

Elias; and in each case the object is apparent. Only a close inspection of a harmony of the Gospels will make this clear; but three or four passages may be mentioned which point in this direction. Luke has already (i. 17) declared that John will go before Jesus "in the spirit and power" of Elias, but he cautiously avoids committing himself to the tradition (Mk. ix. 13; Mat. xvii. 13) that John was Elias. The belief in an actual transmigration of souls he will allow the multitude to entertain (ix. 8, 19), but not Herod; for whereas in Mark (vi. 16) Herod says, "Whom I beheaded, viz., John, this man (οὗτος, corr. text), is risen from the dead," Luke, by a slight transposition of the traditional words, converts the proposition into a question: "John I beheaded; but who is this man?" And, further, in order to prepare the way for the interview between Herod and the Lord—which he purposes to describe at the end of his Gospel (xxiii. 8, 9), and to refer to in his continuation of the Gospel (Acts iv. 27)—he adds the words, "And he (Herod) was desirous to see Him." Again Mark (ix. 6) tells us that Peter "not knowing what to answer," proposed to build three tabernacles for Jesus, Moses, and Elias; but Luke reads (ix. 33), "not knowing what he said," as if to caution the reader against supposing that Elias or Moses could be seriously placed on the same level as Jesus. For the same reason he omits the irreverent misunderstanding of the bystander who supposed that Jesus in his last moments called for Elias, and even the utterance itself (Mat. xxvii. 49; Mk. xv. 36).

Luke's omissions.

With reference to many of the other omissions it will be noticed that Luke seems to have before him somewhat different versions of the narratives, which different versions he inserts elsewhere. For example, he gives a version of the calling of the apostle-fishermen, which adds a miraculous draught of fishes, thereby approximating to the narrative in the Fourth Gospel (xxi. 6-11). Again Luke places the murmuring of the Nazarenes much earlier, in the fore-front of the ministry of Jesus, as was very natural, and gives an entirely different version of it. The ministry of the angels after the temptation he omits; but he alone records the ministry of the angel (xxii. 43) when Jesus was tempted in Gethsemane, for which temptation he carefully prepares the way by saying (iv. 13) that the devil departed from Jesus only "for a season." As regards the anointing "for the burial," it is probable we have a different version of it in his story of the woman that was "a sinner" (vii. 37). The reasons for the omission of the feeding of the four thousand and the withering of the fig-tree are not so obvious. The omission could hardly have been dictated by any desire to minimize the supernatural (seeing that Luke contains many miracles peculiar to himself, and that he does not shrink from giving in full detail the exorcism of the Gadarene). It is possible that he omitted the former as being too similar to the feeding of the five thousand to require to be repeated; and if he regarded it (as the author of the Fourth Gospel does) as having a sacramental meaning, one story of the kind may have seemed sufficient. If the story of the withered fig-tree was regarded by him in the same way (rather as emblematic than as historical), then it may have been replaced in his narrative by the story of the barren fig-tree (peculiar to Luke), to which the master came seeking fruit and finding none. It is also noticeable that the moral (on the power of faith) deduced from the withering of the fig-tree in Matthew and Mark is contained in Luke, but in a different form. In Matthew and Mark it runs: "If ye say to this mountain, Be raised up and cast into the sea;" whereas in Luke (xvii. 6) it is, "Ye might have said to this sycamine tree, Be rooted up and planted in the sea." This perhaps slightly confirms the supposition that Luke regarded the

narrative of the fig-tree rather as a parable than as a fact. But it is important to bear in mind that we have little more than the evidence of conjecture to explain some of Luke's omissions. For example, the story of the walking on the waves, as told by Matthew and Mark, represents the disciples as being alarmed by the thought that the apparition of the Lord was only a spirit (φάντασμα); unless Luke considered that the ground of this narrative was occupied by his account of a similar fear when the disciples beheld the Lord after the resurrection, it is hard to suggest any reason for its omission. This class of omissions may be terminated with that numbered (19) above—the compact of Judas concerning the signal. It is obvious here that Luke has another version of the tradition in his mind. He alone of the three records the words of Jesus, "Betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss," thereby making it unnecessary to explain (with Matthew and Mark) that the kiss was a signal fixed by the traitor.

Another class of passages may possibly have been omitted as being not of interest to the Gentile world, or as being liable to misunderstanding or perversion. The story of the Syro-Phœnician woman perhaps appeared to the editor of the Gentile Gospel to exhibit Jesus in too harsh a light; the application to Jesus of the prophecy "I will smite the Shepherd," appeared more liable to misunderstanding than "He was reckoned with transgressors" (not found in Mark's genuine text); the discussion of the law of divorce and of the regulations touching uncleanness, and the part played by Herodias in the execution of the Baptist, may have seemed to lack interest for readers outside Palestine. In the discourse on the second coming it would be natural for an editor of the tradition writing after the siege of Jerusalem to substitute "encircled by armies" for the "abomination of desolation"—a phrase that would perplex a Gentile reader, and also to modify some of the hyperbolic and emblematic expressions. Lastly, the mention of the "false witness" concerning the destruction of the temple, and the raising up of a new temple in three days, may have begun to present a difficulty in times when the temple actually had been destroyed, and when the Lord Jesus Himself had come to be regarded as the new temple not made with hands. Although therefore Luke does not go so far as the author of the Fourth Gospel (who exhibits Jesus as actually predicting the destruction of the temple and as promising to raise it up in three days), yet he not only omits the "false witness," but also the allusion to it contained in the taunts addressed to Jesus on the cross, "Thou that destroyest the temple and raisest it again in three days, save Thyself" (Mat. xxvii. 40; Mk. xv. 29).

