

we serve Him, or whether we do not; a God that will take the trouble to reckon with us, and with our age, and with all the ages, and with this world of ours at last—that is a faith that lifts a man above himself, up above the world, and that stirs him to chivalrous and glorious achievements; a faith that builds up the great realm of ethical glory and grandeur, of religious aspiration, and hope, and love; the finest outcome of our world's struggle, and trial, and battle.

W. G. ELMSLIE.

A SURVEY OF THE SYNOPTIC QUESTION.

II. POINTS PROVED OR PROBABLE.

ONE respected critic assures us that there is no such thing as a "Synoptic theory," only "a Synoptic craze."¹ Perhaps; but at any rate the epidemic is so widespread that those who are bitten by it can keep each other in countenance. We saw last month how four (or rather five) independent inquirers, approaching the subject under very different conditions, all after study more or less close, and some after study very close indeed, not only shared the belief that there is a Synoptic theory, but agreed in adopting what in its main outlines is virtually the same theory. They agreed in postulating two fundamental documents as the groundwork of the common matter in the three Gospels.

I said however that the theory thus framed fell into several distinct parts, and I undertook to attempt to define the extent to which each of these parts might be considered

¹ Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes, in a collection of four sermons, entitled, *The New Criticism*, p. 14. (London, 1890.)

to be established. My object is at once to help the formation of opinion generally, and in particular to indicate to those who are willing to work at the subject the directions in which I think that they may do so with most profit.

Utterances such as that to which I have just referred prevent me from speaking quite so objectively as I might have been otherwise tempted to do. I cannot lay down what is as a matter of fact and by general consent. I can only express my own opinion, which must be taken for what it is worth. With this reserve I will take separately each of the two hypothetical documents in question, and will draw out certain propositions in regard to them which appear to me to be either proved or probable, or at least fit subjects for discussion.

Beginning then with the first document about which the case seems to be clearest. I believe it to be practically proved (1) that there is such a fundamental document; (2) that it is represented most nearly by the Gospel which bears the name of St. Mark. I believe it to be also highly probable and on the verge of proof, (3) that the common foundation of the three Gospels was a document strictly so called, written and not oral. Lastly, I think that the exact relation of this document to our present St. Mark must be regarded as still an open question, which has made some way towards solution, but is not yet solved.

On the first three of these propositions I should be glad to quote a passage from Mr. Estlin Carpenter. He says:

“We may assume . . . that the verbal coincidences [between the Gospels] are due to one of two causes: either the Gospel which was produced first was employed by the authors of the other two, or all three Gospels were based upon some common sources. This latter view seems best to meet the conditions of the case. Whether these common sources were still unfixed in writing, and were only passed from one to another in oral teaching, or whether they had already been invested with some primitive literary form, is open to question. It is perhaps more important to inquire which of our present Gospels seems

to stand nearest to them in order of time. The answer, which is given with increasing clearness and decision by scholars approaching the problem along very different lines, finds the earliest of our three in 'the Gospel according to S. Mark.'"¹

For "nearness in order of time," I should be inclined to substitute "nearness in substantial reproduction," as that will complicate the statement less with any questions which might arise as to editorial redaction and a possible interval between the earliest form of the Gospel and the form in which it has come down to us. In other respects I should entirely endorse what Mr. Carpenter has said as to the "increasing clearness and decision" with which the so called "priority of St. Mark" is being asserted.

Mr. Carpenter takes the side of caution in allowing for the possibility that the fundamental tradition embodied in our three Gospels was oral and not in writing. He is certainly justified in this, so long as writers of the importance of Dr. Westcott and M. Godet still hold out. There is however no doubt that the great preponderance of opinion at the present time is in favour of a written document; and it seems to me, I confess, that the case has been sufficiently made out. This side of the question has been recently reinforced (1) by the very careful and elaborate essay, by Mr. F. H. Woods, on the "Order of the Synoptic Narratives" in the second volume of *Studia Biblica*;² and (2) by an able argument, not exactly directed to this point, but really applicable to it, by Dr. Paul Ewald.

If the common tradition incorporated in the first three Gospels was transmitted orally the whole of the way until it took the shape in which we now have it, then it follows

¹ *The Synoptic Gospels*, p. 261 f.

