

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php



The Probable Use of the First Gospel by Luke

Author(s): Edward Y. Hincks

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (1891), pp. 92-106

Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4617131>

Accessed: 11/03/2010 14:12

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE PROBABLE USE OF THE FIRST GOSPEL
BY LUKE.

BY PROF. EDWARD Y. HINCKS.

NEW Testament criticism tends towards the belief that Mark, in its present or an earlier form, was written before either Matthew or Luke, and was used as a source respectively by the authors of those Gospels. The preponderance of German opinion is in favor of this hypothesis, and it is gaining ground in England.¹ A point has evidently been reached at which the priority of Mark may be tentatively assumed and attempts made to use it in explaining the structure of the Synoptics. Reasonable explanation of any of their subordinate features built upon the assumption that Mark is prior is a lawful gain to the hypothesis of its priority. And if the hypothesis in explaining the minor phenomena of the first and second Gospels takes on the simplest of its conceivable forms, it gains in this way further help.

Those passages of Luke and Matthew which apparently alike depend upon Mark have a common peculiarity, one which evidently bears upon the relation which the first and third Gospels sustain to the second. This is agreement in deviation from Mark, the common source. In almost all the Marcan passages of Matthew and Luke coincident variations from the second Gospel are found. They are chiefly slight departures from the common source. Many of them are of such a character that taken by themselves their common presence in Matthew and Luke might be thought accidental. But as they are very numerous, and are found almost throughout Mark as it lies imbedded respectively in the first and third Gospels, they cannot be ascribed to chance.

Three ways of accounting for these coincident variations have been taken. First, it has been held that our second Gospel is a redaction

¹ See F. H. Wood's Essay in the *Studia Biblica* Vol. II. and Professor Sanday's "Survey of the Synoptic Question," *Expositor*, Fourth Series, Vol. III., 1891.

of Papias's Mark, and that the original was used as a source respectively by the author of Matthew and by Luke. The coincident variations from Mark show changes which the redactor made. The original form appears in the two later Gospels; Mark is secondary where they both depart from it. Secondly, a more complicated explanation has been made: Mark, it is said probably used the Logia of the apostle Matthew. This we may believe contained, besides sayings of Jesus, much narrative material. Mark had it before him, and wove much of its matter into his narrative, using considerable freedom in his treatment of it, as his having an apostle's oral testimony at his command would make him feel justified in doing. The authors of the first and third Gospels also both used the Logia, and, being farther away from the apostolic tradition, would naturally feel more reverence for its letter than did Mark; hence it might be expected that in passages which they took from Mark they would correct Mark's changes in the Logia. This is what they did in the instances in which they agree in variations from Mark in Marcan excerpts. What appears to be their common departure from Mark is in reality their common restoration of the original form of one of its sources. Weiss, almost the only living advocate of this theory, has employed it in his *Markus-Evangelium*, and his *Matthäus-Evangelium und seine Lukas-parallelen*.

Thirdly, the coincident variations of the first and third Gospels from Mark in their Marcan excerpts are attributed to Luke's familiarity with the Matthew of the canon. It is probable, it is said, that Luke had this Gospel, which seems to have come into wide use very early. If he had it, he must have read it much. His preface would forbid our thinking that he put it in the same rank with Mark and the Logia. We must believe that he would give them higher authority than he would ascribe to this secondary work, and treat their letter with a reverence which he would not feel for the later compilation. Yet he would be influenced more than he knew by a Gospel with which he was so familiar. Often an unconscious reminiscence of its language would determine his use of a word or rendering of a phrase. Such influence naturally explains the variations from Mark which Luke has in common with Matthew. This theory was urged by Edward Simons in a thorough monograph, entitled "*Hat der dritte Evangelist den canonischen Matthäus benutzt?*" (1880). It has gained Holtzmann's assent. Wendt adopts it. Sanday has not been able

to get a copy of the book, but does not see how the hypothesis can be made good.