The above explanation of Luke's omissions may only partially commend itself to the reader; but few will fail to see that there is at least some method and motive in most of them. It is a matter of certainty that in the Triple Tradition many of Luke's omissions and modifications of phrases and words are not accidental but editorial: it is but natural therefore to suppose (especially when reasons can easily be assigned) that editorial reasons may also explain omissions and modifications of narratives and discourses. Of course it is not maintained that Luke, or any individual editor, made these changes on his own responsibility. Many of them are probably the result of a "Gentile use" which had gradually sprung up in certain churches, and which was not created but adopted and expressed by the author of the Third Gospel. Consequently we are not obliged to suppose that the omissions resulted from ignorance. The very fact that it is easy to supply motives and reasons for the omission of these narratives increases their credibility, by diminishing the probability

that they were late traditions unknown to the author of the Third Gospel. The passages omitted are generally in the style of the common tradition, and they contain incidents of a similar kind to the incidents of the common tradition. It only remains to add that (except in the story of the Syro-Phœnician woman, and, in a lesser degree, in the question of the lawyer about the great commandment) Matthew and Mark closely agree whenever Luke separates himself from them. This is also found frequently to be the case in the Triple Tradition.¹ In the midst of very similar context, if Mark is identical, or nearly so, with Matthew, in the expression of some action, it will be found that Luke often suddenly diverges, or makes some omission. Thus—

- (1) Mat. xxi. 12. Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν καὶ ἐξέβαλε πάντα τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν κατέστρεψε, καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλοῦντων τὰς περισσότερας.
- (2) Mk. xi. 15. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν, καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλοῦντων τὰς περισσότερας κατέστρεψε.
- (3) Lu. xix. 45. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας, omitting the rest.

So, in the midst of the story of the rich young man, where Matthew and Mark have ἀπῆλθε λυπούμενος, ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά, Luke, suddenly diverging, has περιλῦτος ἐγενήθη ἦν γὰρ πλοῦσιος σφόδρα (Mk. x. 22; Mat. xix. 22; Lu. xviii. 23). Sometimes the divergence appears to arise from literary motives, and especially from the dislike of repetition (Lu. iv. 32; Mat. vii. 29; Mk. i. 22); but in other cases it cannot be so explained:—Lu. v. 29, 30; Mat. ix. 10, 11; Mk. ii. 15, 16; Lu. v. 33, 34; Mat. ix. 14, 15; Mk. ii. 18, 19 (see also, in a parable, Lu. v. 36; Mat. ix. 16; Mk. ii. 21); Lu. vi. 11; Mat. xii. 14; Mk. iii. 6; Lu. viii. 13; Mat. xiii. 21; Mk. iv. 17; Lu. viii. 44; Mat. ix. 21; Mk. v. 29. In some of these cases the agreement between Matthew and Mark is so close as to suggest that both writers may have used some common document (not oral tradition) which contained little more than certain words of the Lord in a scanty framework of narrative. But this common matter adds little to our knowledge of Christ. The most important narrative in it is the story of the Syro-Phœnician, showing how Jesus, as it were, acknowledged in the woman's persistent faith a divine revelation, extending His gospel even to the heathen. And this narrative is written in language so divergent as to indicate not a document but an oral tradition.

Additions of Mark and Luke.

The Additions of Mark and Luke.—Additions of any length are very few:—

- (1) An exorcism of an unclean spirit (Mk. i. 21-25; Lu. iv. 31-35); (2) the account of Jesus retiring to a solitary place, when He declares that He must carry the gospel elsewhere (Mk. i. 35-39; Lu. iv. 42-44); (3) the saying of John the son of Zebedee, "Master, we saw one casting out devils in Thy name, and we forbade him," and the reply of Jesus (Mk. ix. 38-40; Lu. ix. 49, 50); (4) the short denunciation of the Pharisees that devour widows' houses (Mk. xii. 38-40; Lu. xx. 46, 47); (5) the story of the widow's mite (Mk. xii. 41-44; Lu. xxi. 1-4). Shorter similarities are:—(6) a mention of Jesus as being in retirement (Mk. i. 45; Lu. v. 16); and (7) a mention of "Tyre and Sidon" as places to which the fame of Jesus had spread (Mk. iii. 8; Lu. vi. 17). There is a close verbal agreement between Mark and Luke in the exorcism of the "legion" (a name that does not occur in Mark); in the raising of the daughter of Jairus; and in the stilling of the storm. But gradually as Matthew approximates to Mark, Luke deviates from Mark. There is a return to similarity in the preparation for the Passover (Mk. xiv. 12-16; Lu. xxii. 7-13); but from this point Luke deviates more and more, and, with the exception of two words (σδάρις and φόνος) in the incident of Barabbas, and of a somewhat closer approximation in the incident of Joseph of Arimathea, it may be almost said that Luke has

¹ In the words of the Lord the three Gospels are often closely similar, but seldom in the deeds.

henceforth nothing in common with Mark, except what is found in the Triple Tradition.

