

to the larger kind of coasting craft. A large part of the country formerly covered with forest has been recklessly cleared, but the Tarnova plateau is still a fine wooded district with an area of about 35 or 40 square miles. The red beech is the predominant and in some parts almost the exclusive tree, but it is being displaced by the fir and the pine. A number of pits in the plateau are full of ice all the year round, and yield about 16,000 cwts. annually for the consumption of the neighbouring countries. More than a fifth of the area of the country is pasture-land, and less than a twenty-fourth is under the plough.

The vine is largely cultivated, being not only planted in regular vineyards but introduced in long lines through the ordinary fields and carried up the hills in terraces locally called *ronchi*. Wheat, maize, buck-wheat, and potatoes are the usual crops. Silk growing is largely carried on, especially in the lowlands, and furnishes the material for the most extensive industry of the country. There are about 2000 workers in silk, and the produce is worth upwards of £200,000, while the cotton manufacture, which is next in importance, employs about 1000, and produces £100,000. Leather, linen, paper, and soap are manufactured on a smaller scale. The trade of the country is of very little importance. Görz and Gradisca, according to the constitution of 1861, have a diet consisting of six representatives of the landed proprietors, seven representatives of the towns and industrial interests, and eight representatives of the rural communes. The elector for the landed interest must pay 100 florins (about £10) of land-tax in the Italian circle, and 50 florins (about £5) in the Slovenian circle. Two representatives are sent to the imperial council. The political administration is in the hands of the lieutenant of the coast-lands, which include not only Görz and Gradisca but also Trieste and Istria. Roman Catholicism is the exclusive religion, the only Protestant community being in the town of Görz, and the Jews numbering only some 400. Ethnographically the population must contain much more various elements, but in 1857, out of a total of 196,276 inhabitants, 130,748 were registered as Slovenians, 47,841 as Friulians, 15,134 as Italians, and only 2150 as Germans.

Görz first appears distinctly in history about the close of the 10th century, as part of a district bestowed by the emperor Otto III. on John, patriarch of Aquileia. In the 11th century it became the seat of the Eppenstein family, who frequently bore the title of counts of Gorizia; and in the beginning of the 12th century the countship passed from them to the Lurngan family which continued to exist till the year 1500, and acquired possessions in Tyrol, Carinthia, Friuli, and Styria. In the course of the 13th and 14th centuries the counts often appear as protectors (*Schirmvogt* or *Advocatus*) of the church of Aquileia and as captains-general of Friulia. When the Venetians took possession of Friulia they gave Count Henry the title of hereditary marshal as a compensation for his loss of office. The right of coining was exercised by the counts from the 13th century. On the death of Count Leonhard (12th April 1500) the fief reverted to the house of Hapsburg.

GÖRZ, GÖRTZ, or GÖRIZ (Italian, *Gorizia*; Modern Latin, *Goritia*), the chief town of the crown-land, is beautifully situated in the fruitful valley of the Isonzo, 25 miles N.N.W. of Trieste by railway. It is the seat of an archbishop, of a circle court, and of a head tax-office. The principal buildings are the cathedral, the former Jesuit church and college now converted into barracks, the convents of the brothers and sisters of mercy, of the Franciscans, of the Capuchins, and of the Ursulines, the municipal buildings, the theatre, the house of the bishop, and the old castle of the former counts of Tyrol and Görz now converted into a prison. Among the educational establishments are a central episcopal seminary, a gymnasium, an upper real-school, a deaf and dumb institute, and an agricultural school. The industries include cotton and silk weaving, sugar refining, brewing, the manufacture of leather, and the making of rosoglio. There is also a considerable trade in wooden work, fruit, and wine. On

account of its mild climate the town is coming to be much resorted to by invalids in winter. Charles X., the exiled king of France, died at Görz 6th November 1836. The population of the town in 1869 was 16,659.

Besides the great monograph of K. von Czörnig, *Das Land Görz und Gradisca*, Vienna, 1873 and 1874, see Siegmund, *Südliche Klimatische Kurorte*, Vienna, 1875; Coronini, *Fastorum Goritensium lib. i.*, Vienna, 1769, and *L'Antica moneta Goriziana*, Görz, 1785; Schweizer, *Abriégé de l'histoire des comtes de Gorice*, Trieste, 1859; Carlo Morelli of Schönfeld, *Istoria della Contea di Gorizia*, Görz, 1855-56; Della Bona, *Sunto istorico di Gorizia e di Gradisca*, Görz, 1853; Siebert, *Görz, Stadt und Land*.

GOS-HAWK, *i.e.*, Goose-Hawk, the *Astur palumbarius* of ornithologists, and the largest of the short-winged Hawks used in Falconry. Its English name, however, has possibly been transferred to this species from one of the long-winged Hawks, or true Falcons, since there is no tradition of the Gos-Hawk, now so called, having ever been used in Europe to take Geese or other large and powerful birds. The genus *Astur* may be readily distinguished from *Falco* by the smooth edges of its beak, its short wings (not reaching beyond about the middle of the tail), and its long legs and toes—though these last are stout and comparatively shorter than in the Sparrow-Hawks (*Accipiter*). In plumage the Gos-Hawk has a general resemblance to the Peregrine Falcon (see FALCON, vol. ix. p. 2), and it undergoes a corresponding change as it advances from youth to maturity—the young being longitudinally streaked beneath, while the adults are transversely barred. The irides, however, are always yellow, or in old birds orange, while those of the Falcons are dark brown. The sexes differ greatly in size. There can be little doubt that the Gos-Hawk, now-a-days very rare in Britain, was once common in England, and even towards the end of the last century Thornton obtained a nestling in Scotland, while Irish Gos-Hawks were of old highly celebrated. Being strictly a woodland-bird, its disappearance may be safely connected with the disappearance of our ancient forests, though its destructiveness to Poultry and Pigeons has doubtless contributed to its present scarcity. In many parts of the continent of Europe it still abounds. It ranges eastward to China, and is much valued in India (see FALCONRY, vol. ix. p. 11). In North America it is represented by a very nearly allied species, *A. atricapillus*, chiefly distinguished by the closer barring of the breast. Three or four examples corresponding with this form have been obtained in Britain. A good many other species of *Astur* (some of them passing into *Accipiter*) are found in various parts of the world, but the only one that need here be mentioned is the *A. nova-hollandia* of Australia, which is remarkable for its dimorphism—one form possessing the normal dark-coloured plumage of the genus, and the other being perfectly white, with crimson irides. It must be stated, however, that some writers hold these two forms to be distinct species, and call the dark-coloured one *A. cinereus* or *A. raii*. (A. N.)

