

SWEETGOSPELHARMONY.COM Part I

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

BY

PATON J. GLOAG, D.D.

AUTHOR OF

A COMMENTARY ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PAULINE EPISTLES
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS
ETC. ETC.



EDINBURGH

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1895

8

THIS WORK
IS DEDICATED TO
MY WIFE,
WHO HAS UNWEARIEDLY ASSISTED ME
IN THIS AND IN ALL MY OTHER LITERARY LABOURS

PREFACE

THIS *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels* completes a series of Introductions to the books of the New Testament, in the preparation of which I have been engaged for a quarter of a century. The *Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles*, with a commentary, was published in 1870; the *Introduction to the Thirteen Pauline Epistles*, along with the anonymous *Epistle to the Hebrews*, in 1874; the *Introduction to the Seven Catholic Epistles* in 1887; the *Introduction to the Johannine Writings*, especially the *Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse*, in 1891; and now the *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels* in 1895. The design of these Introductions was not to give any explanation of or commentary on the sacred text (that to the Acts of the Apostles forming an exception), but to examine the genuineness of the writings, their authorship, the readers to whom they were primarily addressed, their design, their sources,—especially the sources of the historical books,—the language in which they were written, their peculiar style and diction, their characteristic features, the integrity of the text, the time when and the place where they were written, and their contents, in short, all that is necessary for their full understanding and intelligent perusal.

Several controversial points have been discussed in all these Introductions; but none of them has presented so many difficulties and perplexities as this *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels*. Critical controversy and inquiry have, in recent years, in a great measure passed from the investigation of the Pauline Epistles, to which they were directed by the

ingenious investigations of Baur and the Tübingen school concerning Petrine and Pauline Christianity, and from the important question concerning the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, which recent discoveries of patristic documents and a more rigid examination of the writings of the Fathers have in a great measure settled, to the great problems connected with the origin and sources of the Synoptic Gospels. I do not allude to the mythical theory promulgated by Strauss, which, at least in its original form, may now be regarded as antiquated, but to the question whence the Synoptists derived their information, and to the causes of the remarkable coincidences and equally remarkable differences which are found in their writings. This so-called "Synoptic problem" is one of the great disputed questions in the biblical criticism of the present day. In this Introduction I have discussed it at considerable length, first giving the most important theories that have been advanced, and then stating what I consider the most probable approaches to the truth. I am very far from supposing that I have arrived at any satisfactory conclusion, and am perfectly aware of the objections to which the theory advanced is exposed, and to which I can only give an imperfect answer: all that I have been able to do is to state what appear to me to be the most probable results of the inquiry. The complete solution of the problem is, I fear, for the present unattainable.

Another question, about which it is still impossible to pronounce an opinion with confidence, has regard to the original language of the Gospel of Matthew. Here the external and internal evidences conflict. Dean Alford observes: "I find myself constrained to abandon the view maintained in my first edition, and to adopt that of a Greek original." My experience has been precisely the reverse. At first, giving weight to the internal evidence, I considered that this Gospel was originally written in Greek, and could not have been a translation; but, owing to the overwhelming weight of the external evidence, as seen in the unanimous and unopposed testimony of the Fathers, I have been led to change that opinion, and now consider the hypothesis of a Hebrew or Aramaic original as upon the whole the more probable; unless,

indeed, the hypothesis be adopted that there were two originals written by Matthew, the one in Hebrew and the other in Greek.

With regard to two other points of much difficulty, I have come to the conclusion, in opposition, it must be confessed, to some of our greatest biblical scholars, that the last verses of Mark's Gospel (xvi. 9-20) are genuine and formed an original portion of that Gospel; and that the variations in our Lord's genealogies, as given in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, can only be accounted for on the supposition that Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph and Luke that of Mary.

It is, I trust, wholly unnecessary to say that in this work I have endeavoured to exercise strict impartiality. I have practised that candour which I have so strongly recommended as an indispensable qualification in all interpreters of Scripture. I am not conscious of having given undue preference to any preconceived opinions or traditional views. On the contrary, I have been led in the course of my investigations to modify and alter several of my former views, although, I confess, with some reluctance, and only after careful and repeated examination. A notable instance of this may be seen in the view maintained in this Introduction of the origin of the "Sermon on the Mount." Certainly the opinion, that this was one connected discourse delivered at one time, is that which a perusal of it in the Gospel of Matthew most naturally suggests; but I have been led to think that whilst a large portion of it was delivered on a single occasion, yet other sayings of our Lord, given at different times and on different occasions, were added by the Evangelist, as is suggested by the fact that the same statements are found in different portions of the Gospel of Luke, and there mentioned in their historical connection.

This Introduction may be regarded by different classes of readers from different points of view. Some may look upon it as too conservative, and as not making proper allowance for those advanced critical views which are now so prevalent; while others may regard it as too rationalistic, yielding too much to the views of those who are considered by many as deniers of inspiration. All that I can say is that I have endeavoured to be honest to my own convictions.

In recent years great progress has been made in the text and criticism of the New Testament, and new light has in consequence been cast on many controverted problems. Manuscripts and versions have been carefully collated, and the various readings compared. We have now a more certain text: the additions to the original, inserted in the *textus receptus*, are now removed, and omissions are now supplied. The result is that we have now obtained a text almost approaching to a restoration of the original. Of course, the readings of the oldest and uncial manuscripts still occupy the first place, but more attention has recently been paid to the cursive manuscripts and to the readings of the versions, especially the Old Italic and Syriac, which have perhaps hitherto been too much undervalued, seeing that they were made from Greek manuscripts much older than any which we now possess. A more accurate scholarship is now applied to the elucidation of Scripture; and the peculiar character of the dialect of New Testament Greek is now better understood. In the Revised Version, whatever may be its defects, we have undoubtedly a much better translation than in the Authorised Version.

Within the last half century there have been several discoveries of remarkable manuscripts, which have had an important bearing upon various questions connected with biblical criticism, especially upon the genuineness and age of the different scriptural books. The *Philosophoumena*, or Refutation of all Heresies, by Hippolytus, in which the references of the early Gnostics to the books of the New Testament are quoted, was discovered at Mount Athos in 1841, and printed by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, in 1851. A complete manuscript of the Clementine Homilies was found in the Vatican by Dressel in 1837, and published at Göttingen in 1853. In 1858, Canon Cureton published a Syriac manuscript containing fragments of the Gospels, found by Archdeacon Tattam in a Syriac monastery in the Nitizian desert in Egypt, and which is now regarded by many as the oldest Syriac version. This version was last year nearly completed by the important discovery of the Sinaitic Syriac manuscript by Mrs. Lewis, if the supposition be

correct that it is a variant copy of the Curetonian. The important Sinaitic manuscript, being, next to the Vatican, the oldest in existence, and materially affecting the reading of the received text, discovered by Tischendorf in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai in 1859, was published in 1862. A complete copy of the Epistle of Barnabas, hitherto imperfect, was attached to the Sinaitic manuscript, and another copy was among the documents discovered by Bryennios. But, next to the Codex Sinaiticus, the most important of all these discoveries is the Diatessaron of Tatian. A translation in the Armenian language of Ephræm's commentary on that work was found in the Armenian convent at Venice, and was printed in that city in 1836; a Latin translation was published in 1876, from which it was proved beyond the possibility of doubt that Tatian's Harmony was made up of the four canonical Gospels; and only a few years ago another manuscript was found by Professor Ciasca in the Vatican Library containing an Arabic translation of the whole work. Another very important document, the "Didachè," or the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," was discovered by Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, in the Jerusalem convent in Constantinople, and published in 1883, which is considered by competent authorities to have been written about the close of the first century and to be the oldest post-apostolic document extant, except the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, and possibly the so-called Epistle of Barnabas. Bound in the same volume with the Didachè was the only complete manuscript of the famous Epistle of Clemens Romanus, the copy in the Codex Alexandrinus being defective at the close. In 1889, J. Rendel Harris of Cambridge discovered in the monastery of Mount Sinai the Apology of Aristides to the Emperor Hadrian. A very important fragment of the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, found in a tomb at Akhman, in Upper Egypt, by the French Archaeological Mission at Cairo in 1886, was published in 1892. And only last year the discovery of an important Syriac version of the four Gospels was made by Mrs. Lewis in that Sinaitic monastery which has yielded so many important biblical manuscripts. These documents have been

discovered in different quarters—the Sinaitic manuscript and the new Sinaitic Syrian version in the monastery of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai; Ephræm's commentary on the Diatessaron in the Armenian convent at Venice; the Arabic version of Tatian, partly in Egypt and partly in Rome; the *Philosophoumena* of Hippolytus in Mount Athos; the *Didachè*, and the complete copy of the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, in Constantinople; and the fragment of the Gospel of Peter in Egypt. The Vatican Library has also yielded many important treasures.

These recent discoveries of biblical documents fill us with the hope of still more important discoveries in the future, when the libraries of the monasteries shall have been more carefully examined by competent scholars. The discovery of the writings of Papias, of the Gospel of the Hebrews, and of the Gospel of Marcion would be an enormous gain to biblical criticism, and might elucidate many unsolved problems; and who, viewing the past discoveries so unexpectedly made, can affirm that such discoveries may not be within the bounds of probability? At the same time, we do not believe that such discoveries will materially affect the main conclusions already arrived at, but rather that they will elucidate questions which still remain unsolved or doubtful.

The present work forms a companion volume to the other Introductions formerly published, and completes the series of Introductions to the New Testament. The scriptural quotations are taken from the Revised Version, except on those rare occasions when the Authorised Version or an independent translation appears preferable. The patristic quotations are taken from Kirchhofer's *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Canons*. Appendices are attached, referring to certain special difficulties and disputed points which seem to require special discussion.

A list of the most important books read or consulted is appended at the end of this work, with references to the editions in my possession, so that the quotations made from them may be referred to and verified. A vast amount of literature has been collected around the Synoptic problem, and the most important works on the subject have been care-

fully read whenever they could be obtained. It would, of course, be an endless task to refer to periodical literature on the subject, but I may mention several important articles which appeared in the *Expositor* for 1891. As in almost all theological discussions, we must betake ourselves to the great German theologians, whose works on the Synoptic problem have been carefully studied. Of these, I would especially mention the works of Holtzmann, Weiss, Wendt, and Paul Ewald. Of English theologians, the researches of Professor Sanday of Oxford on the Synoptic question call for special notice. They are distinguished alike by patience, caution, and logical acumen, and in point of learning and exhaustive investigation are unsurpassed by the above German theologians. It would not be right to omit special reference to the Introductions of the venerable Dr. Samuel Davidson, however much we may dissent from his conclusions. His two Introductions,—that entitled *Introduction to the New Testament*, published in 1848, and that entitled *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, published in 1868, the third edition of which appeared last year (1894), when the author was in his eighty-eighth year,—though written from different standpoints, are most valuable, and exhibit a learning and research seldom equalled by any biblical critic in our country. I have found several commentaries very helpful, especially those of Meyer, Godet, and the late Dr. Morison, whose commentaries on Matthew and Mark are deserving of careful study. Several monographs on particular subjects have also to be mentioned, from which I have derived considerable assistance, as that of Dean Burgon on *The Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark*, Bishop Hervey on the *Genealogies of our Lord*, Resch's *Agrapha*, and Zumpt's *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*. The value of Rushbrooke's *Synopticon* is acknowledged in the body of the work.

Last year (1894) I wrote six articles in the *Thinker* on the Synoptic problem. These, with the kind permission of the editor, the Rev. Joseph Exell, I have freely used in writing this work: they have, however, been rewritten and much altered both by additions and omissions.

It is my pleasing duty to acknowledge my obligations to

several friends who have kindly assisted me in this work—to the Rev. William Hastie, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, and to my brother, Lord Kincairney, for perusing the manuscript before the work went to press, and for valuable hints and suggestions; and to the Rev. David Hunter, D.D., of Galashiels, and the Rev. John Patrick, D.D., of Greenside, Edinburgh, for the verification of my references, and assistance in the correction of the press.