Most of the incidents common to Mark and Luke are so few and so simple that their omission by Matthew requires no explanation. It is possible that the names Jairus and Legion did not exist in the earliest tradition, as it presented itself to Matthew; the "authority" which Mark illustrates (compare i. 22 with i. 27) by exorcism, Matthew applies (and perhaps justly) rather to our Lord's method of teaching (vii. 28, 29); but it is difficult to suppose that any other cause than ignorance could have caused the omission of the saying of Jesus concerning the widow's mite. It is certain that, in some at least of these passages, Mark represents the earlier, and Luke a modified tradition. Luke (see below, p. 806), writing with a literary purpose, has softened many early irregularities, which in Mark retain their original harshness. For example, the ungrammatical οἱ κατέσθιοντες (Mk. xii. 40) is altered (Tischendorf and Tregelles, *pace* Lachmann) into οἱ κατεσθίουσι (Lu. xx. 47); and instead of θελότων before δσπασμοῦς (Mk. xii. 38) Luke inserts φιλοῦντων (Lu. xx. 46). In the story of the widow also, Luke, disapproving of the epithet "beggar" (πτωχή) applied to the poor widow, substitutes the more respectable πεινρά, yet with a natural but inconsistent reverence declines to cancel the same epithet (πτωχή) when (Lu. xxi. 3) it occurs in the words of the Lord. The rarer and less correct (ambiguous also when followed by the feminine αὐτῆς) ὑστερήσεως (Mk. xii. 44) is altered into ὑστερήματος (Lu. xxi. 4); and, lastly, the lengthy duality of Mark, "as many things as she had; all her livelihood" (which looks as if it had arisen from combining two different renderings of the same Aramaic original), is condensed by Luke (who takes one part of one rendering, and another part of the other) into "all the livelihood that she had." It is probable that not only in these but in all passages common to Mark and Luke alone, wherever Mark and Luke differ, Mark represents an earlier, and Luke a later version of the original. And generally it may be said that Luke follows the tradition of Mark most faithfully when it deals with Galilee, and least when it deals with Jerusalem.

Additions common to Matthew and Luke.

Additions common to Matthew and Luke.—These introduce an altogether new element into the tradition. Hitherto the Triple Tradition of Matthew, Mark, and Luke (as well as the double tradition of Matthew and Mark, and of Luke and Mark) has consisted mostly of short "words of the Lord," set in a framework of short narratives, and very seldom agreeing exactly for more than seven or eight consecutive words. But we now come upon "words of the Lord" in Matthew and Luke, some of which agree exactly for several sentences. What was the origin of this close agreement? In order to gain some view of the data for solving this problem, we must briefly consider the principal passages common to Matthew and Luke alone.

The temptation (Mat. iv. 1-10; Lu. iv. 1-12) and the healing of the centurion's servant (Mat. viii. 1-13; Lu. vii. 1-10) are the principal narratives of fact common to Matthew and Luke alone. They resemble the narratives of the Triple Tradition in agreeing so far as concerns the words of Jesus, and of those who address Him, much more than in the general narrative. In the narrative of facts, the story of the centurion in Luke differs altogether from that in Matthew; in the temptation, the difference is less. Dismissing these, we pass to the "words of the Lord." As Luke's avowed object was to write "in order," we will adhere to his arrangement in our enumeration.

(1) Mat. iii. 8-10; Lu. iii. 8, 9. "Generation of vipers," &c.; this agrees *verbatim*, except that Luke has ἀρξήσθε, where Matthew has δόξῃτε.

from the east and the west," &c. In Matthew these words are uttered by Jesus as a comment upon the marvellous faith of the centurion. In Luke they follow a parable peculiar to himself. The clause "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (which, except in this instance, is peculiar to Matthew) is transferred from the end to the beginning; and there are other variations, seemingly purposed. The agreement is far from *verbatim*.

(27) Mat. xxiii. 37-39; Lu. xiii. 34, 35. "Jerusalem, Jerusalem," &c. This is a conspicuous instance of the manner in which Luke has sometimes deviated from the true chronological order. He represents these words to have been uttered in Galilee, when the Pharisees warn Jesus to flee from fear of Herod. But Matthew represents them as having been uttered in Jerusalem, and in the temple. The reason for Luke's transposition is possibly contained in the last words, "Ye shall not see Me till the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." Now these very words, "Blessed is He," &c., were uttered by the crowd welcoming Jesus on His entrance into Jerusalem (xix. 39). Luke therefore, regarding the words of Jesus, "Ye shall not see Me," as a prediction necessarily preceding its fulfilment, is bound to place these words before the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem. But all internal evidence is on the side of Matthew's order, and against Luke's. The agreement is very nearly *verbatim*, but Luke (whose arrangement does not require the word) dispenses with the "henceforth" of Matthew.

(28) Mat. xxii. 1-14; Lu. xiv. 15-24. The parable of the wedding feast. These parables differ entirely in language, and somewhat in thought. In Matthew those who are first invited slay the messengers, and are slain by the king; and, among those who are subsequently invited, one is rejected for being without a wedding garment. In Luke the guests are simply discourteous, and the host merely invites others (the poor and the maimed, and then the wanderers in the streets) in the place of the first. Matthew's parable is therefore political, Luke's social. Note, however, that in the parable of the pounds (Mat. talents, xxv.), Luke introduces (xix. 27) the missing political element, whereas Matthew there omits it. Clearly no common document nor even detailed tradition originated these parables. They are rather (as also are the parables of the talents and the pounds) of the nature of sermons or stories based upon short "words of the Lord" as texts. It is obvious that Matthew lays special stress upon the exclusion of the unfit intruder, Luke upon the inclusion of all the world.

(29) Mat. x. 37-39; Lu. xiv. 26, 27. "He that loveth father and mother more than Me," &c. In Matthew these words are addressed by Jesus to the twelve in Galilee; in Luke to the multitude following Him during His journey to Jerusalem. Here Luke seems to have preserved the older (because more difficult) form of the tradition: "Whosoever hateth not" (Marcion altered *μωσι* into *καταλείπει*) "his father, . . . yea, his own life also," &c. It seems more probable that this was the original form than that Luke intensified the form by any alteration of his own. There is scarcely any agreement of language between Matthew and Luke here.

