

Some Phases of the Synoptic Problem

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS, 1911

ERNEST D. BURTON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

IN his volume on "The Sayings of Jesus," Harnack remarks that "if the criticism of the Gospels had been carried on methodically, so that each author stood, as it were, upon the shoulders of his predecessor, this cardinal problem"—the literary relationship of Q to St. Mark—"would necessarily have been thoroughly discussed long ago, the whole material for discussion would have been set in order and the definite and final conclusion would have been drawn." No doubt there is occasion enough to regret that in this and in other fields scholars have not thus moved forward step by step, but have both turned back to do amiss the things that were already well done, and even more frequently rushed ahead to do last things first. Yet in the face of Harnack's warning and of the danger of repeating the first of these two mistakes, I am constrained at this time to inquire whether the fundamental questions of the Synoptic Problem have been so fully and finally settled that the accepted answers can be unquestioningly used as the basis of further work, and whether in particular the accepted doctrine does not perhaps tend to ignore some data which are nearly or quite as important as those which have received much more attention.

I must at the outset, however, disclaim any purpose to undertake a thorough discussion of the Synoptic Problem, or to bring forward any revolutionary theory. I am in agreement with the current view in recognizing the depend-

ence of Matthew and Luke upon Mark, and immediately or ultimately upon at least one other common source. Most of what I shall have to say, moreover, in the direction of further defining or supplementing the current view, has already been said at one time or another. My task is, therefore, the humble and simple one of directing fresh attention to certain quite obvious facts respecting the Synoptic Gospels and making some not altogether new suggestions respecting the wisdom of reconsidering certain commonly accepted theses, and perhaps of modifying somewhat the customary way of approaching our problem.

The questions that I wish particularly to raise are, *first*, whether, the dependence of Matthew and Luke upon Mark being accepted, the second common source of the gospels is entitled to the place of preëminence which is commonly given to it, whether, in fact, there was not at least one other source which was of equal or almost equal importance with that which is now commonly called Q; *second*, whether, in the determination of the contents of the non-Marcian common source, the criterion of presence of material in both the first and third gospels has not usually been given undue weight; *third*, whether it is not possible to discover two common sources rather than one, with at least approximate definition of the content of each; and *fourth*, whether the matter of the sources of the immediate sources of our synoptic gospels does not demand even more attention than it has received: in other words, whether there is not reason to affirm, and whether it would not facilitate further study of the Synoptic Problem to recognize that our present gospels of Matthew and Luke represent not the second, but at least the third generation of gospel writings, and that accordingly our task of investigation falls into two clearly defined stages, *first*, the discovery of the immediate ancestors of the present gospels, and *then* the search for the sources of the former.

In the endeavor to throw some light upon these questions, the method of approach which most commends itself to me is by way of observation of the way in which Matthew and Luke make use of their common source Mark. In this case

we have both the original material, approximately at least in its original form, and the finished product. Comparison of these with one another cannot fail to disclose some facts at least respecting the method of work of the two later evangelists. And the insight thus gained into their two workshops ought to be of value to us in the endeavor to discover the other material with which they worked, but which exists for us only as an element of their finished products. Moreover, in so far as we are able from the practically identical portions of Matthew and Luke to restore a second common source of the gospels, we may, in a measure, use the same method in reference to this as in respect to Mark, and so still further add to our knowledge of the methods which the evangelists severally followed. In this study of method, matters intrinsically of little importance may be of great value. In fact, the more we keep clear at the outset of such important matters as the doctrinal tendency and specific purpose of the gospels, the more likely perhaps are we to get a clear view of the way in which our authors handled their material. Order of arrangement is, of course, of far less importance for certain purposes, as *e.g.* the history of doctrine, than doctrinal color, whether of sources or of resultant gospels. But as a clue to lead us into the literary method of the evangelists, and so eventually to the literary process by which our gospels were produced, it may be even safer to follow and in the end more valuable than considerations of doctrinal tendency; the latter indeed are rather to be arrived at as the result of our process than used as criteria at the beginning.