CONTENTS



GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

Literature. I. The Title: Synoptic Gospels—Use of the term Gospel—Difference between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel—Number of the Gospels—Uncanonical Gospels—Fragmentary nature of the Gospels. II. Authors of the Synoptic Gospels—Evangelical Symbols. III. Genuineness of the Synoptic Gospels—The Testimony of the Fathers—The Gospel of Peter—The Muratorian Canon—Tatian's Diatessaron—Testimony of Justin Martyr—Statement of Papias—Versions—The Old Latin—The Syriac—Credibility of the Narrative. IV. Relation of the Synoptic Gospels to each other—Points of Agreement—Rushbrook's *Synopticon*—The Threefold Narrative—The Twofold Narrative—The Single Narrative—Summary of Resemblances—Existence of Doublets—Points of Difference—Narrative of the Birth of Christ—The Sermon on the Mount as given by Matthew and Luke—The Passion—The Resurrection—Chronological Order. V. Sources of the Synoptic Gospels—The Problem stated. A. The theory of Mutual Dependence—The originality of Mark—Relation of Matthew and Luke to Mark—Relation of Luke to Matthew; B. The theory of an Oral Gospel—Wright's hypothesis of Catechetical Schools—Modification of this theory by Alford; C. The theory of an original Document or Documents—Modification of this theory by Eichhorn, Bishop Marsh, Schleiermacher, Ewald, Abbott, and Smith of Jordanhill—Supposition of an Aramaic or Hebrew Document; D. The theory of two Documents—Nature of this theory—Statement of Papias—Meaning of the term *Logia* used by him—Modification of this theory by Holtzmann, Weiss, Wendt, Resch, and Sanday—Result of this Discussion. VI. Interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels—Critical Apparatus—Editions of the Greek Text—The Revised Version—Necessity of Candour—Acquaintance with the times of Christ—Nature of Inspiration—Alleged discrepancies in the

Gospels — Instance of the Blind Man at Jericho — Sympathy between the Reader and the Writings — Spiritual Discernment — Teaching of the Synoptics compared with that of the other New Testament Writings — Distinctive peculiarities of the Synoptics.	PAGE
VII. Harmony of the Synoptics,	1-89

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

Literature. I. Genuineness of the Gospel—External Evidence—Internal Evidence—By whom disputed—Examination of Objections. II. The Author of the Gospel—Notices of Matthew in Scripture—Supposed distinction between Matthew and Levi—Notices of Matthew in Ecclesiastical History. III. Sources of the Gospel—Three Sources stated: Personal Observation, Oral Tradition, Written Documents. IV. The Design of the Gospel—Written for Jewish Christians—Proofs of the Messiahship of Jesus. V. Original Language of the Gospel—Difficulty of this Subject—Theory of a Hebrew Original—External Evidence in favour of it—Uniform Testimony of the Fathers—This Evidence disputed—Internal Evidence against a Hebrew Original—The Greek Text not a Translation—Translation of Aramaic expressions—Identity of Greek expressions in Matthew with those in the other Synoptic Gospels—Hypothesis of two original Gospels, the one Hebrew and the other Greek—Opinions of Critics. The Gospel according to the Hebrews—An interpolated Gospel of Matthew—Additions found in it—Language of Judæa in the Days of Christ—Style and Diction of Matthew. VI. Integrity of the Gospel: 1. Narrative of our Lord's Birth, Matt. i. ii.—Evidence in its favour—Objections to it—The Visit of the Magi—The Slaughter of the Infants of Bethlehem—Apparent discrepancies with St. Luke's Narrative—Chronological order of events; 2. Doxology to our Lord's Prayer. VII. Date of the Gospel—Different Opinions—The early Date before A.D. 60—The later Date after A.D. 60—Reconciliation of these two Dates—Place of Composition. VIII. Contents of the Gospel—Dissertation: <i>Quotations from the Old Testament</i> . List of Quotations—Use of the Septuagint—Formulae and Modes of Quotation—Examination of some difficult Passages: 1. Matt. ii. 15, "Out of Egypt have I called my son"; 2. Matt. ii. 17, 18, Slaughter of the Infants of Bethlehem—In what sense the Prophecy of Jeremiah is applicable to that event; 3. Matt. ii. 23, "He shall be called a Nazarene"—Different explanations: a lost Prophecy, a despised Person, a Nazarite, the Branch (Nazir); 4. Matt. xxvii. 9, 10, "The word spoken by Jeremiah the prophet"—The quotation from Zech. xi. 12, 13—Different explanations: in the original Jeremiah omitted; a lost Prophecy; Zech. ix.-xi. constituted a part of Jeremiah; Jeremiah the first Book of the Pro-

phetical Division ; the quotation from Jeremiah ; a quotation from two Prophets ; designed to show the unity of Prophecy ; a mistake of the Author ; a mistake of the Copyist, . . .	PAGE 90-166
--	----------------

THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

Literature. I. Genuineness of the Gospel—External Evidence—Internal Evidence—By whom disputed—Examination of Objections. II. The Author of the Gospel—Notices of Mark in Scripture : Supposition of two Marks ; the one the Disciple of Paul, the other the Disciple of Peter—Supposed to be the young man who followed Christ (Mark xiv. 51, 52)—Notices of Mark in Ecclesiastical History. III. Sources of Mark's Gospel—Negatively, not the Gospels of Matthew and Luke—Positively, the Preaching of Peter—Statements of the Fathers—Connection between Mark and Peter—Meaning of expression "Interpreter of Peter." IV. Design of Mark's Gospel—Written for Gentile Christians. V. Language of Mark's Gospel—Greek the original Language—Style and Diction—Quotations from the Old Testament—Characteristics of Mark's Gospel : its brevity, vividness, realistic character. VI. Integrity of the Gospel—Genuineness of Mark xvi. 9-20—By whom disputed and defended—The External Evidence against and for its genuineness—Internal Evidence against and for its genuineness—On the abrupt Conclusion—Result arrived at—Opinions of Critics. VII. Time and Place of Writing—Conflicting Opinions of the Fathers—Written before the Destruction of Jerusalem—Probable Date—Place of Composition—Probably Cæsarea. VIII. Contents of the Gospel—List of Miracles and Parables,	167-208
--	---------

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

Literature. I. Genuineness of the Gospel—Testimonies of the Fathers—Argument drawn from the Acts of the Apostles—Statement of Objections : 1. An amplification of the Gospel of Marcion—Views of Marcion—The Gospel of Marcion—Its relation to the Gospel of Luke—A mutilation of it ; 2. Luke's Gospel, the work of an Ebionite. II. The Author of the Gospel—Notices of Luke in Scripture and in Ecclesiastical History—Connection between Luke and Paul. III. Sources of Luke's Gospel—The Preface (Luke i. 1-4) : 1. Oral Tradition ; 2. Written Documents—Relation of Luke to Matthew and Mark. IV. Design of Luke's Gospel—Addressed to Theophilus—Written for Gentile Converts. V. Language of Luke's Gospel—Purity of the Greek Style and Diction. VI. Characteristics of Luke's Gospel—Its universality—The Gospel of the Humanity of Christ—Prominence given to Women—Contrasts in Luke's Gospel—Spiritual Songs—Value of Luke's Gospel. VII. Integrity of
--

Luke's Gospel : 1. The Narrative of our Lord's Birth, Luke i.-ii. ;	
2. Different Readings of Luke ii. 14 ; 3. The Lord's Prayer,	
Luke xi. 2-4 ; 4. The Bloody Sweat, Luke xxii. 43, 44—Evi-	
dence for and against its genuineness. VIII. Time and Place	
of Writing—Date inferred from the Acts of the Apostles—Sup-	
posed to be written after the Destruction of Jerusalem—Place	
of Composition. IX. Contents of the Gospel—List of Parables	
and Miracles—Dissertation I. : <i>The Genealogies</i> . Literature on	
the subject—Points of Agreement and Difference between the	
Genealogies of Matthew and Luke—The Sinaitic Palimpsest of	
Mrs. Lewis—Its bearing on the Genealogies—Its importance	
overestimated—The Genealogical Lists—Peculiarities in Mat-	
thew's Genealogy—Genealogy from Salmon to David—Omission	
of three Kings—Omission of Jehoiakim—The threefold Division	
of Matthew's Genealogy—The Genealogy in Luke's Gospel—	
On Shealtiel and Zerubbabel—Three theories of Reconcilia-	
tion of the two Genealogies : 1. The hypothesis of a Levirate	
Marriage—Statement of Julius Africanus ; 2. The hypothesis	
that both are the Genealogy of Joseph—No Evidence from this	
that Jesus is the Son of David—On the Davidic Descent of	
Christ ; 3. The hypothesis that Matthew gives the Descent of	
Joseph and Luke the Descent of Mary—Critical Interpretation	
of Luke iii. 23—Conclusion arrived at—Genealogy among the	
Jews. Dissertation II. : <i>The Census of Quirinius</i> : Luke ii. 1, 2.	
Literature on the subject—Critical remarks—On the Census	
of the Roman Empire—Different methods of Chronology—The	
Census embraced Judæa—Date of our Lord's Birth—Herod	
alive when Christ was born—The Census of Quirinius—State-	
ment of Josephus in conflict with Luke—Different solutions :	
1. Conjectural emendations ; 2. The enrolment was made before	
Quirinius was Governor ; 3. Completed by Quirinius ; 4. Quir-	
inius an extraordinary commissioner ; 5. Called by his well-	
known official name—Investigations of Zumpt—Quirinius was	
twice Governor of Syria—Arguments in support of this fact—	
Sepulchral Inscription found at Tivoli—Results of the Investi-	
gation,	208-284

ERRATA.

- Page 1, l. 12, *for* 1862 *read* 1802.
 „ 6, l. 24, *for* Synoptists *read* Synoptics.
 „ 15, l. 15, *for* uncanonised *read* uncanonical.
 „ 46, last line, *for* Mark *read* Matthew.
 „ 51, l. 4, *for* beforehand *read* before him.
 „ 53, l. 20, *for* consistencies *read* coincidences.
 „ 55, l. 17, *for* Gospel *read* Gospels.
 „ 72, l. 17, *for* collected *read* collated.
 „ 280, last line, *omit* (Dionysian era, B.C. 14).

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.



GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

LITERATURE.—The Literature on the Synoptic Gospels, taken conjointly, is very extensive, as the subject has of late attracted much attention in this country, in Germany, and in America.

The Genuineness of the Synoptic Gospels is treated in the special sections in the Introductions to the New Testament. The most important of these by German critics are those of Bleek (translated 1869; the last German edition much altered by Mangold, 1886), Credner, De Wette, Eichhorn, Guericke, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Hug (translated 1827), Michaelis (translated by Bishop Marsh, with valuable notes and dissertations, 1862), Reuss (translated 1884), Weiss (translated 1887). Of works by English critics may be mentioned Alford's *Prolegomena* to his *Greek Testament*; the two very different Introductions of Dr. Samuel Davidson, the one entitled *Introduction to the New Testament* (1848), and the other *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament* (1868; third edition 1894); Dod's *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1888; Horne's *Introduction to the Scriptures*, with additions by Davidson and Tregelles, 1874; M'Clymont's *The New Testament and its Writers*, London, 1893; and Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1885. To these have to be added Professor Sanday's *Gospels of the Second Century*, 1876; Westcott's *Canon of the New Testament*, 1860; and Andrews Norton's (of Harvard University) *Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, 1847. Jones *On the Canon*, Lardner's

Credibility, Kirchhofer's *Quellensammlung*, and Charteris' *Canonicity*, contain the references to the Synoptic Gospels in the writings of the early Fathers. The special references in the works of Justin Martyr are discussed at considerable length by Purves in his *Testimony of Justin Martyr to early Christianity* (New York, 1888), and Sadler in his *Lost Gospel* (London, 1876). Tischendorf's tractate, *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* (4th ed. 1866; translated 1867) has never been refuted.

