

Further, St. Luke places the home of the holy family in Nazareth, both before and after the birth of our Lord, while St. Matthew says that the home was in Bethlehem, and that after the flight into Egypt Joseph removed to Nazareth from fear of Archelaus. But above all, what makes the two accounts distinct is the fact that the one story is clearly that which would be given by Joseph, while that in St. Luke is as clearly that which could have been derived from Mary alone. The story of the birth of our Lord is preceded by a genealogical table, the purpose of which seems to be, as Zahn points out, not so much to give the Davidic descent of Jesus, as to show that the Jesus who received the name Messiah was 'the goal of the entire history of His people.' This is shown by the incompleteness of the table considered as a line of unbroken descent, and by an indication of 'the change brought about in the Davidic house when the unity of the family and the inheritance of the promise were no longer represented in one person who occupied the throne, but when what was once the royal seed continued to exist only as a number of families, with uncertainty as to which one would enter upon the inheritance.' These characteristics of the section will have a strong determining influence when we come to consider the circumstances, local and temporal, in which this Gospel, as a whole, was produced, but they have little to do with the Synoptic Problem, which is mainly concerned with the inter-relations of the three Gospels. These come into view when we take account of the three main questions, which are :

1. To what extent does this Gospel depend upon Mark, and what is the relation of its Markan material to the corresponding portion of the third Gospel and also to canonical Mark ?
2. What is the Matthaean contribution which will

account for the traditional title given to this Gospel?

3. To what extent is it dependent upon another document (Q), and does it share this dependence with Luke?

These three questions really overlap. It is scarcely possible to discuss the Markan element without reference to the Matthaean, for what cannot be assigned to the one will generally find its place in the other, and as we have seen, our definition of Q involves a definition of the Matthaean Logia. It is the overlapping of these questions which has made the question of Gospel Origins appear so hopeless of solution to the general reader. To us the clue out of the labyrinth is to be found in a phrase which occurs five times, and always in passing from a section containing discourse to narrative. That phrase occurs first at the close of the Sermon on the Mount, where we read (vii. 28), 'And it came to pass when Jesus had ended these words the multitudes were astonished at His teaching.' The same phrase, or a variant which is a distinct equivalent, occurs also at xi. 1, xiii. 53, xix. 1, and xxvi. 1. If we give our attention to what precedes we shall find that in each case it consists of a number of sayings many of them cast in the form of epigram, and entirely independent of historical setting, others expanded into parables, and others again taking the form of set discourses, but all of them dealing with what we have called 'universals,' or the great basal spiritual principles which underlie our Lord's conception and teaching concerning the Kingdom of Heaven. In each case the section which follows is distinctly Markan. It is found in both the first and second Gospel, and the linguistic characteristics are very close. If, now, we remove these sections which, whatever they may be, are certainly not Logian, we find that we have five blocks of quite homogeneous

matter. They evidently belong to one source, and that source is other than the Markan Gospel, in whatever sense this last be interpreted.

Before we pass, however, to consider what that source can be, we ought to consider whether any other sections of the first Gospel belong to the same category, and four passages at once attract attention, inasmuch as they also contain a considerable amount of the teaching of our Lord, and also because they are not found in canonical Mark. These are, as a rule, referred by critics to Q, and the reference is due to two facts; first, they are words spoken by our Lord, which is supposed to stamp them as 'sayings,' and secondly, they are not found in canonical Mark, and for this reason are supposed to belong to a non-Markan source. But when we come to examine them we find that they possess certain features which differentiate them from the five blocks which we have now taken out of the first Gospel, and on the other hand, there are considerations which suggest a Markan source for the sections in spite of the fact that they do not occur in canonical Mark. The first section is that which is found in xi. 2-30. This consists of the account of the Baptist's message to Jesus, and of our Lord's vindication of His Fore-runner. To this must be added the section beginning at verse 20, which is closely connected with the preceding ('Then began Jesus to upbraid,' etc.). In idea also the latter follows on the Baptist section, inasmuch as the cities mentioned had not known the day of their visitation any more than those to whom the Baptist had made his appeal in vain. The section differs from the five blocks aforesaid because its historical setting is necessary before the point of the teaching can be apprehended. The reference is not universal, as is the case with the different parts of the Sermon on the Mount, but is circumscribed by the particular and local relations of the Baptist to the Jews on the one hand, and to Christ on the other. Another

significant fact is this, that it is to be found in the third Gospel though not in the second.

Now when we come to consider the second Gospel we shall at once be struck with the fact that its reference to the ministry of the Baptist is extremely scanty as compared with what we find in the other two Gospels. This is far from indicating, in our opinion, that the account of the Baptist's ministry in the first and third Gospels must be referred to Q. To those who would so relate it, it is sufficient to ask with Dr. Willoughby Allen what the record of the Baptist's preaching has to do with a collection of the discourses of Jesus. A far better explanation of the fuller record of the Baptist's ministry in the first and third Gospel is to be found in a distinction between the Markan sections of those Gospels and canonical Mark. As soon as we have grasped the fact, as it seems to me, that the Markan element in the first and third Gospels was in each case earlier than canonical Mark, and that they were written in Palestine in the one case and for Jewish Christians in the other, while the second Gospel, as we have it, was written for Gentiles in Rome and considerably later, then we see that references in the first and third to the Baptist were likely to be full. Their interest would be great and immediate, while in Rome they would be remote and comparatively unimportant. Thus the section xi. 2-30 would belong, like the fuller account of the baptism and temptation of our Lord, to the earlier editions of the Markan narrative, though it does not appear in canonical Mark. There is no apparent reason why it should be considered to have come from the same source as the Sermon on the Mount.

The second passage of the class now under consideration consists of the first sixteen verses of the twentieth chapter. The parable of the labourers in the vineyard does not occur in either of the other two Gospels. Now if this parable belongs to Q, we may well ask for what reason St.

Luke omitted it from his Gospel. The teaching it contains was admirably suited to one who held with St. Paul that though the Gentiles might enter the kingdom later than did the Jews, they were nevertheless equal in privilege, and fellow-heirs of the grace of God. It is one of the parables which, we consider, St. Luke would have made haste to transcribe if he had found it in Q. But the question remains whether it did belong to Q. It is closely connected, both grammatically and logically, with the section which precedes. St. Peter had said to his Master, 'Lo, we have left all and followed Thee; what shall we have therefore?' The thought of rewards was distinctly before him. Christ closes His reply with the words, 'Many that are first shall be last, and the last first,' and then follows the parable '*For the kingdom of heaven is like. . . .*' To us it seems that St. Luke does not record the saying because it never was in his source. It belongs to the deutero-Mark, and may with confidence be included in the Markan section of the first Gospel.

Another similar passage is that in which we have the parable of the royal marriage feast (Matt. xxii. 1-14). This passage, too, does not occur in the second Gospel, and those who refer everything that does not so occur to Q have no hesitation in ascribing the parable to that source. Unlike the preceding parable in chapter xxi. this is found in the third Gospel; but there it appears not in those sections in which St. Luke appears to be using a collection of sayings, but in that part of the third Gospel which is known by the name of 'the Travel Document,' and which is peculiar to that Gospel. It is given by St. Luke in chapter xiv. 15-24, and if the passage is compared with its equivalent in the first Gospel, it will be seen how different it is in wording and detail. Now we have already seen that the characteristics of St. Luke are least frequent in those passages in which he uses his collection of sayings. He seems least willing to make

changes when he is dealing with the words of Jesus, and if the difference is to be explained on the ground of editorial privilege, it must be admitted that here the third evangelist departs from his usual practice. Is it at all necessary for us to do so? It follows a section in the first Gospel which is distinctly Markan, and its main purpose is closely connected with what precedes, for in each we have the neglect and insult of the lord which culminates in the murder of his servants. In each the lord punishes his rebellious subordinates with death, and their privilege is given to others. The section is so closely connected with what we have in Mark that it seems better to assign this passage too to the Markan source, and the fact that it does not appear in the second Gospel presents no difficulty to those who consider that the three Gospels present us with three editions of Markan writing. The custom of ascribing everything of a parabolic nature to Q does not seem to us to be sound criticism. Indeed it is impossible to eliminate from Mark all parabolic teaching. As we have elsewhere shown, St. Mark does not use Q, but there is no reason why in his writings the words and parables of the Lord should not appear, as they certainly do in chapter iv. We may be quite sure that though St. Peter dealt for the most part with those works of Christ which declared Him to be the Son of God, he would not hesitate to give the teaching of our Lord if the occasion seemed to him to demand it, and that Mark recorded this parable in his second edition we have very little doubt. It was spoken during our Lord's journey up to Jerusalem, but there is little trace of chronological exactness in these memoirs of St. Peter's preaching. St. Luke has given the occasion of its utterance with greater accuracy, but the details of the parable in the two records vary inasmuch as it was derived from different sources.