(30) Mat. xviii. 12-14; Lu. xv. 4-7. "What man having an hundred sheep," &c. The thought is the same, but there is scarcely any similarity of language; and even the conclusion characteristically differs, Matthew having "it is not the will of your Father in heaven that one of these little ones should perish;" Luke having "there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." The contrast between the negative ("not the will") and the positive ("joy"), between the "non-perishing" and the "repenting," is typical of the contrast between the whole of Matthew and the whole of Luke.

(31) Mat. vi. 24; Lu. xvi. 13. "No (servant) can serve two masters," &c. With the exception of "servant" added by Luke for definiteness, this saying is the same *verbatim* in Matthew and Luke.

(32) Mat. xi. 12 and v. 18; Lu. xvi. 16, 17. "The law and the prophets were till John," &c., and "Not one tittle shall pass from the law." There seems little connexion in these sayings as they stand in Luke, and there is very little similarity of language between Matthew and Luke.

(33) Mat. xxiv. 26-28, 37-41; Lu. xvii. 23-27, 34-37. These are scattered sayings on the second coming, likening it to the "days of Noah" and to "lightning," and predicting the severance of those who are "at one mill" and "in one bed." Luke, after his manner, introduces a question, "Where, Lord?" to which the reply comes, "Whosoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together." Matthew, on the other hand, introduces the sentence in the midst of the discourse, "So shall also the coming of the Son of Man be, for wheresoever the body is," &c. The agreement of language is not considerable, except in the last part.

(34) Mat. xxiii. 12; Lu. xviii. 14, and xiv. 11. "Every one that exalteth himself shall be abased," &c. This again furnishes a striking instance of the manner in which Luke utilizes words

of the Lord as texts for discourses. The saying is introduced by Matthew in the midst of the discourse against the Pharisees; but it is made by Luke the conclusion and moral of the parable of the publican and the Pharisee, and of the discourse on choosing the lower room.

(35) Mat. xxv. 14-30; Lu. xix. 1-28. The parable of the talents or pounds. There is no similarity of language, except in the dialogue between the idle servant and the master. Luke, after his manner, inserts a question from the bystanders ("And they said to him, Lord, he hath ten pounds"); and Luke here, as Matthew above (28), introduces a political element, making the master a king, and narrating a royal vengeance.

In the consideration of the passages quoted above, one fact strikes us at once, that the Lord's Prayer is not *verbatim* the same in Matthew and Luke. If this is not identical, it might be thought that we cannot expect any words of the Lord to be identical. And indeed, as a matter not of hypothesis but of fact, those words which have most strongly appealed to men's hearts, and have been most frequently on their lips, from the earliest times of the church; those sayings which have given the tone to Christian life, which have encouraged martyrs, and stimulated waverers, such as (17), "Fear not them which kill the body;" (18), "Whosoever shall confess," &c.; (29), "He that loveth father or mother more than Me," &c.—all these, though identical as regards thought, and similar as regards words, are nevertheless not exactly similar in Matthew and Luke. The exactly similar passages are of a very different nature: they are for the most part passages of a prophetic or historical rather than a doctrinal character with application to individuals. Some, (1), (2), (5), (6), describe the relations between John the Baptist and Christ; another, (8), calls down woe on Chorazin; another, (9), in language that reminds us of the thoughts, though not of the words, of the Fourth Gospel, thanks God for revealing to babes what He has hidden from the wise and prudent; another, (27), pours forth lamentations over doomed Jerusalem. All these passages, dealing as it were on a large scale with the will of God, as it affects religions and nations rather than as it affects individuals, are better fitted for reading in the services of the church than for being transmitted from mouth to mouth in the family from father to son, or from catechist to catechumen, for personal and individual guidance; and consequently they seem more likely to have been handed down in a book than by means of oral tradition. The same conclusion applies to (21), "But know this, that if the goodman," &c. and to (22), "Who then is the faithful and just steward," &c.—both of which passages agree *verbatim*, and both of which appear to have an ecclesiastical rather than an individual reference, at all events in their primary application. In proportion as a rhetorical passage limits itself to individual application, it seems to have been modified by oral tradition so as to deviate from exact agreement: compare in (3) the "mote and the beam;" also (12), "Ask, and it shall be given unto you;" and (19), "Take no thought for the morrow." The only exception perhaps to this rule is in the denunciation of the Pharisees (16). This passage, being of the historical type, ought (according to our rule) to be identical; but Luke differs from Matthew considerably. Possibly, in the earliest days of the church, and especially in the synagogues of Palestine a few years after the death of Christ, the angry conflicts between the disciples of the Lord and the Pharisees may have frequently reproduced and modified by traditional influences the original form of our Lord's denunciation; so that perhaps this subject comes naturally under the head of traditional doctrine. It must also be remembered that, as Luke approaches the later period of the work of Christ in Judæa, he deviates more and more both from Matthew and from Mark; perhaps because there was a Judæan as well as a Galilean tradition of the life of Jesus, and Luke, in the latter part of his history, depended

mainly on the former. These two considerations may explain the deviation of Luke from Matthew in the denunciation of the Pharisees.

That the parables should diverge is natural. Their length and number would prevent them from being remembered, or passed from mouth to mouth, with the same fidelity with which the shorter words of the Lord would be preserved; and as they were probably often repeated by Jesus in varied shapes, no one particular shape of any parable would seem to claim a place in the written document of the words of the Lord, as being of the same importance as the "Woe to Jerusalem," or the other strains of poetic prophecy. The parable of the sower, coming first in order, and being typical of the rest of the parables, and having appended to it an explanation of the motive of the parabolic teaching, would naturally attract attention from the earliest times, and consequently it found a place in the Triple Tradition; but this privilege was accorded to no other parable. There is therefore no ground whatever for inferring from the discrepancy of the language of a parable in Matthew and Luke (*e.g.*, the parable of the lost sheep) that it was not actually uttered by Jesus. The exact similarity of thought and sequence of incident in that parable, as recorded by Matthew and Luke, proves to demonstration that the two records are derived from one source.