² I leave this as it was written, though I fear that it does not do justice to an admirable piece of work, which should have had a more conspicuous place in these papers. It has been less present to my own mind, chiefly because the point with which it deals is one as to which I have long been convinced. But upon that point I believe that it will retain a permanent and even classical value.

that that tradition must have been peculiarly stereotyped in form. The followers of Gieseler have always held that it was so stereotyped. They go on the assumption that in the mother Church at Jerusalem a process went on similar to that which Mr. Wright describes in regard to the catechists,¹ though perhaps somewhat less attached to particular names. The degree of fixity in the tradition thus moulded must have been very considerable to account for the close resemblance which the Gospels present in regard at once to the incidents selected for narration, to the order of the narratives, and to the language in which the stories are told. Now admitting that this degree of fixity was possible; admitting that, although contrary to modern experience, it might yet be accounted for by the peculiar habits of the Jews and the comparative centralization of the primitive Church—it still remains to ask whether we have any evidence that the tradition handed down by the apostles at Jerusalem was actually of this nature.

A doubt on this head may be raised by the actual phenomena of our present Gospels. True, the groundwork of the tradition is remarkably fixed; but when we come to look at it, we see, alongside with this fixed groundwork, a quantity of other matter by no means so determinate. Each of the three Gospels, especially the first and third, contains over and above the common tradition a number of other incidents, a number of other sayings and discourses, which are not found in the rest. Whence did these peculiar sections come? Did not they too circulate in the Church at Jerusalem? If they did, as some of them we cannot help thinking must have done, then the tradition of the mother Church must have been less stereotyped than we suppose. The common groundwork of our three Gospels is not an adequate representation of it.

¹ See the passage quoted in the last number of *THE EXPOSITOR*, pp. 83, 84.

Here is the point at which Professor Ewald comes in with an argument which, I confess, appears to me to be of great force. He is not content with the common isolation of the Synoptic Gospels, and he boldly extends his appeal to the fourth Gospel. Where, he asks, was the special type of tradition which stands out so distinctly there? Those of us who believe in the genuineness of that Gospel would find it hard to answer him without admitting that the so called "triple tradition" is far from containing all that the original apostolic tradition contained.

But Dr. Ewald very rightly does not merely go upon the ground of an assumption. He asserts indeed emphatically the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, but at the same time he marshals the evidence which goes to show that, whether it be genuine or not, a tradition like that which it contains was actually current in apostolic times and among the apostolic circle. The Synoptics themselves, he shows, in many respects imply what is not told by themselves, but by St. John. The other New Testament literature implies it. Even in the Epistle of St. James, for instance, Dr. Ewald finds Johannean reminiscences, not tracing them to the Gospel, but to the discourses recorded in the Gospel. Thus St. James i. 18: "Of His own will He begat us (brought us to birth) with the word of truth." Dr. Ewald refers to the discourse with Nicodemus (St. John iii. 3). We might compare also the comment of the evangelist in St. John i. 13: "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The combination of these two ideas, the Divine will and the process of spiritual generation, is hardly an obvious one. Parallels should be sought for outside the New Testament to determine how far the idea was current. Then again, "The truth shall set you free" (St. John viii. 32) is compared with "the perfect law of liberty" (St. James i. 25); "shall save a soul from death" (St. James v.

20), with "is passed from death unto life" (St. John v. 24). No one would say that the link of connexion between these passages is undeniable. We must not speak hastily until the apocryphal literature has been more fully examined; but there is enough to make us pause and consider, especially when we remember how deeply figurative all this language is and how the figures have to be coined.

But if there are these coincidences—or what seem such—with a writer so unpromising as St. James, it is easier to find them with St. Peter and St. Paul. I must not delay over this part of the argument, but simply refer the reader to Dr. Ewald's "First Excursus." Let it be borne in mind that there are three possible hypotheses: the hypothesis of accidental coincidence of idea; the hypothesis of direct literary influence by the earliest writer (whichever he was) upon the later; and the hypothesis of a common source, which it is most natural to seek in the words of Christ. Our duty is to accept whichever of these hypotheses fits the facts best. That however is a point which will not be reached for some time to come.

