Some Internal Evidence for the Use of the Logia in the First and Third Gospels.

By the Rev. Canon Sir John C. Hawkins, Bart., Oxford.

The often canvassed question as to the use of the Logia by St. Matthew and St. Luke was raised afresh by Mr. W. C. Allen, and was dealt with by Dr. Sanday, in the June and July numbers of The Expository Times. I think that some light may be thrown upon this matter by careful observation of the use which the two evangelists make of their own respective characteristic expressions when they are compiling from their various sources their records of the sayings of our Lord.

For to His sayings or discourses, and to such of them as we have no ground at all for referring to any other than a Logian origin (whether we accept that origin or not), we must strictly confine ourselves while we deal first and chiefly with our immediate subject—though indeed afterwards we shall find that other parts of the Gospels bear upon and illustrate that subject by the parallel phenomena which they exhibit. Therefore (i.) of course I leave out of view for the present all narrative, and with it all such sayings as seem to be quite subsidiary to the narrative and to have been always included in it; *e.g.* Mt 11^5 = Lk 7^{22} as distinguished from the following verses, Lk $7^{41ff.}$ $13^{15.\ 16}$. (ii.) Again, I take no account for the present of such portions of discourse—they amount to about 113 verses in Mt and 76 verses in Lk—as occur in Mk also, although the phenomena of the 'doublets' seem to me to show that some sayings came down independently through two channels, namely, the Marcan channel and another one which supplied materials to Mt and Lk. (iii.) Nor will I include the incidents and inquiries which are briefly recorded (*e.g.* in Mt 15^{12}, Lk 11^{27}) as leading up to or drawing forth sayings of Jesus, although I believe personally that the term Λόγια is comprehensive enough to include them, and did include them. (iv.) On the same ground, and against my own judgment, I will also omit a few sayings which are so bound up with such incidents and inquiries that they do not seem to have ever stood alone, *e.g.* Mt 3^{15}, and the sayings to the two or three aspirants in Mt $8^{19ff.}$, Lk $9^{57ff.}$ (v.) No reference will be made to Mt 26–28, Lk 22–24, because there is no reason (except perhaps a few words in Lk 22^{30}) for thinking that the non-Marcan source used by Mt and Lk in common extended to the periods of the Passion and the Resurrection.

After clearing the way for our present inquiry by making these exclusions, we have still before us about 358 verses in Mt and 328 verses in Lk, both consisting entirely of sayings of Jesus, which cannot be attributed to the Marcan or Petrine source. Of the 358 verses in Mt, there are 168 which are common to that Gospel and to Lk, and 190 which are peculiar to Mt. The 328 verses in Lk are almost equally divided, there being, according to my computation, 164½ which are common to that Gospel and to Mt, and 163½ which are peculiar to Lk. (The apparent discrepancy between the numbers 168 and 164½ as applied to the common verses in Mt and Lk is of course merely the result of the different lengths of the verses in our modern New Testaments: thus, *e.g.*, Mt $7^{3.\ 4.\ 5}$ = Lk $6^{41.\ 42}$, Mt $9^{37.\ 38}$ = Lk 10^2; and on the other hand Mt 10^{28} = Lk $12^{4.\ 5}$.)

Now can we trace any difference in style and vocabulary between these two divisions of the discourses or sayings in Mt and Lk, *i.e.* between (1) the portions of each which have parallels in the other Gospel, and which therefore suggest derivation from the same source (for brevity I will sometimes call them simply the 'common' portions), and (2) those portions which are peculiar to Mt and Lk respectively, and as to the origin of which we can infer nothing? Yes, there is one notable difference. The words and phrases which are characteristic of Mt and of Mk as individual writers are used with considerably more frequency in the former class of passages than in the latter. It appears to me that there can be no doubt as to this fact, which I have worked out in two ways.

A.

I first took the full lists of such characteristics which I had previously made, though not for this exact purpose, and which I had published in *Horæ Synopticæ*, pp. 4–7 and 14–20. I may here repeat that the lists were formed by bringing together the words and phrases which occur at least four times in Mt and Lk respectively, and which either are not found at all in the other Synoptic Gospels or are found in the Gospel in question twice as often as in the other two together.[1] And I have since found two additions that should be made to the Matthæan list, namely, ὀλιγόπιστος and ὅσος ἐάν, and four that should be made to the Lucan list, namely, δοξάζω τὸν Θεόν, γίνομαι with ἐπί and accusative, ἔχω with the infinitive, and ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. So we have altogether 88 characteristics of the First Gospel, and 144 of the Third Gospel, the total occurrences of them in each of those two Gospels being 851 and 1458 respectively. And we shall find that so far as these characteristic expressions find place in the recorded sayings of Jesus, there is a decided preponderance of them in all the 'common' portions of each Gospel, as contrasted with those portions which are peculiar to Mt or Lk.