The following are our conclusions therefore about the additions to the Triple Tradition made jointly by Matthew and Luke. (1.) Their omission by Mark furnishes no argument for their rejection, inasmuch as Mark also omits the Lord's Prayer, and obviously aims at narrating the acts rather than the sayings of the Lord. (2.) Of the additions, some appear to be based upon common tradition, or on documents modified by tradition,—principally those short trenchant sayings (including the Lord's Prayer) which are of a universal and private application. (3.) Others appear to be based upon a common document; and in these documentary additions (as perhaps to some extent in the rest) Luke seems to have modified the original tradition, in words and phrases, with a view to purity of style and intelligibility, or to remove difficulties. (4.) In chronological order and arrangement Matthew and Luke pursue divergent paths; Matthew's object being to group and mass the teaching of the Lord, while Luke aims at supplying motive, occasion, place, and time for each utterance. It is scarcely possible to doubt that the arrangement of neither is to be implicitly adopted. There is much reason to doubt whether what is called the Sermon on the Mount was actually delivered at one time in the shape in which Matthew presents it; and it is equally questionable whether the lamentation over Jerusalem was delivered in a village of Galilee, and whether the denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees (as murderers, on whom should be avenged all the innocent blood shed from the beginning of the world) was uttered at the table of a Pharisee. (6.) As regards the parables, we have to depend—in our conjecture as to the degree to which the thoughts of Jesus have been preserved—mainly upon the presence in them of the same spiritual power and insight which are perceptible in His other recognized genuine sayings. But the dissimilarity of the language of the parables in Matthew and Luke (where the thought is the same) gives no ground for denying that parables on the same subjects, and to the same effect, were actually delivered by Him. (7.) Since the hypothesis that Luke borrowed from Matthew is untenable, and since therefore we must suppose that Matthew and Luke borrowed these additions independently from some early document, we may infer that, before the times of Matthew and Luke, a document containing words of the Lord had existed long enough, and had acquired authority enough, to induce two editors or writers of Gospels, apparently representing different schools of thought

and writing for different churches, to borrow from it independently.

This last conclusion is of the greatest importance; for though the document may be, and almost certainly was, later than the Triple Tradition, yet it would have the advantage of preserving the original utterances of the Lord comparatively unimpaired by traditional transmigrations. When to this consideration is added the authoritative nature of the words of the Lord in this document, their direct reference to events, and the extreme improbability that any disciple would have, or could have, invented them,—for which of the apostles or subordinate disciples could have invented the discourse on "the lilies of the field," or the lamentation over Jerusalem, or the speech which likens John to "a reed shaken by the wind," and pronounces him the greatest of the prophets, yet less than the least in the kingdom of God!—we are led to infer that in all probability we have in these additions of Matthew and Luke a very close approximation to some of the noblest and most impressive utterances of Jesus Himself. With the exception of the healing of the son of the centurion, and the narrative of the temptation, the additions common to Matthew and Luke introduce no new supernatural element.

The Additions and Peculiarities of Mark.—It might be expected that when we come to the additions peculiar to each of the three synoptists we should find some increase to the accounts of supernatural events. Now it seems to be a striking proof of the antiquity of the Second Gospel that we find in it no additions of this kind. Not that Mark does not lay stress on what appears to be supernatural; on the contrary, he records acts of instantaneous healing with greater minuteness of detail than any other evangelist (vii. 31-37; viii. 22-26; ix. 14-27); but we find in Mark no mention of our Lord's birth or childhood, and only the barest prediction of His resurrection. As an explanation of the deficiency of information on the resurrection, it has been frequently suggested that the latter part of the Gospel may have been lost; and, less frequently (Weiss, *Marcusevangelium*, p. 511), that the Gospel was deliberately closed with the prediction of the resurrection by the mouth of an angel, because "the manifestations of the risen Saviour belong (according to the earliest notions) no longer to the earthly sphere of the action of Jesus, and therefore do not fall within the province of the Gospel." Few Greek scholars, however, will be induced to believe that the author of the Second Gospel deliberately chose to end a book on the good news of Christ with the words *ἐφοβούντο γάρ*. From a literary point of view the *γάρ*, and from a moral point of view the ill-omened *ἐφοβούντο*, make it almost incredible that these words represent a deliberate termination assigned by an author to a composition of his own. Others have suggested that the last page of the MS. may have been accidentally destroyed. But this suggestion seems to overlook the consideration that the MS. was in all probability written not for a private library but for use in the church, and that it would immediately be multiplied by copies. Again, we know, from reference to Mat. xxviii. 8 and Lu. xxiv. 9, that the common tradition ceases with the return of the women from the Lord's tomb. But it is precisely at this point that the genuine Mark (xvi. 8) also terminates. Now, that a page should have been torn out containing just that part of Mark which followed after the close of the common tradition would be a most remarkable and unlikely coincidence. It seems far more probable that Mark ends his Gospel here because the common tradition ended here, and because he scrupled to add anything to the notes and traditions which he knew to rest upon a higher authority than his own. If this be the true explanation, it stamps with the seal of a higher authority such traditions

Additions peculiar to Mark.

as have been preserved to us by so scrupulous an author. We proceed therefore to an investigation of the peculiarities of Mark, with a confidence in him increased rather than diminished by the fact that he has neither the introductions nor the appendices which are found in the rest of the Gospels.