To begin then with some elementary and perfectly familiar matters:—

1. If it be granted that Mark, either in its present form or with approximately similar content, was a source of Matthew and Luke, it is also evident *first* that they had one or more non-Marcian sources in common, and *second* that each of them used some material either not accessible to the other or neglected by the other.

2. Respecting the method in which Matthew and Luke

severally used these sources, the following propositions may be regarded as established with a high degree of probability.

a. Luke has a strong predilection for following the order of his documents. The presumption, which may of course be overcome by sufficient counter evidence, is that the order of Luke is approximately the order of his sources.

b. Matthew is less careful to follow the order of his sources. He does not hesitate to sacrifice that order to a topical arrangement of his own.

c. Luke is averse to the inclusion of similar narratives which are open to the suspicion of being duplicate accounts of the same event.

d. Matthew is less averse to duplication, but on the other hand has a tendency to condense narratives, and to omit or shorten narrative introductions to discourse material.

e. Neither evangelist hesitates to modify the language of his source to improve its literary quality, or to make it give a representation of Jesus more in accordance with the evangelist's ideal of his character and teaching. Yet the degree of similarity that exists between the Matthean and Lucan reports of the teaching of Jesus, whether derived from Mark or from the common source, makes it improbable that either of them would depart very widely either in substance or in literary form, except in the matter of order, from the source before him. A large measure of difference between single literary units presumably originally identical, say the narrative of an event or a parable, creates a probability that the authors dealt with different sources which themselves had a common source, documentary or real.

3. If these positions are reasonable, it follows that for those narratives and teachings which are common to Matthew and Luke, and sufficiently alike to make it probable that they came immediately from the same source, there is no more probable arrangement than that in which they appear in Luke, and that wide diversity in form, especially if accompanied by difference of position, points not to identity but to non-identity of immediate source.

Now it happens that the material in Luke which is also to

be found in Matthew, but which does not come from Mark, is found with very slight exception, if any, between 3 1 and 19 28. If the principle above stated is correct, the presumption is that all the non-Marcian material which appears in Lk. 3 1-19 28, and is also found in Matthew, whether in corresponding or different position, stood in the source in the Lucan order. The first step, therefore, toward obtaining the non-Marcian source of Matthew and Luke is simply to omit the Marcian material from Lk. 3 1-19 28.¹

A very noticeable fact respecting this material is that it appears in Luke in large blocks. Especially noteworthy is the Mark-free character of the material from 9 51-19 28. Mark, chap. 10, is manifestly the source of 18 15-43. But with this exception the only parallels to Mark in the ten chapters of Lk. 9 51-19 28 are a portion of the passage concerning casting out demons by Beelzebul, the parable of the mustard seed, and a few short aphorisms,— 35 verses in all according to Sir John Hawkins. The attempt to set apart the non-Marcian material in the corresponding chapters of the Gospel of Matthew, viz., 3-20, issues in a very different result. Instead of its occurring in a few large blocks, it is found in some 40 separate pieces, of which the only ones that reach or exceed the length of a chapter are those in the sermon on the mount and the eleventh chapter.²

This difference between Matthew and Luke, the former breaking up and the latter massing the material taken over from the sources,— for in a measure this difference holds in the case of material taken from Mark also,— is further evidence that it is Luke rather than Matthew who has followed the order of the non-Marcian source, as he manifestly has

¹ This would yield substantially the following: 3 1. 2. 7-15. 17. 18. 22-25, 4 2 b-20, 5 1-11, 6 20-8 a, 9 51-18 14, 19 1-28.