GOSHEN (𐤒𐤱), or the land of Goshen, a territory of Egypt in which the Israelites were settled from Jacob's immigration to the Exodus. In the Septuagint the equivalent is usually the land Gesem (Γεσέμ), but in Gen. xlv. 10 "the land Gesem of Arabia," Arabia being here either the Arabian nome (*Ἀραβίας νομός*) or the extreme east of Lower Egypt. According to Dr Brugsch the Arabian name was the 20th of Lower Egypt in the older division known to us, the 32d in the later, the alteration in the number being due to a new division under the Ptolemies (*Dict. Géogr.*, List following preface). The Egyptian name of the nome was Supt, and the capital was Kesem, probably Kosem, also called Kesem-Abot, Kesem of the East (Arabia), equivalent to the Gesem of the Septuagint, preserved in the classical Phacusa (Pa-Kesem), and the modern Fakoos, where mounds mark the site of the ancient town (*cf.* Brugsch,

76., 876-7, 1049-50). The etymology is doubtful; probably the name is like many others in the same part of Egypt of Semitic origin, as another land of Goshen, with a capital city of the same name, is mentioned in southern Palestine. It is therefore certain that the land of Goshen was around the town of Phacusa. The site of this town lies within the easternmost part of Lower Egypt, under 20 miles in a direct line south of Sán, the site of Tanis. These conditions suit those of the Biblical narrative. It is obvious that Goshen was a pastoral country, that it was suited for a Shemite settlement, and was in the Shemite part of Lower Egypt, its north-eastern portion. It was near the seat of government in that part of the country, which at this time was Tanis-Rameses, which town, or another of the same name, was the starting-point at the Exodus. In one place (Gen. xlvii. 11) the "land of Rameses" occurs where we should expect "the land of Goshen." We are not sufficiently acquainted with the administrative divisions at this early time to be able to explain this. It may, however, be conjectured that if the Rameses of the Exodus journey was the same as Tanis-Rameses, the archaic Tanite nome may have included the land of Goshen.

GOSLAR, a town in the district of Hildesheim, Prussia, province of Hanover, is situated on the Gose, an affluent of the Ocker, at the foot of the Harz, 24 miles S.E. of Hildesheim. It is surrounded by walls, and has a very antique appearance. Among the noteworthy buildings are the market church, in the Romantic style, restored since its partial destruction by fire in 1844, and containing the town archives, and a library in which are some of Luther's manuscripts; the old town-house, possessing many interesting antiquities; the Kaiserworth, with the statues of the German emperors; the Kaiserhaus, founded by Henry III. in 1050, and along with the adjoining Ulrich's chapel restored in 1873 at the cost of the Prussian Government; the small chapel, which is all that remains since 1820 of the old cathedral founded by Henry III. in 1040, containing among other antiquarian relics of the cathedral an old altar supposed to be that of the idol Krodo which formerly stood on the

top of the Burgberg near Neustadt-Harzburg; the church of the monastery of Neuwerk, in the Roman style, with wall paintings of considerable merit; and the house of the bakers' guild, the birthplace of Marshal Maurice of Saxony. There are four Evangelical churches, one Catholic church, a synagogue, a real school of the first order, a higher girls' school, and a number of small foundations. The population are chiefly occupied in connexion with the sulphur, copper, silver, and other mines in the neighbourhood. The town has also been long noted for its beer, and possesses some small manufactures, and a considerable trade in fruit. The population in 1875 was 9838.

Goslar was founded by Henry the Fowler about 920, and when in the time of Otto the Great the mineral treasures in the neighbourhood were discovered it increased rapidly in prosperity. It was frequently the seat of German diets, and the residence of the emperor. About 1350 it joined the Hanseatic League. It was unsuccessfully besieged in 1625, during the Thirty Years' War, but was taken by the Swedes in 1632, and nearly destroyed by fire. Additional conflagrations in 1728 and 1780 gave a severe blow to its ancient prosperity. It was a free town till 1802, when it came into possession of Prussia. In 1807 it was joined to Westphalia, in 1816 to Hanover, and in 1866 it was, along with Hanover, reunited to Prussia.

GOSLICKI, WAWĘŻYNIĘC (1533-1607), a learned Pole, better known under his Latinized name of Laurentius Grimalius Goslicius, was born about 1533. After having studied first at Cracow and afterwards at Padua, he entered the church, and was successively appointed bishop of Kamienetz and of Posen. Goslicki, although an ecclesiastic, was an active man of business, was held in high estimation by his contemporaries, and was frequently engaged in political affairs. It was chiefly through his influence, and through the letter he wrote to the pope against the Jesuits, that they were prevented from establishing their schools at Cracow. He was also a strenuous advocate of religious toleration in Poland. He died October 31, 1607.

His principal work is *De optimo senatore*, &c. (Venice, 1568). There are two English translations published respectively under the titles *A commonwealth of good counsaile*, &c. (1607), and *The Accomplished Senator, done into English by Mr Oldisworth* (1733).

## G O S P E L S

### SYNOPTICAL GOSPELS.

OF the four canonical Gospels<sup>1</sup> (*god*, God or good; *spell*, discourse or tidings, *cf.* εὐαγγέλιον) the first three (differing from the fourth) agree in narrating nearly the same events in somewhat similar language, and are hence called synoptical (σύν, together; ὄψις, view). It will be advantageous to begin with the treatment of these, as to their origin, date, and objects, so far as can be determined from (1) internal evidence and (2) external evidence.

#### Internal Evidence.

In discussing the internal evidence, it will be convenient to speak, first, of those portions of the synoptic narrative which are found in three Gospels; then of those which are found in only two; and, lastly, of those which are found in only one.

*The Triple Tradition.*—Few are aware of the very small extent to which independent narrators of the same events use the same words. A comparison of a few specimens of independent narratives (of such events, for example, as the attempt to assassinate King Humbert, or the recent death of the Prince Imperial) would show that the narratives often contain scarcely two or three consecutive words in common, and rarely or never a whole clause of five or six words. The same statement applies to narratives of discourses of any length reported from memory, and not from notes taken at the moment. Now it is well known

that in many parts of the first three Gospels the same words and phrases are curiously interlaced, in such a way as to suggest that the writers have borrowed either from each other or from some common source. For example, in describing the healing of the sick (Mat. viii. 16; Mk. i. 32; Lu. iv. 40), Matthew begins thus: *ὁφίας δὲ γενομένης*; Mark, *ὁφίας δὲ γενομένης ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος*; Luke, *δίνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου*. From this and many similar passages it might seem natural to infer that Mark borrowed one of these expressions from Matthew and the other from Luke, and that the narrative of Mark is little more than a combination of passages from Matthew and Luke. This is an inference which has actually been drawn by many critics both before and since De Wette; but at present it finds comparatively little support among competent investigators. However, the oscillations of New Testament criticism have been so numerous that it may be of use to indicate a method by which the originality of Mark may be established on an immovable basis. That Mark (at all events in many parts) contains the original document or tradition from which Matthew and Luke have borrowed can be proved from demonstration by a necessary inference from the following specimen of narrative common to the three writers.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> From a *Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels*, now in preparation, by Mr W. G. Rushbrooke, B.A., formerly Scholar of St John college, Cambridge. The text followed here and throughout this article has been generally that of Tischendorf.

33 Ἀλλήν παραβολήν ἀκ- ούσατε. Ἄνθρωπος ἦν οἰκ- οδοποιήσας, ὅστις ἐφύ- τεύσεν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ φραγμὸν ἀύτῳ περιέθηκεν καὶ ὄρυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ ληνὸν καὶ ἐκοδόμησεν πύργον, καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργούς, καὶ ἀπέδημυσεν. 34 ὅτε δὲ ἡ- γ- γ- ε- σ- ε- ν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρ- πῶν, ἀπέστειλεν τοὺς δούλ- ους αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς γεωρ- γοὺς λαβεῖν τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ. 35 καὶ λαβόντες οἱ γεωρ- γοὶ τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ ἔ- ν- μ- ν- ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτε- ι- ν- α- ν, ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν.