The third hypothesis seems to me to have claims superior to those which can be urged in behalf of either of the others; and to be, although not free from difficulties, tenable, and on the whole satisfactory. I have been led to this conclusion chiefly by the force of the arguments advanced by Simons in the above-mentioned monograph. There the facts bearing on the question whether Luke could have known the first Gospel are brought forward and succinctly discussed. Then the coincident variations from Mark are examined singly, in the light of the three rival hypotheses; the arguments for the Urmarcus theory advanced by Holtzmann, and for the Mark-Logia theory employed by Weiss being severally weighed. This is evidently the way to reach an answer to the question under consideration. The key to the phenomena must be found in the phenomena themselves. A monograph dealing with the question at issue in this way, provided it show thoroughness and fairness, must be taken into account by those who are seeking light on the problem it considers.

I shall try to justify the opinion that Matthew's and Luke's common variations from Mark show that Luke depends on Matthew, using Simons's arguments freely, along with some additional ones which occur to me. The fact that his treatise is out of print justifies me, I hope, in reproducing many of its ideas, with the heartiest acknowledgment of their author's proprietorship in them.

The theory advocated has the important advantage over both its rivals of resting on a more probable supposition. Aside from the explanation it affords of the phenomena of Matthew and Luke under consideration, there is not much to be said for the Urmarcus hypothesis. No sure evidences of redaction can be pointed out in the Gospel; no reason for a redactor's making the changes assumed to explain the coincident variations of the first and third Gospels. Holtzmann, it is true, says that the Urmarcus theory will live in one form or another until some "rebellious facts" have been disposed of. These are, First, the *ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* of Mark xi. 25, which he calls "an Urmarcan phrase." But as this is the only instance in the second Gospel in which *πατήρ* is used of God in his relation to the disciples, and as the *ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* is germane to the context (*ἀφή ὑμῶν τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν*) and adds perspicuity, it is not plain why it should be called "Urmarcan." One would expect the tradition used by

Mark, as well as the tradition embodied in the Logia, to use *πατήρ* in describing God's relation to the disciples of Jesus. Finding it so used once, should we reject it because it is not employed oftener?

Holtzmann's second "rebellious fact" is the citation from Malachi (iii. 1) in Mark i. 2, which is united to the citation from Isaiah (xl. 3), and included in the reference to Isaiah. This is said to show dependence on Matt. xi. 10, where Mal. iii. 1 is quoted with the same departure from the Septuagint (*κατασκενάσει* for *ἐπιβλέψεται*), although the words are not ascribed as in Mark to Isaiah. The dependence, it is said, is proved by the fact that here Mark, like Matthew, apparently follows the Hebrew (*κατασκενάζω* = חָזַק), departing from the usual custom of citing the Septuagint (*ἐπιβλέψεται*). But why may we not follow Wendt in believing that the Malachi quotation as given in Matthew was not taken from the Logia, but was added by the editor, being taken by him from Mark? His knowledge of its authorship had led him to drop it from the Marcan excerpt which contained the passage from Isaiah, Matt. iii. 3.

The third of Holtzmann's "rebellious facts" is the Marcan vocabulary of John vii. 53-viii. 11. This shows, it is said, that the pericope stood in the original Mark. A place can be found for it in the narrative between xii. 17 and 18. But against the fact that the pericope contains many of Mark's stylistic peculiarities, must be set the fact that it has some, although not so many, of Luke's. Moreover, our Mark contains nothing suggesting that this pericope ever belonged to it, and the textual history of the passage gives no reason for affirming that it did. So it is proper to say that a fact outside Mark cannot be made the basis for a theory about the composition of that Gospel which is not supported by the Gospel itself. Even if we could believe that the passage dropped out of Mark, we could not safely infer from this that the Gospel had been written over. These facts, then, do not justify one in holding to the Urmarcus hypothesis.

The Mark-Logia theory has serious difficulties to face. If Mark used the Logia, why did he not put more of it into his Gospel? Why did he not give the Lord's Prayer, the Sermon on the Mount, the Missionary Discourse? What principle of selection can be discovered in his (assumed) use of it? And can we believe that the authors of the first and third Gospels would independently of each other correct his use of it, in borrowing from his Gospel? What ground have we for attributing to them such endeavor for literary precision as this implies?