The first thing that strikes us in Mark is his duality. Verbosity we might be tempted to call it at the first sight; but though there is a certain disproportion in the space assigned to detail, duality, and not verbosity, is the better word. It is this duality which gave rise (see above, p. 789) to the erroneous supposition that Mark had borrowed from Matthew and Luke. But it may be shown, by reference to passages where there can be no possibility that Mark borrowed from Matthew and Luke (Mk. ii. 19; iii. 5; iii. 27; iii. 22, 30; v. 3, 5; xii. 44), that this duality is a part of Mark's style. In many cases, e.g., iii. 22, 30 (*Βεελζεβούλ ἔχει* and *πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει*), it is almost forced on the reader that the evangelist had before him two versions of one saying, and that in his "anxiety to omit nothing" he inserted both. Whether there be any definite traces of translation in his Gospel will be considered hereafter. But, so far, we merely note that some of Mark's dualities of expression might be explained as double renderings of the same original. Only one parable is peculiar to Mark; it is one that illustrates (iv. 26-29) the spread of the kingdom of God by the quiet, unperceived, and gradual growth of corn. The subdued tone of this (one of the most interesting of all the parables) was perhaps the reason why it was not at first widely known, as it undoubtedly is the reason why modern readers pay it too little attention. Mark also amplifies the story of the Baptist's execution (vi. 20-28), and the graphic story of the exorcism of the "legion." For the rest, the other additions peculiar to Mark consist either of dual expressions and amplifications of detail, or of realistic details which would naturally be subordinated in later times, as likely to be stumbling-blocks. For amplifications which treat of the resistance and ultimate submission of unclean spirits see i. 26, 27; i. 44; iii. 7-12; ix. 14-27; for others which relate to the crowding of people round Jesus, the publicity of His work, and His desire for solitude, see i. 28; i. 35-37; i. 45; ii. 1-4; ii. 15; iii. 10-12; vi. 32-33, &c. The narrative also, from first to last, abounds with expressions as to the manner and look and minute action of Jesus during dialogues or miracles (cf. iii. 5; vii. 31-37; viii. 22-26). In many of these additions Aramaic words are given as the very utterances of Jesus, e.g., v. 41, *Ταλιθά κοῦμι*; vii. 34, *Ἐφθάθά*; xiv. 36, *Ἀββὰ*; sometimes, also, names that are given by no other writer, e.g., Bartimæus, Boanerges, and Dalmanutha.² Unquestionably, under ordinary circumstances, this elaboration of unimportant detail³ (and especially the introduction of

¹ This is a quotation from Papias preserved by Eusebius (Kirchofer, p. 123): "For he (Mark) took great care about one matter, viz., to omit nothing of all that (*μὴδὲν ὄν*) he heard." If Papias spoke of our Mark, it would seem that this must refer rather to the words than to the incidents recorded in his very scanty Gospel. It seems to be an apology for the disproportion of the narrative. In writing the narrative just as he took it down in notes (from Peter's discourses) "Mark," says Papias, "committed no error," but simply acted as a faithful reporter. We do not, of course, commit ourselves to the truth of this statement; we merely point out that the hypothesis that Mark's Gospel is a collection of "notes," will explain some of the peculiarities of its style.

² Mark's custom of placing the Aramaic original side by side with the Greek translation is perhaps in part suggested by the Palestinian dialect of our Lord's time, in which (especially in certain phrases) Greek and Aramaic were blended together, as in the phrase "my Lord," *κύριε*, which stands for *רַבִּי*, *רַבִּי*, *רַבִּי*. See Lightfoot, *Galat.*, p. 167, for this and other instances. But in Mark the reduplication for the most part is confined to passages expressive of strong emotion.

³ Take, as an instance, the wounding of the high priest's servant by Peter. Here Mark (xiv. 47) merely records the wound; Matthew

names—for instances of which see the Apocryphal Gospels *passim*) is a mark of a late writer and of a composer of fiction rather than history. But all the characteristics of Mark support the belief that in his case they are rather the excrescences and redundancies of one who trusted his memory rather than his judgment, and who preferred to report rather than to select and arrange.

One proof of the early composition of Mark is the rudeness and even vulgarity of his Greek. He uses a great number of words which are expressly forbidden by the grammarians. For example, of Mark's phrase *ἐσχάτως ἔχει* (Mk. v. 23), Phrynichus says (ed. Lobeck, p. 389), "only the *canaille* use it in this sense;" the same grammarian also warns his readers against *κράββατος* (Mk. ii. 4, 9, 11, 12). Other words noted by Phrynichus, and used by Mark (some of which are also used by Matthew) but avoided by Luke, are *μονόφθαλμος* (ix. 47); *εὐσχήμων* (for *πλούσιος*, xv. 43); *κολληβισταί* (xi. 15); *κοράσιον* (v. 41); *ὄρκιζω* (v. 7); *ράπτισμα* (xiv. 65); *ραφίδος* (x. 25).⁴ Such words as these might naturally find their place in the mongrel Greek of the slaves and freedmen who formed the first congregations of the church in Rome; and they are therefore tokens of a date of composition earlier than that of Matthew and Luke. For it is not conceivable that such terms (some of which would so have jarred upon the ear of an educated Greek as almost to correspond to our "slang") should be substituted in later times for a more tasteful vocabulary; whereas it is easily conceivable, and *a priori* probable, that better Greek should, in the prosperous days of the church, be substituted for worse.