36 πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλοις δού- ους πλεονάζοντες τῶν πρώ- των, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς ὡσαύτως.

37 ὅσπερ οὖν δὲ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ λέγων· Ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. 38 οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἰδόντες τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκείνου· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· εἴτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν καὶ σχῶμεν τὴν κληρονο- μίαν αὐτοῦ. 39 καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶ- νος καὶ ἀπέκτειναν. 40 ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶ- νος, τί ποιήσει τοῖς γεωργοῖς ἐκείνοις; 41 λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέ- σει αὐτοὺς, καὶ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐκδώσει αἰσθητοῖς ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς, οἵτινες ἀποδοῦσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν.

42 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γρα- φαῖς· Λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας· παρὰ Κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν; 43 διὰ τὸ τοῦ λέγει ὁ υἱὸς ὅτι ἀρθῆσεται ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δοθήσεται ἐθνικοῦντων τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς.

44 Καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τὸν οὗτον συνθλασθήσεται· ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ, λικμήσει αὐτόν.

9 Ἦρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην. Ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργούς, καὶ ἀπέδημυσεν χρο- νοὺς ἰκανοὺς. 10 καὶ καιρῷ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τοὺς γεωργούς δούλον, ἵνα ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος δώσωσιν αὐτῷ· οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἐξάπέστειλαν αὐτὸν δειραντες κενόν.

11 καὶ προσέθετο ἕτερον πέμψαι· οἱ δὲ κάκεινον δεῖ- ραντες καὶ ἀτιμάσαντες ἐξά- πέστειλαν κενόν. 12 καὶ προσέθετο τρίτον πέμψαι· οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τραυμα- τίσαντες ἐξέβαλον.

13 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος· Τί ποιήσω; πέμψω τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπη- τόν· ἵσως τοῦτον ἐντραπήσου- νται. 14 ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλο- υς λέγοντες· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐ- τόν ἵνα ἡμῶν γένηται ἡ κλη- ρονομία. 15 καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ἀπέ- κτειναν. τί οὖν ποιήσει αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; 16 ἐλευ- σεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς τοῦτοῦς, καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπε- λῶνα ἄλλοις. ἀκούσαντες δὲ εἶπαν, Μὴ γένοιτο.

17 ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς εἶπεν· Τί οὖν ἐστὶν τὸ γε- γραμμένον τοῦτο· Λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας;

18 πᾶς ὁ πεσὼν ἐπ' ἐκείνου τὸν λίθον συνθλασθήσεται· ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ, λικμήσει αὐτόν.

1 Καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν. Ἀμπε- λῶνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν, καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμὸν καὶ ὄρυξεν ὑπολήμιον καὶ ἐκοδόμησεν πύργον, καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωρ- γούς, καὶ ἀπέδημυσεν. 2 καὶ ἀπέ- στειλεν πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς τῷ καιρῷ δούλον, ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρ- πῶν τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος· 3 καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἔδειραν καὶ ἀπέστειλαν κενόν.

4 καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δούλον κάκιστον ἐκεφαλῶσαυ καὶ ἡτίμασαν. 5 καὶ ἄλλον ἀπέστειλεν κάκεινον ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλοις, οὓς μὲν δέροντες οὓς δὲ ὄποκτεν- νυντες.

6 ἔτι ἕνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἕσ- χατον πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων ὅτι· Ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. 7 ἐκείνοις (?) δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπαν ὅτι· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦρ' ἀπο- κτείνωμεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἡμῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία. 8 καὶ λαβόντες ἀπέκτειναν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν (?) ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος. 9 τί ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπε- λῶνος; θείσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς, καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις.

10 Οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταυ- τὴν ἀνέγνωτε, λίθον ὃν ἀπε- δοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας· 11 παρὰ Κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν;

It will be observed in the foregoing extracts<sup>1</sup> that (up to verse 11 of Mark), besides the matter common to all three writers, Mark and Luke have a good deal of additional matter in common (ἤρξατο, the dat. term. (καιρῷ), ἵνα ἀπὸ, ἐξάπέστειλαν αὐτὸν κενόν, κάκεινον, καὶ ἡτίμασαν, ἀγαπητόν, πρὸς, ἡμῶν, θείσεται καὶ, τοὺς γεωργοὺς); Mark and Matthew have also much additional matter in common (καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμὸν καὶ ὄρυξεν (υπο)λήμιον) καὶ ἐκοδό- μησεν πύργον, καὶ λαβόντες, πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν, ἄλλ(ον), ἀπέκτειναν, πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων, ἐαυτοῖς), εἶπ(ον), δεῦτε, λαβόντες, παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν; but, in striking contrast, Matthew and Luke have no additional matter in common, except that in verse 3 of Mark they insert οἱ γεωργοὶ for clearness; in verse 7 they insert ἰδόντες; and in verse 9 they insert οὖν. Are these facts compatible with the theory that Mark com- pounded his narrative out of Matthew and Luke?

We may begin by dismissing the three trifling words which Matthew and Luke agree in adding to the Triple Tradition (by which we mean the matter common to the three Gospels), as being words that any early editor of Mark might naturally insert. The insertion of the subject in verse 3, for clearness, requires no comment. The οὖν in verse 9 softens an abruptness which (however character- istic of Mark) would naturally repel readers and editors. Again, in verse 7 the omission of some phrase to denote that the husbandmen saw the son approaching before they formed their plan, is so abrupt that ἰδόντες or θεασάμενοι has been actually supplied in Mark by several manuscripts and versions (possibly, of course, influenced by Matthew and Luke), and might naturally be supplied by still earlier editors. Having therefore accounted for these words, we are led to this result, that, from Mk. xii. 1 to Mk. xii. 11, Matthew and Luke contain nothing in common which is not also found in a slightly modified edition of Mark.<sup>2</sup> This being the case, it can be proved by *reductio ad absurdum* that Mark did not copy from Matthew and Luke. For suppose that he did so copy, it follows that he must not only have constructed a narrative based upon two others, borrowing here a piece from Matthew and here a piece from Luke, but that he must have deliberately determined to insert, and must have adapted his narrative so as to insert, every word that was common to Matthew and Luke. The difficulty of doing this is enormous, and will be patent to any one who will try to perform a similar literary feat himself. To embody the whole of even one document in a narrative of one's own, without copying it *verbatim*, and to do this in a free and natural manner, requires no little care. But to take two documents, to put them side by side and analyse their common matter, and then to write a narrative, graphic, abrupt, and in all respects the oppo- site of artificial, which shall contain every phrase and word that is common to both—this would be a *tour de force* even for a skilful literary forger of these days, and

<sup>1</sup> The ordinary type on page 790 exhibits the words and phrases common to all three writers, which we will henceforth call the "Triple Tradition"; the underlined type that which is common to each pair (in addition to the matter common to the three); and the spaced type that which each writer has peculiar to himself alone. The black type in the first column represents that which (in addition to the matter common to the three) is common to Matthew and Mark; in the second column it represents that which is common to Luke and Matthew; in the third column, that which is common to Mark and Luke. It follows that the same words which are found as underlined type in the first, second, and third columns will be found as small black type in the second, third, and first columns respectively.