What are the probabilities as regards Luke's use of Matthew? He wrote a number of years after the composition of the Jewish-Christian Gospel (cf. xxi. 24 with Matt. xxiv. 29), and seems to have depended upon earlier biographies of Jesus (Luke i. 1, 2). We can hardly believe that the Jewish-Christian Gospel had not become known to him at the time of his writing. For its catholic character and its preponderating influence in the church of the second century are good reasons for thinking that it circulated swiftly through the church. But, it is said, comparing the two Gospels, we find discrepancies and contradictions between them which forbid the belief that the author of the second knew the first. Let us glance at these alleged divergences and ask what support they give to the assertion that the first and second were mutually independent.

1. Luke does not respect Matthew's use of the Logia. But Matthew was in any case to Luke only a secondary source. His preface gives reason for believing that he would hold a critical attitude towards any Gospels not carrying apostolic authority. In using his best source he would not be greatly influenced by another writer's employment of it.

2. The divergence of Luke's introductory narrative from Matthew's. A different genealogy is given. The visit of the Magi and the flight into Egypt are left out. Joseph's residence before Jesus's birth is given as Nazareth, not Bethlehem. But Luke had access to sources not used by Matthew, and may have thought them superior to those which Matthew employed. The visit of the Magi, supposing that he found no critical objections to it, may, as Simons suggests, have been supplanted in his narrative by the visit of the shepherds; the two narratives being closely akin from the biographer's point of view. He may not have found enough religious significance in the flight into Egypt to care to use it. The value which it had for Matthew as a fulfilment of Hosea xi. 1 would hardly exist for him and his readers. He would follow what he thought the best tradition regarding Joseph's residence before Christ's birth, and there is good reason to believe that he had a better tradition as to this than that followed by the author of Matthew. Perhaps, moreover, Luke shows the influence of the first Gospel in giving a genealogy, and one which connects Jesus with David through Joseph.

3. Luke, it is said, in using Mark disregards Matthew's modifications of that Gospel. But Mark was, we assume, more highly es-

teemed by him. Sometimes he does follow Matthew's change of Mark's narrative; e.g. with Matthew he puts Jesus's visit to Nazareth into his first journey to Capernaum after his baptism (Luke iv. 16 ff., cf. Matt. xiii. 54), instead of giving it with Mark (vi. 1 ff.) a later date.

4. Luke omits some important sayings of Jesus given in the first Gospel. Some found in Matthew appear in the third Gospel with important alterations; e.g. the Parable of the Talents appears in Luke as the Parable of the Pounds. But many of these sayings were probably contained in the Logia, and the problem of their omission or alteration would remain to be solved, if it were proved that Luke did not have Matthew. Some which do not appear to have been in the Logia were evidently omitted by Luke because he wrote from the Gentile-Christian point of view; e.g. Matt. xvi. 18 ff., "Thou art Peter," etc.

5. None of Matthew's pragmatic references to the Old Testament are found in the third Gospel. This is easily accounted for by Luke's point of view, and his independence of Matthew as respects doctrinal conception.

6. The two Gospels give divergent accounts of the resurrection. But Luke had other sources of information than those employed by the author of the first Gospel. He may not have thought that his Jerusalem tradition contradicted Matthew's Galilean tradition. If he had thought so, would he have been prevented by his regard for Matthew from giving what he regarded the truth? Why should we assume that Matthew had acquired a canonical authority as early as when the third Gospel was written?

If the third Gospel contains no facts destroying the antecedent probability that its author had the first Gospel, the hypothesis advanced to account for its coincidences with Matthew in altering Mark, has a better basis than either of its two rivals. This hypothesis must, of course, win its way to acceptance by its success in explaining one by one the common variations. Simons has applied it to them all, and, as far as I can see, with success. His detailed criticism seems to show that the Luke-Matthew hypothesis gives a more reasonable explanation of the facts than is afforded by either of its rivals. I venture to reproduce enough of it to give material for a fair estimate of the value of his work.