The last of these passages is that which occurs in chapter xxiii. 15-39. This again is closely connected with a

preceding Markan section though it does not appear in canonical Mark. It is the passage in which our Lord declares the woes of the Scribes and Pharisees, and it is given in substance by St. Luke, though the latter does not follow the order in which the woes are given in the first Gospel, and his account is very much abbreviated. We would therefore assign this passage also to the Markan section of the first Gospel; and if the question be raised why it does not appear in the second Gospel, we would answer that the subject-matter of the section, while of extreme importance to Jews, would be omitted from an edition prepared for a Gentile Church in Rome, as being of much less importance and interest to them. Now if this analysis of these sections be correct, we are left with a sharp division between the five blocks of homogeneous 'sayings,' and the great mass of Markan material into which the sayings seem to have been thrust.

It is true that much of what we have assigned to the Markan document is held by critics to have been derived from Q, and these sections will be duly weighed, but assuming for the present that the division we have made is a true division, we now proceed to consider the five blocks of sayings which we have taken out of the first Gospel.<sup>1</sup> The very arrangement of a group of five is significant. Sir John Hawkins compares with it the five books of the Pentateuch, the five books of the Psalms, the five Megilloth, as well as other similar groups, and concludes by saying: 'It is hard to believe that it is by accident that we find in a writer with the Jewish affinities of Matthew this five times repeated formula,' *i.e.* 'When Jesus had finished these sayings.' Another most significant fact is that, according to Eusebius (iii. 39), Papias wrote a commentary on the Logia of Matthew in *five* books, and we may conclude that he did so because the sayings were already grouped into that number of chapters.

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed analysis of these sections, see Additional Note, p. 93 ff.

All this makes a strong *prima facie* argument that the Logia of Matthew are not lost, but exist in the first Gospel, sandwiched between corresponding portions of Markan narrative. The traditional title of the first Gospel is thus easily accounted for. If the distinctive portion of the Gospel had been taken from some Gospel (Q) of unknown authorship, there is no apparent reason why the name of St. Matthew should have been attached to it, and if a work of such first-rate importance as one written by the apostle Matthew, and containing the discourses of Christ, was ever in existence, it is hard to believe that it could have disappeared from among the treasured documents of the Christian Church. The statement of Papias cannot lightly be set aside, and our analysis of the Gospel enables us to see that St. Matthew's work has never been lost, but is still before us in the Gospel which bears his name.

The history of the Gospel may then be reconstructed somewhat as follows:—In quite early days St. Matthew collated the sayings ascribed to Jesus, rejecting those that were spurious and retaining those that he recognised as having been spoken at different times by his great Master. He arranged these according to an approved Jewish method by placing them in five groups, the sayings in each group dealing directly with some topic upon which our Lord was wont to discourse from time to time. When the Church began to find converts among the Hellenistic Jews of the Dispersion, translations of these sayings were made, and one such copy found its way to Egypt, where there were from earliest times a considerable number of Jews. St. Mark had already left there a copy of his memoirs of St. Peter's preaching; it was not identical with either that earlier edition which he had left at Caesarea (see chap. v.) nor with one which he was to publish considerably later in Rome. It contained parables and other teaching of our Lord's, which St. Matthew had not included in his work,



and there were in it certain references which would be of special interest to Christians living in Egypt. It fell to the lot of some member of this Church to throw into one volume these two accounts of what Jesus said and what Jesus did. He accomplished this in a very simple, a very rough and ready manner, by separating the five chapters and inserting each at some likely point in the Markan narrative, but he was always careful to mark the point of transition by a formula which is found nowhere else. He also possessed an account of the birth of our Lord which had been derived through stages of which we have no trace, from Joseph the husband of the mother of our Lord, and which, from its inclusion of the flight into Egypt and other details, seems to have been drawn up in Egypt.<sup>1</sup> This he naturally prefixed to the other two sections. He further interpolated quotations from a collection of Messianic proof-texts at points at which such seemed appropriate, and to the Gospel thus prepared the name of 'The Gospel according to St. Matthew' was given to distinguish it from the Gospel according to St. Mark, which by that time was beginning to be known.

If this account of the way in which St. Matthew's name was attached to this Gospel be correct, it follows that we need not seek for any exact definition in time for the occasions on which the several discourses or the individual sayings were uttered by our Lord. The relation of saying to saying is that of its bearing upon the topic which St. Matthew discovered underlying the general teaching of Jesus. He would put together sayings some of which were uttered early in the course of our Lord's ministry, and others which He uttered on His way to Jerusalem, or in the course of His latest ministry in the temple.

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note that while Justin (*Dial.* 77, 78) and Tertullian (*Jud.* 9) say that the Magi came from Arabia, which lies to the south of Palestine, the first Gospel says that they came 'from the East.' The two statements are seen to be in agreement if we accept the theory that the birthplace of the first Gospel was Alexandria.

Thus we shall still continue to use the term 'The Sermon on the Mount,' but the unity of that sermon is to be ascribed to St. Matthew rather than to the great Teacher whose words he recorded. We need not on this account take up the position that our Lord never delivered a set discourse in which many of these sayings found utterance, but it does not seem likely that we have such a discourse in this 'sermon.' For in the first place no report of that discourse could have been taken down, and it is impossible to accept that any one could have committed it to memory on the strength of a single utterance. In the second place, no amount of editorial freedom would have led St. Luke to separate that discourse into disjointed fragments as, on this hypothesis, he has done. Further, it is extremely difficult to account for the connection of such passages as Matthew v. 31, 32, vi. 7-15, and vii. 7-11 if they formed parts of a single discourse. Those who hold that the sermon was actually delivered as a sermon by our Lord are forced to regard these and other passages as interpolations, but this method of accounting for the collection as it stands raises other difficulties. Then if the arrangement of sayings was the work of our Lord, there is no reason why we should not suppose that the other sections in which we have blocks of sayings in the first Gospel are also given as delivered by Him, and this would produce an impression of Christ's method far different from what we believe was the fact. It would make Him out to be a formalist, whereas the remarks have a spontaneity and freshness about them which make it far more probable that they were uttered as each several occasion demanded, with a readiness suggestive of a fountain of truth which was brim-full, and ever ready to pour forth the riches of its contents.

What then was the 'unity' which appealed to the mind of St. Matthew, and led him to group together the sayings which make up our 'Sermon on the Mount'? The answer varies with the scholar who considers it. Professor

Votaw considers that the theme is sufficiently described under the title 'The Ideal Life,' and the Beatitudes are considered to give a summary of the theme which is afterwards developed in detail. Dr. Stanton describes the theme as 'The Character of the Heirs of the Kingdom,' but this seems more appropriate as a description of chapter xviii. Holtzmann, Wendt, and others find the unity in v. 17-20, and describe it as 'The Fulfilment of the Law.' None of these however seems, to the present writer at least, to supply a sufficient unity. The present Bishop of Oxford comes much nearer to it when he describes it as 'The Moral Law of the Kingdom.' Dr. Gore, however, goes on to say that it is 'law, not grace; letter, not spirit.' But although we shall acknowledge that it contains what we should expect in a first chapter of discourses on the Kingdom—a statement of its statutes, of the great principles that underlie the whole conception of that great Jewish ideal as it existed in the thought of Christ—it is the *spirit* of the law, rather than its letter that is before us.