From the New Testament Dr. Ewald passes to the extra-canonical literature. Now here I think that he has a clearer case. It is admitted on all hands that there are Johannean touches and turns of phrase in the sub-apostolic writers, Clement, Barnabas, Ignatius, and in the *Didaché*. It has been sometimes contended that these coincidences proved the use of the Gospel. That, I think, is rightly denied. They do not prove the use of the Gospel; but they do prove that there was floating about the Christian Churches a Johannean cycle of tradition as well as a Synoptic cycle. I will take an example which is not treated in detail by Dr. Ewald, but with which I have been much impressed since its first discovery. I refer to the *Didaché*. The eucharistic prayer in chaps. ix., x. is evidently something more than the composition of an individual: it

represents thoughts and expressions which must have had a certain amount of general currency. But read the following :¹

DIDACHE, chaps. ix., x.

We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David, Thy servant,^a which Thou hast made known (ἐγνώρισας)^b to us through Jesus Thy servant.

As this broken bread (κλάσμα) was scattered (διεσκορπισμένον)^c upon the mountains, and gathered together became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom.

We thank Thee, holy Father,^d for Thy holy name which Thou hast caused to dwell (tabernacle) in our hearts^e (Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου οὗ κατέσκηνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν [edd., ὕμῶν, Cod.]), and for the knowledge and faith and immortality^f which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy Servant: to Thee be the glory for ever.

To us Thou didst freely give spiritual food and drink and eternal life^g through Thy Servant.

Remember, O Lord, Thy Church, to deliver her from all evil,^h and to perfect her in Thy loveⁱ (τοῦ ῥύσασθαι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ, καὶ τελειῶσαι αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου).

^a Cf. St. John xv. 1 f. The reference to Christ rather than the Church is made highly probable by the parallel in Clement of Alexandria, *Quis div. salv.* 29: οὗτος ὁ τὸν οἶνον, τὸ αἶμα τῆς ἀμπέλου τῆς Δαβὶδ, ἐκχέας ἡμῖν. [I owe to friends, (i.) a reference to Delitzsch, *Iris*, p. 185 Eng. trans., where the Targum on Ps. lxxx. 15, 16 is quoted as proving that Vine=Messiah; (ii.) the suggestion that here, as in St. John xv., the ideas of the Church and its Head are closely connected.]

^b Cf. St. John xv. 15, xvii. 26, though it is rather too much to say with Harnack, "Dies feierliche γνωρίζεν ist nur Johanneisch."

^c Cf. St. John xi. 52: ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα συναγάγῃ εἰς ἓν.

^d Only in St. John xvii. 11.

^e Cf. esp. St. John xvii. 11, 12 (in the corrected text): Πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, κ.τ.λ. κατασκήνω is also a Johannean word.

^f This conjunction of "knowledge, faith, and immortality" is noted as Johannean (cf. St. John vi. 69, 70; x. 12, 38, etc.), the only difference being that St. John's phrase is not ἀθανασία, but ζωὴ αἰώνιος.

^g πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν is perhaps more Pauline than Johannean; but ζωὴν αἰώνιον carries us back on to Johannean ground, and the thought is just that of St. John vi. 27, 32-35, 47-58.

^h Cf. St. John xvii. 15.

ⁱ Cf. 1 John ii. 5; iv. 12, 18.

¹ I check my own impressions by the use of Harnack, *Texte und Untersuch.* ii. 79 ff., and Wohlenberg, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel in ihrem Verhältniss zum neutestl. Schrifttum*, p. 56 ff.

This last phrase (τελειῶσαι ἐν ἀγάπῃ) is especially remarkable, and it seems to me, taken with what has gone before, convincingly to prove the acquaintance of the author of the *Didaché* with that branch of the evangelical tradition which is preserved most distinctly in St. John. But what holds good for the *Didaché* holds good also in greater or less degree for all the apostolic Fathers; one might almost say, for all the extant Christian literature outside the New Testament up to and including Justin.