Mark iv. 10	Matt. xiii. 10	Luke viii. 9
Those about him, with the twelve, asked, etc.	The disciples	His disciples

The Urmarcus and the Mark-Logia hypothesis both assume that Mark changed "the disciples" into "those about him, with the twelve"; an inexplicable alteration. It is natural that Matthew should condense into "the disciples," and that Luke should follow him.

Mark iii. 34	Matt. xii. 49	Luke viii. 21
Looking round upon those sitting in a circle about him, he said	Stretching forth the hand, he said	He said

The above-mentioned hypotheses make this an embellishment set upon the original narrative by Mark. Is it not more reasonable to suppose that Matthew dropped it for the sake of brevity, and that Luke followed him in doing so?

Mark iv. 38	Matt. viii. 24	Luke viii. 23
He was sleeping in the stern upon the cushion	He was sleeping	He was asleep

Abbreviation is here more credible than embellishment.

Mark iv. 38	Matt. viii. 25	Luke viii. 24
Teacher, dost thou not care that we perish	Lord, save, we perish	Master, Master, (<i>ἐπι- σάρα</i>) we perish

It is more probable that the longer and less reverent exclamation was changed by Matthew, followed by Luke, into the shorter and more reverent form than that Mark made the converse change.

Mark vi. 14	Matt. xiv. 1	Luke ix. 7
And king Herod heard	Herod the tetrarch	Herod the tetrarch

Mark would not change "tetrarch" into "king," the less exact word; the converse change is not improbable.

Mark viii. 35	Matt. xvi. 25	Luke ix. 24
Whosoever shall save his life, etc. . . . lose his life for my sake and the gospel's	Lose his life for my sake	Lose his life for my sake

Which is probably earlier? No motive can easily be thought of for changing "my sake" into "my sake and the gospel's." The growing belief that Christianity is Christ would account for the contrary change.

Mark ix. 4	Matt. xvii. 3	Luke ix. 30.
And there appeared to them Elias with Moses	Moses and Elias	Moses and Elias.

Why should Mark change "Moses and Elias" to "Elias with Moses"? The reason for the contrary change is obvious.

Mark xiii. 9, 10	Matt. x. 17, 18
But take heed to yourselves, they will deliver you to sanhedrins, and ye shall be scourged in synagogues, and ye shall stand before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony to them, And unto all the Gentiles must the gospel first be preached.	But beware of men; for they shall deliver you up to sanhedrins, and in their synagogues shall they scourge you, and before rulers and kings shall ye be brought for my sake, for a testimony to them and to the Gentiles.

Here Mark is probably secondary. The clause "to the Gentiles" in Matthew seems to have been expanded into verse 10. The reverse is hardly conceivable. If, then, Matt. x. 17-22 is in the Logia, we must believe that Mark had that document. But Mark's Parousia Discourse is so different in its style from the rest of his Gospel as to suggest a special written source. Simons follows Colani and Weizsäcker in thinking that this source was "a little apocalypse, an independent literary production, written in A.D. 68." Without accepting this view in all its details, I am ready to believe that Mark had a special source for this part of his Gospel, and that part of that document may, as Simons thinks, have been woven into the Mission Discourse of this chapter. But Luke apparently did not have it.

Mark vi. 7	Matt. x. 1, 5	Luke ix. 1 f.
And he calls the twelve, and began to send them forth two by two, and gave them power over unclean spirits	And having called his twelve disciples, he gave them power over unclean spirits, etc. . . . ⁵ These twelve Jesus sent forth	And having called to- gether the twelve, he gave them power and authority over all demons, etc. . . . ² And he sent them forth

In Matthew and Luke the endowment is mentioned before the departure. This is the natural order. Mark's reverse order would naturally have been changed into it; the converse is inconceivable.