<sup>2</sup> The verse added in Matt. xxi. 44 is omitted by Tischendorf, and is perhaps not part of the text of Matthew. But, if genuine, it is a reference to the "winnowing-stone" in Daniel ii. 44, 45, which might naturally be added by some early editor of the original tradition, and might readily be adopted into the subsequent editions of it, which are known to us as the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke.

may be dismissed as an impossibility for the writer of the Second Gospel.

For example, Mark might have begun his narrative, Καὶ ἔλεγε αὐτοῖς, omitting παραβολήν; he might have borrowed οἰκοδομοῦντες from Matthew and have dropped ἄνθρωπος; he might have borrowed πέμψαι from Luke (ver. 11) instead of ἀπέστειλε. Had he done these things (all natural enough), we should have at once had, as additional "common matter" for Matthew and Luke, παραβολήν, ἄνθρωπος, and ἀπέστειλεν, and all in the space of three verses, and "common matter" proportionally in the rest of the narrative. We may assume, therefore, that Mark did not copy Matthew and Luke in this passage, nor in other passages where a similar phenomenon occurs. But it occurs throughout by far the greater part of Mark's narrative. We may, there- fore, regard it as absolutely certain that by far the greater part of Mark is not borrowed from Matthew and Luke, and that the duality of phrase, which is undoubtedly a characteristic of Mark, must be explained by other causes. (For other passages where Matthew and Luke have little or no additional matter in common, compare more espe- cially the passages parallel to Mk. ii. 13-17; iii. 1-6; v. 1-39; x. 17-31; xi. 1-10; xii. 13-27; xiii. 1-19; xiv. 1-16; xv. 1-11.)

The question remains, Were Matthew and Luke entirely dependent upon Mark for that part of their narrative which covers the same ground as Mark? It would not be difficult, from a comparison of the three columns above, to make it probable that both Matthew and Luke did not borrow from the complete Mark as we have it. For though each of the three additions οὖν, ἰδόντες, οἱ γεωργοὶ, is in itself natural enough, yet the hypothesis that Matthew and Luke independently adopted precisely these and no other additions is most improbable. From a comparison of many such passages the improbability of the borrowing hypothesis might be increased. But as the process of proof could not be complete, and would certainly be long, it will be better to bring forward some short passages which are wholly irreconcilable with the hypo- thesis of deliberate borrowing, and which point to an original source, either written or oral, round which the three narratives play. Those passages will be most con- vincing where there are traces that some original tradition has been differently understood by the different writers.

(a) One natural error in interpreting a terse tradition (perhaps translated from Aramaic into Greek) would be to supply different subjects to the same verbs, as in the following important passages, which variously describe the message of the angel or angels to the women at the tomb of Jesus:—

- (1) Matt. xxviii. 7, προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε· ἰδοὺ, εἶπον ὑμῖν—"behold, I have told you."
- (2) Mk. xvi. 7, προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε, καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν—"as He told you."
- On the other hand, Luke, who records several appearances of the Lord to the disciples in or near Jerusalem, and who does not take the Galilean view of the resurrection, finds the words εἰς τὴν Γ. out of place in his narrative. Yet his memory or knowledge of the common tradition is too strong to allow him to omit all mention of Galilee, and he therefore inserts it, but differently.
- (3) Lu. xxiv. 6, μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἐτι ὃν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ—"remember how He spake unto you while He was still in Galilee."
- (8) (1) Matt. iii. 5, ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν . . . πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.
- (2) Mk. i. 5 (agreeing here with Matthew), ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν . . . πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα.
- (3) Lu. iii. 3, ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.
- (7) In some cases the confusion is so important as seriously to affect the context, as in—
- (1) Matt. xix. 16, Διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω—which is

Evidence of an original source.

followed (in the correct text) by "Why askest thou me about the good?"

- (2) Mk. x. 17, Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω—which is followed by "Why callest thou me good?"
(3) Luke (xviii. 18) agrees with Mark: Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας. Note that a scribe has endeavoured to combine the two traditions by inserting ἀγαθέ in Matt. xix. 16.

In the following the confusions are between only two narratives:—

- (3) (1) Mk. iv. 19, αἱ μέριμναι . . . εἰσπορευόμεναι συνπνίγουναι—“cares, going into the heart, choke (the word).”
(2) Lu. viii. 14, ἐπὶ μεριμνῶν . . . πορευόμενοι συνπνίγονται—“(the men) going their way (or gradually, as in LXX.), are choked by cares, or under the influence of cares.

(e) In the following, Matthew and Mark concur in attributing “desire” and “fear;” but Matthew attributes the “desire” to Herod, Mark to Herodias; again, Matthew makes the object of the “fear” to be the “crowd,” Mark “John the Baptist.”

- (1) Matt. xiv. 5, Καὶ θέλων αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον.
(2) Mk. vi. 19, Ἦ δὲ Ἡρωδίας . . . ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, καὶ οὐκ ἔδύνατο· ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην.

(c) In a record of dialogue, the phrases, “said he,” “answered they,” would naturally vary (as they do, Matthew, Mark, and Luke having peculiarities in this respect), and they might sometimes be omitted, with the important result of transmuting a statement of fact (Mark) into an utterance of Jesus (Matthew), thus:—

- (1) Matt. xxvi. 2, Οἶσθε ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ πάσχα γίνεται.
(2) Mk. xiv. 1, Ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἔξομα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας.

(7) The following is another case of difference in the grammatical subject of the verb; the resemblance will appear demonstrative proof of confusion to those who compare the context, and who also remember that ἀκολουθεῖν is used habitually of others following Jesus, but not of Jesus following others.

- (1) Matt. ix. 19, Καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ.
(2) Mk. v. 24, Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν μετ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πλῆθος.

(e) In the following there is a curious confusion from the omission of some words by Luke, so that what is the apodosis in Matthew becomes the protasis in Luke:—

- (1) Matt. xii. 26, Καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς [τὸν Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει], ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη πᾶς [οὐδ’] σταθίσει ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ;
(2) Lu. xi. 18, εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν διμερίσθη, πᾶς σταθίσει ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ;

(c) The following suggests that some Aramaic word meaning to “question” and to “try” or “tempt” may have been diversely rendered by—

- (1) Matt. xii. 10, Καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν, λέγοντες εἰ ἔξειστι θεραπεύειν.
(2) Lu. vi. 7, Παρητηρόντο δὲ αὐτὸν εἰ θεραπεύει.

(κ) (1) Matt. xxvii. 49, Οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἔλεγον, Ἀφές, ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἠλίας σώσων αὐτόν.
(2) Mk. xv. 36, λέγων, Ἀφέτε, ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἠλίας καθελεῖν αὐτόν.