To maintain this however is little more than an outwork of Dr. Ewald's position. Behind this he has a second line more formidable still. I wrote myself¹ some little time ago as follows:

“The advocates of oral tradition invariably and naturally look to Jerusalem as the home of that tradition. Is it not then strange that it should say so little about the work of our Lord at Jerusalem? Here is a tradition which is supposed to have been formed and circulated for some forty years at Jerusalem, and yet its contents are almost entirely taken up, not with those visits to Jerusalem of which St. John has so much to say, but with the ministry in Galilee. Are these two things easily reconciled? It does not seem so.”

Of an argument like this Dr. Ewald makes most effective use. Once more he does not assume what an opponent cannot be expected to grant. He takes his stand, not upon the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, but upon general historical probability. The more reasonable of those who refuse to identify the author of the Gospel with St. John still allow that he was right in laying so much of the scene of our Lord's ministry in Judæa and Jerusalem. If it was true that a prophet could not “perish out of Jerusalem” (St. Luke xiii. 33); if it was true that Jerusalem was the true home of the prophets, which made it all the more remarkable that the Messiah was without honour there (St. John iv. 44); if the lament over Jerusalem speaks of the

¹ In a popular introduction not yet published.

many times when He would have gathered His little ones together there,—then we may be sure that those opportunities really were given, that the last passover was not the only feast which saw the presence of Jesus in its streets, that the household at Bethany was not the only one that had listened to and accepted His teaching, that there was more than one “upper room” in the city itself in which He would have been welcome.

But once assume this—assume that there was a Judæan ministry as well as a Galilæan, and we have to find an explanation for the fact that the Synoptic Gospels record only the latter. How can we explain it if the tradition which they record grew up in the heart of the city which it so strangely neglected? How can we explain it if St. John was one of those who helped to form the tradition?

The truth is, that we must give up the idea that the Synoptic Gospels represent a central tradition at all. There is, as Dr. Ewald says, something one-sided about them; and thus the problem is, How did that one-sidedness get there? A satisfactory answer cannot be given so long as they are regarded as a product of the Church working collectively. The stamp which they bear is not collective, but individual; the tradition which they represent is not central, but sectional. The solution is indeed not far to seek. We are brought back once more to the express statement of Papias. Notes by St. Mark of the preaching of St. Peter give us the essentials of what we want. What the whole Church could not omit, what the whole body of the apostles could not omit, that a single apostle—not sitting down deliberately to write history, but merely from time to time choosing his subjects for edification—might very well fail to mention.

We have seen that the theory which bases our present Gospels directly upon oral tradition is bound up with the hypothesis that that tradition was formed in the bosom of

the apostolic college at Jerusalem. A blow therefore that is struck at that hypothesis tells also against the theory which it supports; and coming as it does on the top of so many other serious difficulties in the oral theory, it may, I think, be taken as practically disposing of it. We do not exclude oral tradition by any means; it is quite possible that some sections in our present Gospels may be due to it: but to take it as the main factor in accounting for the phenomena of the Gospels as we have them seems to me untenable. If we wish to look for a specimen of the working of oral tradition—not in the first or apostolic generation, but at a later date, in the period which is called sub-apostolic—we may see it in the various readings of a group of very early authorities, at the head of which is that notoriously eccentric MS. Codex Bezae (D).¹

For those of us who are constrained to seek for the foundation of our Gospels in a written document, two questions will remain in regard to that document: (1) What was its extent? (2) What was its composition?

We have already seen that the fundamental document approached most nearly in its character to our present St. Mark. The question therefore as to its extent is really a question as to its relation to our St. Mark. Was it identical with it? Was it co-extensive with it? If not co-extensive, was it longer or shorter?

The view that there was an original Gospel like our St. Mark, but not exactly to be identified with it, is one of those niceties of criticism which cannot be expected to commend themselves at once to the lay mind. It is based on the fact, that although, when our St. Mark is compared with the other two Synoptics, in by far the majority of cases it presents a form of the narrative which approves itself as older or more original, there still remains a minor-

¹ For other possible explanations of these readings see the fourth paper in this series.