The Logia and Mark have independent reports of the discourse of Christ which follows. That of Mark is much briefer. Matthew gives that from the Logia. Luke gives the Logia discourse in connection with the sending forth of the Seventy (Luke x. 1 ff.), therefore he here follows Mark. Weiss (*Matt.-Ev.* 259) thinks that Luke was aided to his opinion of the occasion of the Logia discourse by the *ἄλλοι* of the saying which he gives in x. 1. The "few" are the twelve; more are needed, therefore seventy more are sent out. Wendt (*Lehre Jesu*, II. 84) suggests that perhaps the Logia said that Jesus not only sent forth the twelve, but again a larger company, and that Luke found in the discourse given in Mark, and again as given in a different form in the Logia, what he regarded as the discourses given on the two occasions. The double report should be regarded as an indication that Luke had supposed he had two independent sources. If Mark had the discourse as given in the Logia, we cannot see why he should not have taken more of it (Simons). Luke omits some verses because he uses them elsewhere. His omission of Matt. x. 23, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel until the Son of Man be come," is naturally accounted for by the fact that he wrote after Matthew (Simons).

The hypothesis advanced to account for the variant forms in which this discourse comes to us (viz. that the Logia and Mark give independent reports of it) seems to me a reasonable one. Several other variants are most naturally accounted for in the same way. One of these is Mark iii. 22-26 = Matt. xii. 24-28 = Luke xi. 15-20 (the accusation of alliance with Satan). Matt. xii. 27, 28 and Luke xi. 19, 20 plainly bear the stamp of originality. But as Mark's account cannot be explained as an abridgement, we are obliged to assume two sources.

Simons's application of his hypothesis to the reports of the Sermon on the Mount given respectively by Matthew and Luke, is very interesting, and yields fruitful results for the hypothesis. Granting that both evangelists found the discourse in the Logia, Luke's dependence on Matthew, he says, seems to be shown by their both joining it to the same paragraph of Mark, Mark iii. 7-13; cf. Matt. iv. 23-25, Luke vi. 17, 18. The Marcan verses are taken

by Matthew out of their context and used as an introduction to the discourse. Luke, although he has inserted an account of the calling of the twelve as the immediate occasion of the discourse, gives these verses between this insertion and the discourse, evidently following Matthew. As we have not before us the discourse as contained in the Logia, we cannot reasonably infer from the variations in the two reports of it that Luke did not know the first evangelist's rendering of it. For many of these variations we can assign good literary reasons. Simons thinks, with Weiss, that several of the verses found in Matthew but not in Luke were added by the first evangelist. Jesus's statement concerning his attitude toward the law would naturally be omitted by the Gentile-Christian evangelist. Sayings of Jesus incorporated by Matthew into the discourse, he omits from deference to the Logia.

The use made by Matthew and Luke respectively of another passage of the Logia, that in which Jonah is held up as a sign to Jesus's contemporaries, demands attention. The divergence in the two redactions is said to be of such a character as to show that Luke cannot have seen that of Matthew.

Matt. xii. 38-42

Then answered him some of the scribes and Pharisees, saying, Teacher, we would see a sign from thee. But he answering said to them, An evil and adulterous generation seeks a sign; and a sign shall not be given it, save the sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall rise at the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, be-

Luke xi. 29-32.

And when the people were gathered thick together, he began to say, This is an evil generation: it seeks a sign; and there shall no sign be given it, save the sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them; for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh

Matt. xii. 41 f.

hold a greater than Jonas is here. The queen of the south shall rise up at the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here.

Luke xi. 32.

shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here.

Simons accounts for Luke's introduction to the discourse by the fact that in verse 16 he has already mentioned the demand made by Jesus's enemies for a sign. As this introduction, however, harmonizes with the discourse (which Matthew's does not), it may have been taken from the Logia. Luke's omission of Matthew's verse 40 is said by some to show that he did not know the corresponding passage of that Gospel. But if Matt. xii. 40 was in the Logia, as is claimed, the reason which led Luke to omit it would presumably be strong enough to make him disregard the example set by Matthew in inserting it. But there is much reason for thinking that the verse was added by the evangelist. It does not harmonize with verse 41, which represents the *preaching* of Jonah as the sign given to the men of Nineveh. This has its analogue in the preaching of Jesus, to which his generation is refusing to listen, so incurring greater guilt than was incurred by the men of Nineveh in turning a deaf ear to the preaching of Jonah. Besides, a definite prediction of his resurrection made to unbelieving minds would have been a departure from the usual method of Christ's teaching hard to account for. Then, as Simons pertinently says, the promise (if the sign means the resurrection) was not kept, for the people of Israel did not see the risen Christ; he only appeared to his disciples. Simons, however, concedes to Weiss that Luke agreed with Matthew in regarding the sign to be Jonah's person, not his preaching; inferring this from his *ζωται*, vs. 30, and his inverting Matthew's vs. 41 and 42. Here he thinks we find evidence of Matthew's influence upon Luke.