² The list is as follows: 3 7-10. 12. 14. 15, 4 2-11. 12-16, 5 1-22, 5 21-6 14, 6 16-7 27, 8 4-12. 19-22, 9 27. 28, 10 4-8 b. 12. 12. 15. 16. 22-25. 27-32, 11 1-20, 12 5-7. 11. 12. 17-25 a. 27. 28. 30. 32-35, 13 14-17. 24-30. 32-34, 14 22-21. 22, 15 12-14. 22. 24. 20. 21, 16 17-19, 17 a. 7. 12. 24-27, 18 4. 10. 15-24, 19 10-12. 27 b. 28, 20 1-16. But very short Marcian passages occurring in the midst of passages included in this list, and very short non-Marcian passages occurring between them have been ignored, thus in both cases diminishing the number of separate non-Marcian passages.

that of Mark. For an author who breaks up a source to interpolate it into another document will easily, of course, depart from the order in the process of interpolation; but an author who retains his material in large blocks will be unlikely to transpose sections within the limits of those blocks. That he might transpose even in the latter case under the influence of a desire to secure a topical or logical or even a chronological order is of course true. But this consideration only strengthens the argument in favor of believing that it is Luke and not Matthew who has preserved the order of their common source or sources; for it is impossible to discover in Luke's great interpolation any intention to arrange matters in a topical order, or to improve the chronology of the source, while it is transparently evident that Matthew is influenced by an effort after topical arrangement in the location of practically all the material which he has in common with Luke's non-Marcian source.

There is still further evidence of Luke's respect for the order of his source document in his way of making use of that document, whatever it was, which he used alongside of Mark, as a source for his 3 1-9 50. While the narratives common to Mark and Luke are almost without exception in the same order in both gospels, on the other hand, in those instances in which Luke omits Mark's account of an event and uses one drawn mainly from a different source, he also gives it a different position. The narratives of the Calling of the Four, and of the Rejection at Nazareth, illustrate this point. The simplest explanation of this changed position is that Luke is following the order of the source from which the preferred account is drawn.

4. But let this suffice for questions of order. Consider again the material in Lk. 3 1-19 23, and in the corresponding portion of Matthew, viz., chaps. 3-20, with reference to the non-Marcian source, or sources. In Lk. 3 1-19 23 is to be found all the material (except perhaps 22 23-30) which Matthew and Luke derived from their non-Marcian common source, or sources. But here is also considerable non-Marcian material, which is not common because not used by Matthew,

and in Matthew, chaps. 8-20, there is a considerable amount of material not used by Luke. These facts obviously raise two questions. *First*, Has Luke omitted anything from the common source which Matthew used? If so, this would account for the material peculiar to Matthew. *Second*, Has Luke, or some one preceding him, added something to the common source? If so, this would account for Matthew's omission of material included in Luke; in other words, for Luke's peculiar material. But an inspection of Lk. 8 1-19 28 also raises a third question. Has Luke combined two or more sources, not by mutual interpolation, but by placing them in succession?

a. The last question may best be considered first. Let it be noted in the first place that Lk. 9 51 evidently constitutes a sort of boundary post in the third gospel. At this point the evangelist clearly marks a change in the geographical location and general point of view of Jesus' ministry, introducing a period which extends to 19 28 inclusive. But it is of much more importance for our present purpose to observe the differences in Matthew's way of using material found also in Luke, corresponding to the difference of location in Luke. Of non-Marcian material standing in Luke after 19 28 Matthew makes no use, with the possible exception of Lk. 22 28-30, to which there is a parallel in Mt. 19 28. The non-Marcian material previous to Lk. 9 51 which occurs also in Matthew is found in the corresponding portion of Matthew's gospel. But respecting the non-Marcian material which is found in Lk. 9 51-19 28 and also in Matthew quite the reverse is true. Although Matthew uses a large amount of this material, often in form almost identical with that of Luke, it never appears in Matthew between the points corresponding to Lk. 9 51 and 19 28, but always either in the Galilean period or the Jerusalem ministry. In other words, up to the beginning of his Perean period, Matthew makes use of Mark, and of a source or sources which he shares with Luke (much of this standing in Luke in what we may for convenience call also his Perean period), and has also much material peculiar to himself; the same is true after this