The most satisfactory account, which we have seen, of the theme not only of this first chapter of St. Matthew's work, but also of the remaining four sections, is given by Monsignor Barnes in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1905. M. Barnes holds that St. Matthew's purpose was to illustrate from the teaching of Jesus His exposition of that idea which was always prominently before the religious conception of the Jew, and which formed the purpose of the preaching of both the Baptist and the Christ—the Kingdom of God. M. Barnes thus arranges the sections :

Matt. v., vi., vii. : The Law of the Kingdom.

Matt. x. : The Rulers of the Kingdom.

Matt. xiii. : The Parables of the Kingdom.

Matt. xviii. : Relations of the Members of the Kingdom.

Matt. xxiv., xxv. : The Coming of the King.

This seems a fair description of the contents of these sections, though others may prefer other titles.

In discussing the Markan narrative which we have in the first Gospel, it will be best to begin with a statement of the points which have secured recognition and acceptance among scholars. These can scarcely be better stated than they are by Dr. Stanton in the work to which frequent reference has been made, and which will long remain a storehouse of scholarly research and critical acumen. Dr. Stanton says :

1. While the narratives of the birth and infancy of Jesus in St. Matthew and St. Luke are widely different, these Gospels begin to agree with one another and with St. Mark from the point at which the latter begins, namely, with the ministry of John the Baptist.
2. By far the greater part of the subject-matter of St. Mark is found in both St. Matthew and St. Luke, and there is on the whole a close parallelism between all three in the arrangement of this matter. In other words, there is a common outline ; into this in St. Matthew and St. Luke a considerable amount of additional matter has been quite diversely introduced.
3. With very few exceptions, our first and third evangelists, so far as they omit incidents and sayings given in St. Mark, do not omit the same ones ; the result being that almost all the sections in St. Mark are found also in one or other of the two remaining Synoptics ; that is to say, there are very few passages peculiar to this Gospel.
4. When the sequence of narratives in St. Matthew or St. Luke differs from that in St. Mark, the other one agrees with St. Mark. In other words, St. Matthew and St. Luke do not, save in one or two

instances, unite against St. Mark as to order. When all three do not agree in respect to it, we have the same sequence in St. Matthew and St. Mark, or in St. Luke and St. Mark.

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

Dr. Stanton concludes that if we suppose that St. Matthew and St. Luke used Mark, or *a document resembling Mark*, and each in his own way revised and supplemented it, we have a simple and natural explanation of these phenomena. The present writer finds himself in complete agreement with all the facts as related by Dr. Stanton, but in the conclusion drawn he would prefer the second of the alternatives offered by him, and would rather say that the two authors used 'a document resembling St. Mark,' and not the second Gospel as we know it. The reasons for this preference are set forth in the chapter dealing with the

second Gospel, and we proceed now to discuss, in the light of this preference, the Markan narrative as it appears in the first.

The first section which we assign to the authorship of St. Mark is the one which is most disputed, and it raises most of the questions which gather around the question of the Markan element in St. Matthew and St. Luke. It is the section in which the ministry of the Baptist is set forth with the sequel so closely connected with it—the temptation of our Lord. The majority of critics refer this section to Q, and we have already alluded to this in general terms. A comparison of the three accounts reveals at once the ground upon which they arrive at their conclusion. By far the fullest account is given by St. Luke, and this evangelist prefaces his account with a detailed chronological statement which is a distinct addition of his own.

The account given in the first Gospel is not quite so extensive as that in the third Gospel, but it is in close agreement with it in giving the words of the Baptist in some detail, and in calling attention to the rebuke given by the Baptist to the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The second Gospel gives the account of the Baptist's ministry in a most scanty fashion. The preaching of the Baptist is referred to in the very brief statement that he preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. There is no reference to the denunciation of the religious leaders among the Jews. The announcement of the coming of Jesus varies in precisely the same way in the three accounts. St. Luke's account is the fullest and St. Mark's the briefest. At the same time it is to be noticed that both in this and in the preceding section, where we get a reference to the same matter in the first Gospel and in the second, whether it be the description of the habits of the Baptist or of his reference to the coming Messiah, there is marked resemblance in phraseology, so that we may infer that if

St. Matthew derived the sections from any one source, St. Mark also must have taken them from that source. In describing the ministry of the coming Messiah, the first Gospel (here in agreement with the third) makes the significant addition that He would baptize 'with fire.' In the baptism of our Lord the first Gospel represents the Baptist as accepting a position of inferiority to Him who came to be baptized. We can see how this would be a point to be insisted upon when addressing those who held John to be 'that prophet' if not the Messiah Himself, and the fulfilling of 'righteousness' would again have weight with those to whom the Old Testament teaching on the subject of righteousness would be familiar. The second Gospel also differs characteristically by the insertion of the word *σχιζομένους*, 'rent asunder,' where the other Gospels say simply that the heavens 'were opened.' This addition is one of the many vivid details which make up the outstanding feature of the second Gospel. They indicate not only the evidence of an eye-witness, but also the experience of the speaker who has learnt how to make his narrative vivid and effective for his hearers. They are distinctly Petrine in origin, and appear appropriately in the later rather than in the earlier edition of the Petrine memoirs.

The temptation of our Lord sprang directly out of the manifestation made in the course of His baptism, and forms one section with the foregoing. It exhibits precisely the same features as we find in the latter; a full account in the third Gospel, another almost as full in the first with the reference to 'the holy city' which repeats the Jewish tendency, and an account in the second which by comparison is the merest outline, and gives no details of our Lord's temptation. It exhibits, however, the same vivid touch, which we have already found in the second Gospel, in the statement peculiar to that Gospel that our Lord was 'with the wild beasts.'

Now apparently the reason which leads critics to refer the whole of this section to Q is the difficulty of finding a place for it in the Markan source, when that source is taken to be the canonical Mark. If this section belongs to that source, then we have the editors of the first and third Gospels making additions to that source for which no account can be given. To avoid this difficulty, the whole section is commonly assigned to Q. And yet if we accept this, we entirely destroy the character of Q, so far as we can assign it a definite character. For in this section we must admit that the proportion of narrative is far in excess of anything in the nature of discourse. It contains far more of the words of the Baptist than of the teaching of Christ, and the very few words of Jesus which it records differ in what we have seen to be an essential point from Logia properly so called. They do not deal with essential spiritual principles, but are dependent for interpretation upon the circumstances which called them forth. If again the editors of the first and third Gospels derived the section from Q, the fact that they differ as they do between themselves creates a further difficulty. St. Luke treats his Logian source with the greatest respect. What are called 'Lukan characteristics' are least apparent in this part of his Gospel, which means that he felt less inclined to use his editorial freedom in amending this one of his sources. This was only natural to one who realised that in this he was dealing with 'the words of the Lord Jesus.' But how then are we to explain the fact that he differs from St. Matthew as he does if they both used the same source? In the teaching of the Baptist, in the order of the temptations, and in minor details, he seems to be using a source which, while exhibiting a general likeness to that used in compiling the first Gospel, nevertheless is far from being identical with that source.

Now all these difficulties find an easy solution when we refer this section not to Q, but to Mark, meaning by that



an earlier edition of the work of that evangelist. We see at once that the earlier editions, prepared in Palestine, or for Jews, would be in this section much fuller than they would be in the later edition which belongs to Rome, while the latter would exhibit just those vivid details which we have found in it. We also secure what seems to the present writer the great advantage of considering Q to be homogeneous. It is difficult to answer the objection of those who say that if this narrative section can be allowed at the beginning of Q, there is no reason why we should refuse to admit that it also closed with an account of our Lord's Passion. But if Q contained both these sections it must have been to all intents and purposes 'a Gospel,' and its disappearance and loss becomes inexplicable. Returning to the section as it appears in the first Gospel, we notice that it contains more than one allusion to what we may call a Jewish interest. The denunciation of the religious orders among the Jews and the reference to the 'holy city,' these are things which would appear naturally in an account written for those who were Jewish Christians, and in describing the difference between the baptism of John and the baptism of our Lord, the addition of the significant phrase 'He shall baptise *with fire*,' belongs naturally to an edition prepared for those who had witnessed or heard of what took place at Pentecost and in the house of Cornelius, but the phrase would have lost significance for those who belonged to a later age, and lived in Rome. It therefore fails to appear in the second Gospel. We confidently then refer this section to the Markan source rather than to Q.

The next Markan section in the first Gospel begins at iv. 17-25 and continues on in chapters viii. and ix., the sequence being broken, as we have seen, by the insertion of chapters v., vi., and vii. which are taken from another source. In this passage we notice that the call of the first four disciples while agreeing almost word for word

with what we have in St. Mark does not appear in St. Luke. This evangelist gives in the fifth chapter of his Gospel what is evidently a later and more decisive call than what is given here. The fact of the two calls creates no difficulty. We can see from the fourth Gospel that the first attachment of the disciples to Christ was apparently less binding, and that their connection with Him became a much closer thing later on. In the first edition of Mark the later call was described, and as such appears in the third Gospel, but in the later editions the earlier call was given.

This is followed by the story of the cure of a leper, chap. viii. 1-4. The section is given in practically the same terms in all three accounts, but in the second Gospel we notice at least two 'vivid touches.' In verse 41 of that Gospel we read that Christ 'had compassion' upon the leper, and in verse 43 a remarkable word<sup>1</sup> is used to describe the strictness with which Christ charged the man that he was not to publish his cure abroad. That these two expressions do not appear in the first Gospel is usually explained on the ground that they were omitted by its editor probably for the sake of brevity. But the brevity so gained would be very slight in amount, and one would scarcely imagine that to secure this slight advantage words which have so much to do with the personal feeling of our Lord would be omitted; and that St. Luke, writing under quite different conditions and for a different clientele, should fix upon precisely the same words to save space seems to us most unlikely. A far more reasonable explanation is to suppose that their non-appearance in the first Gospel is due simply to the fact that they were not included in the edition of Mark which was used by the editor. Time had revealed to both St. Peter and St. Mark that the personality of their Lord was the great treasure which they had to hand down to the Church, and thus

<sup>1</sup> ἐμβριμησάμενος.

that which had to do with the personal life of Christ found expression in the later edition though it was absent from the earlier.

The story of the cure of the centurion's servant which follows is one of the most disputed sections of our Gospel. It is given both by St. Luke and by the editor of the first Gospel, but it is completely absent from the second. On the principle that non-Markan material means Q, this section also is assigned to the Logian document, and with Dr. Willoughby Allen we are compelled to ask what a compilation of discourses can have in common with a narrative section like this. Dr. Allen points out that 'the central point of the story is not Christ's *saying* "not even in Israel have I found such faith," for as a saying apart from its context that has no meaning, but the *facts* that Christ could heal with a word, and that He had done such a healing for the servant of a centurion.' To us this comment of Dr. Allen seems unanswerable, and on the theory of a deutero-Mark in which the section appeared, though it was omitted from the trito-Mark, we have no hesitation in referring this section also to the Markan document.

From this point to the end of the ninth chapter we have what is accepted as Markan material. The three versions differ, as we should expect them to differ, if, while written down by one man, they were written on different occasions and for different classes of persons. There are also editorial changes, especially in the third Gospel, but these need not detain us.

We have shown that chapters x.-xi. 1 belong to the Logia, and we have also given reasons for relating the section which follows this xi. 2-30 to the Markan document. From xii. 1-xiii. 23 we have a distinct Markan section, only broken by the insertion of a quotation from the Messianic proof-texts to which reference has previously been made. In verses 5-7 of the twelfth chapter we have a statement

made by our Lord which appears in the first Gospel, but not in the others. The statement carries that Jewish reference which we have seen is characteristic of the first Gospel throughout. It reflects upon the attitude of the religious teachers of the Jews, and would have its place in a narrative prepared by St. Mark for the Jewish Christians of Alexandria. It is wholly unnecessary to refer it to Q. In the parallel section of canonical Mark we find a statement which is entirely apposite to the discussion on the Sabbath given by all three evangelists, and yet the remarkable words do not appear in either the first or the third Gospel. In Mark ii. 27 we read that 'the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.' Now if canonical Mark was before both the first and the third Evangelists, it is exceedingly difficult to see on what ground they omitted the striking words which go so far to support their own point of view. The so-called 'omissions' of these evangelists make an insuperable difficulty in the way of those who accept the theory that canonical Mark was one of their sources.

In xii. 22-32 we have the account of a discussion which followed upon the cure of a blind and dumb demoniac. This section also appears in the second Gospel. Those who consider that non-Markan material indicates Q assign this section to that document, and get over the inconsistency which might be charged against them by assuming that in this case St. Mark must have used Q. With reference to the supposed use of Q by St. Mark we have written elsewhere (see page 109). It is to be noticed that if St. Mark were here reproducing Q, it is strange that he should have omitted such striking words as are given in the first Gospel in verses 27, 28 and 30. Dr. Streeter<sup>1</sup> holds that St. Mark quoted Q from memory, thus accounting for passages in which there is a divergence from Q in the second Gospel, and in any case he contends that St. Mark

<sup>1</sup> *Oxford Studies*, p. 219.

only used the Logian document to a limited extent. But this limited use of sayings in the second Gospel is better accounted for if the point may be conceded that the narrative of an event does not necessarily exclude the words of Jesus uttered on the occasion. This opinion is expressed clearly by Dr. Stanton<sup>1</sup> who says: 'The mere fact of the existence of parallels in the Logian document to sayings contained in St. Mark is no proof that the author of the latter must have derived them from the oral or written Logian collection, and not directly or independently from the Apostle Peter.' This section therefore with the rest we assign to St. Mark's narrative rather than to Q. There are differences between the one account and the other, but these are fully accounted for on the theory of three editions of Mark. The section in which a description of Scribes and Pharisees demanding a sign from our Lord is given does not appear in St. Mark's Gospel, but that need create no difficulty; for as it has to do with the attitude of these Jews to Christ it would be more apposite in the proto- and deutero-Mark than in the trito-Mark.

The next Markan section of the first Gospel according to our division is found in chapters xii. 33-50 and xiii. 1-23. In this the verses 33-45 in the twelfth chapter do not appear in the second Gospel; they have the appearance of such sayings as we have found in the five great sections which we have taken to constitute St. Matthew's contribution to this Gospel. But it is clear that they are closely connected with the passage which follows in verses 46-50 which is distinctly Markan, and as they have to do with the spiritual failure of the Scribes and Pharisees, and with our Lord's reflections upon them, it is probable that they were excluded from the trito-Mark for this reason.

xiii. 24-52 is, as we have seen, another of the divisions of this Gospel which close with the formula of transition

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 174.

from sayings to narrative. The fact that one of the parables—that of the mustard seed—occurs in St. Mark should not lead us either to include the Matthaean section in the Markan narrative, or to infer that here St. Mark is using Q, for there is no reason in the world why we should rule out from the preaching of St. Peter, reproduced by St. Mark, any parable of our Lord which the preacher or the evangelist might have thought fit to give. The parable might have come into the Matthaean Logia along quite another line of tradition, and there are linguistic differences between the two accounts which lead us to infer that this was so. Further, St. Mark closely connects it with the parable of the seed growing secretly, and we have shown that if St. Mark derived this latter parable from Q it is difficult to see why both St. Matthew and St. Luke should have omitted it in using that document.

At verse 53 a long section common to the first and second Gospel begins and continues to xxiv. 36. In the twentieth, the twenty-second and the twenty-third chapters occur short sections containing the teaching of our Lord, which some would on that account refer to Q, but we have shown reason for including these also in the Markan document (see p. 68 ff.). A considerable part of the matter contained in this section does not appear at all in the third Gospel. It forms what has been called 'the great omission' from the third Gospel, and a discussion of it will be found in chapter vi.

It will not be necessary to dwell here upon the differences between the deutero- and trito-Mark in this section. They exhibit exactly what, we have seen, might be expected in the way of difference between one edition and another—a certain amount of resemblance, inasmuch as both were the work of one evangelist, but also a certain amount of difference inasmuch as they were prepared under different conditions and in the interests of con-

gregations one of which was mainly Jewish, and the other mainly Gentile. We may notice as confirmatory of this that the trito-Mark omits the woes spoken by our Lord against the Scribes and Pharisees.

The last section of the Matthaean Logia begins at xxiv. 37 and continues to xxv. 46. It is what constitutes the Eschatological section of the first Gospel, although Eschatological references in the teaching of our Lord are not limited to this section. The difficult question of the relation of this discourse to the 'Little Apocalypse' in the second Gospel will be better discussed in the following chapter of this work.

In the concluding section, chapters xxvi. 1 to xxviii. 20, the correspondence between the first and second Gospels is particularly close. As we shall see, St. Luke here departs considerably from the Markan source in relating the Passion and the post-Resurrection appearances of our Lord. But the close correspondence between the other two is of peculiar value to us in view of the fact that the last chapter of St. Mark has been obviously mutilated. There can be very little doubt that if we are to seek the close of the second Gospel we shall find it, with such variations as we have found between the one edition and the other, in the first Gospel, and we thus have the Galilean setting of the Markan narrative unbroken to the end, while in the third Gospel St. Luke adopts an account which is far more Judaeian than Galilean. The significance of this will appear in chapter vi.

We may thus conclude that the passages of the first Gospel which we have been considering are Markan in origin, but it is obvious that they have not been taken directly from the second Gospel. In the Additional Notes appended to the fifth chapter of this work it will be seen that the points of difference between these sections and the corresponding passages in Mark are many and considerable. They are usually accounted for as editorial

alterations of Mark, but such explanations are in the majority of cases far from satisfactory. They raise as many difficulties as they remove. If, however, the Markan narrative in the first Gospel is prior to that which we find in the second in this sense—that it formed an earlier edition of St. Mark's work, written when that evangelist was in Egypt, we have a simple but a satisfactory explanation of both resemblances and divergences, and the latter will be seen to be just those which would appear when a writer gives two accounts of the same events, one account being written on behalf of a Jewish-Christian community, and the other written at a later date in the interests of a Gentile Christian Church such as that which was in existence in Rome about the seventh decade of the first century.

In making this analysis of the first Gospel we are perfectly aware that many questions of detail and of linguistic correspondence and difference have not been considered. Different scholars have analysed this Gospel with quite other results. Some of these will be given in the Additional Notes which follow this chapter. What has been offered here has been an analysis on broad and simple lines, taking into account traditional views of the book and attempting to discover from internal evidence such a differentiation of the several parts of the Gospel as will fall in with a reasonable interpretation of that tradition. It would seem more likely that the books which make up the Synoptic Gospels were constructed upon such broad and simple lines, than that they are a mosaic of small portions of narrative and of discourses thrown together according to some elaborate plan. Such a method does not seem to be a likely one in the age in which these Gospels assumed the form in which we know them now, and the somewhat mechanical method of compilation suggested here may after all come nearer the truth than the more elaborate methods which are offered



by modern scholarship. The present writer is far from disparaging the research of scholars to whom he himself is under such great obligation, but the perils of statistics are well known, and it is possible to build up by the use of verbal categories and the enumeration of vocabularies a structure which will command our respect for the ingenuity of its composer, but which may after all be very far from a true representation of the way in which the Gospels came into being.

### ADDITIONAL NOTE I

#### HARNACK'S RE-ARRANGEMENT OF THE LOGIAN DOCUMENT IN THE FIRST GOSPEL (THE SAYINGS OF JESUS, pp. 127-146.)

- |                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Matt. iii. 5, 7-12.                | 21. Matt. x. 10 <sup>b</sup> .                            |
| 2. Matt. iv. 1-11.                    | 22. Matt. x. 15.  |
| 3. Matt. v. 1-4, 6, 11, 12.           | 23. Matt. xi. 21-23.                                      |
| 4. Matt. v. 39-40.                    | 24. Matt. x. 40.  |
| 5. Matt. v. 42.                       | 25. Matt. xi. 25-27.                                      |
| 6. Matt. v. 44-48.                    | 26. Matt. xiii. 16, 17.                                   |
| 7. Matt. vii. 12.                     | 27. Matt. vi. 9-13.                                       |
| 8. Matt. vii. 1-5.                    | 28. Matt. vii. 7-11.                                      |
| 9. Matt. xv. 14.                      | 29. Matt. xii. 22, 23, 25, 27,<br>28, 30, 43-45.          |
| 10. Matt. x. 24-25.                   | 30. Matt. xii. 38, 39, 41, 42.                            |
| 11. Matt. vii. 16-18, xii. 33.        | 31. Matt. v. 15.  |
| 12. Matt. vii. 21, 24-27.             | 32. Matt. vi. 22, 23.                                     |
| 13. Matt. vii. 28, viii. 5-10,<br>13. | 33. Matt. xxiii. 4, 13, 23, 25,<br>27, 29, 30, 32, 34-36. |
| 14. Matt. xi. 2-11.                   | 34. Matt. x. 26-33. ( <i>b</i> ) Matt.<br>xii. 32.        |
| 15. Matt. xi. 16-19.                  | 35. Matt. vi. 25-33.                                      |
| 16. Matt. x. 7.                       | 36. Matt. vi. 19-21.                                      |
| 17. Matt. viii. 19-22.                | 37. Matt. xxiv. 43-51.                                    |
| 18. Matt. ix. 37-38.                  | 38. Matt. x. 34-36.                                       |
| 19. Matt. x. 16 <sup>a</sup> .        |   |
| 20. Matt. x. 12, 13.                  |   |

- |                          |                                   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 39. Matt. v. 25-26.      | 50. Matt. xi. 12, 13.             |
| 40. Matt. xiii. 31-33.   | 51. Matt. v. 18.                  |
| 41. Matt. vii. 13, 14.   | 52. Matt. v. 32.                  |
| 42. Matt. viii. 11, 12.  | 53. Matt. xviii. 17.              |
| 43. Matt. xxiii. 37-39.  | 54. Matt. xviii. 15, 21, 22.      |
| 44. Matt. xxiii. 12.     | 55. Matt. xvii. 20 <sup>b</sup> . |
| 45. Matt. x. 37.         | 56. Matt. xxiv. 26-28, 37-41.     |
| 46. Matt. x. 38.         | 57. Matt. x. 39.                  |
| 47. Matt. v. 13.         | 58. Matt. xxv. 29.                |
| 48. Matt. xviii. 12, 13. | 59. Matt. xix. 28.                |
| 49. Matt. vi. 24.        |                                   |

For a criticism of the above see Dr. Willoughby C. Allen in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 235-272. Dr. Allen offers an alternative rearrangement which may be examined by the student and compared with Harnack's as given above.

Dr. Burkitt considers that if we wish to reconstruct the order and arrangement of the lost document used by Matthew and Luke (he will not call it the Logia), we must take the outline of it from Luke rather than from Matthew. We must subtract from Luke the first two chapters, and those sections of the third Gospel which are derived from Mark: what is left will give us an approximate outline of the document in question. In this Dr. Burkitt is in agreement with Dr. Armitage Robinson. See *The Gospel History in Transmission*, pp. 130 ff.

Dr. Stanton also seems to prefer St. Luke in analysing the Logian source known to the first and third evangelists. His analysis of this source in the first Gospel is as follows:—

1. The ushering in of the Ministry of Christ: Matt. iii. 5, 7-12, 13-17 and iv. 1-11<sup>a</sup>.
2. The first stage in the Preaching of the Gospel: Matt. v. 3; vi. 8; vi. 16-18; vii. 1-5, 12, 15-21, 24-27; viii. 5-10, 13; xi. 2-11, 16-19.
3. The Extension of the Gospel: Matt. ix. 35; viii. 19-22; ix. 37, 38; x. 5<sup>a</sup>, 7-16, 40.
4. The Rejection and the Reception of Divine truth: Matt. xi. 21-23, 25-27; xiii. 16, 17.
5. Instruction on Prayer: Matt. vi. 9-13; vii. 7-11.
6. Jesus and His Antagonists: Matt. xxii. 34-40; xii. 22-30, 43-45, 39-42; vi. 22, 23; xxiii. 136.
7. Exhortations to disciples in view of the opposition and

other trials that awaited them: Matt. x. 26-33; xii. 32; vi. 25-34, 19-21; xxiv. 43-44, 45-51; x. 34-38; xiii. 31-33; xviii. 5-7, 15, 21, 22; xvii. 19-20.

8. The doom on Jerusalem, and the things of the end: Matt. xxiii. 37-39; xxiv. 26-28, 37-41.

Dr. Stanton adds that there may be among pieces peculiar to St. Matthew or St. Luke a few derived from this source which are not included in the above. But the amount of such matter is not likely to have been considerable. In the *Oxford Studies of the Synoptic Problem* Dr. Willoughby Allen criticises Harnack's reconstruction of the Book of Sayings, and offers an alternative of his own based on the principle that the sayings in Matthew, over and above those already found in Mark, when put together present us with a homogeneous, consistent and intelligible work (no doubt only fragmentary). This source, he holds, was a collection of Christ's sayings and discourses compiled to represent certain aspects of His teaching, and was marked by a very characteristic phraseology. Dr. Allen's reconstruction of this source is as follows:

1. Matt. v. 3-12. Nine Beatitudes.  
17, 20, 21-24, 27-28, 31-32, 33-48. The old Law and new righteousness.
- vi. 1-6, 16-18; vii. 1-5, 6, 12, 15-16, 21-23. Illustrations of the better righteousness.
- vii. 24-27. Concluding parable.
- ix. 37-38; x. 5<sup>b</sup>-8; x. 12-13, 15-16, 23. The Mission of the Disciples.
- x. 24-41. A Discourse about Persecution.
- xi. 2-11, 12-15, 16-19. Discourse about John the Baptist.
- xi. 20-30. Woes upon certain cities followed by thanksgiving to the Father.
- xii. 27-28, 30, 32, 33-37. A Discourse about Beelzebub.
- xii. 38-45. Discourse in answer to request for a sign.
- xiii. 24-33, 26-52. Parables concerning the Kingdom.
- xviii. 15-20; xviii. 21-35. A Discourse on forgiveness.
- xxiii. 2-36. A Denunciation of the Pharisees.

Matt. xxiv. 10-12, 26-28, 30, 37-41, 43-51; xxv. 1-12, 14-46. Eschatological Sayings.

v. 13-16, 18-19, 25-26, 29-30; vi. 7-8, 9-13, 14-15, 19-34; vii. 7-11, 13-14, 16-19. Fragments inserted by editor in the Sermon on the Mount.

viii. 11-12, 19-22; ix. 13; xii. 5-7, 11-12; xiii. 16-17. xv. 13-14; xvi. 17-19; xviii. 7, 10-12-14; xix. 11-12, 28.

xxiii. 37-39. Detached Sayings, which stood in the source in positions which we cannot rediscover.

xx. 1-15; xxi. 28-32; xxii. 2-14. Other parables.

Dr. Allen is more consistent than most critics in omitting from the Logia sections which really belong to the Narrative Source, but it does not appear to the present writer that he has accounted for the tradition which connects the name of St. Matthew with the first Gospel, and it seems more likely that the compilation of that Gospel was a more simple matter than the somewhat elaborate arrangement here suggested. Dr. Allen marks certain words and phrases as characteristic of this source. They are such as *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, *ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, *δικαιοσύνη*, *ὁμοιόω*, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, *ἐμπροσθεν* c. Gen., *πονηρός*, *οἱ ὑποκριταί*, *ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. It does not seem, however, that too much weight should be given to a vocabulary of this sort. Such words belong to the phraseology commonly used in such teaching as our Lord would give, and they would inevitably appear in any collection of sayings, however formless and inconsecutive they might be. To us it seems more likely that the arrangement should be assigned to St. Matthew, the language to his translator, or the editor of the Gospel as we know it. But, if arrangement belongs to the Apostle, then the arrangement of five blocks should be taken into account.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE II

ANALYSIS OF ST. MATTHEW'S FIVE COLLECTIONS  
OF SAYINGS OF JESUS

## SECTION 1, MATT. v., vi., vii.

- v. 1. εἰς τὸ ὄρος. Luke has ἔσται ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ. The eight beatitudes in Matt. are represented by only three in Luke. In Luke the disciples are directly addressed, and the beatitudes are followed by corresponding woes.
3. τῷ πνεύματι, an interpretation of πτωχοί, which may have been in the source, or may have been added by St. Matthew.
4. πενθοῦντες . . . παρακληθήσονται. In Luke we read κλαίοντες . . . γελάσατε, κλαίειν is frequent in Luke, and γελᾶν would follow by antithesis, but the expressions are Hebraistic (cf. Ps. cxxvi. 6, Eccl. iii. 4), and may have been in the source.
11. ψευδόμενοι does not appear elsewhere in the Synoptists, and the word reads as if it were an interpolation. It is omitted in D. Latt. and Syrs. The wording of this verse in Luke is entirely different. We infer from this not that St. Luke altered Q, but that he used a different collection of Logia. See p. 56 ff.
12. ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, Luke σκιρτήσατε. Cf. Luke i. 41, 44 and Psalm 68, 16.
- 13-16. Two brief parables. The former is given by St. Luke in xiv. 34 as having been spoken on the way from Galilee to Jerusalem. It also appears in Mark ix. 50, but it does not follow from this that St. Mark took it from Q. See p. 109. The second is given by St. Luke in viii. 16 with considerable verbal differences. It also appears in Mark. iv. 21 where it is thrown into the form of a question, and seems to be quite independent of the statements made in Matt. and Luke.
- 17-48. Relation of the New Law of the Kingdom to the Old Law.
18. Appears in St. Luke's account of the journey up to Jerusalem.

- v. 20. Note as a Matthaean characteristic the condemnation of the Scribes and Pharisees.
- 21-24. These sayings do not appear at all in Luke. Why should he have omitted them if they belonged to a source which was common to him and to St. Matthew?
- 25-26. Derived by St. Luke from 'the Travel Document,' xii. 58. The wording varies in the two versions. Matt. has ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ, while Luke has δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι αὐτοῦ. So also where Matt. has ὑπηρέτης, Luke has πράκτωρ.
- 27-28. This saying is not given by St. Luke. See note on vv. 21-24.
- 29-30. This passage appears as a 'Doublet' in chap. xix. 9, which latter is a Markan Section. Cf. Mark x. 11, and Luke xvi. 18. It is to be noticed that Matthew adds the words παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας. This is in keeping with his Jewish 'Tendency.' See Allen, *I.C.C. in loco*.
- 33-37. Not in Luke.
- 38-40. Luke vi. 29.
- 41-42. ῥαπίζειν, elsewhere only in Matt. xxvi. 17.
41. Not in Luke.
- 43-48. Luke vi. 27-36.
- Matt. has ἔσσεσθε τέλειοι, but Luke has γίνεσθε οἰκτεῖρμονες; which last word appears only here in the Gospels. To take this as a deliberate alteration on the part of St. Luke can hardly be justified.
- vi. 1-18. Warnings against hypocrisy. Dr. Wright says that this section contains 'foreign matter,' and that Matt. vi. 7-15 is 'out of place.' But this criticism presupposes a stricter coherence than is to be expected from the character of the source used by St. Matthew. See p. 56 ff.
- 1-8. Does not occur in Luke. It is difficult to think that he would have omitted them, if he had used either the first Gospel or the same collection of Sayings as St. Matthew used.
- 9-15. We find in Luke that this model Prayer was given on an occasion when the disciples asked their Master to teach them to pray. Luke xi. 2-4. The version he gives contains only three petitions and no doxology. The latter seems to be an addition even in the Matthaean

text. See *Comm. in loco*. In the Lukan version of the first petition there is a remarkable variant found in Gregory of Nyssa, which reads as follows:—*ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρῶς ἡμᾶς*.

- vi. 11. *ἐπιούσιον*. See *Comm. and Wright in loco*. It is impossible that St. Luke made all these alterations and omissions if the details given us in Matt. had appeared in his source also. We conclude that he used a different source.

16-18. Not in Luke.

19-33. The importance of the spiritual.

19-21. Luke xii. 32. Note difference of wording.

22-23. Luke xi. 34, 35.

24. Luke xvi. 13.

25-33. Of this passage too Dr. Wright says that it is 'out of place.' See note on vi. 1-18. It appears in Luke in xii. 22.

- vii. 1-12. The Laws of the Kingdom.

1-5. The Law concerning Censoriousness. Luke vi. 37-38.

The section which follows in Luke is given in Matt. in xv. 14 and x. 24 ff. A clear indication of the non-chronological character of the source, and of the difference between this and the source used by St. Luke.

6. The Law of Sacrilege. Not in Luke.

7-11. The Law concerning Prayer. Luke xi. 9-13.

12. The Golden Rule. Luke vi. 31.

13-23. Warnings.

13-14. This appears in Luke xiii. 22-25.

15. Not in Luke.

16-19. Luke vi. 43-45. The passage in Matt. xii. 33-35 contains similar teaching, but it is not a true doublet. The figure was one which might have been used by our Lord with incidental variations.

22-23. St. Luke takes this from 'the Travel Document.' xiii. 26.

24-27. Concluding similitude. Given in Luke with differences in wording which we account for on the ground not of alterations made by St. Luke, but of a difference in the sources. See p. 56 ff.

28-viii. 1. An editorial note marking a transition from

discourse to narrative. The phrase *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν* is Hebraistic. See Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 32.

#### SECTION 2, ix. 37-x. 42.

- ix. 37-38. St. Luke gives this (x. 1) as a remark made to the Seventy, but Matthew gives it as addressed to the Twelve, and follows it with an account of the call of the Twelve and of Christ's charge to them.
- x. 1. Luke ix. 1.
- 7-10. Luke ix. 2-3, but part of verse 10 appears in Luke as addressed to the Seventy.
- 7. St. Luke gives this charge in brief and general terms, but adds the characteristic word *ἰασθαι*.
- 11. Appears in Luke ix. 4-6 as spoken to the Twelve.
- 12-15. Appears in Luke as spoken to the Seventy (x. 5-12).
- 16. Appears in Luke as spoken to the Seventy (x. 3).
- 17-22. This does not appear in Luke at all. Dr. Wright describes it as a Markan addition. It is true that Mark has a similar passage (xiii. 9 ff.), but the introduction of the Logion here indicates another source. That a similar saying should appear in Markan narrative does not imply that St. Mark used Q. St. Peter might well quote such a saying of our Lord's in the course of his preaching.
- 23. This is an eschatological saying which St. Matthew inserts here as an appropriate conclusion to the passage.
- 24. This is inserted by St. Luke in the sermon on the Plain (vi. 40).
- 25. *ἀρεκτὸν τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος* appears in Luke as *κατηρτισμένος πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος*. The word *κατηρτισμένος* appears only here in the Gospels, though it is not uncommon in the Pauline letters. The word *ἀρεκτόν* is found only in Matt.
- 26-33. St. Luke gives this as a part of the address to the Twelve (xii. 3 ff.) The Lukan form differs from the Matthaean. St. Luke has five sparrows for two farthings. Harnack describes this variant as 'an enigma,' and asks whether sparrows had become cheaper when St. Luke wrote! To such straits are critics reduced when they



- insist upon the theory that the editors of the first and third gospels used the same Logian source, or Q, and that variants imply emendation.
- x. 34-36. Luke xii. 49-53. Where Matthew has μάχαιραν, Luke has διαμερισμόν.
- 37-39. This appears in Luke as spoken when Christ was journeying up to Jerusalem (xiv. 25-27). As verse 38 appears also in Mark (viii. 35), we are not surprised to find that it occurs as a doublet in both Matthew and Luke. The occurrence of the Pauline words περιποιεῖσθαι and ζωογονεῖν in the Lukan version is to be noted. See Acts xx. 28 and 1 Tim. iii. 13 for the one, and Acts. vii. 19 and 1 Tim. 6, 13 for the other. They do not occur elsewhere in the Gospels.
40. The passage in xviii. 5 is not a true doublet. The sayings seem rather to have been uttered by our Lord on different occasions, and St. Mark followed by St. Luke has run the two sayings together.
41. Does not occur at all in St. Luke.
42. This also does not appear in St. Luke's Gospel. It occurs in St. Mark's (ix. 41), but it does not follow either that St. Matthew derived it from St. Mark, or that the latter obtained it from Q.
- xi. 1. Note the formula of transition from discourse to narrative; and compare xiii. 53 and xix. 1.

The way in which throughout this section some of these sayings are given by St. Luke as spoken to the Twelve, others as spoken to the Seventy, while others again are given as spoken on quite other occasions, while St. Matthew gives them all as spoken to the Twelve Disciples, is strongly confirmatory of the contention that each took the sayings from different collections of Logia, in which the occasion of utterance was not marked. St. Matthew, as making a topical arrangement of sayings, brings them all under one head.

### SECTION 3, xiii. 16-53.

St. Matthew has attached to the Markan section which contains the parable of the Sower and its interpretation the

following additional parables which he took from his Logian source.

v. 16-17. Luke gives this as spoken on the way up to Jerusalem when the Seventy returned from their mission.

18-23. The interpretation of the parable of the Sower. The difference in phraseology between this account and that which appears in Mark, especially in the introductory words, seems to indicate that the two accounts are from different sources. That there should be a considerable amount of agreement is not to be wondered at. It does not necessarily indicate a common origin.

24-30. Parable of the Tares. In St. Mark's gospel the parable of the Sower is followed by that of the Seed growing secretly, and this latter is peculiar to Mark. This is a clear indication that there is no common origin for the two sections. It is difficult to see why St. Matthew should have omitted the latter if it was in his source. The parable of the Tares is not, as some would assume, a variant of the parable of the Seed growing secretly. Each parable illustrates the tendency of the two evangelists. St. Matthew inserts the one because it illustrates the corruption of Judaism. St. Mark inserts the other because it accounts for the spontaneous answer of the human heart,—Gentile though it may be—to the appeal of the Gospel—the good seed of the Kingdom.

31-32. The parable of the Mustard Seed. (Mark. iv. 30-32. Luke xiii. 18-19.) All three accounts vary, and St. Luke places the parable in his account of the journey up to Jerusalem. This parable then is from three different sources. St. Mark's source is Petrine. St. Matthew derives it from the Logia; St. Luke gets it from 'the Travel Document.'

33. The parable of the Leaven. Luke xiii. 20-21.

34-35. An insertion from the collection of Messianic Texts.