ity of instances where this is not the case, and where the preference has rather to be given to one or both of the other Gospels. One of the criteria by which we establish the priority of St. Mark is its constant agreement with one of the companion Gospels against the other. This applies both to the order of the narratives and to the language in which they are told. So far as the order is concerned, I believe that there is no true exception. There are a few cases where all three Gospels diverge from each other: but, as a rule, if St. Matthew deserts St. Mark, St. Luke agrees with him; and if St. Luke deserts St. Mark, St. Matthew agrees with him. There is no case in which the order of a section common to all three is supported by St. Matthew and St. Luke against St. Mark. On the whole, what is true of the order of the narratives is true also of their language. Here too St. Mark is the meeting-ground. If we take the sections common to the three evangelists, there is a vast number of expressions in which St. Mark coincides with one or other of his fellows against the third. Rather more often he coincides with St. Matthew against St. Luke; but the instances are also very numerous in which he coincides with St. Luke against St. Matthew. On the strength of this phenomenon, we say that he is *prior* to both.

But here the facts are not quite so uniform as they are in regard to the order. The rule is certainly a rule which has the immense preponderance of instances in its favour throughout the Gospel. Still it is not without exceptions. Let us take one of the first sections we come to, the two verses which are all St. Mark gives to the temptation. I place the three columns side by side, representing the points common to St. Mark with St. Matthew against St. Luke and with St. Luke against St. Matthew by italics, and those common to St. Matthew and St. Luke against St. Mark by small capitals.

ST. MATTHEW iv. 1, 2.

“Then was JESUS LED up of the Spirit *into* the wilderness to be tempted of the DEVIL. And when He had fasted forty days and forty nights, HE afterward HUNGERED.”

ST. MARK i. 12, 13.

“And straightway the Spirit driveth Him forth *into* the wilderness. And He was *in* the wilderness forty days, *being* tempted of Satan; and He was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto Him.”

ST. LUKE iv. 1, 2.

“And JESUS, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was LED by the Spirit *in* the wilderness during forty days, *being* tempted of the DEVIL. And He did eat nothing in those days: and when they were completed, HE HUNGERED.”

There are some noticeable things in this passage, though it does not quite fairly represent the relation ordinarily subsisting between the three Gospels; the amount of variation is rather greater than usual. Yet even here there are small points which are significant. It will be observed that St. Mark has the double expression, “into the wilderness,” and “in the wilderness.” St. Matthew has the one, St. Luke has the other. Again, both St. Mark and St. Luke have the expression “being tempted,” implying that the temptation was spread over the days. These are the kind of coincidences—though not nearly so strong or so numerous as in many other sections—which suggest the use of a written document; and that document would be in these respects most nearly represented by St. Mark.

But then there is another group of expressions—not to lay stress upon the common root in “led,” which may not however be accidental—“Jesus,” “the devil,” “He hungered,” in which St. Matthew and St. Luke combine their forces against St. Mark: so that by the same criterion by which in a multitude of other instances we infer the priority of St. Mark, we should infer here his posteriority; we should infer that there was a common original which the other two Gospels represented better than he did. I have said that there are peculiarities in this section: it is not

one that I should choose on which to construct a theory of the mutual relations of the Gospels, and I cannot stay to discuss its bearing upon the whole question of those relations. I merely quote it as an example of this double phenomenon which we find in St. Mark, indications—*prima facie* indications, if you will, but a closer examination I believe will support them—of priority and posteriority side by side.

It is this double aspect of the Gospel which has led many critics to think that, although our Gospel is very like the original document, it is still not identical with it; that behind our St. Mark there was an original or proto-Mark slightly different from it. There are obvious difficulties and improbabilities in this view. Foremost among them is the question, how it can have entered into the head of any one to alter a document which lay before him just in these small respects and no more.

The student of the Synoptics is brought here face to face with a real problem; and he will do well to set steadily before him all the possible hypotheses he can think of for its solution. One hypothesis, which I am myself much inclined to keep in sight, though I should not venture to say that it was adequate to explain the facts, is, that these facts were not so much editorial as textual, that they did not mark any deliberate recension of the Gospel, but were only incidental to the process of copying. This I think we can prove, that, as we approach nearer to the autographs, the freedom of the copyists increases. In the first two or three copies, especially of the Gospel of St. Luke, it must have been very considerable indeed. Here we have a *vera causa*, which may be introduced if we want it. I hope some day to test more exactly how far it will carry us, but I doubt if it will carry us far enough.