period except that here the material which he shares with Luke is *all* Perea in Luke; but in the Perea period he has only Marcan material and material peculiar to himself. These facts are easily accounted for if Matthew had before him separately two sources also used by Luke, the one containing material now found in Luke between 3 1 and 9 50, the other containing material now found in Luke 9 51-19 28, but with no indication in them that they covered successive periods of the ministry of Jesus. They are very difficult to account for otherwise; for in neither gospel is there anything to explain why, if Matthew had the material in one document with indication of the boundary line at Luke 9 51, or in two documents, with indication of the period to which each belonged, he should so studiously have disregarded the intimations of his sources. The evidence, therefore, indicates that the non-Markan material common to Matthew and Luke found now in Luke between 3 1 and 19 28 was, in Matthew's hands at least, not in one document but in two;² that Luke blended one of them with the Marcan account of the Galilean ministry, adding the other and interpolating into it Mark's account of the last journey to Jerusalem; that Matthew on the other hand used both of them to enrich and illustrate discourses which he set into his account of the Galilean ministry of Jesus; but when he reached Mark's comparatively brief account of the journey to Jerusalem (Mark, chap. 10), he employed beside Mark only a source peculiar to himself, unless perhaps the material of 19 10-12 and 20 1-16 was, though not used by Luke, found in one of the common sources above named.

b. Having answered the last question first, we may now proceed to the second one. Was Luke's form of the common sources more extensive than Matthew's, or did he perhaps have an additional document which Matthew did not pos-

² I waive the question whether these two came into Luke's hands also as separate documents or already combined into one. It need hardly be added that when I speak of common material as being found in a certain portion of Luke or Matthew, I mean to convey no implication as to whether the form of Matthew or of Luke is the more original. This is a wholly distinct matter.

sess? In other words, must something be subtracted from Luke's sources to recover that which Matthew used?

Respecting the document which Matthew and Luke both used for the Galilean period, there is no strong reason to think that Luke had a longer form than Matthew. The material used by him and omitted by Matthew is neither so large in amount nor so different in quality from that which has been taken up by both as to call for the supposition of another distinct source or of addition from floating tradition. Omission by Matthew is in this case an adequate explanation, and of course, the simplest.

In respect to the document which Luke used in his Perea period, the much larger amount of the material not used by Matthew and the character of it more strongly suggests a difference between the sources used by Luke and Matthew. Little stress can be laid upon Matthew's omission of the narrative introductions found in Luke. This is in accordance with Matthew's tendency, as shown in his treatment of material taken over from Mark. If, having accepted Mark as his chief source for narrative and his chief controlling source for order, he did not hesitate to abbreviate the narratives and narrative introductions in this source, he would be still more likely to omit narrative elements of a document which he was employing as an enriching rather than a principal source. But when all this narrative material has been set aside, there remain not far from 150 verses for the omission of which by Matthew there is less obvious reason.⁴ Indeed, a considerable part of it would seem to have been very congenial to his point of view and purpose. The presence in Luke of such passages as the good Samaritan, the Galileans slain by Pilate, the lost coin, the prodigal son, the reproof of the pharisees for avarice, the pharisee and the publican, is rather surprising on the hypothesis that these sections were in a document which Matthew and Luke used in common.

⁴ Approximately the following: 9 51-56. 61. 62, 10 25-42, 11 5-8. 27. 28, 12 13-21. 25-28. 47. 48, 13 1-17, 15 8-32, 16 1-12. 14. 15. 19-21, 18 1-14, 19 1-10. But it is obviously impossible to draw a line with certainty between what Matthew possessed and did not possess.

The evidence is not decisive, but if these sections were not in the document which Matthew used, then the quantity of this non-Matthean material which Luke has incorporated in his Perean section, and its literary character, make it probable that we have to do with two documents, of which Matthew had but one. Whether Luke possessed the two separately and himself combined them, or whether they were before him already combined, is like the question referred to above, whether for him the Galilean and non-Galilean documents had been combined, a matter of minor consequence on which I know of no decisive evidence.

c. We come then to the question whether Luke has omitted any of the material in the sources which he used in common with Matthew. This question may be subdivided into two. Did Luke and Matthew both omit any material in their common sources? Did Luke omit material which Matthew retained? The second of these questions may be put in another form: Was the material which is peculiar to Matthew, or any considerable part of it, in the source used also by Luke, and was it therefore omitted by him, or did Matthew derive it from a source or sources not drawn upon by Luke?