The important question as to the origin of the Synoptic Gospels has been much discussed during the latter half of this century, and at no period more so than in the present day. The following are the most important works on this subject, given alphabetically: the article on the Gospels by Dr. Abbott in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*; Baur's *Marcusevangelium*, 1881; Badham on the *Formation of the Gospels*, London, 1892; Bleek's *Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien* (Leipzig, 1862); Eichhorn's theory is contained in his *Einleitung in das N.T.*, and the remarks on it by Bishop Marsh in his translation of Michaelis' *Introduction*; Paul Ewald's *Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage* (Leipzig, 1890); Ewald's *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1871; Gieseler's *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien* (Leipzig, 1818); Godet, "The Origin of the Four Gospels," in his *Studies in the N.T.* 1873; Holtzmann's *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien nach ihrer Entstehung und geschichtlichen Bedeutung*, 1854; Jolley, *The Synoptic Problem for English Readers* (London, 1893); Keim's *Jesus of Nazara* (translated 1876-1883); Morison's *Commentary on St. Mark's Gospel* (3rd ed. London, 1882); Norton's *Genuineness of the Gospels*, already adverted to; Resch, *Agrapha: ausserkanonische Evangelienfragmente*, 1893; Roberts, *Language of Christ and His Apostles*, 1888; Sabatier's *Sources de la Vie de Jesus*, Paris, 1866; Schenkel's *Das Charakterbild Jesu* (1864; translated 1869); Schleiermacher's *St. Luke*, especially the introduction to it by the translator, Bishop Thirlwall (London, 1828); Scholten's *Das älteste Evangelium*, 1869; Smith's *Dissertation on the Gospels*, Edinburgh,

1853; the Introduction to the Gospels in the *Speaker's Commentary*, by Archbishop Thomson, and his article on the Gospels in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (in the new edition there is a valuable supplement to that article by Professor Sanday); Volkmar's *Marcus und die Synopse der Evangelien*, 1876; Weiss, *Das Marcus Evangelium und seine Synoptische Parallelen*, 1872; Wendt, *Evangel. Quellenberichte über die Lehre Jesu*, 1886; Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*, 1864, and his *Apostolisches Zeitalter*, 1890, now translated 1894; Wright's *Composition of the Four Gospels*, London, 1890. Besides these, there are many important articles on the origin of the Synoptic Gospels by Dr. Sanday, Professor Marshall, and others in the *Expositor*, fourth series, vol. iii. The subject is also discussed by Dr. Schaff in his *History of the Christian Church* (vol. i. pp. 575–612). To these also is to be added Rushbrooke's *Synopticon; or an Exposition of the common matter in the Synoptic Gospels*, where the matter common to the three Gospels and the matter common to two of them are so distinctly indicated by different types and colours as to be recognised at a glance. Other important works will be mentioned in the course of this Introduction.

A list of the chief Harmonies of the Gospel will be given when the Harmony of the Synoptics is discussed.

I. THE TITLE: SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

The word *Gospel* is a translation of the Greek *εὐαγγέλιον*. It probably came into use through Wickliff's translation. It is a contraction for Godspel, *God's word*, or more probably for Goodspel, *good news* (from *spellian*, to tell). The English version is the only European one in which the Greek word is translated; in other modern languages it is reproduced after the modified form of the Latin *evangelium*, as in German *Evangelium*, in French *evangile*, in Italian *evangelo*, etc. *Εὐαγγέλιον*, as used in the New Testament, is correctly rendered *good news*, and primarily denotes a good message; hence the glad tidings of salvation announced to the world in connection with Jesus Christ. Thus the angel on the plain

of Bethlehem proclaimed: "Behold, I bring you good tidings (*εὐαγγελίζομαι*) of great joy" (Luke ii. 10). Hence the usual phrase, "the Gospel of Jesus Christ"; because Christ was the subject of these good news. Taken in a general sense, the word came to denote the whole revelation of salvation by Christ. Thus Paul speaks of "my gospel" (2 Tim. ii. 8), that is, the system of salvation which he preached. It was only at a later period that the term came to be applied to a written record, and especially to denote the record of the sayings and doings of Christ, as in its application to the four historical Lives of Christ which form our canonical Gospels. We have a trace of this application in the introductory words to St. Mark's Gospel: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" (*ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Mark i. 1), where perhaps the evangelist entitles his work a Gospel. In the writings of Justin Martyr we have the first undoubted use of the term in this sense: "For the apostles," he observes, "in the memoirs composed by them which we call Gospels, have thus declared."¹

The superscriptions to the Gospels in the manuscripts of the Greek Testament are: *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην*.² We cannot tell when these titles were affixed to our Gospels; but as these titles are all similar, it is probable that it was not until they were collected together in a volume. The force of the preposition *κατὰ* has been variously explained. It may denote that the traditions collected by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, *i.e.* their oral teaching, were committed to writing or edited by others, so that, according to this view, these evangelists were only the indirect authors of their Gospels. It is thus understood by Credner³ and others. But the general testimony of the Fathers is opposed to this meaning of the preposition; for

¹ *Apol.* i. 66: οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονευμασιν ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια οὕτως παρέδωκαν. Earlier instances of the use of the term are found in the Didaché, and in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians, v.

² The important codices \aleph and B have simply *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, etc.

³ *Einleitung*, § 89, note. De Wette observes: "The titles *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, etc., do not definitely indicate these men as their authors; but the opinion of all antiquity attests the commonly accepted sense." *Einleitung*, § 78.

the evangelists are always regarded as the direct authors of their Gospels. The oneness of the Gospels is implied by the use of the preposition instead of the genitive.¹ There are not, strictly speaking, four Gospels, but one given in four different forms; the Gospel not *of*, but *according to* Matthew, the Gospel *according to* Mark, etc.

The term *synoptic* is a recent critical designation. As the adjective from Synopsis (which is compounded of *σύν* and *ὄψις*, parallel to the Latin *conspectus*), it denotes that in these Gospels we have a narrative of the life of Christ which may be arranged into sections, so as to afford us a general view or conspectus of His sayings and doings. The term is used to distinguish the first three Gospels from the fourth, which is more concerned with the discourses than with the actions of Christ. It is comparatively modern,² and does not occur in the writings of the Fathers.

The specific difference between the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel is obvious. It is not necessary to enter upon it here in detail, as it has already been fully discussed in a former Introduction.³ We would only notice four points of difference. 1. They differ in regard to the *locality* of the events narrated. In the Synoptics the scene of our Lord's ministry is chiefly laid in Galilee. Until the period of His last sufferings there is little mention of Judæa, and we would hardly have known that He frequently visited that country.⁴ On the other hand, in John's Gospel the scene is chiefly laid in Judæa. The visits of Christ to Jerusalem at the great annual feasts, His conversation with the Jews on these occasions, and the miracles which He then performed, form the chief contents of that Gospel; whilst His ministry in Galilee is seldom, and only incidentally, alluded to.⁵ 2. They appar-

¹ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τετράμορφον, Irenæus.

² According to Archdeacon Farrar, it was brought into general use by Griesbach. See also Holtzmann's *Einleitung*, p. 370.

³ Gloag's *Introduction to the Johannine Writings*, pp. 130-147.

⁴ Luke ix. 41 would seem to intimate a journey to Jerusalem in the middle of His ministry: it may, however, allude by anticipation to His last journey.

⁵ Allusions to a Galilean ministry in John's Gospel are found in John ii. 12, vi. 1, 4, 59, vii. 1.

ently differ as to the *duration* of Christ's ministry. In the Synoptics our Lord's ministry would seem to be comprised within the short space of one year. There is mention only of one visit to Jerusalem, at the Passover when He suffered; and nothing would lead us to suppose that three Passovers occurred during the course of His ministry. Whereas in John's Gospel three Passovers are recorded,¹ so that His ministry must have extended over two or three years. 3. They differ in the *events* narrated. There is little in common between the facts and discourses recorded in the Synoptics and those recorded in the Fourth Gospel. Excluding the narrative of our Lord's last visit to Jerusalem when He suffered, and the narrative of His resurrection, there are only three incidents which John relates in common with the other evangelists—the miraculous feeding of the multitude, the walking on the Sea of Galilee, and the anointing by Mary the sister of Lazarus. The miraculous birth of Christ, His baptism and temptation, the transfiguration, the institution of the Supper, the agony of Gethsemane, narrated by the Synoptists, are omitted in John's Gospel; whilst the cure of the man who was born blind, the healing of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, and the resurrection of Lazarus, mentioned by John, are omitted by the Synoptists. 4. They differ in the *character of the teaching or discourses of Jesus*. In the Synoptists the discourses of our Lord are chiefly given in parables: His teaching is brought down to the comprehension of the multitude. On the other hand, in the Fourth Gospel this mode of instruction is entirely wanting, except where there is an approach to it in the allegories of the Good Shepherd and of the Vine and its branches: the discourses are for the most part of a subjective and mystical character, relating to the deep things of God. These differences have been variously accounted for, and reasons have been assigned for them; but still they notably exist, and are sufficient to justify the distinction which has been made between the Fourth Gospel and the other three.

The Fathers have always recognised only four Gospels, namely, the three Synoptics, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and the Fourth Gospel, that of John. Thus Irenæus, in a well-

¹ John ii. 13, vi. 3, 4, xii. 1.

known passage, observes: "Since there are four regions of the world in which we live, and four principal winds, and since the Church is spread over all the world, and the gospel is the pillar and ground of the Church, it is fitting that it should have four pillars breathing out immortality and imparting life to men. From which it is evident the Word, the Creator of all men, and who sitteth above the cherubim, and is the Sustainer of all, has given us the gospel under four aspects, but bound together by one Spirit."¹ We have nothing to do with the fanciful illustrations of Irenæus, but only with the fact which he attests, that there are four Gospels, neither more nor less. These Gospels he afterwards declares to be those of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. No other Gospel was admitted among the sacred books of the early Christians: neither in the writings of the Fathers, nor in the manuscripts of the New Testament, is any other Gospel mentioned as having received the authority and sanction of the Church. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus, when referring to a passage taken from an apocryphal Gospel, says: "We do not find this statement in the four Gospels that have been handed down to us, but in that according to the Egyptians."²

But although there were only four Gospels received as of any authority by the Church at the close of the second century, namely, those which we now possess, yet numbers of non-canonical Gospels were written and disseminated chiefly in the second century.³ Most of them are of no importance, and are full of the most trivial and extravagant incidents. Three may be mentioned which for certain reasons have attained notoriety, but which, although frequently referred to by the Fathers, were never regarded as of any authority. The Gospel to the Hebrews (*Εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίων*) was used by the Ebionites, Nazarenes, and other Jewish-

¹ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 11. 8; Charteris' *Canonicity*, pp. 68, 69. Dr. Taylor supposes that this statement of Irenæus about the fourfold Gospel was anticipated by Hermas, A.D. 143.

² Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* iii. 13.

³ For a succinct account of the non-canonical Gospels, see Guericke, *Isagogik*, pp. 225 ff.; De Wette, *Einleitung*, §§ 63-74; translation, pp. 87-124; and Baring-Gould, *Lost and Hostile Gospels*.

Christian sects. It appears to have been closely related to the Gospel of Matthew, and will occupy our attention when we come to the special consideration of that Gospel. The Gospel of Marcion, an anti-Judaistic-Gnostic Gospel, constructed by Marcion for the propagation of his opinions, was the subject of much controversy toward the close of the second century, and was fiercely attacked by Tertullian.¹ It was closely related to the Gospel of Luke, which was mutilated and corrupted by Marcion from dogmatic considerations.² It will also occupy our attention when we consider the third Gospel. The Gospel of Peter, which has recently obtained additional interest from the discovery of an important fragment, and which is especially valuable, as that fragment contains an account of the trial and death of Christ.

The four Gospels, whilst they contain an account of the life and teaching of Christ, record only a small portion of the events of our Lord's life. There must have been numerous other works done by Christ, and numerous other discourses delivered by Him, which are not recorded; we have at best only selected deeds and discourses narrated. St. John expressly asserts the fragmentary nature of his Gospel: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book" (John xx. 30; comp. John xxi. 25). When we reflect on the fulness of such a life as that of Jesus, that He must have been ever actively engaged in His Father's business, and ever teaching the multitude in public and His disciples in private, we cannot but conclude that the accounts which we possess are of a most fragmentary nature. We have, for example, only a few incidents of the early life of Jesus before He attained to the age of thirty, when He entered upon His ministry. Luke only states one incident, His converse with the doctors in the temple (Luke ii. 41-51), when He was about twelve years of age. And after He commenced His public ministry, the Gospels themselves suggest the fragmentary nature of their accounts. By comparing the Fourth

¹ *Contra Marcion*.

² Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* i. 27. 2; Tertullian, *Contra Marcion*, iv. 2.

Gospel with the Synoptics we see what important events and discourses they have omitted.¹ In the accounts given us there is also a want of chronological order.² The Synoptists do not follow the same order in the events they record; so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to form a harmony of their accounts.

II. THE AUTHORS OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

The authors of the Synoptic Gospels were Matthew, Mark, and Luke; one an apostle, the other two disciples of the apostles. The author of the Fourth Gospel was "the beloved disciple." They wrote for different readers, as we shall see when we examine the Gospels *seriatim*. It has been held that St. Matthew's is the Gospel for the Jews; St. Mark's is the Gospel for the Romans; St. Luke's is the Gospel for the Greeks; St. John's is the Gospel for the universal Church.