i. Let us take first and by itself what is by far the longest and most important body of teaching, Mt's Sermon on the Mount. Deducting from its 107 verses 7 which have more or less distinct Marcan parallels, and which may therefore conceivably have a Marcan origin (namely, Mt $5^{13.\ 15.\ 29.\ 30.\ 32}$ $6^{14.\ 15}$), there remain 100 verses, of which 60 have more or less close parallels in various parts of Lk, while 40 are found in Mt only. Now in the 60 'common' verses there are only 51 of Mt's characteristics, being in the proportion of about 5 to 6 of the verses, or less than one to each verse, taking an average; while there is a rather larger number of them, namely, 54, contained in the 40 peculiar verses, being, on an average, more than one and a quarter to each verse.

[1] Of course such a rule must include some expressions which hardly deserve inclusion (see below), and perhaps *vice versâ*, but I still do not know how a fairer one can be devised. I see that a similar plan has been adopted for estimating the characteristics of various documents in a new and important work, *The Hexateuch*, edited by the Revs. J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby; see vol. i. p. 183 f., also p. 61.

ii. If we now take the whole of the discourses in Mt (of course as limited in the second paragraph of this article, but including the Sermon on the Mount which has just been considered separately), we shall find a very similar contrast to that which has already appeared. Our 'common' verses of discourse drawn from Mt 5–25 (there are not any previous to chap. 5) amount to 168, and the characteristic Matthæan expressions in them are 143, being again in the proportion of about 5 of the latter to 6 of the former, or less than one characteristic to each verse; while in the 190 verses peculiar to Mt there are 241 occurrences of his characteristics, which would give an average of about one and a quarter to each verse, very much as in the Sermon on the Mount alone.

iii. Turning to Lk, I have not attempted to deal with his Sermon on the Plain by itself, for the peculiar verses in it are too few (I should so regard only 6^{24-26} and ^{34}) to supply material for any adequate comparison with the numerous 'common' verses. Let us take then together all the sayings in Lk which come within the scope of the present inquiry. They are almost equally divided between common and peculiar matter, there being, according to the best computation I can make, about 164 verses of each kind.[2] But the occurrences of the characteristically Lucan expressions are far from following this division into halves; they are very much more unevenly distributed. There are but 120 of them in the 164 common verses—or about 3 to every 4 verses; while in the 164 peculiar verses that proportion is reversed, there being in them 214 of the characteristics, or about 4 to every 3 verses. The contrast, then, in the Third Gospel is of the same kind as that in the First.

B.

But it may be not unfairly objected that the contrast in both cases, and especially in Mt, may be vitiated by the fact that a considerable portion of the discourses which have been thus examined consists of parables, in which there are some frequently recurring words which are almost or quite necessitated by the subject-matter, and which therefore can prove little or nothing as to the habitual and favourite vocabulary of the

[2] To speak exactly, I marked, as I have said, 164½ verses as 'common,' and 163½ as peculiar to Lk.

writers who use them. Such words in Mt are ζιζάνιον and συλλέγω (13[24-30] and [36-42]); ἀποδίδωμι and σύνδουλος (18[23-34]); γάμος (22[2-13]); παρθένος and λαμπάς (25[1-12]); τάλαντον and κερδαίνω (25[14-30]); ξένος, γυμνός, and δψάω (25[31-46]); in Lk, οἰκόνομος (16[1-8]); μνᾶ and δέκα (19[12-27]); also perhaps θύω and λιμός (15[11-32]). I therefore struck out these 12 and 5 words from the Matthæan and Lucan lists respectively. And as I had thus begun to revise the (so to speak) automatically formed lists according to my own judgment, I struck out also some other words which seemed to be so largely, if not entirely, caused by the subject in hand, or to be so colourless and commonplace in themselves, or to be so comparatively seldom employed, that for one or more of these reasons they might be thought too insignificant to be reckoned as characteristics.[1] On such grounds I shortened the Matthæan list by omitting the following 20 words, the great majority of which are found in the discourses now under consideration:—ἀνατολή, γεννάω, διώκω, δῶρον, ἔνοχος, ἐργάζομαι, θυσιαστήριον, κλέπτω, μάγος, μετοικεσία, ὀμνύω, ὁμοιόω, ὅρκος, πρόβατον, σαπρός, σεισμός, σκανδαλίζομαι ἐν, φονεύω, φρόνιμος, χρυσός. And similarly I deducted from the Lucan list these 17 words:—ἀθετέω, γονεῖς, ἐπιθυμέω, ἔτος, κεῖμαι, κοιλία, κριτής, λύχνος, μήν, μιμνήσκομαι, παρέχω, πειρασμός, πέμπω, συλλαμβάνω, συνκαλέω, ὑψόω, φάτνη.