The first question is chiefly of speculative interest since *ex-hypothesi* we no longer possess the material in question in any form. The analogy of the use of Mark by Matthew and Luke would, however, suggest the probability that the non-Marcian source also contained some material which neither of the evangelists took over. Moreover, there is a little indirect but positive evidence that points in the same direction. Mention has previously been made of the evidence that Luke preserved the order of the material taken from his second Galilean source. But if so, since order is a relative matter, consisting in standing before or after something else, it is suggested that, beside the two events of which Luke preferred the account given in the second source to that of Mark, the former contained other sections, which Luke omitted indeed, preferring the Mark narrative, but which, being parallel accounts of events recorded in Mark, served the purpose of determining the position, in relation

to the Mark narrative, of those sections which he took over from this second source. The argument is manifestly not decisive, but if the conclusion is in fact correct, it may serve to explain certain minor peculiarities of the Lucan version of sections evidently derived mainly from Mark.

As concerns the possibility of a special source of the material peculiar to Matthew, it is pertinent to note first the position of the material. Previous to Matt. 3 1, which corresponds to Lk. 3 1, there is no material which is found also in Mark or Luke. Subsequent to the end of chapter 25, which corresponds to the end of Luke's chapter 21, there is no material (if we except a sentence or two of doubtful textual authority) which is common to Matthew and Luke except what comes from Mark. In other words, the non-Marcan material that is found in the first two and last three chapters of Matthew is from sources peculiar to Matthew. It may be added that all this peculiar material is either narrative or clearly editorial in character, and evidently of relatively late origin. Of this material little need be said at this point. But when we come into the body of the gospel, in which we find, alongside of the Marcan material, much also which is common to Matthew and Luke only, we find in addition much that is peculiar to Matthew. It is difficult to state the exact amount of this latter, but it may be approximately estimated at 230 verses. Some of it is merely editorial comment, requiring no source to account for it. Some of it, chiefly narrative, is so similar in character to the peculiar material in chapters 1, 2, and 26-28 as to suggest, not indeed identity of documentary source, but similar origin. But besides this there remains a still larger amount of material, consisting of sayings and discourses, sometimes with brief narrative introductions or connective tissue, which is homogeneous in character and very similar in general type to the discourse material which is common to Matthew and Luke. It amounts to approximately 150 verses,⁵ or about

⁵ The list is approximately as follows: Matt. 5 4. 7-10. 13 a. 14. 16. 17. 19-24. 27. 28. 29-30 a. 41. 42. 6 1-4. 16-18. 24. 7 c. 12. 22. 10 5. 4. 8 b. 41. 11 28-30. 12 6-7. 11. 12 a. 24 a. 26. 27. 13 24-30. 44-45. 51. 52. 15 13-14. 18 4. 10. 14. 23-24. 20 1-15. 21 25-23. 22 1-10. 23 2. 2. 5. 7 b-10. 15-22. 24. 25. 23. 24 10-12. 25 1-13. With these passages may be in-

six-sevenths of the amount of non-Marcian material common to Matthew and Luke. If this material was in the non-Marcian source common to Matthew and Luke, it was a very important portion of it, being, as already stated, nearly equal in extent to the material which is identifiable as in the common source by the fact that it is in both the gospels. If it was not in the common source, then alike by its length and its character it is entitled to careful consideration as a source of scarcely less importance than the common source or sources of Matthew and Luke. Against the supposition that Matthew derived this material from various sources is its general homogeneity. We lack, of course, the definite criterion of its use by two gospels in substantially the same form, which in the case of the material common to Matthew and Luke enables us to establish the existence of one or more sources of definite content. But intrinsically there is no more reason to think in this case of scattered bits of material gathered from various sources than there is in the case of the common sources of Matthew and Luke. And the facts about the common sources having established, what indeed Luke distinctly affirms for his time, that in Matthew's time also there were various gospel documents in existence, there is the less reason for falling back in this case on the hypothesis of *disjecta membra*. On the other hand, against the hypothesis that this material was in any of the sources used in common by Matthew and Luke, is its extent and Luke's habit in respect to his sources. If Luke had this material, he must have omitted almost as much material as he and Matthew drew in common from their non-Marcian sources, or in other words, nearly as much material as, according to