These Gospels have been symbolised in accordance with the description of the cherubim in the prophecy of Ezekiel, and of the living creatures in the Apocalypse. In Ezekiel the cherubim are described as having each four faces—the face of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle (Ezek. i. 10); whilst in the Apocalypse the living creatures are thus described: "The first creature was like a lion, the second like a calf, the third like a man, the fourth like a flying eagle" (Rev. iv. 7). These symbols were, at a very early period, taken to represent the Gospels, and have been enshrined in Christian art. Irenæus thus explains these evangelical symbols. The first living creature, the lion, the symbol of strength, dominion, and royal power, represents the Gospel of John, relating the glorious generation of Christ from the Father, as the Word by whom all things were made. The second living creature, the ox, the symbol of sacrifice and priesthood, represents the Gospel of Luke, commencing

¹ See Alford's *Greek Testament*, vol. i. Prolegomena, ch. i. § v.; Archbishop Thomson in *Speaker's Commentary N.T.* vol. i. p. vii f.; Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 20.

² See Eichhorn's *Einleitung in das N.T.* § 136

with Zechariah the priest offering up a sacrifice to God. The third living creature, the man, the symbol of humanity, represents the Gospel of Matthew, proclaiming the human birth of Christ, and commencing with His generation as a man. The fourth living creature, the flying eagle, pointing to the gift of the Spirit, hovering with His wings over the Church, represents the Gospel of Mark, testifying to the prophetic Spirit which comes from above by referring to the prophet Isaiah.¹ So that, according to Irenæus, the lion is the symbol of John, the ox of Luke, the man of Matthew, and the eagle of Mark. These symbols are given in a different order by other Fathers. According to Athanasius, the man denotes Matthew, the ox Mark, the lion Luke, and the eagle John. Augustine assigns the lion to Matthew, the man to Mark, the ox to Luke, and the eagle to John. The symbolism now generally adopted and found in paintings and sculptures is that given us by Jerome. "The first form, that of a man," he observes, "denotes Matthew, because he at once begins to write of the man. The form of the lion denotes Mark, the voice of the roaring lion in the wilderness being heard in his Gospel. The third, that of the ox, represents Luke, who begins with the priest Zechariah. The fourth form, that of the eagle, represents John, who soars above as on eagle's wings, and speaks of the divine Word."² These analogies are, no doubt, fanciful, and of no importance in themselves, still they bear upon the question as to the number of Gospels regarded as canonical and authentic.

III. GENUINENESS OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

The external and internal evidences accrediting each of these Gospels will be examined when we consider them separately. Here we take the Synoptic Gospels together as a whole. We shall commence with the period when they were universally acknowledged by the Church, and trace the proofs of their existence backwards as near to their source as possible. Irenæus (A.D. 180) thus mentions the four

¹ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 11. 8; Kirchhofer's *Quellensammlung*, p. 40.

² Prologue to his *Comment. in Ev. Matthæi*.

Gospels: "Matthew issued a written Gospel among the Hebrews in their own dialect, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and laying the foundation of the Church. After their departure, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, did also hand down to us in writing what had been preached by Peter. Luke also, the companion of Paul, recorded in a book the gospel preached by him. Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also had leaned upon His breast, did himself publish a Gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia."¹ And we have already mentioned his reference to those four Gospels in assigning to each of them the prophetic symbols. The testimony of Irenæus is very important, as he ministered both in the East in Proconsular Asia, and in the West in Gaul. He was also the disciple of Polycarp, and accordingly only one step removed from the apostles. His testimony is corroborated by his contemporaries, Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian. Clemens Alexandrinus (A.D. 190) repeatedly alludes to the four Gospels. He states that the Gospels containing the genealogies were written first; and that the Gospel of St. John came last, that apostle writing at the instigation of his friends a spiritual Gospel.² In a passage already quoted, he speaks of the four Gospels committed to us.³ Tertullian (A.D. 200) is equally explicit: "Of the apostles, John and Matthew instil faith into us, whilst of apostolic men Luke and Mark afterwards renew it."⁴

These testimonies are not only of importance as the testimonies of these early Fathers, but as being the testimonies of the Churches which they represented; so that in Asia Minor, in Gaul, in Egypt, and in Roman Africa, we have the assurance that toward the close of the second century the four Gospels which we possess were in circulation, and accepted by the whole Christian Church as authoritative histories of the life of Christ. In the forcible words

¹ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 1. 1; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 8.

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 14.

³ Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* iii. 13.

⁴ Tertullian, *Contra Marcion*, iv. 2: Nobis fidem ex apostolis Joannes et Matthæus insinuant, ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant.

of Professor Norton: "About the end of the second century the Gospels were revered as sacred books by a community dispersed over the whole world, composed of men of different nations and languages. There were, to say the least, sixty thousand copies in existence.¹ They were read in the assemblies of Christians; they were continually quoted and appealed to, as of the highest authority; their reputation was as well established among believers from one end of the Roman Empire to the other as it is among Christians at the present day. The general reception of the Gospels as books of the highest authority at the end of the second century necessarily implies their celebrity at a much earlier period, and the long operation of causes sufficient to produce so remarkable a phenomenon."²

A remarkable fragment of the so-called Gospel of Peter has lately been brought to light. This Gospel, seldom alluded to by the Fathers, is adverted to by Eusebius.³ He mentions among the spurious writings ascribed to Peter, "the Gospel which bears his name."⁴ He also informs us that this Gospel is mentioned by Serapion, the bishop of Antioch (A.D. 190), as in use in the church of Rhossus in his diocese, and that it was rejected by him on account of the heretical doctrines which it contained. At first the bishop permitted it to be read, because, not having seen it, he was ignorant of its erroneous teaching; but this having been brought to his knowledge, he forbade its use: "Having obtained this Gospel from others who have studied it diligently, namely, from the successors of those who first used it, whom we call Docetæ, we have read it through, and find many things in accordance with the true doctrine of the

¹ Professor Norton bases this calculation on the fact that at the end of the second century there would be three millions of believers, anxious to obtain copies of the Gospels; and supposing one copy for every fifty Christians, this would give sixty thousand copies. The number is somewhat exaggerated, but it must have been very great. We have very little information as to the cost of books in ancient times.

² Norton, *The Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 123. See also pp. 31, 32.

³ Mentioned also by Origen, *Ad Matth.* xiii. 54.

⁴ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 3.

Saviour, but some things added to that doctrine which we have pointed out to you further on.”¹ In 1886 a fragment was discovered in a tomb near the town of Akhman, the Panopolis of Strabo, in Egypt, containing an account of the sufferings and resurrection of Christ, which has with extreme probability been supposed to be a part of this Gospel.² It completely agrees with the description given by Serapion, being in general accordance with the orthodox doctrine of Christ, but tinged with Docetism; as, for example, it states that when Christ hung upon the cross He was free from pain, and that He was deserted by the Power at the moment of His death.³ The latest date that can be assigned to it is A.D. 170, having been referred to by Serapion in A.D. 190; probably it belongs to the middle of the second century.⁴ Some imagine that it may possibly have been one of the documents referred to by Luke in his Gospel; but this is extremely improbable, as from the nature of its contents it is to be classed among the spurious Gospels. The fragment we possess is taken from our Gospels with several additions. The trial of Jesus is transferred from Pilate to Herod. There are references in it to all the Synoptic Gospels; as, for example, it is stated that Pilate washed his hands, which is mentioned only in Matthew’s Gospel; that our Lord was tried before Herod, to which Luke only alludes; and although no incident is recorded peculiar to Mark, yet this is accounted for by the similarity of this Gospel to the other two. In this fragment, then, we have a proof that the Synoptic Gospels were current in the Church before A.D. 170.⁵

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 12. See also Jones *On the Canon*, vol. i. pp. 284–290.

² Along with this fragment of the Gospel of Peter were found portions of the Book of Enoch and the Apocalypse of Peter.

³ Instead of the evangelic words, “My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?” the Gospel of Peter has, “My power, my power, Thou hast left me,”—*ἡ δύναμις μου, ἡ δύναμις μου κατέλειψας με*.

⁴ Zahn fixes the date about A.D. 140 or 150; Sanday, hardly later than the end of the first quarter of the second century; Harnack, about A.D. 115. It has been supposed that Justin makes use of this Gospel. Sanday’s *Bampton Lectures*, p. 310.

⁵ See *The Akhman Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter*, by Professor Swete, 1893; *The Gospel according to Peter*, two lectures by J.

The next testimony to which we advert is the Muratorian Canon. This celebrated and valuable fragment, mutilated both at the beginning and at the end, was discovered in the Ambrosian Library in Milan, and first published by Muratori in 1740. It professes to have been written by a contemporary of Pius, bishop of Rome, and is therefore to be placed about the year A.D. 160. Its genuineness has been generally acknowledged. Owing to its mutilation, the first two Gospels are not named; but there is no doubt that the canon recognised the four Gospels, as the Gospel of Luke is mentioned as the third, and the Gospel of John as the fourth; and we may therefore infer that the first and second Gospels were mentioned in that part of the canon which is wanting.¹

Tatian (A.D. 160) is another important witness to the existence of the Synoptic Gospels in the middle of the second century. He was, as he himself informs us, born in the land of Assyria, and was a disciple of Justin Martyr. After the death of Justin he fell into heresy, having adopted the errors of the Encratites, a Gnostic sect of an ascetic nature, related to Marcion.² His Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, was his great work, and was probably written before his lapse into heresy.³ Eusebius informs us that "Tatian composed a certain combination and collection of the Gospels, to which he gave the name Diatessaron, and which is current

Armitage Robinson and M. R. James; *Bruchstücke des Evangelium und der Apocalypse des Petrus*, by Harnack, 1893; *Das Evangelium des Petrus*, by Zahn, 1893; Gebhart, *Das Evangelium und die Apocalypse Petrus*; Schubert, *Die Composition der pseudopetrinischen Evangelien-Fragmente*; Dr. Salmon's (of Dublin) *Introduction to the N.T.*, 7th edition, Appendix, Note III., The Gospel of Peter, pp. 581-589; *The Newly-Discovered Gospel of St. Peter*, by J. Rendel Harris, 1893.

¹ The fullest account of the Muratorian canon is given by Tregelles in his "*Canon Muratorianus*, the earliest catalogue of the books of the New Testament, edited with notes, and a facsimile of the MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan." A transcript of it is given by Kirchhofer in his *Quellen-sammlung*, pp. 1, 2; by Westcott in his *Canon of the New Testament*, pp. 466-480; and by Dr. Charteris in his *Canonicity*, pp. 3-8.

² Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* i. 28. 1, iii. 23. 8.

³ Besides the Diatessaron, Tatian wrote an "Address to the Greeks," entitled, *Τατιανουῦ πρὸς Ἕλληνας*, a work of great merit.

with some persons even in the present day.”¹ And Epiphanius says: “The Diatessaron Gospel is said to have been composed by Tatian.”² This harmony of the Gospels was in great repute in the fifth century among the Syrian Churches. Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus (A.D. 420), informs us that “Tatian composed the Gospel which is called the Diatessaron, omitting the genealogies and whatever other passages show that our Lord was born of the seed of David according to the flesh;” and he tells us that in his diocese there were more than two hundred copies of it.³ Dionysius Bar-Salibi, an Armenian bishop of the twelfth century, informs us that Ephræm Syrus (A.D. 370) wrote a commentary upon it.⁴ Its existence was called in question, and it was asserted that Tatian’s Diatessaron was not a harmony of the four Gospels, but was to be ranked among the uncanonised or spurious Gospels.⁵ This assertion has been recently proved to be unfounded. The commentary of Ephræm Syrus has been discovered in an Armenian version in the Armenian convent near Venice, in two manuscripts, bearing the date A.D. 1195, and agreeing with what we know of Tatian’s harmony; and a Latin translation of it by Aucher, one of the Armenian monks, was corrected and published by Mœsinger in 1876.⁶ But more recently still two manuscripts have been discovered by Professor Agostino Ciasca, the one in the Vatican and the other in the Borgian Museum, containing Arabic translations of the Diatessaron itself.⁷ A note attached

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 29.

² Epiphanius, *Hæc.* xlv. 1.

³ Theodoret, *Hæc. Fab.* i. 20, ii. 158 ff. Theodoret regarded the Diatessaron with prejudice. He says that he collected and put away all the copies and substituted the Gospels of the four evangelists in their stead. He is mistaken in asserting that Tatian purposely omitted passages which referred to Christ being born of the seed of David.

⁴ Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* ii. p. 158 ff.

⁵ *Supernatural Religion*, vol. ii. p. 152 ff.

⁶ *Evangelii concordantis expositio facta a Sancto Ephræmo Doctore Syro. In Latinum translata a J. B. Aucher. Edidit Mœsinger. Venetiis, 1876.* See on the discovery of Ephræm’s commentary on Tatian’s Diatessaron two interesting articles by Professor Wace in the *Expositor* for 1882, and Zahn’s *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, p. 240 ff.