Here (1) in Matthew the bystanders address the man who brings the drink to Jesus; but (2) in Mark the man addresses the bystanders. In (1) the meaning is “desist from giving the drink;” in (2) it appears to be “desist from mocking.” But in any case, the meaning differs in Matthew and Mark.

Many other instances might be given (e.g., Mat. xiv. 2; Mk. vi. 16; Lu. ix. 9; Mk. ix. 5; Lu. ix. 34); but we will conclude with one in which two traditional versions of a saying of our Lord, blended into one by Mark, appear to have caused a confusion: (a) “Every sin and blasphemy shall be remitted to men, but blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be remitted;” (b) “Whoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be remitted to him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be remitted to him.” Matthew gives both these versions, Luke one of them (with slight variations). But Mark,

1 Here, as elsewhere in this article, it has not been thought necessary to mention by name those critics whose statements are traversed. For a brief summary of the history of recent criticism on the Gospels, see the end of this article.

combining the former part of the first version with the latter part of the second, so as to omit the phrase “Son of Man,” and yet feeling that some mention of “Son of Man” was made in the tradition, substitutes for “men” “sons of men,” a phrase that is not found elsewhere in the whole of the Gospels:—

- (A) (1) Matt. xii. 31, 32, (a) [διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται καὶ] (b) ὅς ἐάν τις εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, ὅς δ’ ἐάν τις εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.
(2) Lu. xii. 10 (using eis for κατὰ, ερεῖ for ἐν εἴπῃ, and borrowing from (a) the word βλασφημεῖν), (b) καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.

(3) Mk. iii. 28, 29 (probably transposing υἱός, and using the dative instead of κατὰ or εἰς), (a) λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἁμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασφημῖαι ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσῃσι; (b) ὃς δ’ ἐν βλασφημίᾳ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Even those who may reject this explanation of the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in Mark will probably feel that this passage, and all those previously quoted, point to some original tradition (whether written or oral) upon which our three synoptic Gospels are based. These then are the results to which (so far) we are led:—(1) Mark certainly did not borrow from Matthew and Luke; (2) Matthew and Luke, though clearly influenced by some form of Mark, yet probably borrowed, not from Mark, but from some original tradition upon which Mark also is based.

The Nature of the Triple Tradition.—What was the original tradition upon which our three synoptic Gospels are based? Was it Aramaic or Greek? oral or written? single or manifold? Did the earliest of our synoptists receive it fresh from its first source, or after it had passed through many recensions? Few or none of these questions (to some of which reference will be made hereafter) can be answered with absolute certainty; but it is evident that, if Matthew, Mark, and Luke are all based upon an earlier original tradition, then those words and phrases which are common to Matthew, Mark, and Luke (to which we have given the name of the Triple Tradition) must have a peculiar weight, as approximating to the original tradition itself. If it be found that these scattered words and phrases make up of themselves an almost continuous narrative, we may fairly suppose that we are approximating very closely indeed to the original tradition. We shall not expect to find a perfectly continuous narrative. On the contrary, a perfectly continuous narrative, identical in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, would imply, not a floating early variable tradition, but a document simply copied by the authors of our Gospels.

An early tradition, circulated perhaps in various churches, in Antioch, in Rome, in Ephesus, in Corinth, before being embodied in a document, will naturally have been modified, supplemented, and sometimes (as above) confused. More especially in certain unimportant and constantly recurring words and phrases we may expect variations. The words “said,” “answered,” “went,” “journeyed,” “asked,” “questioned,” “tempted,” “refused,” “rebuked,” &c., may naturally be expected to differ in the three versions. But greater differences will soon arise. One version will lay greater stress on the details of miracles; another on the relations between Jesus and John the Baptist; another on the law; another on the forgiveness of sins; and this varying emphasis will produce certain modifications of the original tradition. Again, in the early times of the church, the Greek of slaves and freedmen may pass without offence; but in later times an editor of the Gospel, writing for readers of higher rank and better education, will

substitute less uncouth words for the original barbarisms. Thus, from varying causes, the different versions of the tradition will deviate; and when we come to compare three of them together, and to write down the words common to the three, we shall no longer find the original continuous tradition. Gaps in the sense will occur every now and then, owing to the omission of some necessary word. On the other hand, although the literary cement (so to speak) which fills up the interstices between the words and deeds of the Lord may naturally vary, we may expect that the words of the Lord Himself will be more carefully preserved, and more identically reported by all three synoptists, so that they will give a more continuous sense, and will enable us to approximate to the original tradition. Let us now take the Gospel of Mark, and set down, from the first two chapters of it, all such words as it contains in common with Matthew and Luke, merely adding in italics such words as may enable the reader to perceive the structure of each sentence; and let us see whether the words thus collected show any traces of a continuous narrative:—

“Esaias | the prophet: | the voice of one crying in the wilderness. Prepare the way of the Lord, make His paths straight. | John | in the wilderness preaching | repent(t). | All | went(t) forth | to be baptiz(ed) by him. | There cometh one stronger than I | whose shoe-latchet [Mat. shoes] | I am not worthy to loose [Mat. bear]. | I baptiz(e) you with water, He | shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit. | Jesu(s) was baptiz(ed). | The heaven² | and the Spirit, as a dove, descend(ing) on Him. And a voic(e) from | heaven | My beloved Son, in Thee [Mat. whom] I am well pleased. | The Spirit drives Him: | in the wildern(ess) forty days tempt(ed) by [Satan; Lu. devil]. | He came into Galilee. | Com(eth) into the house of Simon [Mat. Petef]. | Stepmother sick of a fever. | And the fever left her; | she ministered to the(m). | He heale(d). | He preach(e)d in the synagogu(es) of Galil(ee). | There came a leper | saying to Him(m), If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean. And stretching forth His hand, He touched him | I will, be thou clean: And immediately there departed from him the leprosy. - | And He said to him, Tell no one, but | show thyself to the priest, and offer that which Moses ordained as a testimony to them.” Chap. ii. “ | And they bring(g) Him(m) a paralytic(c). | And seeing their faith, | He said, Thy sins are forgive(n). | The scribes said, This man blasphem(eth). | Jesu(s) said to the(m), | Why reason ye in your hearts? Which is easier, to say | Thy sins are forgive(u), or to say, Rise(e) | and walk. But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, He saith to the paralytic(c), | Rise, take thy bed, | go to thy house. And | having taken it up, he went. | And they glorif(ed) God. And He saw one sitting at the receipt of custom, and said to him, Follow Me, | and arising he follow(e)d Him. | And he feasted Him in his house, and man(y) publican(s) | were feast(ing). | And the Pharisee(s) sai(d) to His discip(les), Why eat with publicans and sinners? | He(e) | said to them, They that are strong [Lu. healthy] have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. I cam(e) not to call the righteous but sinners. | The disciples of John | say to Him(m): | The disciples of John and of the Pharisee(s) fas(t), but Thin(e) do not. Jesu(s) said to the(m), Can the son(s) of the bride-chamber fast? | The bridegroom shall be taken from them. Then shall they fast. | No one putteth on a | patch upon an ol(d) garment(t). No one putteth new wine into old bottles. Else, it will burst the bottle(s), and the wine will peris(h) and the bottles also. But new wine into new bottles, | On the Sabbath, they were going through corn-fields; His disciples pluck(e)d the wheat-ears. | The Pharisee(s) said, They are doin(g) on the Sabbath(h) that which is not lawful. He said to the(m), Have ye not read what David did when he was an hungered, and they that were with him? how he went into the house of God, | and ate the shewbread, which it is not law(ful) to eat, save for the priest(s)? | The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath.”