cluded with greater or less probability a number of others which are omitted from the primary list either because they have partial parallels in Luke and so may come from a common source, or because they are subject to the suspicion of being, in part or in whole, derived from relatively late sources or of being the work of the editor. Here belong 3 14, 15, 5 21, 22, 6 7-12, 7 12 b, 9 12 a, 10 22, 23, 13 28-32, 49, 50, 16 17 b-19 a, 25 14-24. If the hypothesis that the parallels between Lk. 6 20-49 and Matthew, chapters 5-7, are due not to an immediate but a more remote common source is justified, there would be some still further additions to the list.

the common hypothesis, Q contained. This could be rendered probable only by something in the character of the material which would explain why Luke should have wished to omit it. But there is, so far as I can discover, nothing of this character in it.

But these general arguments for a separate and integrate source of discourse material peculiar to Matthew are reënforced by some important though easily overlooked facts as to the way in which Matthew has severally used the material peculiar to himself and the material drawn from the common sources. In his 13th chapter, for example, there is material found also in Mark and Luke, material found also in Luke but not in Mark, and material peculiar to Matthew. More specifically, the parable of the sower, and the basis of the paragraph on the purpose of parables are found also in Mark and Luke, and are doubtless derived by Matthew from Mark. The blessing on those who see and hear what the disciples see and hear is derived from that common source of Matthew and Luke which stands in Luke between 9 51 and 19 28. The interpretation of the parable of the sower is found also in Mark and Luke. Matthew now omits the statement about the lamp under the bushel, etc., found in Mark and Luke at this point, having already used a considerable part of it in his chapters 5, 10, and 11, and inserts the parable of the tares which is peculiar to him. Following this is the parable of the mustard seed, found both in Mark and in the Perea portion of Luke; Matthew, however, has it in conflate form, following Mark mainly but using a phrase or two found in Luke. Now just after this parable as it stands in Luke, chapter 13, comes the parable of the leaven, and this Matthew now introduces in the same position. This done, he brings in the conclusion of this group of parables, which in Mark stands immediately after the parable of the mustard seed, and then adds a quotation from Isaiah. But he is not yet through with his special source, for after introducing the explanation of the parable of the tares, he brings in three parables which are also peculiar to himself, the hid treasure, the pearl of great price, and the dragnet, after

which there stands another conclusion not in either of the identifiable common sources. It seems scarcely possible to doubt that he is here using three sources, Mark, a second common source, and a peculiar source, and that he has taken over the two conclusions which stood in Mark and the peculiar source respectively. The evidence of multiplicity of sources is still clearer in the sermon on the mount. There is, as is well known, a certain amount of material in this discourse which is parallel to Luke 6 20-49 both in thought and, in the main, in order. There is another considerable portion which is peculiar to Matthew, and a third important quantum that is paralleled in Luke outside the discourse of Lk. 6 20-49, all this latter being found in Luke between 9 51 and 19 28. There is a fourth small element, viz., material found in Mark, some of this being also found in Matthew at another place. It is an important fact that all the material which is paralleled in Lk. 6 20-49 and the portion peculiar to Matthew blend into a unified discourse on a single theme, but that all the material which is paralleled in Lk. 9 51-19 28, though on the surface usually seeming to be germane to the connection, appears on further examination to constitute a digression from the theme of the basal discourse. These phenomena suggest one or the other of two processes. The first suggestion is that the evangelist had a document containing Lk. 6 20-49, that he added to it from a source peculiar to himself the germane material, producing the unified basal discourse, to which he then added the less germane material derived from the document which constitutes one of the elements of Lk. 9 51-19 28. The other suggestion is that the evangelist possessed in one of his sources the basal discourse, *i.e.* a discourse parallel to Lk. 6 20-49, but containing also much material peculiar to Matthew, and that his part of the work was simply to add the material from the document now imbedded in Lk. 9 51-19 28. It is certainly in favor of this latter hypothesis that on the other theory the same mind must first have built up a unified discourse out of two elements, and then have marred its unity by the addition of a third. But what I am at present interested to

