

SOME POINTS IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

II.

THE SUPPOSED RELATION OF ST. MATTHEW AND ST. LUKE
TO THE "LOGIA" AS A COMMON SOURCE.

THE common features of all the first three Gospels, and their broad differences from the Fourth, are the phenomena which first strike us in comparing the Gospels. And I contended in my last paper, that, in spite of what has been recently urged, this contrast finds its most natural explanation in the characteristics of the earliest, the oral, stage in the delivery of the Gospel. I granted that our first and third evangelists seem to have had St. Mark's Gospel, or one very like it, before them as they wrote. But we saw that some force has to be supposed which caused them to be satisfied with the general character of its representation, and which controlled their choice of additional matter, or determined the supply of it at their disposal. Such a force we have if at the time when all three Synoptists wrote there was a prevailing type and outline of teaching to which preachers and catechists in the main conformed in popularly imparting the facts of the Gospel.

If I were attempting a comprehensive discussion of the problem of the Origin of the Gospels, the relations of the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke to that according to St. Mark would next demand careful consideration. The proofs of that belief that it was the first of the three, and that the other two have made use of it, to which I have referred, would have to be exhibited. But this is a point on which much may be found in works accessible to all.¹ Moreover, my main object in these papers is to ex-

¹ *E.g.* see Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, chap. ix.

amine some of those conclusions of recent critics which seem to me most open to doubt. The extent of the relations of St. Matthew and St. Luke to St. Mark will, however, be incidentally referred to in the course of my argument as a standard of comparison in other cases.

Dr. Sanday has told us that "the two-document hypothesis holds the field."¹ This, to quote Dr. Sanday's description of it, is "the hypothesis that at the root of our three Synoptics there lie two main documents—a narrative by St. Mark composed from the preaching of St. Peter, and a collection of our Lord's discourses first put together by St. Matthew."² Not only is it the theory maintained, though in different forms, by Holtzmann and Weiss and Wendt, but it is also, he tells us, "the common postulate" of certain recent writers whom he has noticed in the same article, "of Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Wright in England, and of Dr. Ewald and Dr. Resch in Germany."³ It may be questioned whether it is proper to use the term "two-document" in the case of a writer who, like Mr. Wright, endeavours to solve the Synoptic problem by an elaborate system of modifications of *oral* traditions. This, however, may be allowed to pass, as it is on the ground of Mr. Wright's view of the inter-relations of the Synoptists and of the sources of their material that Dr. Sanday classes him with the other writers.

It is a consideration of more importance that in the description of the "two-document" theory given above the words, "at the root of our three Synoptics there lie two main documents," apply with very varying degrees of accuracy to the views of the different critics named. For while Wendt, for example, derives nearly the whole of the large amount of matter peculiar to St. Luke, as well as that

¹ EXPOSITOR for February, 1891, p. 91.

² *Ib.*

³ *Ib.*

which he and St. Matthew (but not St. Mark) contain, from the "Logia," so that he may be strictly called an adherent of the "two-document hypothesis,"—Weiss, and now Ewald, hold that St. Luke had a *third* source, special to himself, besides St. Mark and the "Logia." And Dr. Sanday himself in the same article made still further use of the hypothesis of a source peculiar to Luke,¹ till the "Logia" seems, as far as that Evangelist is concerned, in danger of being driven to take a very subordinate position. Some of these differences, however, do not matter for our present purpose, as they relate to points which do not come into view till the question of the common use of the "Logia" has been decided. It is the matter common to St. Matthew and St. Luke which has suggested this common source, and which (if the general fact is considered established) must ever be the main guide to its character and contents.

It requires some courage to call in question the soundness of a theory which has won the assent of a large number of the most thorough investigators in this field of New Testament criticism, and thus to render oneself liable to the imputation of desiring to impede the progress of criticism and the general acceptance of its conclusions. Nor am I insensible to the attractiveness of the theory. The attempt to reconstruct a lost document by a careful analysis and comparison of later writings which have preserved fragments of it, or otherwise used it, is not in itself illegitimate, and the hope of effecting this has a singular charm for the mind of the critic. More particularly must this be the case when, as in the present instance, we should thus obtain a clearer view of that which is most original and most to be relied upon in the sources of our knowledge concerning the Christ. But the very fascination which such a theory must possess is a reason for meeting it with peculiar caution. It

¹ EXPOSITOR for April, 1891, p. 315. And see more below.

is hard to restrict the imagination to its true office in such inquiries. When once we have thought ourselves into a particular theory, a conviction of its truth is apt to be bred in the mind, which is altogether beyond the evidence, while inconvenient facts are ignored.