After making these considerable excisions, there remain selected lists of 56 (instead of 88) and 122 (instead of 144) characteristics of Mt and Lk respectively. No doubt exception might be taken to a few even of these, but on the whole it will be allowed that the words and phrases, and the phrases most convincingly, bring out the independent and personal styles and mannerisms of the two writers to whom we owe our First and Third Gospels in substantially their present form.

Let us now see whether these, like the expressions in the longer lists that were before dealt with, are used in different proportions in the 'common' and peculiar portions respectively of Mt and Lk. If we follow the same plan as before, we shall find under our first heading the strongest and most notable of all our contrasts.

i. For if here again we take first and by itself Mt's Sermon on the Mount, we find that in the 60 verses common to Mt and Lk there are only 34 occurrences of the selected characteristics, being an average of little more than one of them to every two verses. But in the 40 verses peculiar to Mt there are no less than 53 such characteristics, being in the proportion of about 5 to 4, or considerably more than one to each verse.

ii. Taking next the whole of the discourses in Mt so far as they enter into our present comparison, we find in the common parts a somewhat similar proportion to that in the Sermon on the Mount, for in the 168 verses there are but 89 occurrences of the characteristics, being not much more than one of them to every two verses. When we turn, however, to the peculiar parts, the contrast with the common parts is not as striking as elsewhere, for the former also contain fewer characteristics than verses—a result chiefly owing to the parables. But even here the contrast, so far as it goes, is in the same direction as our other ones; for there are 142 of the characteristics spread over the 190 peculiar verses, being about 3 to every 4 verses, or one and a half to every two verses—an appreciably smaller proportion than the 'not much more than one' to every two verses which we found to be the proportion in the 'common' parts.

iii. In Lk the 164 verses of discourse which are substantially common to him with Mt contain only 104 of our selected Lucan characteristics, *i.e.* rather less than 2 to every 3 verses. But in the 164 verses peculiar to Lk the excess of numbers is in the other direction, there being in the 164 verses of this kind 181 of the characteristics—a proportion of about 8 to 9, or rather more than one characteristic to each verse.

Six comparative calculations have thus been made, three of them (A, i., ii., iii.) by the use of a more full list, three of them (B, i., ii., iii.) by the use of a more select list of characteristic words and phrases. All the six point in the same direction, though with various degrees of distinctness, Mt supplying both the most forcible (B, i.) and the least forcible (B, ii.) contrast. They all, without exception, exhibit Mt and Lk as employing their own favourite and most habitual vocabulary and turns of language less abundantly in the passages in which they are parallel to the other Gospel than in those in which they stand alone. Surely this must mean something. And what it seems most

[1] In the printed lists above referred to I had already obelized or bracketed some, but not all, of these words as being unimportant.

obviously and naturally to mean is, that in compiling these parallel reports of sayings the two writers were drawing upon the same source, and that for some reason they employed it with more exactness and less freedom than they used in drawing upon those other sources from which they derived the sayings which are peculiar to each of them. I have nothing to suggest as to the nature of those other sources — whether they were merely oral traditions used after the Jewish manner in catechetical teaching, or whether they were other documents (perhaps St. Luke in his preface alludes to such in slightly disparaging terms) which held a less authoritative position and were followed with less close and strict attention than the one which both Mt and Lk had before them. I only urge that there was such a distinction made between this one source and the others, and that the distinction existed in the minds of both evangelists. And it seems to me that this consideration lends support to the 'two-document hypothesis,' whether we take that term in its narrower sense as implying the use of two documents only, or in its wider sense as meaning that two documents seem to have stood out from among others, as being of paramount antiquity and value. Hitherto I have been keeping only one such document in view, because, as Mr. Allen has reminded us, the existence of that one still seems problematical to some scholars who have little or no doubt as to the other one, and therefore the Logian half of the hypothesis still needs any support that can be found for it. But now let us turn to the more generally accepted or Marcan half of the hypothesis, and observe the support which it gives to my present contention by the similar state of things which it exhibits. Here, of course, we can no longer limit our view to discourse; for the parallels between the other Synoptists and Mk are very far from being confined to sayings of Jesus, as is almost exclusively the case with the parallels between Mt and Lk themselves. Let us proceed then to examine from our present point of view all the matter, whether consisting of discourse or of narrative or of both intermingled, in which our First and Third Gospels are parallel to the Second, and in which they are now pretty generally admitted to be derived from it, because of its many and various signs of priority and originality.

i. Mt has 517 verses of such matter. They contain 246 occurrences of his characteristics according to the complete list, and 211 according to the select list, being in the former case slightly less, and in the latter case considerably less, than one characteristic to every two verses. There is a marked contrast to this state of things when we turn to the 337 verses which are peculiar to Mt. According to the fuller list of characteristics it is a very great contrast, there being 454 of these in the 337 verses, or an average of one and one-third to every single verse. According to the shorter, or select list, the contrast is much weaker, but it lies in the same direction; for in the 337 verses there are 263 occurrences of the select characteristics, showing an average of about three-fourths of one in each verse, or in every two verses one and a half,—whereas we found only an average of 'considerably less than one' in every two of the verses parallel to Mk.