point out is that in either case the first evangelist must have had two, and probably three, sources beside Mark. On the first hypothesis he had a document, which Luke also possessed and from which he derived his 6 20-49. He must also have had a source peculiar to himself from which he added the germane material which, with the matter from the first source, yielded the unified basal discourse, and finally he must have had a source which Luke used in 9 51-19 28. On the second hypothesis the first evangelist had a source which though akin to Lk. 6 20-49 was not identical with it, and he must have had the third of the sources just named. But we have already seen that he also possessed a source which, in common with Luke, he used alongside of Mark in his Galilean narrative. Now this latter can hardly have been identical with the first-named source, for, unless we would needlessly multiply sources for Luke, we must recognize that the latter contained Lk. 6 20-49, and it could not have contained both forms of this discourse. If it be suggested that this Galilean source, if I may so refer to it, perhaps contained Matthew's basal discourse instead of Lk. 6 20-49, this cannot perhaps be disproved, but the character of that discourse is against it, and in any case the result would be simply to reduce Matthew's sources and increase Luke's with the result of a more complicated and incongruous hypothesis than on the other view.

Similar results would be reached by examining the other built-up discourses in Matthew's gospel, and the total result is to establish a strong probability that Matthew possessed a source peculiar to himself, which contained over 150 verses of discourse material ascribed to Jesus, and included some of the most weighty of the utterances which the synoptic gospels report as coming from him. The only alternative, and on the whole less probable hypothesis, is that these 150 verses belong along with the 175 which are common to Matthew and Luke to a common source of Matthew and Luke, and were omitted by the latter. Some things that still remain to be said will make this latter hypothesis appear still more improbable.

5. Reference has been made at several points to the probability that documents which lay behind our present gospels had, like our gospels themselves, elements of similarity. And, in fact, there is much to suggest that if we could recover the immediate ancestors of our present gospels, we should find that they also would present the same phenomena of resemblance and difference which we find in our present gospels, though the phenomena of resemblance would doubtless appear in much less measure.

To recur to cases already referred to, both Mark and the Perean portion of Luke contain the parable of the mustard seed. That Luke and Mark should both contain it is, of course, nothing strange; but it is quite exceptional that it should stand in Mark's Galilean portion and in Luke's Perean section. The fact that it does so stand, and the fact already mentioned, that Matthew has it, in conflate form in the Marcan position, but immediately followed, as it is in Luke, by the parable of the leaven, strongly suggest the existence of the parable of the mustard seed in two sources.

The case of Luke 6 20-49 compared with the basal discourse in Matthew, chapters 5 to 7, points in the same direction. These two discourses have evidently a common parentage. Yet neither Matthew's habit nor Luke's can explain how the two should diverge so much as they do if the two evangelists had before them the same discourse and nothing more. The more probable hypothesis is that, though they may have both had the Lucan form, or something much like it, Matthew had also a fuller form and one closely resembling the present discourse, minus what one may for brevity call the Perean and Marcan additions.

But there are other instances that have not been referred to. Luke relates both the mission of the Twelve and the mission of the Seventy, evidently drawn from different sources. When he had even in the same source, if perhaps they were both in his edition of Mark, the feeding of the five thousand and the feeding of the four thousand, he omitted the latter in accordance with his general disposition to avoid apparent duplicates. But apparently the great difference

between the numbers 12 and 70 led him to include both accounts of the sending out of the disciples to preach, though taken from different sources and having much similar material. Matthew, not for the purpose of avoiding duplication, but in accordance with his general plan of building up a few great discourses, each on a single theme, combines the Marcan discourse to the Twelve and the Lucan discourse to the Seventy, adding, as in all such cases, some material peculiar to himself.