Now the opposed conceptions of the character of the "Logia" and of the relation of St. Matthew and St. Luke to this document, which different critics have formed, should from the outset act as a warning that no one of the theories does justice to the facts as a whole, and that one set of facts will be found to have been neglected in one theory, another set in another. And here I may be allowed to observe that Dr. Sanday's mode of describing the present position of the inquiry seems too much to obscure this consideration. He includes "the two-document hypothesis" apparently among "points proved or probable"; and then indicates the two main views that are held of the relations of our first and third Gospels severally to the supposed original "collection of discourses" by St. Matthew, and mentions some of the difficulties in the way of each which may incline us to adopt the other.¹ He seems to say to us, "Here are all these able critics agreeing in the assumption that our first and third evangelists used another common source besides St. Mark. This much must be considered proved, or in the highest degree probable. The further question whether the first or the third represents this document most truly is one about which they widely differ. A good deal may be said on both sides; it must be regarded at present as an undecided point."

Now if the diversity consisted simply in the treatment of subsidiary and detached points, this might be so. But, in fact, it penetrates to the grounds on which the theory that the two evangelists both used the "Logia" can be justified

¹ Articles II. and III., *EXPOSITOR* for March and April, 1891.

at all. And the reasons which the advocates of each may urge against the other seem to be in combination destructive of the hypothesis which underlies them both. If the two evangelists both used the "Logia," their relations to it must be conceived in one of two opposite ways. We successively try each of these, and find that a different set of very serious difficulties exists in each case. The natural result must be, and ought to be, to throw grave doubt (that I may say no more) on the assumption from which we started.

Let us proceed to examine the alternative explanations in the light of general probability: (1) In respect to the different arrangement of the common matter in the first and third Gospels; (2) To differences of expression and detail. We will then notice (3) How the difficulties, to which each explanation is exposed, even when we confine ourselves simply to considerations of general probability, are enhanced by calling to mind how the first and third evangelists appear to have acted in the use which we may on much better grounds believe them to have made of St. Mark's narrative.

1. The general character of the arrangement of the common matter in the first Gospel is that it is massed in a few discourses, whereas in the third Gospel it is much more distributed, the occasions being given on which different sayings and passages of teaching were spoken. Holtzmann has represented in forcible language what violence we must suppose St. Luke to have done to his authority, if the grouping of the matter in that authority corresponded, even generally, with that in our St. Matthew.¹ And I would ask those who adopt this latter hypothesis, Can they really imagine that St. Luke broke up and scattered large portions of the discourses which he found in the "Logia," and in-

¹ See, for example, the words quoted by Sanday, *EXPOSITOR*, 1891, p. 307.

vented incidents to form settings for the fragments? For my own part I find such a supposition wholly inconsistent with his general characteristics as a writer. Will it be said: "He did not invent them, but he found them already existing in oral tradition, or in some written source open to him, where sayings like those in the "Logia" were already connected with them. By these and other means of information, he assigned the occasions for the teaching, the verbal form of which he took from the "Logia." But what a clumsy and improbable mode of workmanship is thus attributed to St. Luke! Surely we shall obtain a more reasonable hypothesis if we suppose that he found in some other written source, if not in oral tradition, the several pieces of instruction, or sayings, with the events that called them forth, just as he has given them.

We see, then, to what difficulties we shall be exposed, if assuming the "Logia" to be a source used both in the first and the third Gospel, we refuse to frame our conception of the order and division of the contents of this source mainly from the latter. Suppose, then, we agree to take our idea of the "Logia" primarily from St. Luke; does this create no grave difficulties in regard to St. Matthew's relation to the document? To begin with, there is the objection urged by Weiss,¹ and Ewald,² and Sanday,³ that if the original form of that which was related in St. Matthew's work was so much less faithfully preserved in our first than in the third Gospel, it is incomprehensible how the former of these should from a very early time have been universally identified with St. Matthew's name. It is true, Wendt and others, who derive their idea of the outline of the "Logia" from St. Luke, think that our St. Matthew has in some cases kept more closely than St. Luke has to turns of ex-

¹ *Introduction to New Test.*, II., p. 235 n. 1, Eng. Trans.

² *Hauptproblem*, p. 29.