The parts of Matthew and Luke which respectively give the account of Jesus's experience from the last supper to and including the resur-

rection are of especial significance for our purpose. The Logia narrative, as even Weiss admits, does not extend so far. Hence, common divergences from Mark, if equally numerous and important with those appearing in the preceding parts of these two Gospels, go far towards proving that his Mark-Logia hypothesis is invalid. An exact estimate of the relative number of common variations can hardly be made. Those in the Passion sections are certainly not noticeably less in number or in consequence than in other sections of equal extent. I give them as presented by Simons, omitting some of the less important ones.

THE BETRAYAL.

Mark xiv. 10, 11	Matt. xxvi. 14-16	Luke xxii. 3-6
10 Ἰ. Ἰσκαριώθ	14 λεγόμενος Ἰ. Ἰσκαριώτης	3 Ἰ. τὸν καλούμενον Ἰσκαριώτην
11 ἐζήτει πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαιρῶς παραδοῖ	16 ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδοῖ	5 ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι

GETHSEMANE.

Mark xiv. 32-42	Matt. xxvi. 36-46	Luke xxii. 39-46
36 καὶ ἔλεγεν ἀββὰ ἀλλά	39 λέγων vacat πλήν	42 λέγων vacat πλήν
37 ἔρχεται	40 ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς	45 ἔλθων πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς
36 οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σύ	42 γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου	42 μὴ τὸ θέλημα μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω

THE ARREST.

Mark xiv. 43-50	Matt. xxvi. 47-56	Luke xxii. 47-53
43 εὐθύς vacat	47 vacat ἰδοῦ	47 vacat ἰδοῦ
45 after Judas's kiss Christ says nothing	50 after Judas's kiss Christ speaks a protesting word: ἑταῖρε, Comrade, for what art thou present?	48 do. Judas, with a kiss betrayest thou the Son of man?

Mark xiv.	Matt. xvi.	Luke xxii.
47 <i>ἔπαισεν τὸν δοῦλον ἀτάριον vacat</i>	51 <i>πατάξας ἀτίον 52 Jesus's rebuke</i>	50 <i>ἐπάταξεν τὸ οὖν 51 Jesus's rebuke</i>

THE TRIAL AND PETER'S DENIAL.

Mark xiv. 53-72	Matt. xxvi. 57-75	Luke xxii. 54-71
72 <i>καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν</i>	75 <i>καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἕξω ἔκ- λαυσεν πικρῶς</i>	62 <i>καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἕξω ἔκ- λαυσεν πικρῶς</i>

BEFORE THE HIGH PRIEST.

61 Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?	63 I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us if thou art the Christ, the Son of God	66 If thou art the Christ, tell us
62 Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power	64 <i>ἀπ' ἄρτι</i> etc.	68 <i>Ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν</i> etc.
62 <i>ἐγὼ εἰμι</i>	<i>οὐ εἶπας</i>	70 <i>ὕμεις λέγετε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι</i>

JESUS BEFORE PILATE.

Mark xv. 1	Matt. xxvii. 2	Luke xxiii. 1-25
1 <i>Ἰησοῦν ἀπήνεγκαν</i>	2 <i>ἀπήγαγον</i>	1 <i>ἤγαγον</i>
(Luke omits Matthew's account of Judas's fate, of Pilate's wife's dream, and of Pilate's washing his hands.)		

THE CRUCIFIXION.