It is a natural characteristic of an unpractised reporter that he lays undue stress on a few vivid expressions and striking words, and that he reproduces or exaggerates anacolutha which, though not objectionable in a speech, are inconvenient in a book, because they tend to obscure or subordinate the subject matter. Many such words are inserted by Mark, and avoided by Matthew or Luke, or by both, e.g., *σχιζομένους*, i. 10; *ἀγαφος*, ii. 21; *κομπούλευς*, i. 38; *ἀναλον*, ix. 50. For irregular constructions see iv. 28 (*πλήρης σίτος*, the correct reading); xii. 40, *οἱ κατέσθοντες* (altered by Luke); v. 23, *ἵνα ἐπιθῆς*; note also the curious change of construction from *ἴνα* to the infinitive in iii. 15, as compared with iii. 14. The Latinisms of this Gospel are well known: see xv. 15, *τὸ ἴκανόν ποιῆσαι*; vi. 35, *ἴρα πολλή*; vi. 27, *σπεκουλάτωρ*; xv. 39, *κεντυρίων*. The words *πραυτέριον* (xv. 16), *κῆνος* (xii. 14), and *φραγελλοῦν* (xv. 15) Mark shares with Matthew. Other barbarisms are the use of *ὄταν* with the indicative, and the use of *ὄτι* to ask a question (ii. 16; ix. 11; ix. 28), both of which idioms are common in the *Acta Pilati*, and perhaps indicate Latin influence.

A still more cogent proof of the early date of Mark is that this Gospel contains many expressions which would be likely to be stumbling-blocks in the way of weak believers, so that they are omitted in the later Gospels, and would not have been tolerated except in a Gospel of extreme antiquity. For example, the strong expression (vi. 5, 6), "He was not able to do there any mighty work;" the statement (i. 32, 34) that *all* the sick were brought to Jesus, but that He healed *only many*, whereas Matthew (viii. 16) says that He healed *all*, and Luke (iv. 40) that He healed *each one* (*ἐνὶ ἑκάστῳ*);

(xxvi. 52) adds the reproof addressed by Jesus to Peter; Luke (xxii. 50, 51) adds that it was the "right" ear, and that Jesus healed the man; lastly, the Fourth Gospel, while omitting the healing, retains the "right" ear, and adds that the servant's name was Malchus. In such a case it is impossible to feel certain that the simpler narrative of Mark may not have been modified by later accretions.

⁴ Such arguments as that "Hippocrates used *ραφίς*" cannot count for anything against the general feeling of dislike for the word expressed by the dictum of Phrynichus, "*ἡ δὲ ραφίς τι ἔστιν οὐκ ἄν τις γνοίη.*"

the attempt of His mother and brethren to lay hands on Him on the ground that He was insane (iii. 20-21); the imputation of an ambitious petition to James and John, instead of (as Matthew) to their mother (x. 35); the mention of the marvel of Pilate at the speedy death of Jesus, which might have been perverted to support those who denied that Jesus had really died upon the cross (xv. 44); the statement that Jesus only gave power to His apostles to cast out devils (iii. 15, correct text), and not (as Mat. x. 1) to heal diseases; the enumeration of the different stages by which Jesus, at least on one occasion, effected a cure, and the description of the, at first, only partial cure (viii. 24); the statement that the fig-tree, instead of being withered up "immediately" (as Matthew, *παροχρόμη*, xxi. 19), was not observed to be withered till after the interval of a day; the bare statement (xvi. 4) that the women found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre (which might have been used to support the statements of those who maintained that the friends or enemies of Jesus had stolen His body), whereas Matthew (xxviii. 2) distinctly meets such an objection by asserting that an angel descended from heaven in the sight of the keepers and rolled away the stone;—these, and probably other expressions, indicate a very early date of composition, and a disposition to record facts as they came, without emphasis or subordination. Mark neither masses similar sayings or deeds, as Matthew does, nor supplies motives and occasions, as Luke does. It is most interesting to note that the words "law," "lawyer," which played so prominent a part in Matthew and Luke, are not to be found at all in Mark's narrative. His business is simply with the life of Christ. Again, whereas Matthew and (in a less degree) Luke are careful to point out that Jesus fulfilled the sayings of the prophets, Mark, on the other hand, though he recognizes in John the Baptist (i. 2) the messenger predicted by the prophets, sees in Jesus a Being too absorbing and interesting as a man to find much time for contemplation of Him as the mere fulfiller of prophecy. In a word, Mark writes of Jesus, not as the destroyer or fulfiller of the law, not as the Messiah predicted by the prophets, not as the refuge of the Gentiles, but rather as a man; subject to anger, and disappointment, and weariness; not knowing all things; not able to do all things; but endowed with strange powers of healing the souls and bodies of men; and carrying out a mysterious plan for the regeneration of the world, through a spirit of childlike obedience to God and brotherly love towards men; lastly, a man who assumed for Himself and for His disciples a power of forgiving sins, and who based all the success of His plans upon His predicted death and resurrection, to be followed by a second coming.

True, Mark's Gospel is disproportioned, inartistic, and uncouth—scarcely, indeed, to be called a book, but rather a collection of graphic anecdotes. Yet it has a unity derived from its naive simplicity and single-mindedness, in recording whatever it records as it was delivered from the earliest sources in its entirety; and possibly in that string of anecdotes the development of Christ's life and work may be traced with not less clearness than in the ampler and more artistic production of Luke.