³ *EXPOSITOR*, 1891, p. 308.

pression in the Source.¹ But even if this greater verbal accuracy extended to his reproductions generally, it would not have struck the eye nearly so much as the great differences of arrangement. This, however, is not the only difficulty in the way of supposing that the general form of the "Logia" is most truly represented in St. Luke. At first sight it may seem that the amount of violence done to the Source by the supposed massing of discourses and sayings with regard to their subject-matter, to bring them to the shape in which we find them in the first Gospel, would be decidedly less serious than that which the alternative hypothesis involves. But in reality the difference is not so great. It may be admitted that even if St. Luke in the main followed the assumed Source in the setting which he gives to the discourses and sayings which he has taken from it, yet the connexion and circumstances might conceivably in some instances have been more slightly indicated there than they are by him. And to this extent a regrouping might necessitate a less marked breach with the original authority than the reader of our present Gospels might be disposed to imagine. But the cases are far too numerous, and many of the occasions with which St. Luke connects them are far too distinct, for this explanation to suffice. If the writer of our first Gospel, finding our Lord's teaching about prayer reported in the "Logia," on a separate and specified occasion, represented it as a part of the Sermon on the Mount; if again he treated in a similar manner the warning against being careful for worldly things, which in the "Logia" was seen to have been called forth by a special incident; if he combined two discourses to different bodies of disciples, fused various denunciations of the Pharisees into one, made one discourse out of various sayings on the Things of the End, although the Source implied that

¹ See Wendt's *Lehre Jesu*, e.g. pp. 85, 86, 88, 97, etc.

they were spoken at different times, then he on his part feigned the occasions on which the portions of teaching which he so transferred were delivered, in defiance of an authority which he had strong reason to follow.

So far our attention has been directed to the massing of material in the discourses given by St. Matthew, which in St. Luke is scattered. A few chief instances have been indicated; a fuller examination of the principal discourses in St. Matthew and the parallels to their contents in St. Luke would confirm what has been already said as to the strange difference of grouping. Here we have new discourses made up, or different occasions suggested, by one or other of the two Evangelists, though each is supposed to be drawing from the same source.

The different placing by St. Matthew and St. Luke of incidents, sayings, and discourses, which are complete and substantially the same in each, is the point to which we next turn. This, however, will afford a less satisfactory test. For two different writers might easily differ to some extent as to the best way of combining two series of incidents, etc., from two Sources. Nevertheless the amount of difference of this kind between St. Matthew and St. Luke seems to be greater than would probably thus arise. It is the exception rather than the rule that the same order should be suggested.

Let us briefly compare them with reference to this point. The preaching of the Baptist naturally comes just before the beginning of our Lord's Ministry in both. The place for the narrative of the Temptation, too, was fixed by St. Mark's brief notice, if by no other consideration. Besides these the Healing of the Centurion's Servant follows closely upon the Sermon on the Mount in both Gospels. The question whether the place at which St. Matthew and St. Luke introduce the Sermon on the Mount corresponds to the same or a different point in St. Mark's Outline is a

more difficult one. It seems to be the fashion with recent critics to say that it is the same.¹ But this appears to me to be an error, though I am willing to admit that it is not for our present purpose an important difference. Still it is worth observing that the spread of Christ's fame, which made an occasion for introducing the sermon, is connected by St. Matthew with the extensive preaching in the Synagogues, related by St. Mark in chap. i. 39; whereas St. Luke connects it with a *second* notice of Christ's wide influence in St. Mark, at chap. iii. 7-12, which is also given by St. Matthew in his strictly parallel passage, xii. 15-21. This must, I think, be evident to anyone who will write down in order the headings of the series of narratives in the three Synoptists in parallel columns, leaving spaces where they do not correspond. It is more important to observe that there is a considerable number of sections which St. Matthew places in the central part of the Galilæan Ministry, while St. Luke places them in the period of last journeyings towards Jerusalem, each Evangelist often differing also in the circumstances detailed. It is hard to suppose that the arrangement and the introductory notices in the Source would be readily compatible with both of two such opposite modes of treatment as this.

The internal order, however, as we may term it, of the narratives common only to St. Matthew and St. Luke,—that is to say, the relative order among themselves of these narratives in each Gospel—may be reasonably held to be of more importance as an indication of derivation from a common source, than the manner in which the two Evangelists have combined them with other narratives. And it is to be admitted that there is in this respect a good deal of correspondence. Yet there are also several exceptions; and it should at the same time be remembered, that there would

¹ Simons, *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* p. 36. Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, p. 53. Sanday, *EXPOSITION* for 1891, p. 312.

probably be a good deal of similarity in the order in which incidents would have come to the two Evangelists, by whatever channels they reached them, both because the sequence in which the incidents happened would naturally be preserved in many cases, and from considerations of internal fitness.