If now, in the light of this example, we examine the facts respecting the discourse on casting out demons by Beezebul, it will be clear that here also we have a case of similar material in two of the immediate sources of our gospels. In Mark, chapter 3, we have an incident of demon expulsion followed by discussion of the power by which Jesus cast out demons. In Luke, chapter 11, is a similar narrative; but it is not at all probable that it came from Mark, for Mark is not here a source for Luke, and Luke's general habit of following the order of his source is against the supposition of transposition. Moreover, Luke contains about four verses quite germane to the context which are not found in Mark. In Matthew's 12th chapter, following his usual impulse, Matthew has a conflate account, blending the story given in Mark with that which appears in Luke's chapter 11. The most reasonable explanation is that Mark and the common source of Matthew and Luke had a similar section on casting out demons; and the same arguments which lead us to predicate common sources of our present gospels, point in this case to a common source of the sources.

The parable of the pounds and the talents furnishes another probable instance. The former stands in Lk. 19 11-28, the latter in Matt. 25 14-30. They are enough alike to suggest a common original, and Matthew may easily have had the source which Luke used in his 19th chapter. But the wide departure of the Matthean form from that found in Luke, so much wider than Matthew customarily allows himself, makes it highly probable that he also had a version of this parable in his peculiar source.

Of single short sayings, which by the same kind of evidence are indicated to have existed in more than one of the immediate sources of our present gospels, many examples could be given. Some of the instances, both longer and shorter, may, of course, be accounted for by the supposition that the common source commonly called Q was a source of Mark. It may be doubted whether this is of itself a sufficient explanation. But what I am seeking now to emphasize is that there are so many and so clear phenomena pointing to sources behind the immediate sources of our gospels, that clearness of thinking requires us to divide the process of discovering the ultimate sources of our gospels into two clearly distinguished stages,—first, the discovery of the immediate sources of our synoptic gospels, with no presumption against the occurrence of duplicates in these sources, and second, the discovery of the sources of the sources. The genealogy of these documents is not so simple as has sometimes been supposed; and we are in danger of missing the true clue by confusing uncles with nephews, and daughters-in-law with mothers-in-law.

These, then, are the propositions which I venture to set forth for the consideration of students of the Synoptic Problem:—

1. The concentration of attention upon Mark and Q as the principal sources of Matthew and Luke to the extent that it is common among writers on the Synoptic Problem is scarcely justified by the facts. The two-document hypothesis has held the center of the stage too long. It should give way to the multiple-document hypothesis.

2. It is more probable that Matthew had a peculiar source for the teaching of Jesus than that the teachings peculiar to his gospel were either in the common sources of Matthew and Luke or existed as *disiecta membra*. This body of material deserves attention as possibly constituting a document inferior to none of the sources of our synoptic gospels in age or value.

3. It is more probable that the non-Marcan material common to Matthew and Luke was, for Matthew at least, in two

documents than that it was in one. The dividing line is to be drawn between Lk. 9 50 and 51. The first document probably contained substantially all the material in Lk. 3 1-9 50 not derived from Mark. Respecting 9 51-18 14, 19 1-23, however, it is not clear whether Matthew possessed the whole or only a portion of it; in the latter case Luke either had, beside the document which Matthew possessed, a source peculiar to himself, containing along with other material the parables of the good Samaritan and the prodigal son, or a document which was itself a combination of these two sources. For purposes of study, accordingly, the non-Marcian material in Lk. 3 1-19 23 falls by definite external tests into three parts, one used by both Matthew and Luke in the Galilean period, a second used by Luke in the Perean period and by Matthew in the Galilean period and the Jerusalem ministry, a third used by Luke only and in his Perean period. In what combinations they came into the hands of Matthew and Luke respectively is a matter for investigation, but apparently the two which Matthew used came to him separately, not combined.

4. It is highly probable that the immediate sources of our gospels contained severally a considerable amount of common material, which is itself to be accounted for by sources, in part at least, written, and lying behind the immediate sources of our Gospels.

5. The recovery of immediate sources needs to be differentiated as sharply as possible from the discovery of ultimate sources.