Another expedient which has found increasing favour during the last ten years has for its chief recommendation

that it enables us to dispense with the assumption of an older form of the Gospel altogether. This expedient consists in the supposition, which is simple enough in itself, that the latest of the three Synoptists had seen, not only one, but both his predecessors. This position was stoutly maintained in a tract by Simons, *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* (Bonn, 1880.) This tract has been for some time out of print, and I have not succeeded in obtaining access to a copy. Simons has succeeded in making a number of converts, including Holtzmann—who had been one of the chief advocates of an *Ur-Marcus* or proto-Mark—Wendt, and now Dr. Paul Ewald. Those who take this view have to explain how it is that St. Luke, if he was acquainted with our St. Matthew, nevertheless diverges from him so considerably. They do so by supposing that the use which he made of our first Gospel was very subsidiary, that he probably had not a copy before him when he wrote, and that the influence was only through the memory. No doubt this hypothesis would greatly simplify matters if it could be adopted. I cannot claim to have tested it in close detail, and yet I question whether it will account satisfactorily for the facts. The secondary features in St. Mark are one of the problems connected with the Synoptic Gospels which have not yet received, and most urgently need, a definitive solution.

Though Dr. P. Ewald accepts a theory which exempts him from the necessity of supposing an *Ur-Marcus*, or older form of the present Gospel, he yet does suppose such an older form, and that under rather peculiar conditions. His *Ur-Marcus* is simply our present Gospel, with three omissions: St. Mark i. 1-3, vii. 24 to viii. 26, and xvi. 9-20. For the last omission he has of course some textual authority. And one of his points is that the first omission

conforms to it: a Gospel without an end, he thinks, should be also a Gospel without a beginning. There might be something tempting in this, we might think that we were getting back to the original "notes without order" of Papias, if it were not that between those two points the order that exists is so good. I must not stay to argue the point. I can only say that the grounds alleged for these omissions do not seem to me to be convincing.

A question akin to this of the *Ur-Marcus* is that as to the composition of our second Gospel. Was any other source made use of in it besides the "Notes of the Preaching of St. Peter"? This is another important question about which critics are still divided. The leading supporters of the Two-Document Hypothesis take opposite sides here. Holtzmann says, No; the second evangelist derived his material entirely from St. Peter, unless it were a little which he got from tradition or from his own personal knowledge, such as the incident of the young man who fled at the arrest of Jesus. On this side, I believe, is to be ranked Dr. P. Ewald. Dr. Bernhard Weiss answers on the contrary, Yes; our second evangelist had the same two main documents as the rest. He also had access, not only to the "Notes of St. Peter's Preaching," but also to the *Logia* collected by St. Matthew. It will be observed that here we have another way of getting out of the difficulty caused by the secondary features in St. Mark. For the preaching of St. Peter he is himself the primary authority; but the *Logia* he did not reproduce so fully or so carefully as his colleagues. Hence there are not a few places where they must take precedence of him. I gather that Dr. Resch takes this view, and indeed goes beyond Dr. Weiss in the extent to which he believes that the *Logia* were used;¹ but he has not yet expressed himself

¹ *Agrapha*, p. 28.

fully on the subject. The theory at first sight seems a complicated and cumbrous one. It implies that the first and third evangelists used the same document, the *Logia*, twice over, once separately in its original form, and once as already (partially) incorporated in our St. Mark. And yet complex phenomena require a complex hypothesis to account for them. There is very much the same kind of objection to the theory of Holtzmann and his allies, who hold that the third evangelist used at once our first Gospel, as we have it, and the two separate documents out of which the larger part of it is constructed. In both cases the objection is real, but in neither is it fatal.

In investigating this question, an important factor is supplied by the "doublets," or apparently repeated sections, which occur in the Gospels, the presumption being that when the same event or saying is recorded twice over it is taken in each case from a different source. It is a merit of Mr. Badham's little book, *The Formation of the Gospels* (London, 1891), to have seized hold of this point. It seems to me however, that the passages which can be regarded as doublets will need more rigorously sifting, and also that it is too paradoxical to ascribe to the preaching of St. Peter just that part of the Synoptic tradition with which St. Mark is *not* associated.

W. SANDAY.