⁷ At the end of the Vatican MS. is written: “Here endeth by the help of God the sacred Gospel which Tatian collected out of the four Gospels,

to each asserts that it is Tatian's Diatessaron. A translation was published by Ciasca in 1888, based upon the two Arabic manuscripts, accompanied by introductory explanations.¹ An English translation has been made by the Rev. J. Hamlyn Hill (1894), with an important introduction and several appendices.² It has also been proved that the Codex Fuldensis, a Latin version of the New Testament belonging to the sixth century in the form of a harmony, is probably based on the Diatessaron.³ The importance of this discovery is very great. There is no doubt whatever that we have here manuscripts of the translation of the Diatessaron; and accordingly it is now demonstrated that Tatian composed a harmony of the four canonical Gospels.⁴ He used our Gospels only: there is no trace of any non-canonical Gospels. The difference is but slight between it and our Gospels: there are few additions and omissions. The most important omissions are the genealogies of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, as Theodoret testifies, and as is found to be the case in the Borgian Arabic manuscript.⁵ It is very valuable as a harmony, and, indeed, can bear a comparison with recent harmonies.⁶ It is not improbable that the Diatessaron was written, as Professor Zahn surmises, in Syriac, and that the version which was employed was the Curetonian version.⁷ This will account for and which is commonly called the Diatessaron"; and at the beginning of the Borgian MS.: "With the assistance of the Most High God we begin to translate the holy Gospel entitled the Diatessaron, which Tatian, a Greek, compiled out of the four Gospels."

¹ *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmonia Arabice*, 1888.

² "The earliest life of Christ ever compiled from the Four Gospels, being the Diatessaron of Tatian, literally transcribed from the Arabic Version, and containing the Four Gospels woven in one story," by the Rev. J. Hamlyn Hill. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1894. The translation is from the Latin translation of the Arabic versions by Ciasca compared with the Arabic.

³ See article by H. Wace in *Expositor* for 1881.

⁴ See Rendel Harris' *Diatessaron of Tatian*; Hemphill's *Diatessaron*.

⁵ The Vatican MS. contains the genealogies, but in the Borgian MS. they are absent from the body of the work, and are inserted in an Appendix.

⁶ See Hamlyn Hill's translation, and the Appendices attached to it. The variations between the Diatessaron and the Gospels are wonderfully small.

⁷ Zahn's *Tatian's Diatessaron*, pp. 18, 229. Zahn, before the discovery of the Arabic MSS., attempted a reconstruction of Tatian's works, chiefly from Ephræm's commentary.

the comparative ignorance of it in the Latin and Greek Churches, and for its use in the Syriac Churches. It was looked upon with suspicion by the early Fathers, on account of the heretical views of the author.¹

Next in order is the important testimony of Justin Martyr (A.D. 150). The extant works of Justin consist of two Apologies and a dialogue with Trypho the Jew. The Apologies were addressed to Antoninus Pius, and are assigned to the middle of the second century. In them he speaks frequently of the Memoirs or Memorabilia of the Apostles. The Gospels are not named, but there are various quotations from them; and the incidents of our Lord's life mentioned by Justin are in accordance with them. It is true that in the quotations the precise words are not given; Justin appears to have quoted from memory; but that is also the case with his quotations from the Old Testament. Justin informs us that the Memoirs of the Apostles were read publicly in the churches, and were regarded with as much reverence as the writings of the prophets. The quotations and references to our Gospels are exceedingly numerous; and whatever dubiety there may be as regards St. John's Gospel,² there is no doubt whatever that the Synoptic Gospels are repeatedly quoted. Thus Matthew is directly quoted in these words: "Christ when on earth told those who said that Elias would come before Christ, Elias will indeed come and restore all things; but I say unto you that Elias came already, and they knew him not, but did to him all that they listed. And it is written, Then understood the disciples that He spoke to them of John the Baptist"³ (Matt. xvii. 13); Mark is directly quoted in the following words: "It is said that He changed the name of one of the apostles to Peter; and it is written in the Memoirs of Him that He changed the name of other two brothers, the sons of

¹ See an elaborate article on Tatian by Professor Fuller of King's College, London, in Smith's *Dictionary of Biography*, and another by Müller in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. xv. pp. 208 ff.

² That Justin used the Gospel of John is now generally admitted. See Ezra Abbot's work on the *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*.

³ *Dial.* ch. xlix.

Zebedee, to Boanerges, which means the sons of thunder"¹ (Mark iii. 16, 17); and Luke is directly quoted in these words: "For when Christ was giving up His spirit on the cross, He said, Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit, as I have learned from the Memoirs"² (Luke xxiii. 46). It is true that there are one or two incidents mentioned by Justin which are not recorded in our Gospels, and which have given rise to the assertion that Justin did not quote from the Synoptics, but from some uncanonical Gospel.³ Thus Justin says that "Christ being regarded as a worker in wood, did make while among men ploughs and yokes, thus setting before them symbols of righteousness, and teaching them an active life;"⁴ and that "when Jesus came to Jordan, where John was baptizing, upon His entering the water a fire was kindled in the Jordan."⁵ But these extra-canonical incidents are few, and may be accounted for either as inferences which Justin drew from the statements of the evangelists, or as traditions of the life of Jesus which at that early period survived in the Church. As Paley remarks: "In all Justin's works, from which might be extracted almost a complete life of Christ, there are but two instances in which he refers to anything as said or done by Christ which is not related concerning Him in the present Gospels; which shows that these Gospels, and these alone, were the authorities from which the Christians of that day drew the information on which they depended."⁶

We now come to the important and much controverted statement of Papias (A.D. 120). Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, may well be regarded as an apostolic Father, as he was either, along with Polycarp, a disciple of the Apostle John,⁷ or a disciple of John the Presbyter.⁸ He

¹ *Dial.* ch. cvi.

² *Dial.* ch. cv.

³ Thus De Wette mentions among the uncanonical Gospels the Gospel of Justin, §§ 66, 67.

⁴ *Dial. cum Tryph.* ch. lxxxviii.

⁵ *Idem.*

⁶ Paley's *Evidences of Christianity*, pt. i. ch. ix. § 1.

⁷ Irenæus, *Adv. Hæc.* v. 33. 4.

⁸ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39. It is a question whether John the Presbyter ever existed, or whether this is merely another name for

professes to have conversed with those who were intimate with several of the apostles. He was a voluminous writer, his chief work being an exposition of the discourses of our Lord (*λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*); but only a few fragments of his works remain preserved by Eusebius.¹ We have the following important testimony to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark: "John the Presbyter also said, Mark having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, though not indeed in order, whatsoever he remembered of the things said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed Him; but afterward, as is said, he followed Peter, who adapted his teaching to the needs of his hearers, but with no intention of giving a connected account of the Lord's discourses, so that Mark committed no error, while he thus wrote some things as he remembered them. For he was careful of one thing, not to omit any of the things which he had heard, and not to state any of them falsely. These things are related by Papias concerning Mark. Concerning Matthew he writes as follows: Matthew composed his discourses (*λόγια*) in the Hebrew language, and everyone interpreted them as he was able."² This statement will, in the course of our Introduction, frequently occupy our attention; much has been made of it in the question regarding the origin of the Synoptic Gospels. It proves

John the apostle. Gloag's *Introduction to the Johannine Writings*, pp. 268-270.

¹ On the fragments from Papias, see Holtzmann's *Synopt. Evangel.* pp. 248 ff.; Weizsäcker, *Untersuch. über d. evang. Geschichte*; Steitz in Herzog's *Encykl.* 1st ed. vol. xi. pp. 79 f.

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39. The words of Papias are so very important, and will be so often referred to, that we give this quotation from Eusebius in full: *Καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε· Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενομένος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν· οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. Οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δέ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρω, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων, ὥστε οὐδὲν ἡμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἕνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. Ἐνὸς γὰρ ἐποίησατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψεύσασθαι τι ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἰστίρηται τῷ Παπία περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται· Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἡδύνατο ἕκαστος.*

that in the time of Papias writings did exist which bore the names of the first two evangelists, Matthew and Mark.¹

We do not carry our investigation further back. In the writings of the apostolic Fathers there are allusions more or less distinct to the Synoptic Gospels, and especially in the *Didaché* there is a distinct correspondence to the Sermon on the Mount; but as such evidence relates to particular Gospels rather than to the Synoptic Gospels collectively, it will be considered in its proper place.

Besides these quotations from the Fathers, there is also the evidence derived from the ancient versions, especially the old Latin and the Syriac. The old Latin (*Vetus Latina*) must have existed about A.D. 170, because it is quoted and used by Tertullian and in the Latin translation of Irenæus. It was made, not for the use of the Church of Rome, which was at first Greek, but for the Christians in the Roman province of Africa, of which Carthage was the capital. All the manuscripts contain the four Gospels. The Syriac is probably the earliest version, as it would be the first required; and the probability is that Tatian made use of it in the composition of his *Diatessaron*. There are good reasons for fixing its date about the middle of the second century (A.D. 150).² Although some of the books of Scripture are omitted, yet in all the Syriac manuscripts the four Gospels are found. Some suppose that the Peshito, the well-known Syriac version, is not the original form of the Syriac, but a revised version from an older form, of which the

¹ It has been asserted that Papias does not here speak of our Gospels, but of an original Mark (Ur-Marcus) and an original Matthew (Ur-Matthæus), from which our Gospels were derived; or else he mentions two distinct documents, "the teaching of Peter," as given by Mark, and "the logia of Matthew," which formed the chief sources of the Synoptic Gospels. These opinions will afterwards form the subject of discussion. Others assert that there is no reason to suppose that Papias does not refer to our canonical Gospels then existing. See Lightfoot's *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, pp. 163-168. Papias does not refer to Luke; and, of course, his testimony has no bearing upon the genuineness of that Gospel.

² "There is no sufficient reason," observes Westcott, "to desert the opinion, which has obtained the sanction of the most competent scholars, that its formation is to be fixed within the first half of the second century." Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 211.

Curetonian manuscript is a fragment; and that the Peshito bears the same relation to the ancient Syriac as the Vulgate does to the old Latin.¹

Such is the evidence for the genuineness of the Synoptic Gospels as a whole. No classical writing of the ancients has the same amount of testimony. When we consider the universal acceptance of these Gospels toward the close of the second century, the reverence shown to them as sacred books, their wide distribution throughout all the provinces of the Roman Empire, the explicit testimony of Justin Martyr to them in the middle of that century, their translation into the Latin and Syriac languages, we cannot fail to be convinced that they are the genuine records of the life of Christ. The hypothesis that they were inventions is inadmissible in regard to documents written so soon after the events they purport to record, and they were of an importance too vital to those to whom they were addressed, to be received on insufficient evidence. The theory of Strauss, that the Gospels contain myths and legends, which half a century ago made such a noise, and was regarded as a formidable objection, is now generally discarded as utterly baseless; the time between the events recorded and the publication of these Gospels is too short to admit of such a prolific growth of legends or myths.² And so, also, the more acute and ingenious theory of Baur, that the Gospels and other books of Scripture were written with a tendency-design, either as statements of Pauline or of Petrine Christianity, or with a view to mediate between two antagonistic systems, has now few adherents.³ Hilgenfeld and Holsten, and perhaps we may also include Pfleiderer, are almost the only real representatives of the Tübingen school, and yet their opinions differ materially from

¹ See on this point Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament*, vol. ii. p. 84. The Syriac version, found by Mrs. Lewis in 1893 in the monastery of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai, is supposed to be a variation of the Curetonian version.

² Row's *Jesus of the Evangelists*, ch. xvi.; Fairbairn's *Christ of Modern History*, pp. 232-242.

³ According to Baur, Matthew contained Petrine and Luke Pauline Christianity; whilst Mark was conciliatory, and John contained the full reconciliation of Petrine and Pauline Christianity in the Catholic Church.

those of Baur. Even according to their own admission such tendency-designs are hardly recognisable in the Synoptic Gospels; because, before these Gospels were written, the antagonism of Pauline and Petrine Christianity had been smoothed down, and the Gospels were composed chiefly with a conciliatory design. In short, we are led from all evidence, external as well as internal, to accept the Synoptic Gospels as credible records of the deeds and words of Christ.¹ There are certainly great, perhaps insoluble, difficulties connected with their origin; but these, as we shall afterwards see, are not sufficient to shake our confidence in the credibility of the history.