Few will have any difficulty in following the above narrative which represents the Triple Tradition of the synoptists. It will be generally admitted that, so far as it extends, it omits little of importance; and its con-

1 A gap in the narrative of Mark is signified by |, a longer gap by ||. Bracketed parts of words signify that the word occurs in the three Gospels, but in different forms.

2 Here Mark uses a strong word, meaning “cleaving” or “rending”; Matthew and Luke prefer the more usual word, meaning “opening.” Hence the gap.

tinuity will commend it as likely to be, if not the original tradition, at all events a closer approximation to it than we are likely to find elsewhere. It therefore becomes an important business to consider the scope and variations of the Triple Tradition,—where it is full and ample, where it is meagre, where it begins and where it ends.

The commencement of the Triple Tradition has been given in the specimen quoted above. It begins with the proclamation made by John the Baptist, of the advent of the Stronger One. Describing (Mk. iii.) the cure of the withered hand, the choice of the Twelve, the discourse on blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, and the answer to the question, “Who is My mother and My brethren?” it passes (chap. iv.) to the parables of the sower and the mustard seed, which it gives very fully; the rebuking of the wind and the exorcism of the legion (Mk. v.) are given as follows:—

Mk. iv. 35, “Let us go across to the other side. They took Him(m) | in a boat. | They wak(e) Him(m) say(ing), We perish: and He, arising, rebuked the win(d). | And there was a calm. He said to them, | Your faith! | They said, Who is this that even the wind obey(eth) Him?” Mk. v. 1. “And they came across into the land of the [Gadarenes, Gerasenes, or Gergesenes]. There met Him | one [Mat. two] in the || tombs || crying, | What is there between me and Thee, Thou Son of God? || Torment me not. || And he [Mat. they] besought Him . . . into . . . || And He . . . them, | goin(g) forth, they come to (or into) the swine, and the herd rushed down the steep place into the sea [Lu. lake] and [were] choked, Mat. perished. | Those that were feeding them | fled and brought word into the city. | They came || Jesu(s). || And | they besought Him to depart from | them.”

This is given as a specimen of those passages where the narrative is not so continuous, and where there is some appearance of confusion. The evidence of confusion is confirmed (1) by the fact that a word is used here (δαίμων) to denote “spirit” or “demon,” which is not found once elsewhere in the whole of the Gospels, nor, indeed, anywhere in the New Testament (except in the Apocalypse twice), whereas δαιμόνιον is used forty-five times, and πνεῦμα twenty-seven times in the three Gospels alone; (2) by the difference of the names for the locality, Gadara, Gerasa, Gergesa; (3) by the fact that Matthew speaks of two demoniacs instead of one.<sup>3</sup>

The restoring to life of the daughter of a ruler (Mk. and Lu., ruler of a synagogue) is next thus briefly related: “He came into the house. | She is not dead, but sleepeth. And they mocked Him. | Having taken her by the hand | Arise.” Then follow (chap. vi.) the mission of the twelve, Herod’s conjecture about the new prophet, and the feeding of the five thousand, which runs thus (Mk. vi. 44):—

3 It has been suggested (Abbott, Through Nature to Christ, p. 447) that this extremely difficult narrative may have arisen from a misunderstanding of the phenomena of possession. Compare the story in the Evangelium Infantiae Arabicum (a Gospel which shows special traces of Mark’s influence) in which (chap. xi.) it is said of a certain demoniac that “demons, in the shape of crows and serpents, began to go forth, fleeing from out his mouth.” But it is perhaps more likely that the variation in the name of the place points to some misunderstanding as to the origin of the story. The name Gadara, Γάδαρα, sometimes means a “sheepfold”; and gādār, though not a Syriac word, is yet given in the Syriac lexicons as Hebrew for “rock.” Again, the correct reading in Mark is probably “Gerasene,” not “Gadarene”; and the word גָּרְסָא means “to cast out.” Lastly, the fact that author (Comm. in Ev. Johann., vi. 24) to mean “παροικία ἐκ Βεβαθηκόντων,” “the district of those who cast out”; and he suggests that the name was probably prophetic, referring to our Lord’s expulsion from the district (ἐπάνυμιος οὐσα γὰρ προφητικῶς). Now, when a narrative of an event reported to have occurred at a certain place contains three different names of the place, and when each of the three names is adapted to the event, such a triple adaptation is obviously likely to be not a mere casual coincidence, but rather a convergence pointing to some misunderstanding or non-historical nucleus as the centre and origin of the narrative. What the misunderstanding was may be a matter of conjecture, but that there was some misunderstanding is a probability approaching to certainty.

"Send them away, that they may go into villages. | Give ye them to eat. | We have five loaves and two fishes. | Having taken the five loaves and the two fishes, looking up to heaven, He blessed, and having broke(n) them, He gave them to the disciples. And they all ate and were filled. | And they to(ok) up twelve basket(ets) of fragments. They were | five thousand men."

The walking on the waves is much more briefly recorded (Mk. vi. 46-51). "He went to the mountain. | It was late. | They see Him walking on the sea. | It is I; be not afraid." Then follows a blank, in which Matthew and Mark generally agree, while Luke is altogether wanting; and, after this, the famous confession of Peter, followed closely by the transfiguration.

Mk. viii. 27. "He aske(d) them, | saying, | Whom | do they say that I am? They answered, | John the Baptist; | others Elias; but others a proph(et). | He said, But whom do ye say that I am? Peter | answering said, Christ(t). Tell no one. He said that He must needs | suffer many things | from the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be slain, and after three days [or, on the third day] He must be raised up [Mk. ἀναστήναι, Lu. and Mat. ἐγερθήναι.] | If any one wishes to come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me. For whosoever wishes to save his life shall lose it, but whosoever los(eth) his life for My sake shall save it. For what is a man proud(ed), to gain the whole world, and be lost? | The Son of Man shall come in glory, with the angels." Mk. ix. "I say unto you, There are some of those stand(ing) here who shall not taste death till they see th(e) kingdo(m). | After six [Lu. eight] day(s) he take(th) | Peter and James and John | into a mountain. | His garment(s) become white. | And there appear(ed) Elias and Moses speak(ing) with Him. | Peter said to Jesus(s), It is good for us to be here; let us mak(e) three tabernacles, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. | A cloud overshadow(ed) the(m), and there was a voice from the cloud, This is My Son: hear Him. | They saw Jesus alone."

From Mark ix. 14 to x. 16 there is a break in the common tradition, which here records little except three or four sayings of the Lord.

"O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you?" "The Son of Man is to be betrayed into the hands of men." "Whosoever receiveth a child in My name receiveth Me." "If any one cause one of these little ones to stumble, a mill-stone round his neck, and let him be cast into the sea(a)." "Salt is good, but if the salt lose its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?" "Suffer the children; forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom."