The Additions and Peculiarities of Matthew.—The principal additions to the common tradition contributed by Matthew alone are the following:—

(1) i. 1-17, the genealogy of Jesus from David; (2) i. 18-25, the annunciation, and the dream of Joseph; (3) ii. 1-12, the adoration of the Magi; (4) ii. 13-23, the massacre of children in Bethlehem and the flight of the parents of Jesus to Egypt, together with their return to Nazareth; (5) iii. 13-17, the reluctance of John to baptize Jesus; (6) iv. 14-16, the fulfilment of the prophecy, "The people that sit in darkness," &c.; (7) v. 5-10, the six beatitudes on the sorrowing, the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peace-makers, the persecuted; (8) v. 17-48, the new law is more exacting than the old law; (9) vi. 1-18, warnings against ostentation in almsgiving, prayer, and fasting; (10) vi. 34, "Sufficient for the

day is the evil thereof"; (11) vii. 6, "Give not that which is holy to dogs," &c.; (12) vii. 13, 14, "Broad is the gate," &c.; (13) vii. 22, "In thy name have we cast out devils," &c.; (14) ix. 13 and xii. 7, the saying, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice"; (15) ix. 27-34, the cure of two blind men and of a deaf man; (16) x. 5-8, "Go not into any city of the Samaritans," &c., instructions to the twelve; (17) x. 23, "But when they pursue you in this city, flee unto the other; for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel until the Son of Man be come"; (18) x. 25, "The servant is not above his master," &c.; (19) xi. 28-30, "Come unto Me, all ye that are weary," &c.; (20) xii. 17-21, the prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold my servant," &c., is fulfilled in Jesus; (21) xii. 22, 23, the healing of one that was both dumb and blind; (22) xii. 33, "Either make the tree sound and the fruit sound, or," &c.; (23) xii. 36, 37, "Every idle word," &c.; (24) xii. 40, "As Jonas was in the whale's belly," &c.; (25) xiii. 14, 15, the fulfilment of a prophecy of Isaiah in the misunderstanding of Christ's teaching; (26) xiii. 24-30, the enemy and the tares; (27) xiii. 35, the fulfilment of prophecy in Christ's teaching by parables; (28) xiii. 36-43, the interpretation of the parable of the tares; (29) xiii. 44-50, "The kingdom of heaven is like (a) a treasure, (b) a merchant buying a pearl, (c) a net"; (30) xiii. 51, 52, Every disciple to bring forth things new and old," &c.; (31) xiv. 28-33, the attempt of Peter to walk upon the waves; (32) xv. 13, "Every plant that My heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up," &c.; (33) xvi. 17-19, the blessing on Peter; (34) xvii. 24-27, the tribute money; (35) xviii. 3, 4, "If ye be not converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter," &c.; (36) xviii. 10, "Their angels do always behold," &c.; (37) xviii. 12-14, the parable of the hundred sheep (given by Luke in similar language); (38) xviii. 15-18, "Tell it to the church," &c., the course of procedure in case of quarrel; (39) xviii. 21, 22, the question of Peter, "How often shall my brother sin against me?" (40) xviii. 23-34, the parable of the unforgiving servant; (41) xix. 19-22, "There are some eunuchs," &c.; (42) xx. 1-15, the labourers in the vineyard; (43) xxi. 5, the fulfilment of the prophecy, "Behold thy King cometh," &c.; (44) xxi. 16, the fulfilment of the prophecy, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings," &c.; (45) xxi. 28-32, "I go" and "I go not"; (46) xxi. 43, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and shall be given to a nation that bringeth forth the fruits thereof"; (47) xxii. 1-14, the parable of the despiteful and murderous guests (very dissimilar in Luke); (48) xxiii. 1-3, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat," &c.; (49) xxiii. 7-12; *ib.* 15-22, "Be not called Rabbi," &c., "He that sweareth by the altar," &c.; (50) xxv. 1-13, the parable of the ten virgins; (51) xxv. 14-28, the parable of the talents; (52) xxv. 31-46, the parable of the sheep and the goats; (53) xxvi. 51-54, "Put up thy sword," and "Thinkest thou not that I cannot now pray to My Father," &c.; (54) xxvii. 3-10, the fulfilment of the prophecy, "And they took the thirty pieces of silver," &c.; (55) xxvii. 19, "Have thou nothing to do with that just man," &c.; (56) xxvii. 24-25, Pilate washing his hands; (57) xxvii. 52, 53, "And many bodies of them that slept arose," &c.; (58) xxvii. 62-66, the Jews seal the sepulchre; (59) xxviii. 2-5, the angel rolls the stone from the tomb of Jesus; (60) xxviii. 9-16, the women clasp the feet of the risen Jesus; the soldiers are bribed to say that the disciples stole away the body; (61) xxviii. 16-20, Jesus appears to the eleven disciples on a mountain in Galilee.

The preface (chaps. i. and ii.) reveals a part of the purpose of the whole Gospel, in tracing the genealogy of Jesus, not from David merely, who was under the law, but from Abraham, who was the receiver of the promise (Gal. iii. 16) and the father of the faithful (Gal. iii. 7). Such a genealogy is the fitting preface of a book which aims at exhibiting the law, not as trampled upon but as fulfilled and developed into a higher law of promise, in which all the families of the world were to be blessed (Gen. xii. 3). But by this time, also, the church required some distinct affirmation concerning the divine origin of Jesus. The gap left in the opening of Mark's Gospel needed to be filled up. The mere earthly pedigree from Abraham was insufficient; nor did it suffice that Jesus should be declared to be spiritually the Son of God. It was necessary that the verity of the spiritual birth of Jesus from the Father should be embodied in a narrative so expressed as to be intelligible to all.

The differences between the prefaces of Matthew and Luke are obvious, and need no stress laid on them, except as illustrations of the freedom which, at this period, was allowed in the handling of the various introductions to the

¹ Possibly these narratives may refer to events also described by Mark; but, as the language presents no similarity, they are placed here.