ii. Turning to Lk, we once more find contrasts of the same kind, but there is no such great difference between the results of the two lists as there was in the case of Mt. For the 386 verses of Lk which have parallels in Mk contain 412 of the Lucan characteristics according to the full list, and 390 according to the select list—an average to each verse of slightly more than one in the former case and of almost exactly one in the latter case. But when we take, on the other hand, the 499 verses which are peculiar to Lk, we find the numbers in the two lists of characteristics to be 762 and 677 respectively, giving an average of either upwards of one and a half, or upwards of one and one-third, to each verse, according to which list is employed.

Altogether our calculations have taken into account nearly the whole of the First and Third Gospels, namely, 1022 of the 1068 verses in Mt, and 1049 of the 1149 verses in Lk. The remaining 46 and 100 verses were designedly excluded because of the difficulty of classing them as peculiar to Mt or Lk, or as Marcan, or as presumably Logian, without begging questions which must remain open. The most important of these verses are those which contain the details of the Temptation (Mt $4^{3\text{-}10}$ = Lk $4^{3\text{-}12}$), and the narrative in Mt $8^{5\text{-}10.\ 13}$ = Lk $7^{1\text{-}10}$ of the healing of the Centurion's Servant (though for myself I think that both these passages may well have had their places in the Logia, the former as being taken to have come from the lips of Him who alone could have

known those details, and the latter because the whole narrative leads up to, and is needed in order to make intelligible, the logion, 'I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel'); others of them provide certain sayings with introductions which may be original, but may be editorial; and many of the remainder are verses of Lk 22 and 23, in which, though there is a general resemblance to Mk, there are so many divergences as to render Lk's reliance on a 'special source' of his own a probability, though perhaps not a necessity.

Putting aside, then, these 46 and 100 verses, let us try to estimate the results of the comparative calculations that have been made as to the 1022 and 1049 verses which form the main bodies of the First and Third Gospels. We have been finding, in the latter portion of this article, that in such parts of those Gospels as are parallel to Mk *either in narrative or in discourse*, both Mt and Lk use their own favourite expressions, which characterize them throughout as individual writers, more sparingly than in the peculiar parts of their Gospels. Now this is exactly what we had previously found to occur where Mt and Lk are parallel to one another in the *discourse* which forms almost the whole of the ground which they have in common (when they are without any Marcan parallel); there, too, we saw that the habitual literary idiosyncrasies of both writers always appeared less frequently in the common than in the peculiar records of sayings. So now I suggest as to both these cases, as I suggested before as to one of them, that Mt and Lk had access to two sources,—one consisting of narrative and discourse, the other of discourse only or mainly,—which they deferred to more carefully and clung to more closely than to any of the other sources, whether oral or written, from which they drew materials. If this suggestion is accepted as in any degree probable, it will in that degree give the independent support of internal evidence to that very theory—*i.e.* the 'two-document hypothesis'—for which by far our oldest patristic authority supplies external evidence. For the two sources, which we have seen to stand out from all others because of the otherwise unequalled attention paid to them, show in the natures of their respective subject-matters a remarkable correspondence with the two documents,—one attributed to Mark as the interpreter of Peter and consisting of τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα, and the other attributed to Matthew and consisting of τὰ λόγια,—of which the mention has come down to us from Papias, and through him (at least as to one of them) from a yet older authority than himself (ὁ πρεσβύτερος). To me it seems very difficult to refrain from identifying these two pairs of sources which thus correspond. No doubt the way is far from being entirely clear for doing so, for while the Petrine or Marcan document is probably preserved to us in our Second Gospel, the Matthæan one is lost—at any rate in its original form, and therefore it is still a subject for speculation and for more or less imaginary reconstruction. And there is the special and very serious difficulty—effectively urged by Mr. Allen and admitted by Dr. Sanday[1]—which is caused by the supersession of the Hebrew or Aramaic original by the single Greek translation which was evidently in the hands of both Mt and Lk. But even that difficulty seems to me to be outweighed by such a concurrence of internal with external evidence as that which I have been trying to indicate. Let me state my point once again in the form of a question. If two, and no more than two, substantially apostolic writings, the one recording both the words and deeds of Christ, but the other apparently devoted to His sacred sayings, are named by the first ecclesiastical writer who deals with authorship at all, and if we find that Mt and Lk always follow two sources, of just those two kinds, more closely than they follow any of their other sources, is the coincidence likely to be accidental?

[1] THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xi. pp. 425 and 472.