IV. RELATION OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS TO EACH OTHER.

Until recent times it has been generally supposed that the three Synoptic Gospels were wholly independent narratives; that the evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, infallibly guided by the Spirit of God, each made a selection of the incidents of our Lord's life and of His discourses, without having seen the writings of the other two, or without having recourse to any common oral tradition or written document. Such an opinion, however, has not been confirmed by an examination of their contents. A perusal of the harmony of these Gospels, whether drawn up in English or in Greek, and especially an attentive consideration of the coincidences between them, both in the events recorded and in the language employed, must convince every unprejudiced reader that common materials must have been used in their construction, that absolute independence is by the facts of the case excluded, and that to a large extent there was a

¹ "We ought," observes Holtzmann, "at least with regard to the Synoptic Gospels, to maintain definitely that they contain as their kernel nothing else than the genuine, and in the chief features clearly recognisable portrait of Jesus of Nazareth." Holtzmann's *Kommentar: die Synoptiker*, p. 14. "I look," says Goethe, "upon the four Gospels as thoroughly genuine; for there is in them a reflection of a greatness which emanated from the person of Jesus, and which was of as divine a kind as ever was seen upon earth." *Conversations of Goethe with Eckermann*, p. 567. Bohn edition.

source or sources common to all three. But, along with these coincidences, there are points of difference, especially in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which prove that the writers of these two Gospels must on these points have drawn their information from different sources. The Synoptic problem—which is the great question at present in the criticism of the New Testament—has to take account of these coincidences and differences, and to explain them by reference to the source or sources of the Gospels themselves. It is proved that there is a dependence between them, and the question is, What is the original basis of this dependence? But before we attempt to answer this question, and to consider the different theories that have been advanced, or to suggest any probable solution, it is essential that we should understand the conditions of the problem.

1. *Points of agreement.*—The Synoptic Gospels agree as to the *locality* of our Lord's ministry. They narrate chiefly the ministry in Galilee, omitting the ministry in Judæa, until the period of our Lord's passion; they are all Galilean Gospels; the references to the earlier Judæan ministry are only indirect and inferential. They agree as to the *duration* of the ministry. There is only mention of one Passover, that at which our Lord suffered; and, were it not for the information afforded in John's Gospel, we might be led to infer that our Lord's ministry did not extend beyond one year. They agree as to the *order* of the ministry. Although there is a considerable variation in the chronological order of particular incidents, yet the general order, in its main features, is the same. In their accounts of Christ's public ministry they all commence with the preaching of the Baptist and the baptism and temptation of Christ, relate the ministry of Galilee in a somewhat similar order, mention the great crises that occurred in the middle of that ministry,—the confession of the Messiahship of Jesus by the disciples, and the Transfiguration,—and close their narratives by an account of our Lord's death and resurrection. They agree, to a large extent, in the *incidents recorded*. Although the works and discourses of Jesus must have been far more numerous than those related, as the Gospel of John proves, yet more than a half of the incidents

mentioned in the Synoptics are the same in all three. "If," observes Holtzmann, "Jesus doubtless delivered unrecorded sayings, how is it that the narrators have limited themselves to the same selection? If Jesus healed so many sick, why do all three record almost only the same examples? If He pronounces a woe on Chorazin and Bethsaida, as Matthew and Luke record, how is it that neither of these evangelists mention the conduct which merited such a denunciation?"¹

But there is not merely a similarity in the selection of incidents and discourses, but what is even more remarkable, there is a similarity in the language in which these incidents and discourses are expressed. In the examination of this point we are greatly assisted by Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, a work of immense labour and utility.²

1. *The threefold narrative*.—As already observed, there is a remarkable sameness in the incidents recorded by all the three Synoptists. The following sections are common to all three:—

Ministry of the Baptist, Matt. iii. 1–12; Mark i. 2–8; Luke iii. 1–18.

Baptism of Christ, Matt. iii. 13–17; Mark i. 9–11; Luke iii. 21, 22.

Temptation of Christ, Matt. iv. 1–11; Mark i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1–13.

Call of the four apostles, Matt. iv. 18–22; Mark i. 16–19; Luke v. 1, 2, 9–11.

¹ Holtzmann's *Einleitung*, p. 331. See also Salmon's *Introduction to the N.T.* p. 139: "The Synoptic Gospels," he observes, "agree in the main in their selection of facts—all travelling over nearly the same ground, though independent narrators would be sure to have differed a good deal in their choice of subjects for narration out of a public life of three years. In point of fact, we find exactly such a difference between the life of our Lord as related by St. John and by the Synoptics."

² *Synopticon*, an exposition of the common matter of the Synoptic Gospels, by W. G. Rushbrooke, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co., 1887. Rushbrooke first gives us what he calls "the triple tradition of the Synoptics," in parallel columns, taking the Gospel of Mark as the type, marking in red colour the words in which all three agree; and then in an appendix the twofold edition of Matthew and Luke, with distinctive types marking their agreements and differences, and lastly, the single tradition of Matthew and Luke.

Cure of Peter's mother-in-law, Matt. viii. 14-17; Mark i. 29-34; Luke iv. 38-43.

Cleansing of the leper, Matt. viii. 1-4; Mark i. 40-45; Luke v. 12-16.

Cure of the paralytic man, Matt. ix. 1-8; Mark ii. 1-12; Luke v. 17-26.

Call of Matthew, Matt. ix. 9-17; Mark ii. 13-22; Luke v. 27-39.

Our Lord's discourse on the Sabbath, Matt. xii. 1-8; Mark ii. 23-28; Luke vi. 1-5.

Cure of the man with the withered hand, Matt. xii. 9-15; Mark iii. 1-6; Luke vi. 6-11.

Confutation of the statement that Christ cast out devils through Beelzebub, Matt. xii. 22-45; Mark iii. 20-30; Luke xi. 14-23.

Parable of the Sower, Matt. xiii. 1-23; Mark iv. 1-20; Luke viii. 4-15.

Stilling of the tempest, Matt. viii. 18-27; Mark iv. 35-41; Luke viii. 22-25.

Cure of the Gadarene demoniac, Matt. viii. 28-34; Mark v. 1-20; Luke viii. 26-39.

Raising of the daughter of Jairus, Matt. ix. 18-26; Mark v. 21-43; Luke viii. 40-56.

Mission of the twelve, Matt. x. 1-15; Mark vi. 7-13; Luke ix. 1-6.

Feeding of the five thousand, Matt. xiv. 13-21; Mark vi. 31-44; Luke ix. 10-17.

Confession of the apostles that Jesus is the Messiah, Matt. xvi. 13-28; Mark viii. 27-33; Luke ix. 18-27.

The transfiguration, Matt. xvii. 1-10; Mark ix. 2-9; Luke ix. 28-36.

Cure of the demoniac boy, Matt. xvii. 14-21; Mark ix. 14-29; Luke ix. 37-43.

Dispute among the disciples concerning precedence, Matt. xviii. 1-5; Mark ix. 33-37; Luke ix. 46-48.

Blessing pronounced on children, Matt. xix. 13-15; Mark x. 13-16; Luke xviii. 15-17.

Our Lord's address to the rich ruler, Matt. xix. 16-30; Mark x. 17-31; Luke xviii. 18-30.

Cure of the blind man at Jericho, Matt. xx. 29-34 ; Mark x. 46-52 ; Luke xviii. 35-43.

Entrance into Jerusalem, Matt. xxi. 1-11 ; Mark xi. 1-11 ; Luke xix. 29-44.

Expulsion of the buyers and sellers from the temple, Matt. xxi. 12-14 ; Mark xi. 15-17 ; Luke xix. 45, 46.

Parable of the Vineyard, Matt. xxi. 33-46 ; Mark xii. 1-12 ; Luke xx. 9-19.

Refutation of the Sadducees, Matt. xxii. 15-33 ; Mark xii. 18-34 ; Luke xx. 20-40.

Our Lord's appeal to Ps. cx., Matt. xxii. 41-46 ; Mark xii. 35-37 ; Luke xx. 41-45.

Prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, Matt. xxiv. 1-36 ; Mark xiii. 1-36 ; Luke xxi. 5-36.

Institution of the supper, Matt. xxvi. 17-29 ; Mark xiv. 17-26 ; Luke xxii. 14-23.

The agony in Gethsemane, Matt. xxvi. 30-46 ; Mark xiv. 26-42 ; Luke xxii. 39-46.

Arrest of Christ, Matt. xxvi. 47-58 ; Mark xiv. 43-54 ; Luke xxii. 47-58.

Denial of Peter, Matt. xxvi. 69-73 ; Mark xiv. 66-72 ; Luke xxii. 54-62.

Narrative of the Passion, Matt. xxvii. ; Mark xv. ; Luke xxiii.

Narrative of the Resurrection, Matt. xxviii. ; Mark xvi. ; Luke xxiv.

In the narration of these incidents there is frequently a close identity of language. We give two examples in the words of the Revised Version, in which the nature of the resemblance may be as clearly seen as in the Greek. The first example is the words spoken by Jesus to the Pharisees when He cured the paralytic man.

MATT. ix. 4-8.

Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts ? For whether is easier, to say, Thy sins are forgiven ; or to say, Arise, and walk ? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth

MARK ii. 8-11.

Why reason ye these things in your hearts ? Whether is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven ; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk ? But that ye may

LUKE v. 22-26.

What reason ye in your hearts ? Whether is easier, to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee ; or to say, Arise, and walk ? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth

to forgive sins (then saith He to the sick of the palsy), Arise, and take up thy bed, and go unto thy house.	know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (He saith to the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house.	to forgive sins (He said unto him that was palsied), I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go unto thy house.
--	---	--

The other example is taken from our Lord's prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem.

MATT. xxiv. 32-35.

Now from the fig tree learn her parable : when her branch is now become tender, and putteth forth its leaves, ye know that summer is nigh ; even so ye also, when ye see all these things, know ye that He is nigh, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall pass away : but my words shall not pass away.

MARK xiii. 28-31.

Now from the fig tree learn her parable : when her branch is now become tender, and putteth forth its leaves, ye know that summer is nigh ; even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that He is nigh, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall pass away : but my words shall not pass away.

LUKE xxi. 29-33.

Behold the fig tree, and all the trees : when they now shoot forth, ye see it and know of your own selves that the summer is now nigh. Even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all things be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall pass away : but my words shall not pass away.

But these passages are only examples of a similarity of language, approaching to identity, which pervades the accounts of the three evangelists. Numerous other examples might be given : as the call of Matthew (Matt. ix. 9-17 ; Mark ii. 13-22 ; Luke v. 27-39), the parable of the Sower (Matt. xiii. 1-34 ; Mark iv. 1-34 ; Luke viii. 4-18), the stilling of the storm and the cure of the Gadarene demoniac (Matt. viii. 18-34 ; Mark iv. 35-41, v. 1-20 ; Luke viii. 22-39), the feeding of the four thousand (Matt. xiv. 13-21 ; Mark vi. 30-44 ; Luke ix. 10-17), the transfiguration and the cure of the demoniac boy (Matt. xvii. 1-21 ; Mark ix. 2-8, 14-29 ; Luke ix. 28-43), and the entrance into Jerusalem (Matt. xxi. 1-11 ; Mark xi. 1-10 ; Luke xix. 29-44).

Such similarities, not merely of incident but of expression, with only slight variations, would in other writings demon-

strate an inherent dependence.¹ If we heard three discourses which although in some respects dissimilar, yet were interwoven with passages almost identical, we would rightly infer that in these passages the preachers copied from each other, or that they plagiarised from the same discourse. If, in the writings of the Fathers, we found passages almost identical with those contained in the Epistles of St. Paul, we should be justified in inferring that there was a distinct reference to the writings of that apostle. Three eye-witnesses in recording the same facts, if their reports were independent of each other, would not express themselves in the same words. And the case is still stronger if the general opinion be correct, that our Lord spoke, not in Greek, but in Aramaic,² and that consequently the words of His discourses given us by the evangelists are translations; and it is highly improbable that in translating they would use precisely the same words. We are then constrained to adopt one or other of three suppositions: either that the evangelists copied from each other; or that they all had recourse to some common document; or that there was an oral or traditional Gospel—a collection of the sayings of Christ and of the incidents in His life which had in many points become stereotyped. These suppositions are reserved for after consideration.

The twofold narrative.—But there is not only a threefold narrative,—an agreement of all three evangelists in the incidents recorded, and often almost an identity of language,—but there is a twofold narrative, where two of the evangelists agree—Matthew and Mark, Mark and Luke, and Matthew and Luke.

The principal incidents and discourses common to Matthew and Mark and not found in Luke are:—

The mode of the Baptist's martyrdom, Matt. xiv. 1–12; Mark vi. 14–29.

Our Lord's walking on the water, Matt. xiv. 22–33; Mark vi. 45–51.

¹ "The verbal and material agreement," observes Archbishop Thomson, of the first three evangelists "is such as does not occur in any other authors who have written independently of one another."