Mark xv. 20-41	Matt. xxvii. 31-56	Luke xxiii. 26-49
20 <i>ἐξάγουσιν</i>	31 <i>ἀπήγαγον</i>	26 <i>ἀπήγαγον</i>
21 <i>τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάν- δρου καὶ Ῥούφου</i>	32 <i>vacat</i>	26 <i>vacat</i>
22 <i>μεθερμηνευόμενον</i>	33 <i>λεγόμενος</i>	33 <i>καλούμενον</i>

Mark xv.	Matt. xxviii.	Luke xxiii.
24 casting a lot upon them (the garments) <i>τίς τί ἄρη</i>	35 casting a lot	34 they cast lots
26 vacat	37 οὗτος	38 οὗτος
37 ἐξέπνευσεν	50 ἀφήκεν τὸ πνεῦμα	46 εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθειμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου . . . ἐξέπνευσεν

(Luke passes over the earthquake and the resurrection of saints (51^b-53Matt.), very likely for dogmatic and critical reasons.)

39 <i>κεντυρίων</i> <i>ιδὼν ὁ κεντυρίων . . .</i> <i>οὔτως ἐξέπνευσεν</i>	54 <i>ἐκατόνταρχος</i> <i>. . . ιδόντες τὸν σεισ-</i> <i>μὸν καὶ τὰ γινόμενα</i>	47 <i>ἐκατοντάρχης</i> <i>ιδὼν δὲ ὁ ἐκατον-</i> <i>τάρχης τὸ γινόμε-</i> <i>νον</i>
---	--	--

Luke can hardly refer here to what is said in 46 (Jesus dying with a cry), nor to what is told in 45 (the rending of the temple veil); the *τὸ γινόμενον* seems to show Matthew's influence.

41 who followed him when he was in Galilee	55 followed from Galilee	49 following him from Galilee
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------

THE BURIAL.

Mark xv. 42-47	Matt. xxvii. 57-66	Luke xxiii. 50-56
42 ἦν παρασκευή	transferred to 62 after the interment	also told after the interment
43 <i>τολμήσας εἰσῆλθεν</i> <i>πρὸς τὸν Πειλάτον</i> <i>καὶ ᾗτήσατο τὸ</i> <i>σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ</i>	58 (<i>τολμήσας</i> omitted) <i>οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ</i> <i>Πειλάτῳ ᾗτήσατο τὸ</i> <i>σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ</i>	52 (<i>τολμήσας</i> omitted) <i>οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ</i> <i>Πειλάτῳ ᾗτήσατο τὸ</i> <i>σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ</i>
44, 45 Pilate wondered if he were already dead; asked centurion; learned that he was	vacat	vacat
46 ἐνείλησεν	59 ἐνετύλιξεν	53 ἐνετύλιξεν

(This word occurs only in these verses and in John xx. 7.)

Mark xv. does not say that the tomb was new	Matt. xxvii. 60 ἐν τῷ καινῷ	Luke xxiii. 53 οὐ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὐ- πο κείμενος 54 καὶ σάββατον ἐπέ- φωσκεν
---	--------------------------------	---

THE RESURRECTION.

Mark xvi. 1-8 1 καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου 5. εἶδον νεανίσκον κα- θήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιῶις περιβεβλη- μένον στολὴν λευ- κήν	Matt. xxviii. 1-8 1 τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων 2 ἄγγελος γὰρ κυρίου καταβάς 3 ἦν δὲ ἡ εἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπή	Luke xxiv. 1-9 [xxiii. 54 καὶ σάββα- τον ἐπέφωσκεν] (This word only found in N. T. in these two passages.) 4 ἄνδρες δύο ἐπέστησαν αὐταῖς ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτύσῃ
--	--	---

Luke's two men seem to be a combining of Mark's young man in white raiment (vs. 5) and Matthew's angel (vs. 3).

2 ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου 6 ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε	1 vacat 6 οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε ἠγέρθη γάρ	1 vacat 6 οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη
8 καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστα- σις · καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐ- δὲν εἶπαν, ἐφοβοῦν- το γάρ	8 καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβον καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἔ- δραμον ἀπαγγεί- λαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ	9 καὶ ὑποστρέψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπήγ- γειλαν ταῦτα πάν- τα τοῖς ἑνδεκα καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς