the two Clements, has every appearance of being original.

Another curious and interesting passage is spread over six quotations in as many writers. In its fullest form it runs thus : " The Lord also said that he who gives is more blessed than he who receives. For woe to those who possess and receive by hypocrisy (ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβανόντων = I suppose, as we might say, " obtains by false pretences "), or are able to help themselves, and desire to receive from others; for each shall give account to the Lord God in the day of judgment." Not quite all the places where the whole or part of this is quoted are likely to be independent of each other. The oldest (partial) quotation is in the *Didaché* ; and Hermas also has it, not on this occasion borrowing from the *Didaché*, because he quotes rather more than the *Didaché* does. It is quoted besides in a fragment attributed to Clement of Alexandria, in the *Didascalia*, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and Anastasius Sinaita.

The first portion of the saying is quoted in Acts xx. 35. From the citation in the *Apostolic Constitutions* it would seem that there was some interval between the two parts ; but this was probably slight. It will be observed that the balance of " blessing " and " woe " goes to confirm the historical character of St. Luke's form of the Beatitudes.

The negative version of the Christian precept, " Do to others as ye would they should do unto you," is another widely diffused saying. Dr. Resch gives eleven examples of it, several of them not independent. These again begin with the *Didaché*, and they include the spurious addition to Acts xv. 20 and 29. The different expressions used rather suggest translation.

> ὅσα ἂν μὴ βούληται ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτῷ γίνεσθαι.
> ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσῳς μὴ γίνεσθαί σοι.
> ὅσα μὴ θέλεις σοὶ γενέσθαι
> ὃ σὺ μισεῖς ὑφ᾽ ἑτέρου σοι γένεσθαι.

This last form however recalls a parallel in Tobit iv. 15 (16), καὶ ὃ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσεις ; and the possibility is not remote that this and the positive form of the saying in Luke vi. 31 may have together given rise to the corresponding negative form.

Before leaving Dr. Resch, of whose work I have only given a few more or less characteristic examples, I ought perhaps to refer to one instance in which he believes that the original *Logia* are quoted, not only in fact, but by name. The false Ignatius (*Ad Magn.* 9) has the following :

> ὁ μὴ ἐργαζόμενος γὰρ μὴ ἐσθιέτω ἐν ἱδρῶτι γὰρ τοῦ προσώπου σου
> φάγῃ τὸν ἄρτον σου φασὶ τὰ λόγια.

Dr. Resch allows indeed that the latter half of the quotation comes from Genesis iii. 19 ; still he gives reasons for thinking that ὁ μὴ ἐργαζόμενος, κ.τ.λ., is a real *logion* of the Lord. Unfortunately the same phrase, φασὶ τὰ λόγια, occurs elsewhere in the same writer (*Smyrn.* 3), where the quotation is evidently taken from Acts i. 11; so that in both places we ought apparently to take λόγια in the wider sense of " the Scriptures."

I have hardly left myself space to deal at any length with Herr Bousset. He is an independent follower in the steps

of Dr. Resch, rather deficient in clearness of style and exposition,[1] but otherwise well equipped for his task. His inquiry is devoted specially to the quotations which appear to be taken from a Gospel or Gospels in Justin Martyr. He does not question the use of our Synoptics; indeed he strengthens the arguments which have been urged in proof of such use by pointing out that Justin must have had before him the Sermon on the Mount in the form in which it now stands in our St. Matthew. But he thinks that, besides our present Gospel, Justin had access to some other document essentially of the Synoptic type, but where it differs from them showing signs of still greater originality and value. When he asks himself what that document is, we cannot be surprised that he should answer, the *Logia* of St. Matthew referred to by Papias. He thinks that while our Synoptics were read and occasionally copied by Justin, this still more ancient document clung to his memory and deeply influenced the form of his quotations.

If I may sum up rather abruptly, the state of the case in regard to Justin seems to me to be something like this. He constantly used, and largely used, our three Synoptic Gospels. I believe that he also used the fourth Gospel, but that does not now concern us. And yet by the side of this use of the Synoptics there is, I think it must be admitted, an unknown element, which cannot be wholly accounted for by mere freedom of quotation. The question then is, Where does this unknown element come from ? As a preliminary question, Is it single ? Is it homogeneous ? If it is, then I am afraid that we could not adopt Herr Bousset's conclusion. For I should be more clear that some of the features in Justin's quotations are secondary than that others are primary. Most of us would

---

[1] This seems to me conspicuously the case in the first paragraph on p. 93. I quite fail to understand what Herr Bousset regards as the true history of the passage in question.

gladly enough, I doubt not, gather up and treasure all that
we have of the fragments of a Gospel older even than our
own. I do not deny that there may be such fragments
embedded in the works of Justin ; and Dr. Resch and Herr
Bousset have done much to help us to find them. But it
is impossible to include in the number such traits as the
cave of the nativity, the fire on the Jordan at the baptism,
and a number of various readings, which, however early
attested, are probably in most cases, and can be almost
demonstrated in some, not to be genuine. By the time
that Justin wrote, a good deal of corruption had made its
way into the canonical text; and one branch of these cor-
rupting influences he had not escaped.

There remains yet another hypothesis which the student
of Justin's quotations ought, I think, to test very closely.
Repeatedly we are struck by the way in which Justin ap-
pears to combine the texts of more than one of our present
evangelists. Conceivably he may be quoting an original
from which all of them are derived. But the other alter-
native must also be borne in mind, that he had before him
a harmony, in which this process of combination had been
already carried out. When I wrote on Justin, some sixteen
years ago, I added a note at the end of the chapter to
the effect that, on looking back over it, I was inclined to
lean more than I did to the hypothesis that Justin used a
harmony. I then thought that the " phenomena of varia-
tion " seemed " to be too persistent and too evenly dis-
tributed to allow of the supposition of alternate quoting
from different Gospels." [1]   Since that time I am afraid that
the question has lain on the shelf so far as I am concerned.
But only within the last week I have come across two
striking coincidences, which might almost be called confir-
mations of the idea. The first is a review of Bousset by
Schürer in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* for Feb. 7th. He

[1] *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 136.

does not say in so many words that Justin used a harmony, but he expresses the opinion that all the divergences in the Sermon on the Mount may be explained by a fusion of the texts of St. Matthew and St. Luke ; and he goes on further to call attention to the points of contact between Tatian's *Diatessaron* and Justin, and he urges the argument that, if the peculiarities in the text of Tatian certainly rest upon the foundation of our four Gospels, the same may be true of Justin—the peculiarities in his text too are more likely to be *posterior* to our Gospels than derived from a document anterior to them. These seem to me to be weighty considerations.

The second coincidence is with that acute scholar and indefatigable worker, Prof. Rendel Harris, who, in his recent treatise on the *Diatessaron of Tatian,* argues independently of Justin that there must have been a harmony of the four Gospels earlier than Tatian's. He bases this inference upon a remarkable group of readings, called by Westcott and Hort "Western Non-Interpolations," all but one of which are found in the last chapter of St. Luke. The point is, that these readings hang together and were probably all introduced at the same time; that they probably had their origin in a harmony, but that traces of them are already found in the text out of which Tatian constructed his *Diatessaron*. The proof that they were in the *Diatessaron* turns especially upon the coincidence of the Curetonian Syriac and the Arabic version of the *Diatessaron* in the two readings where both are extant. There are however some gaps in the extension of the inference from these, and the proof as a whole does not seem to me altogether stringent.

But whether or not any one of the many hypotheses which are floating about is finally established, enough will have been said to show how deeply interesting is the stage which these inquiries have now reached. The horizon has

widened. The scene is in part shifted from the first century to the second. And I myself believe strongly in the method of working backwards from ascertained facts in the early history of the text to the circumstances of its origin. It is probably in these outlying regions that a conclusion will first be reached. But there is a stage in most inquiries where, the key once found for a portion of the problem, brings with it rapidly the solution of other portions, and so a way is made gradually towards the centre. I quite admit that the present problem is still surrounded by difficulties, many and serious, but the removal of them may be nearer than we suppose.

W. SANDAY.