To sum up what seems to me to be the result of this first part of the argument. The striking differences in the arrangement by St. Luke of much of the material contained in the chief discourses of St. Matthew's Gospel is highly unfavourable to the idea that they both found this matter in the same document. On the more general questions as to the order of incidents it is less easy to form an opinion; yet on the whole the differences of arrangement seem to be greater than might be expected, if both Evangelists were following the same revered authority.

2. From the general arrangement we turn to the details and verbal form of the material which St. Matthew and St. Luke are supposed both to have derived from the "Logia." We will ask at once, Is St. Matthew or St. Luke faithful to the "Logia," in the position of the second and third *temptations of our Lord in the Wilderness*,¹ the *opening passage of the Sermon on the Mount*,² the *healing of the Centurion's Servant*,³ the *parables of the Great Feast*,⁴ the *Master who left his servants in charge*?⁵ Yet all these are commonly reckoned among the contents of the "Logia."

If these inconsistencies stood alone in the midst of close general similarity, we might imagine that one or other Evangelist had been led to recast what he related owing to information which he had obtained in some other way. They might be paralleled by some, if not such striking,

¹ Matt. iv. 5-11; Luke iv. 9-13.

² Matt. v. 3-12; Luke vi. 20-26.

³ Matt. viii. 5-13; Luke vii. 1-10.

⁴ Matt. xxii. 1-14; Luke xiv. 15-24.

⁵ Matt. xxiv. 14-30; Luke xix. 11-27.

examples of direct inconsistency between the same two Evangelists severally and St. Mark. But at least they militate, so far as they go, against the view that the two Evangelists were using a common source. They make it all the more necessary to measure the amount and the closeness of the similarity in other parts. Are these sufficient to establish or to render probable the supposed use of the "Logia" by both St. Matthew and St. Luke?

Now there is a considerable number of passages in which there is very close, in some cases almost exact, verbal agreement between St. Matthew and St. Luke, and these constitute together an interesting and remarkable phenomenon. Yet they amount in length to somewhat less than a third of the passages which in substance are parallel in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and are not contained in St. Mark. In the remaining two-thirds the degree of verbal agreement is markedly less, and, speaking generally, is not at all close.¹

¹ The following will, I believe, be found a complete, or nearly complete, list of the close parallels, including those which do not extend beyond a single sentence:—

Matt. iii. 7-10, 12.	Luke iii. 7-9, 17.
vi. 24.	xvi. 13.
vi. 25-33.	xii. 22-31.
vii. 3-5.	vi. 41, 42.
vii. 7-11.	xi. 9-13.
viii. 9, 10.	vii. 8, 9.
viii. 19-22.	ix. 57-60.
ix. 37, 38.	x. 2.
xi. 3-11.	vii. 19, 22-28.
xi. 16-19.	vii. 31-35.
xi. 21-27.	x. 12-22.
xii. 25-30.	xi. 17-23.
xii. 38-45.	xi. 29-32, 24-26.
xiii. 33.	xiii. 21.
xxi. 44 (genuineness doubtful).	xx. 18.

I have not included in this list the account of the three temptations in the two Evangelists, not only because of the difference of order but also because the verbal similarity is mainly due to the fact that the temptations and replies are, to a large extent, quotations from the Old Testament. The number of verses in the above table is seventy-nine, each, in St. Matthew and St. Luke. The

Now the passages which are so nearly identical in the two Gospels afford a standard whereby to judge the others. Why should St. Luke, say, if he was using the same document as St. Matthew, have treated it so differently in the two sets of cases?

This diversity becomes more striking when we examine particular instances. Thus in the Sermon on the Mount, as St. Luke gives it, *only two verses* are verbally identical with St. Matthew. In the whole of the rest of the discourse as it is recorded in the third Gospel, though the substance is contained in St. Matthew, there is not a single sentence that is verbally the same, and for the most part there is considerable difference of phraseology. It is a singular circumstance that just those parallels in St. Luke to passages in the Sermon as St. Matthew gives it, in which there is full coincidence, are brought in by him in other contexts. To take another example, there is no close verbal similarity throughout the *Charge to the Twelve* in St. Matthew with the Lucan parallels.