36-43. Interpretation of the parable of the Tares.

44. Parable of the hidden Treasure. Peculiar to Matthew.

45-46. Parable of the Pearl of great Price. Peculiar to Matthew.

47-50. Parable of the Drawnet. Peculiar to Matthew.

51-52. The Householder and his Treasury.

53. Formula of transition from discourse to Narrative. Note the word *μετῆρην* found in only these formulae, cf. vii. 28.

#### SECTION 4, xviii. 1-xix. 1.

- v. 1-11. A discourse on true greatness. Considerable portions of this are common to all three evangelists; but Matthew differs so much from the other two, both in what appears and what does not, while in addition he gives quite another occasion for the giving of the discourse, that it is best to consider the rest of this chapter to belong to the Matthaean Logia. That it should also appear in the Markan narrative (with variants) should create no difficulty. Why should not St. Peter have given the gist of this teaching in the course of his preaching? The latter part of the section dealing with 'offences' was given very briefly in the proto-Mark. See Luke xvii. 2.
- 12-14. Parable of the Lost Sheep. Taken by St. Matthew from the Logia. St. Luke has substantially the same parable; but he derives it from 'the Travel Document,' and it appears in xv. 3-7.
- 15-22. The Law of Forbearance. There is a brief statement to the same effect in Luke xvii. 3-4. St. Matthew follows the enunciation of the law with the parable of the Unforgiving Servant, which does not appear elsewhere. Note the phrase *συναίρειν λόγον* which occurs again in Matthew xxv. 19, another of the five sections of St. Matthew's collections, and not elsewhere.
- 23-35. The parable of the Unforgiving Servant.
- xix. 1. Formula of transition to Markan narrative. Note the repetition of *μετῆρην*. See note on vii. 28.

#### SECTION 5, xxiv. 37-xxvi. 1.

The close correspondence between what precedes this section with the Markan parallel, which is given by St. Luke also, forbids our assigning it to the Logia of St. Matthew. But at verse 37 the editor of the first gospel departs from his Markan

source, and what follows may be assigned to the Logia. The editor seems to have joined on to Christ's words as to the destruction of Jerusalem His teaching with reference to the Parousia. Probably the Apocalyptic language used of both events suggested his doing this.

v. 37. In Luke the phrase ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου appears as ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. There is no reason whatever why St. Luke should have altered the word παρουσία, if he found it in his source. Harnack says that he abandoned it because it belonged to the sphere of Jewish Messianic dogma, and was an unsuitable term for that second coming in which Christians believed. It is difficult to see how Harnack can hold this opinion in view of St. Paul's use of the word. See 1 Thess. ii. 20 and elsewhere.

33. At this point St. Luke inserts an additional parallel from the history of Lot. If the two evangelists used a common source in which it appeared, it is hard to say why St. Matthew should have omitted to give it. If it was not in the source, then it is equally hard to say whence St. Luke derived it. To account for it as a 'scrap of oral tradition' begs the whole question of an oral basis for the Gospels, and against this there is too much to be said. See Chapter i., Additional Note.

40. Where Matthew has ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ Luke has ἐπὶ κλίνης. Harnack thinks that St. Luke altered Q in this way so as to convey the idea that the coming might be at night. This seems to be an unnecessary refinement of criticism.

43-51. This Logion appears in Luke in 'the Travel Document,' xii. 39-40.

xxv. 1-13. The parable of the Ten Virgins. This is peculiar to Matthew. It is appropriate to him as it records the failure of the Jews to welcome the Messiah.

14-30. The parable of the Talents. In spite of the general likeness between this parable and that of the Pounds (Luke xix. 11-26), we do not hold that the two parables are identical. The Lukan parable appears to be taken from 'the Travel Document.' It was spoken at Jericho in the house of Zacchaeus, and all the details of the two parables differ. The parable of the Pounds in Luke

seems to be based upon the history of the effort of Archelaus to obtain the title of βασιλεύς. See Commentaries. If the parables are identical and from the same source, then St. Luke has allowed himself an altogether unwonted amount of licence in the alteration of details. It is better to consider that the two accounts not only differ in origin, but were spoken on different occasions. Their common theme is that of privilege and responsibility, and on that subject we may imagine that our Lord would frequently speak.

31-46. The Last Judgment. Peculiar to Matthew.

xxvi. 1. Formula of transition. See note on vii. 28.

### ADDITIONAL NOTE III

#### QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE FIRST GOSPEL

A marked feature of the first Gospel is to be found in the way in which passages from the Old Testament are woven into the narrative. A distinction, however, has to be drawn between citations which are given as made by our Lord Himself in the course of His ministry, whether of teaching or of healing, and those passages which are evidently introduced by the unknown editor of the Gospel as we have it. The connection of the former with what precedes is always such as would be naturally used by a speaker who wished to point his remarks from the authoritative literature of his people, but the latter are invariably introduced by the phrase 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet,' or its equivalent. The passages are as follows:—

Matt. i. 22, 23. = Isaiah vii. 14.

ii. 5, 6. = Micah v. 1, 4<sup>a</sup>.

15. = Hosea xi. 1.

17, 18. = Jerem. xxxi. 15.

23.

iv. 14, 16. = Isaiah viii. 23.

viii. 17. = Isaiah liii. 4.

Matt. xii. 17-21. = Isaiah xlii. 1-4.

xiii. 35.

xxi. 4, 5. = Isaiah lxii. 11 ; Zech. ix. 9.

xxvii. 9-10.

Of these it is to be noticed

1. That the passage from ii. 23 does not occur in any book of the Old Testament.

2. That the passages in Matt. ii. 6, 15, viii. 17 are apparently cited from a different text from that which we have, as there is considerable difference between the quotation and the passages with which they are usually identified.

3. That the passage in Matt. xxvii. 9 is said to be taken from the prophet Jeremiah, whereas it seems rather to correspond, and that not very closely, to Zechariah xi. 13.

4. In the passage in xiii. 35 the Sinaitic manuscript reads *Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου*, and Dr. Hort seems to consider it the true reading. If so then a passage is assigned to Isaiah which is really taken from Psalm lxviii. 2.

5. The quotations are made usually from the Hebrew, but some of the passages seem to be taken from the LXX. This is notably the case in Matt. iii. 3 and i. 23, though some other passages also read as if they were reminiscences of the LXX. On the other hand the passages given as quoted by our Lord are wholly from the LXX. They belong, as it seems, to the Markan source used by the editor of the first Gospel, the fuller citations found in Matt. xiii. 14, 15 and xix. 18, 19 being due not to the editor, but to the source; that source was not canonical Mark, but an earlier edition prepared especially for Jewish Christians, and for that reason making a fuller reference to the Jewish scriptures. We need not therefore make any further reference to these passages.

Returning to the other class we may draw from the facts enumerated above the conclusion that these quotations were made from a collection of similar passages taken from the Hebrew. Dr. Stanton considers that they came before the editor in a translation from an Aramaic document, which may be described as 'a Catena of fulfilments of prophecy,' and this description would account for the features which they exhibit. Probably the name of the prophets, from whose writings the quotations were made, had not been attached to them in this

Catena, and we can account thus for the uncertainty as to origin which some of them exhibit. Dr. Stanton holds that the collection was not a bare Catena, but that the incident which was held to fulfil the prophecy was in each case attached. It is, however, scarcely possible from such slender material as we possess to reconstruct even in outline the contents of the source. It may have been full, or it may have been a very incomplete collection. The paucity of passages referring to the Passion and Crucifixion of our Lord would indicate that it was very imperfect. Dr. Burkitt considers that possibly the compilation was made by St. Matthew, and that it was because of the use made of it in the first Gospel that the name of that apostle was attached to the Gospel. This, however, seems to us a very slender cause for giving St. Matthew's name to the Gospel, and we have indicated a far more likely reason for his name being connected with it. See pages, 72, 73.