² The ordinary language of our Lord and His apostles will afterwards form the subject of discussion.

The discourse on the traditions of the elders, Matt. xv. 1-20; Mark vii. 1-23.

The cure of the daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman, Matt. xv. 21-28; Mark vii. 24-30.

Feeding of the four thousand, Matt. xv. 32-38; Mark viii. 1-9.

Discussion on the Mosaic law concerning divorce, Matt. xix. 3-10; Mark x. 2-11.

Petition of the sons of Zebedee and their mother, Matt. xx. 20-28; Mark x. 35-45.

The withering of the fig tree, Matt. xxi. 18-22; Mark xi. 13, 14, 20.

The anointing of our Lord before His passion,¹ Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark xiv. 3-9.

The utterance of Jesus on the cross, My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me? Matt. xxvii. 46-49; Mark xv. 34, 35.

Here also there is often a close identity of language. We take as an example the anointing of our Lord before His passion, an incident which is also recorded, but in very different language, by St. John.

MATT. xxvi. 6-13.

Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, there came unto Him a woman having an alabaster cruse of exceeding precious ointment, and she poured it upon His head, as He sat at meat. But when the disciples saw it, they had indignation, saying, To what purpose is this waste? For this ointment might have been sold for much, and given to the poor. But Jesus perceiving it, said unto them, Why trouble ye the woman? for she hath wrought a good work upon me. For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always. For in that she poured this ointment upon my body, she did it to prepare me for burial. Verily I say

MARK xiv. 3-19.

And while He was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, as He sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster cruse of ointment of spikenard very costly; and she brake the cruse, and poured it over His head. But there were some that had indignation among themselves, saying, To what purpose hath this waste of the ointment been made? For this ointment might have been sold for above three hundred pence, and given to the poor. And they murmured against her. But Jesus said, Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work on me. For ye have the poor always with you, and whensoever ye will ye can do them

¹ We consider this anointing different from that by the sinful woman mentioned in Luke's Gospel.

<p>unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.</p>	<p>good : but me ye have not always. She hath done what she could ; she hath anointed my body aforehand for the burying. And verily I say unto you, Wheresoever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.</p>
---	---

This example is perhaps not so convincing an argument in favour of a common source, as it is just possible that two witnesses might have expressed themselves in terms somewhat similar ; but compare with it the narrative in St. John's Gospel, where the difference is much more marked.

The incidents common to Mark and Luke, but omitted by Matthew, are not numerous. They are as follows—

The casting out of an unclean spirit, Mark i. 23–28 ; Luke iv. 33–37.

Declaration of our Lord that He must preach the gospel in other places, Mark i. 35–38 ; Luke iv. 42, 43.

The apostles forbidding a man to cast out devils in Christ's name, Mark ix. 38–40 ; Luke ix. 49, 50.

The incident of the widow's mite, Mark xii. 41–44 ; Luke xxi. 1–4.

We take this last as an example of identity of language—

MARK xii. 43, 44.

Verily I say unto you, This poor widow cast in more than all they which are casting into the treasury : for they all did cast in of their superfluity ; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, *even* all her living.

LUKE xxi. 3, 4.

Of a truth I say unto you, This poor widow cast in more than they all : for all these did of their superfluity cast in unto the gifts : but she of her want did cast in all the living that she had.

The coincidences in the twofold narrative of Matthew and Luke are still more remarkable. These two evangelists agree in recording the following particulars :—

Address of the Baptist to the scribes and Pharisees, Matt. iii. 8–10 ; Luke iii. 8, 9.

Threelfold temptation of our Lord, Matt. iv. 1–11 ; Luke iv. 1–13.

Cure of the centurion's servant, Matt. viii. 5–13 ; Luke vii. 1–10.

Our Lord's address to those who professed a desire to follow Him, Matt. viii. 19-22; Luke ix. 57-60.

His exhortations to His disciples, Matt. x. 5-16, 24-26; Luke x. 1-12, xii. 2-9, 51-53.

Mission of the disciples of the Baptist to Christ, Matt. xi. 2-19; Luke vii. 18-35.

The woe pronounced on the cities of Galilee, Matt. xi. 20-24; Luke x. 12-15.

The gospel hid from the wise and prudent, Matt. xi. 25-27; Luke x. 21, 22.

Our Lord's answer to the Pharisees when they asked of Him a sign from heaven, Matt. xii. 38-45; Luke xi. 29-32.

The parable of the Leaven, Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 20, 21.

The parable of the Lost Sheep, Matt. xviii. 12-14; Luke xv. 3-7.

The parable of the Marriage Feast, Matt. xxii. 1-10; Luke xiv. 15-24.

The woe pronounced on the Pharisees, Matt. xxiii. 13-36; Luke xi. 37-80.

The woe pronounced on Jerusalem, Matt. xxiii. 37-39; Luke xiii. 34, 35.

The faithful and unfaithful stewards, Matt. xxiv. 45-51; Luke xii. 42-48.

The parable of the Talents and of the Pounds, Matt. xxv. 14-30; Luke xi. 11-28.¹

The instances of identity of language in these two Gospels are very numerous and striking; sometimes the identity is absolute, as in the two following examples:—

MATT. vi. 24.

No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

LUKE xvi. 13.

No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

MATT. xi. 25-27.

I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou didst

LUKE x. 21, 22.

I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou didst

¹ These parables, notwithstanding their resemblances, are generally considered as different. See Trench on the Parables.

hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes : yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in Thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father : and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father ; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.

hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes : yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in Thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father : and no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father ; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.

Numerous other passages might be given where the identity of language is also striking ; for example, compare Matt. iii. 7-10, 12 with Luke iii. 7-9, 13 ; Matt. vii. 7-11 with Luke xi. 9-13 ; Matt. vi. 25-33 with Luke xii. 22-31 ; Matt. xiii. 33 with Luke xiii. 20, 21 ; Matt. xxiv. 43-51 with Luke xii. 39-46. Now this greatly complicates the problem. If the fact were that only the three Gospels agreed, or if only Matthew and Mark, and Mark and Luke agreed, we might refer them to a common source or an original Gospel, either the Gospel of Mark or one closely resembling it. But when Matthew and Luke also agree in incidents and discourses not found in Mark's Gospel, and where there is an identity of language in their statements, we are constrained to conclude, either that Matthew copied from Luke, or conversely,—an hypothesis which we shall afterwards see cannot be maintained,—or that there was a common source, whether oral or written, which contains the sayings found in both.

3. *The single narrative.*—But besides the coincidences common to these Gospels, each Gospel has its own peculiar incidents and discourses ; there is a single as well as a twofold and threefold narrative.

The following incidents and discourses are peculiar to the Gospel of Matthew : the genealogy of Jesus from David (i. 1-17) ; the annunciation to Joseph (i. 18-25) ; the adoration of the Magi, the massacre of the infants in Bethlehem, and the flight into Egypt (ii. 1-23) ; the Sermon on the Mount, given as a whole (v., vi., vii.) ; the cure of two blind men (ix. 27-34) ; the invitation to the weary and heavy laden (xi. 28-30) ; the parables of the Tares, the Hidden Treasure, the Merchant seeking goodly Pearls, and the Drag Net

(xiii. 24–53); the attempt of Peter to walk on the sea (xiv. 28–33); the blessing pronounced on Peter (xvi. 17–19); the parables of the Unforgiving Servant (xviii. 21–35), the Householder hiring Labourers for his Vineyard (xx. 1–16), the Ten Virgins (xxv. 1–13), and the Sheep and the Goats (xxv. 31–46); the resurrection of the saints after Christ's death (xxvii. 52, 53); the bribery of the soldiers to say that the disciples stole the body (xxviii. 11–15); the appearance of Christ on a mountain in Galilee, and the institution of Christian baptism (xxviii. 16–20).

The Gospel of Mark has little that is peculiar. Nearly the whole of it is contained in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke; about two-thirds of it are common to these Gospels, whilst the other third is contained partly in the Gospel of Matthew and partly in the Gospel of Luke,—a mere fragment, in all about seventeen verses, is peculiar to Mark. These peculiarities are the parable of the inperceptible Growth of the Seed (iv. 26–29), the cure of a deaf man who had an impediment in his speech (vii. 32–37), the cure of a blind man at Bethsaida (viii. 22–26), and the account of the man who followed Christ from Gethsemane, having a linen cloth cast about him (xiv. 51, 52). It may be thought that Mark's Gospel is a compilation, and that the incidents are borrowed from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. But we are prevented from adopting this solution; a careful examination of Mark's Gospel proves that he is more graphic in his descriptions than the other two evangelists; that his account is more like that of an eye-witness than of a compiler, and that the incidents recorded are more expanded than those found in the other Gospels. Mark's Gospel is shorter, because it relates chiefly the incidents of the life of Christ, and gives only a few of His discourses.

The Gospel of Luke contains the following incidents and discourses peculiar to it:—The vision of Zacharias (i. 5–25); the annunciation (i. 26–38); the meeting between Elizabeth and Mary (i. 39–45); the song of Mary (i. 46–56); the birth of the Baptist and the prophecy of Zacharias (i. 57–80); the journey of Mary and Joseph to Bethlehem (ii. 1–7); the angel's message to the shepherds (ii. 8–20); the song of

Simeon (ii. 25-35); Anna the prophetess (ii. 36-40); Christ and the doctors (ii. 41-52); the genealogy of Jesus from Adam (iii. 23-38); the rejection of Jesus by the inhabitants of Nazareth (iv. 14-30); the miraculous draught of fishes (v. 1-11); various sayings of Jesus scattered throughout the Gospel, and which are contained in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount; the raising of the widow's son at Nain (vii. 11-17); the anointing of the woman who was a sinner, and the parable of the Two Debtors (vii. 36-50); the wish expressed by James and John to call down fire on the Samaritans (ix. 51-56); the parable of the Good Samaritan (x. 25-37); our Lord's reception by Mary and Martha (x. 38-42); the parable of the Rich Man who boasted of his Goods (xii. 13-21); the parable of the Barren Fig Tree (xiii. 6-9); the cure of the woman with the spirit of infirmity (xiii. 10-17); the cure of the dropsical man on the Sabbath (xiv. 1-6); the parables of the Marriage Feast (xiv. 7-24), the Lost Piece of Money (xv. 8-10), the Prodigal Son (xv. 11-32), the Unjust Steward (xvi. 1-13), and the Rich Man and Lazarus (xvi. 19-21); the ten lepers and the grateful Samaritan (xvii. 11-19); the parable of the Unjust Judge and the Importunate Widow (xviii. 1-8); the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (xviii. 9-14); the visit to Zacchæus (xix. 1-10); our Lord's examination before Herod (xxiii. 8-12); the address to the daughters of Jerusalem (xxiii. 27-31); the disciples going to Emmaus (xxiv. 13-35), and the ascension (xxiv. 50, 51).

There is a considerable passage in the middle of the Gospel of Luke, including at least three chapters (xiv., xv., xvi.),¹ which has only a very few resemblances to the other two Gospels. There are in it a few sayings and incidents which are common to all the Synoptics, and a few which are common to Matthew and Luke, but by far the larger portion is peculiar to Luke. It contains the important parables of the Marriage Feast, the Lost Piece of Money, the Lost Sheep,² the Prodigal Son, the Unjust Steward, and the Rich Man and Lazarus. It has received various names, being called "the

¹ Most critics consider the great insertion as including Luke ix. 51-xviii. 41.

² The parable of the Lost Sheep is also contained in Matthew's Gospel.

Journal of Travel" (*Reisebericht*), "the great interpolation or insertion" (*die grosse Einschaltung*), and "the Peraean section." It would appear that Luke here made use of a source of information which was not possessed by the other two evangelists.

The amount of agreement between the three evangelists has been given in various forms by different writers. Thus, Archbishop Thomson says: "If the history be harmonised and then divided into 89 sections, it will be found that in 42 of these (nearly a half) all the narratives coincide, that 12 more are given by Matthew and Mark only, that 5 are common to Mark and Luke only, and that 14 are found in Matthew and Luke. To these should be added 5 peculiar to Matthew, 2 to Mark, and 9 to Luke, and the number is complete."¹ Bishop Westcott observes: "If the total contents of the several Gospels be represented by 100, the following table is obtained:—

	Peculiarities.	Concordances.
" Mark,	7	93
Matthew,	42	58
Luke,	59	41" ²

Another peculiarity, proving the mutual dependence of the three Synoptists, is the coincidence between them in their quotations from the Old Testament. In general, the quotations are made from the Septuagint; and in these cases the verbal agreement between them is easily accounted for, as these quotations are from the same version. But there are a few quotations from the Old Testament, in which the evangelists verbally agree, which are taken neither from the Hebrew nor from the Septuagint, and which accordingly seem to indicate that they were found in the document or documents which were common to them. Thus, for example, the quotation from Isa. xl. 3 is thus given in the three Synoptics: *φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ* (Matt. iii. 3; Mark i. 3;

¹ The *Speaker's Bible*: New Testament, vol. i., Introduction, p. viii. See also article on the Gospels in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

² Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 177. Reuss gives a list of agreement according to the number of verses (*History of the N.T.* p. 177, translation), and Schaff according to the number of words. Bishop Westcott's table is taken from Stroud's *Greek Harmony of the Gospels*, Introduction, p. cxvii.