Now Dr. Ewald and Dr. Sanday have noticed the fact that the resemblance between the first and third Gospels in passages which might be supposed to be taken from the "Logia" is very much chosen in some places than in others;¹ though they do not seem to me to have recognised it adequately. Dr. Sanday, however, is led by it to suggest that while "St. Luke," as well as St. Matthew, "had access to the 'Logia,'" "he also had before him some other document—entirely independent of the "Logia"—which contained a discourse spoken originally on some other occasion, but yet so like the Sermon on the Mount as to be identified

whole number of verses in "the double tradition of St. Matthew and St. Luke," in Mr. Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, omitting the genealogies and accounts of the infancy and beginning from the Ministry of John, is in St. Matthew 275, in St. Luke 259. That is, the *close* parallels are, as I have said, somewhat less than a third of the whole.

¹ *Expositor* for April, 1891, p. 309.

with it by St. Luke. That Evangelist seems to have given us, not either discourse singly or separately, but the two fused together, the language and expression of the discourse peculiar to himself predominating."¹ First, I would remark that this language does not well correspond to the phenomena of the two Gospels. For surely if either "fuses," it is St. Matthew. And further, if St. Luke, besides having the discourse in his own peculiar source, also knew the source from which St. Matthew takes his, he must, instead of identifying the two, have thought them not the same, and have determined to give some of the portions which were not in his own special source in clearly different connections. It is, however, significant, that one so free from any prejudice against the "two-document hypothesis," as Dr. Sanday has shown himself to be, should be led to adopt such a view. If it is consistently carried out in accordance with the facts to which I have alluded, the consequence must be that the "Logia" must hold quite a subordinate position among St. Luke's authorities. And I think we shall then be driven to ask whether the kind of use of the "Logia" which is thus attributed to him is at all a natural one, or whether some more probable explanation of the close parallels between St. Matthew and St. Luke cannot be found.

3. Thus far in considering the question whether the differences (1) in arrangement and (2) in language and detail in the matter peculiar to St. Matthew and St. Luke are not greater than might be expected if both Evangelists derived it from a common apostolic source, we have confined ourselves to considerations of general probability. But there is a more definite test which we may apply. There is good ground, as I have said, for believing that the second of our Gospels, or a document substantially the same, was used in

¹ EXPOSITOR for April, 1891, p. 315.

the composition of the third, and also in bringing our first to its present shape. We may at all events assume this for the purpose of our present argument, for none of those who hold the theory we are discussing would dispute it. We have, then, in the use which our first and third Evangelists appear to have made of St. Mark, a standard by which to try their use of the "Logia." We know how they treated one document which they followed as an authority, how close they kept to it, what kind of divergences they permitted themselves; we may infer how they would proceed with any other, which occupied an analogous position. This is a line of argument which seems to have received surprisingly little, if any, attention hitherto. And yet, be it observed, they had even more reason to pay reverence to, and to accept the supposed "Logia." For in St. Mark's Gospel they had but the report of the disciple of an eye-witness, while the "Logia," according to the generally accepted view, was the actual work of an Apostle.

(a) Let us first try our proposed standard in regard to the arrangement of common matter. We observe that both St. Matthew and St. Luke have, to speak generally, adhered to the outline of St. Mark throughout. Each makes a few omissions, St. Luke somewhat more than St. Matthew. Each inserts a considerable amount of new matter, but after such insertions each resumes the thread of St. Mark's narrative just where for the moment he had dropped it. The exceptions in St. Matthew are the different positions of (1) the *healing of Peter's wife's mother*,¹ which (if we allow for the space occupied by the insertion of the Sermon on the Mount) will be seen to be not greatly displaced, (2) of the *storm on the lake and the exorcism on its further side*,² which St. Matthew places just before the

¹ Matt. viii. 14-17; Mark i. 29-34.

² Matt. viii. 23-34.

healing of the paralytic,¹ and of the *raising of the ruler's daughter*,² which he places just after it, whereas St. Luke places this *storm and exorcism and raising of Jairus's daughter*,³ in immediate succession after the *teaching by parables*; ⁴ (3) the *mission of the twelve*,⁵ which again St. Matthew brings in at an earlier point than St. Mark does. Perhaps we should add that he combines in one narrative the *cursing and withering of the fig-tree*,⁶ which in St. Mark are kept separate by the events of twenty-four hours.