In contrast to this discontinuity, Mark x. 17-52 gives a continuous tradition about the rich young man, the promise of reward to the disciples, the predictions of betrayal, and the healing of the blind man near Jericho. The entry into Jerusalem and the purification of the temple (xi. 1-17) are also fairly continuous. The disputes in the temple touching the baptism of John. (xi. 27-33), the wicked husbandmen (xii. 1-12), and the tribute-money (xii. 13-17) are very continuous. A brief denunciation of the Pharisees, who love the first seats in synagogues and at feasts, is found in Mark xii. 38-40. The Triple Tradition then touches on the second coming of Jesus. Luke has here omitted many important passages which are recorded by Matthew and Mark alone, and which will be given hereafter (see p. 795). Here we will set down nothing but the common tradition, marking Luke's omissions.

Mk. xiii. 1. "And | He said. | Not a stone shall be left on stone, which shall not be cast down. | They asked Him, | When shall these things be? And what is the sign? He answered, Take heed lest any deceiv(e) you. Many shall come in My name saying, I am He. | When ye hea(r) of wars, be not alarmed [Lu. substitutes the usual LXX. word πονηῆτε for the LXX. ἀπαι λεγόμενον, θροῦσθε, which is in Mat. and Mk.]. These things must needs come to pass, but the end is not yet. Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. There shall be earthquakes in places, there shall be famines. | They shall deliver you . . . for a witness . . . | And ye shall be hated by all men for My name's sake, but he that remain(eth) shall be saved. When ye see | desolat(ion), then let them that are in Judæa flee to the mountains. | He that is on the house-top let him not descend, | and he that is in the field let him not turn back. | But woe to

<sup>1</sup> This passage is found in Matthew and Mark here, but in Luke elsewhere (xvii. 32).

them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days.\* [Here Luke leaves a blank in which Matthew and Mark predict "false Christs" and "the darkening of the sun."] "And the powers of (or in) the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of Man coming in the cloud(s) with great power and glory. | From the fig-tree ye know that the summer is near. So also ye, when ye see these things. | Heaven and earth shall pass away; but My words shall never pass away."

In Matthew and Mark there follows the avowal that "of that day or hour none knoweth, not even the angels in heaven, nor even the Son, but only the Father." But Luke omits this. The Triple Tradition passes to the betrayal of Jesus. The traitor's compact (Mk. xiv. 10, 11) and the visit to the city to eat the Passover are briefly narrated. From this point the Triple Tradition becomes more and more scanty, till it leaves us at last little more than a few disconnected sayings of Jesus.

Mk. xiv. 21. "The Son of Man goeth indeed, as it is written; but woe to that man by whom He is to be betrayed. | Having taken bread, He brake it, and ga(ve) it. | This is My body. And taking the cup, This is My blood of the testamen(t), that is shed . . . | I say unto you, I will never drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom. | And | they wen(t) forth to the Mount of Olives. | I say unto thee, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny Me thrice. | He pray(ed), If it be possible . . . | He said(d), Fath(er), take this cup from Me; | yet not as I wil(l), but as Thou wilt. | And having foun(d) them sleeping, He said, Pray, that ye enter not into temptation. | While He was still speaking, came Judas, | one of the twelve, | and a multitud(e) with him. | He kiss(ed) Him. | One smote [Mk. εἶρασε, for which Mat. and Lu. substitute the more appropriate and common word ἐδάρασε] the servant of the high priest, and cut off his ea(r). | Jesus said, As against a thief have ye com(e) out with swords and staves? I was daily | in the temple; and ye took Me not. | They led Him to th(e) high priest(t). | Peter followe(d) afar off | and sat in | the hall. Art thou the Son of God [Mk. the Blessed]? | Thou shalt see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of the Power. | What need have we yet of witnesses? | They sai(d) unto Him, Prophecy. | A maid-servan(t) spake unto Peter(t). | But he denied, saying, I do not know Him. | Verily thou art one of them, for . . . | And Peter remembered, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny Me thrice, and he wept(t)."

Mk. xv. "They led Him to Pilat(e). | He aske(d) Him, | Art Thou the King of the Jews? He said to him, Thou sayest . . . Barabbas . . . | Crucif(ly) Him. Why, what evil hath He done? | Crucif(ly) Him. | Pilate released Barabbas, and delivered over Jesus. | And they le(a)d Him away. | They made Simon a Cyrenian carry the cross. | They came to the place of the Skull. | They divide(d) His garments and cast lots. | There was written up, The King of the Jews. | On the right hand and on the left . . . | He saved others; let Him save (Him)self. | About the sixth(h) hou(r) there was darkness over the earth until the ninth hour. | Jesus with a loud voice emitted His breath. | And the women | who in [or from] Galilee had followed Him beheld(d) [Mk. and Mat. θεωρεῖν, Lu. ἑβάν, reserving θεωρεῖν for v. 55] these things from afar. | Joseph of Arimathæa | cam(e) to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus, | and wound [Mk. ἐνέλιπον; Mat. and Lu. ἐνέλιξε]; it in linen | and laid it in a tomb."

At this point the tradition not only becomes discontinuous, but also shows marks of confusion. The tradition appears to have been that the women "beheld," or came to "behold" (another tradition added at "dawn"), and came to the tomb; but what "dawn" is meant, and what was the object of their beholding, is left uncertain.

(1) Matt. xxvii. 61; xxviii. 1. "There were there Mary Magdalene and the other Mary sitting over against the tomb. Late in the Sabbath, at the hour of dawning (τῆ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ), before the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and Mary to behold (θεωρῆσαι) the tomb (τάφος)."

(2) Mk. xv. 47; xvi. 1. "Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Jesus beheld (ἐθεώρουν) where He was laid (τεθείται). When the Sabbath was passed, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Salome brought spices that they might come and anoint Him."

(3) Lu. xxiii. 54. "And the Sabbath was dawning (ἐπιφωσκε); and having followed Him (to the grave), the women who had come with Him from Galilee beheld (εθεώσαντο) the tomb, and how His body was laid (τεθείται), and returning they brought spices."

\* It may be observed that the same Syriac word is used to denote evening as well as morning twilight. See Gildemeister, *De Evangeliiis in Arabicum e simplicia Syriaca translatis*. Bonn, 1865, p. 20.

The only remaining words of the tradition are: ". . . the first day of the week . . . roll(ed) away [i. e., the stone at the opening of the tomb] . . . He is not here; He is risen . . . Galilee . . . they fled from the tomb." Matthew and Mark continue for a few lines a narrative based upon some common tradition; but even here there occurs the confusion mentioned above—Mark, "as He told you;" Matthew, "behold, I told you;" and the narrative of Mark ends at xvi. 9. The remaining verses of Mark are an appendix added by some later editor; and henceforth the narratives of Matthew and Luke—having lost Mark—present no further traces of agreement.