Luke iii. 4); whereas in the Septuagint, instead of *τρίβους αὐτοῦ*, we have the very important variation *τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*.¹ So, also, the quotation from Zech. xiii. 7, in which Matthew and Mark agree, except that Matthew adds *τῆς ποιμνῆς*, is given as follows: *πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα*: "I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad" (Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 37); whereas the words in the Septuagint are: *πατάξατε τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ ἐκσπάσατε τὰ πρόβατα*: "Smite ye the shepherds, and draw out the sheep."²

It is also important to remark that the identity of language is found chiefly in the sayings of others, and especially in the sayings of Jesus, and not in the mere narrative or statement of facts.³ The words of our Lord are frequently found verbatim in the different Gospels, especially in the sayings of our Lord contained in the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew's Gospel, and the precisely similar sayings found in different parts of Luke's Gospel. "By far the larger portion of this verbal agreement," observes Norton, "is found in the recital of the words of others, and particularly of the words of Jesus. Thus, in Matthew's Gospel, the passages verbally coincident with one or both of the other two Gospels amount to less than a sixth part of its contents; and of this, about seven-eighths occur in the recital of the words of others, and only about one-eighth in what, by way of distinction, I may call mere narrative, in which the evangelist, speaking in his own person, was unrestrained in the choice of his expressions. In Mark the proportion of coincident passages to the contents of the Gospel is about one-sixth, of which not one-fifth occurs in the narrative. Luke has still less agreement of expression with the other evangelists. The passages in which it is found amount only to about a tenth part of his Gospel; and

¹ In the Hebrew: "Make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

² There is here, however, a difference of reading in the manuscripts of the Septuagint. In the Hebrew it is: "Smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered."

³ See Bishop Thirlwall's introduction to his translation of Schleiermacher's *St. Luke*, p. 36.

but an inconsiderable portion of it appears in the narrative, in which there are very few instances of its existence for more than half a dozen words together."¹

Another peculiarity in the Synoptic Gospels, on which stress has recently been laid, is the supposed existence of what have been called "doublets"; that is, expressions or incidents which are repeated in the same Gospel. Attention has been drawn to this point by Mr. Badham in his ingenious work on the *Formation of the Gospels*. He gives a long list of doublets, extending over twenty pages, found in the three Synoptic Gospels.² Most of these doublets, however, when examined, depend only on slight resemblances, or the repetition of a few words, and many of them are strained; and when the number is reduced by the omission of these, only a small residue remains. The following are a few of the most obvious and striking: In the Gospel of Matthew it is twice stated, in almost the same words, that Jesus went through the cities and villages of Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness (Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35).³ The cure of a dumb man possessed with a devil, with the remark of the Pharisees upon it, that He cast out devils by Beelzebub, is twice recorded (Matt. ix. 32-34, xii. 22-24). So also in the Gospel of Luke, the saying about lighting a candle and putting it under a couch (Luke viii. 16, xi. 33), and the warning, "Whosoever shall save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it" (Luke ix. 24, xvii. 33), are twice repeated in language almost identical. It is twice stated that there was a contention among the disciples which of them should be the greatest (Luke ix. 46, xxii. 24). The inference which Mr. Badham draws from these phenomena is, that these doublets occurred in separate documents used by

¹ Norton on *The Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 240.

² Badham's *Formation of the Gospels*, pp. 12-23. This is a very ingenious, but somewhat unsatisfactory book. The recognition of doublets in the Gospel is interesting and suggestive, but we do not think very important.

³ These words refer to two different circuits of Christ in Galilee; the one at the commencement of His Galilean ministry, and the other towards its close.

the evangelists. But other reasons may be assigned for them. There is no improbability in the supposition that our Lord might repeat sayings of primary importance, especially if they were of the nature of proverbial expressions, such as that of concealing the light, and that solemn warning about saving the soul; the contention among the disciples for pre-eminence might have occurred on two different occasions; and the two incidents recorded in Matthew's Gospel of the cure of the dumb man possessed with a devil differ in some respects, and both might have occurred.¹ Thus there are two miracles of feeding the multitude which differ in several particulars, and only one of them is recorded by Luke.

II. *Points of difference.*—In considering the Synoptic problem we must attend, not merely to the points on which the evangelists agree, but also to the points on which they differ; the one class of phenomena is of as much importance as the other. We have already seen that whilst there is upon the whole an agreement between the Gospel of Mark and the other two, the Gospels of Matthew and Luke differ materially in their contents. Each has incidents and discourses which the other wants. Even in those passages where there is a general agreement, there are often important verbal differences. Thus in the encouragement to prayer given by our Lord, Matthew has: "How much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things (ἀγαθά) to them that ask Him?" (Matt. vii. 11); whilst Luke instead of "good things" has "the Holy Spirit" (πνεῦμα ἅγιον) (Luke xi. 13). In repelling the assertions of the Pharisees that He cast out devils through Beelzebub, Jesus is reported by Matthew as saying: "If I by the Spirit of God (ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ) cast out devils" (Matt. xii. 28); whilst Luke has "by the finger of God" (ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ) (Luke xi. 20). Speaking of the power of faith, our Lord, according to Matthew, says: "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say to this mountain (τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ), Remove hence to yonder place" (Matt. xvii. 20); whilst Luke has: "Whoso-

¹ In Matt ix. 32-34 the man is represented as dumb, and possessed with a devil; whereas in Matt. xii. 22-24 he is represented as both blind and dumb.

ever shall say to this sycamine tree" (τῇ συκαμίνῳ ταύτῃ) (Luke xvii. 6). These differences cannot be accounted for on the ground that they are different translations from the Aramaic.¹

There are also striking differences in many of the events of our Lord's life which are recorded by Matthew and Luke. Thus in the accounts given of the birth of Christ—an event omitted in Mark's Gospel—there are important variations. There is no discrepancy between their accounts; both assert that Christ was born in Bethlehem, but they evidently drew their information from different sources. In Matthew the annunciation is made to Joseph; in Luke it is made to Mary. Matthew mentions the visit of the wise men; Luke, the visit of the shepherds. Matthew relates the massacre of the infants in Bethlehem and the flight to Egypt, neither of which particulars is recorded by Luke; whilst Luke mentions the circumcision and the presentation in the temple, both of which are omitted by Matthew. There is also a remarkable difference between Matthew and Luke with regard to the so-called Sermon on the Mount. In Matthew's Gospel it is given as one connected discourse; whereas the sayings contained in that discourse are scattered throughout Luke's Gospel, and are to be found in at least ten different places; almost the whole sermon given in Matthew's Gospel is thus contained in the Gospel of Luke. Comparing it as found in a connected form in Matthew's Gospel with the scattered portions of it in Luke's Gospel, we have the following table of coincidences:—

Matt. v. 3-12.	Luke vi. 20-25.	Matt. vi. 24.	Luke xvi. 13.
„ v. 13.	„ xiv. 34, 35.	„ vi. 25-34.	„ xii. 22-31.
„ v. 15.	„ xi. 33.	„ vii. 1-5.	„ vi. 37-42.
„ v. 18.	„ xvi. 17.	„ vii. 7-11.	„ xi. 9-13.
„ v. 25, 26.	„ xii. 57-59.	„ vii. 12.	„ vi. 31.
„ v. 31, 32.	„ xvi. 18.	„ vii. 13, 14.	„ xiii. 23, 24.
„ v. 38-48.	„ vi. 27-30, 32-36.	„ vii. 15-20.	„ vi. 43-45.
„ vi. 9-15.	„ xi. 1-4.	„ vii. 23.	„ xiii. 27.
„ vi. 19-21.	„ xii. 33, 34.	„ vii. 24-27.	„ vi. 47-49. ²
„ vi. 22, 23.	„ xi. 34-36.		

¹ See on these verbal variations, Bruce's *Kingdom of God*, p. 17.

² See Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, pp. 138-147; Holtzmann's *Einleitung*, pp. 356, 357.

But not only are the sentiments the same, but there is often a remarkable identity in the language in which these sentiments are expressed. Compare Matt. v. 25, 26 with Luke xii. 57-59; Matt. vi. 9-13 with Luke xi. 1-4; Matt. vi. 21 with Luke xii. 34; Matt. vi. 24 with Luke xvi. 13; Matt. vi. 25-34 with Luke xii. 22-31; Matt. vii. 3-5 with Luke vi. 41, 42; Matt. vii. 7-11 with Luke xi. 9-13.¹ On the other hand, there are remarkable differences, as, for example, in the Beatitudes;² in Matthew they are extended, whilst in Luke they are abbreviated, and a series of corresponding denunciations is attached to them. Different inferences have been drawn from these points of agreement and difference.³ Some suppose, but contrary to all probability, that our Lord delivered two similar discourses, the one on the mount, recorded by Matthew, and the other on the plain, recorded by Luke.⁴ Tholuck gives the preference to the form contained in Matthew's Gospel, arguing from the continuity of its thoughts, and thinks that the narrative of Luke has less claim to originality.⁵ Others, as Olshausen and Godet, suppose that Matthew collected the sayings of our Lord into one discourse; whereas Luke gives them at the time when they were spoken,⁶ or, according to others, inserts them as he

¹ See Paul Ewald's *Evangelienfrage*, p. 216.

² In Matthew there are eight beatitudes; in Luke there are four.

³ In Matthew's Gospel it is said that our Lord went up to a mountain and there addressed the multitude; and from the manner in which the discourse is introduced, we are led to suppose that it was then delivered. Probably a large portion of it was delivered on that occasion; and additions were afterwards added by the evangelist.

⁴ There can be no reasonable doubt that the discourse related in Luke vi. 20-49 is the same as that related by Matthew.

⁵ Tholuck's *Sermon on the Mount*, translation: "The narrative of Luke," he observes, "has less claim to be considered a faithful account than that of Matthew" (p. 17). "Our conclusion is that the arrangement of the sayings of our Lord given by Matthew in his account of the Sermon on the Mount is in the main correct" (p. 27).

⁶ Olshausen, *On the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 182: "The unity of the Sermon on the Mount," he observes, "has not descended to us from the Saviour Himself, but from Matthew." "It does not appear to me," observes Godet, "that in the majority of these cases (those given by Luke) a thorough student of the subject could refuse to give the preference to the position indicated by the third Gospel." Godet's *Biblical Studies*, pp. 15, 16.

found them in the written documents which he employed, or in the oral sources from which he drew his materials.¹

Several remarkable points of variation occur in the accounts of the passion given by Matthew and Luke. Matthew relates the suicide of Judas, the dream of Pilate's wife, and informs us that at the death of Christ the vail of the temple was rent in twain, the earth did quake, the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose. Luke relates the examination of our Lord before Herod, the conversion of the penitent thief on the cross, and gives us that divine prayer for forgiveness: "Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do."²

Matthew and Luke also vary in their accounts of the resurrection of our Lord. Matthew relates the rolling away of the stone by an angel, the address of the angel to the women, the appearance of Jesus to them, the terror of the guard, the bribery of the soldiers to induce them to diffuse a false account of the resurrection, the appearance of Christ to the disciples in Galilee, and the great commission to make disciples of all nations. Luke relates the address of the angels to the women at the sepulchre, the appearance of Christ to the two disciples going to Emmaus and to the disciples in Jerusalem, and concludes with a reference to the ascension. In his Gospel the appearances of Christ after His resurrection are confined to Jerusalem and its neighbourhood; there is no mention of Galilee; and were it not for the accounts contained in the other Gospels, it might be inferred that all the appearances occurred on one day.

There is also a considerable difference in the chronological order in which the events are recorded.³ There is a general agreement, but a difference in detail. Thus our Lord's lamentation over Jerusalem was, according to Luke's Gospel, pronounced during the course of His ministry in

¹ It must be acknowledged that the connection discernible in the different parts of Matthew's account is in favour of the unity of the discourse as given by him. We must leave this point undetermined.

² For the different Synoptic histories of the passion, see Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, pp. 299-304.

³ Credner's *Einleitung*, p. 169.