The exceptions in St. Luke are (1) the *visit to Nazareth*,⁷ described by him at the opening of Christ's ministry; though indeed this differs so much in the fulness of its particulars from the visit recorded at a later point by St. Mark (and St. Matthew), that it may have referred to a different occasion, or may at all events have been thought by the Evangelist to do so; (2) the *call of the first four disciples*,⁸ which St. Mark places before, and St. Luke after, the same brief series of incidents, while the latter connects it with a miracle related only by himself; (3) the *charge that Jesus cast out devils by Beelzebub* and His answer, which St. Mark connects with *the attempt of the relatives of Jesus to seize Him as mad*, and places just before *the teaching by parables*, is by St. Luke placed in the period of the last journeyings towards Jerusalem; ⁹ (4) the account of *the mother and brethren of Jesus seeking to speak with Him*,¹⁰ is placed by St. Luke immediately after instead of immediately before the *teaching by parables*.

¹ Matt. ix. 1-8.

² Matt. ix. 18-26.

³ Mark iv. 35, v. 43.

⁴ Mark iv. 1-34.

⁵ Matt. x.; Mark vi. 7-13.

⁶ Matt. xxi. 18-22; Mark xi. 12-14, v. 19-25.

⁷ Luke iv. 16-30.

⁸ Luke v. 1-11.

⁹ Mark iii. 22-30; Luke xi. 14-26.

¹⁰ Mark iii. 31-35; Luke viii. 19-21.

These differences of arrangement form the main difficulties that have to be met in connexion with the view that St. Matthew and St. Luke used St. Mark. It would be interesting, if space permitted, to examine these cases in detail. In some the looseness of the formula by which the particular incident is introduced by the Evangelist who diverges from St. Mark prevents an express contradiction. Again, the displacement in some of the instances is but slight, and there are circumstances that help to explain it, as when the introduction of additional matter into St. Mark's outline has made some rearrangement natural. The one serious difference is in the place assigned by St. Matthew to the group of incidents beginning with the storm on the lake. But when the most has been made of all the differences, they afford no parallel to those in the setting of the discourse-material common to St. Matthew and St. Luke alone.

(b) In using the relation of St. Matthew and St. Luke to St. Mark as a test in respect to verbal agreement, we must for the purpose of the present argument leave out of account the discourses which St. Mark, as well as the other two, has recorded. For there is a theory that here they were not dependent on him, but that he too was dependent, as they were, on the "Logia." The rest of the matter common to St. Mark with one or both the others consists of description, with brief sayings of our Lord, and answers and questions of His and of His interlocutors imbedded in it. We are to compare the amount of verbal agreement here between the parallels with the verbal agreement in the matter common to St. Matthew and St. Luke only, which consists mainly of discourse. Now in order that full justice may be done to the force of this comparison, the difference between the character of the subject-matter must be borne in mind. In dealing with mere descriptions of incidents the most truthful historian

may justly feel it right to exercise his own imagination. The details and attendant circumstances of the simplest event are too numerous and complicated for any reporter to record them fully. Fresh narrators, though they were not themselves present, may nevertheless, by employing not only direct information but their general knowledge of human nature and of the time and characters concerned, place the same incidents in a new and more vivid light. But spoken and recorded words are definite facts. Different condensed accounts of what has been spoken may indeed both be true, both being partial. But we are thinking now of the way in which two chroniclers would treat a single written report lying before them, of what they had not themselves heard spoken. It is true that ancient historians were often ready to invent speeches for the actors in the events which they related. But it is another thing to suppose that when they had possession of authentic records of speeches, they would have been disposed freely to alter them. And it is difficult indeed to believe that the Evangelists would have trusted to their own imagination, rather than to evidence, in representing the teaching of the Lord. It is then very striking to observe in passage after passage, that even in description St. Matthew and St. Luke keep much closer to St. Mark than they do to one another in the larger and looser of the two classes of their parallels, the matter contained in which amounts to more than twice that in the other. It seems impossible to suppose that when both were so faithful to one authority even in narrative, one or other of them could have reproduced less faithfully, when it was a question of drawing from a "Collection of the Lord's Discourses" put together by an Apostle.

One or two other points connected with the subject of this paper have yet to be considered, but we must for the present defer the discussion of them. Yet at the stage at

which we have already arrived, we may say that the theory that both St. Matthew and St. Luke used the "Logia" is open to many grave objections, and that it seems at all events impossible to suppose that they both used it to anything like the extent ordinarily assumed.

V. H. STANTON.