To sum up the contents of the common tradition, it omits the genealogies, miraculous incarnation, and the picturesque details of the infancy; it lays emphasis on the relations between John the Baptist and Jesus; it contains none of the parables except the sower, the mustard seed, and the wicked husbandmen, and few of the long discourses of Jesus, except an abridged prediction of the second coming. The disputes between Jesus and the Pharisees about the Sabbath, about fasting, about exorcism, about the baptism of John, and the tribute, and Christ the Son of David, and the dialogue with the Sadducees about the resurrection, are very fully given; and so also is the dialogue with the rich young man. Indeed it is a collection of dialogues and anecdotes rather than a set treatise of doctrine or biography. The sayings of Jesus recorded in it are short, pithy, and abrupt, and many of them are polemical. Only now and then do we find a sentence which goes down deep below all polemics, and reveals a deep-laid spiritual plan. But putting such sentences together we perceive that the Triple Tradition describes a prophet wholly different from any that had before appeared in Israel; a prophet who not only (like Isaiah) protested against sabbaths and purifications as ends in themselves, but who also preached the Fatherhood of God in a manner entirely peculiar to Himself, and who set aside the Mosaic law of divorce (Mk. x. 2-11). He also instructed His disciples to enter into the kingdom as little children (x. 15), and seems to have attached a certain symbolic mystery to childhood as representing Himself (ix. 37). He taught His disciples further to devote their lives to Him, and to ignore all life apart from Him (viii. 34), ("to confess Christ, to deny themselves"). From the first He claims the power of forgiving sins (ii. 7); and, as soon as one of His disciples confessed Him to be the Messiah, He prepared for death, predicting that He should die, but rise again. Then, after prophesying the fall of the temple, and great distress in all nations, He predicted a final triumph for His disciples; and after bequeathing Himself, His body and His blood, as at a funeral feast, as His final legacy to His disciples, He was arrested and put to death.

Several miracles of healing are recorded, and, in addition to these, the exorcism of the Gadarene (in which, however, great confusion is apparent), the stilling of the storm, the feeding of the five thousand, and the transfiguration. From the beginning of the discourse on the second coming, Luke diverges more and more from Matthew and Mark. After the death of Jesus, Matthew and Mark continue to agree in words and phrases, but a little confusion is apparent; and the tradition suddenly terminates without any record of the appearance of Jesus to His disciples. However we may regret this, it is perhaps what may be naturally expected on the hypothesis that we have before us an early tradition originated at a time when the numerous manifestations of Jesus after His death were still attested by living witnesses; when as yet it had been

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Justin, *Apol. I.* (Kirchhofer, p. 89), *βραχίεις τε καὶ σύντομοι καὶ αὐτοῦ λόγοι γρηγόρασι.*

found impossible to reduce the experiences and impressions of those who had seen Him—impressions necessarily variable and transient, blended with fear and with an excitement bordering on ecstasy—to a consistent and historical shape; and when it had not yet been found necessary to define and harden the narrative so as to adapt it for the purpose of meeting doubts and objections.

The Additions common to Matthew and Mark.—The additions to the Triple Tradition which are found in Matthew and Mark, but not in Luke, are the following:—

- (1) The description of John the Baptist (Mat. iii. 4; Mk. i. 6);
- (2) the ministering of the angels (Mat. iv. 11; Mk. i. 13);
- (3) the calling of the fishermen (Mat. iv. 18-22; Mk. i. 14-20);
- (4) the murmuring of His friends at Nazareth (Mat. xiii. 53-57; Mk. vi. 1-4);
- (5) the influence of Herodias in procuring John's execution (Mat. xiv. 8-13; Mk. vi. 25-29);
- (6) the walking on the water (Mat. xiv. 22-28; Mk. vi. 45-51);
- (7) the disputes with the scribes from Jerusalem (Mat. xv. 1-20; Mk. vii. 1-23);
- (8) the story of the Syro-Phoenician woman, which is narrated by Matthew and Mark in widely divergent language, but with an almost identical conclusion (Mat. xv. 21-28; Mk. vii. 24-30);
- (9) the feeding of the four thousand (Mat. xv. 32-38; Mk. viii. 1-9), and the comparison between this miracle and that of the five thousand (Mat. xvi. 5-12; Mk. viii. 14-21);
- (10) the saying of Jesus that Elias had already come (Mat. xvii. 12; Mk. ix. 13);
- (11) the discussion of the enactments of Moses concerning divorce (Mat. xix. 4-8; Mk. x. 2-9);
- (12) the saying (but Luke inserts it elsewhere) that "many that are first shall be last" (Mat. xix. 30; Mk. x. 31);
- (13) the petition of the sons of Zebedee for the chief places (Mat. xx. 20-28; Mk. x. 35-45);
- (14) the withering of the fig-tree (Mat. xxi. 18-22; Mk. xi. 13, 14, 20);
- (15) the introductory question of the lawyer, "Which is the great commandment" (Mat. xxii. 36; Mk. xii. 28);
- (16) in the discourse on the last day, Luke omits reference to the "consummation," *συντέλεια* (Mat.), *συντελείσθαι* (Mk.); "these things are the beginning of troubles;" "the abomination of desolation," &c.; "he that readeth let him understand;" "pray that your flight may not be in winter;" "(tribulation) such as was not from the beginning till now, nor ever shall be;" the expression about the "shortening" of the days "for the elects' sake;" "He shall send His angels, and gather together the elect;" "of this hour the Son knoweth not;" (17) later on, Luke omits the anointing of Jesus "for His burial" (Mat. xxvi. 6-13; Mk. xiv. 3-9); (18) "I will smite the Shepherd," &c., and "I will go before you into Galilee" (Mat. xxvi. 31, 32; Mk. xiv. 27, 28); (19) the compact of Judas with the priests that a kiss should be the signal (Mat. xxvi. 48; Mk. xiv. 44); (20) the false witness about "destroying the temple in three days" (Mat. xxvi. 59, 62; Mk. xiv. 56-60); (21) the taunt "Thou that destroyest the temple" (Mat. xxvii. 40; Mk. xv. 29); (22) the utterance of Jesus, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" with the consequent misunderstanding of the bystanders (Mat. xxvii. 46-49; Mk. xv. 34-36); (23) the utterance of the angel (or angels) at the tomb, "He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see Him" (Mat. xxviii. 7; Mk. xvi. 7).

In considering these passages it is natural to ask whether any reason (besides ignorance of them) can be alleged why Luke should have omitted them. It is scarcely possible to fail to see design in some of these omissions,—for example, in those which relate to John the Baptist and Elias (1), (5), and (10). The author of the Acts of the Apostles is by general consent admitted to be identical with the author of the Third Gospel. Now remembering that Luke in the Acts (xix. 3) informs us that, many years after the death of Jesus, there were in Ephesus several disciples who were baptized with the baptism of John, and knew nothing of the Holy Spirit, we may well understand that the author of the Acts finds it necessary, when writing a gospel, to put in as clear a light as possible the subordination of John to Jesus. Accordingly, in place of the graphic description of the austere food and garb of the prophet, he gives (iii. 10-14) a description of his teaching, as containing the elements of a simple and almost commonplace morality, intended merely to prepare the way for a higher teaching, and he adds an express negative from the prophet in answer to those who doubted whether John were the Messiah. Repeatedly does Luke deviate from the common tradition of Matthew and Mark on the subject of