§u.] INDEPENDENCE OF ONE ANOTHER. [1ntroprcrion.   
   
   
 the same phenomena have been curiously and variously interpreted.   
 What, in one writer’s view, has been a deficiency in one Evangelist   
 which another has supplied,—has been, in that of a second writer, a   
 condensation on the part of the one Evangelist of the full account of   
 the other ;—while a third writer again has seen in the fuller account   
 the more minute depicting of later tradition.   
 2. Let us, however, observe the evidence furnished by the Gospels   
 themselves. Each of the sacred Historians is, we may presume, anxious   
 to give his readers an accurate and consistent account of the great   
 events of Redemption. On either of the above hypotheses, two of them   
 respectively sit down to their work with one, or two, of our present nar-   
 ratives before them. We are reduced then to adopt one or other: of the   
 following suppositions: Either, (a) they found those other Gospels in-   
 sufficient, and were anxious to supply what was wanting; or, (b) they   
 believed them to be erroneous, and purposed to correct what was inac-   
 curate ; or, (c) they wished to adapt their contents to a different class of   
 readers, incorporating at the same time whatever additional matter they   
 possessed ; or (d) receiving them as authentic, they borrowed from them   
 such parts as they purposed to relate in common with them.   
 3. There is but one other supposition, which is plainly out of the   
 range of probability, and which I should not have stated, were it not the   
 only one, on the hypothesis of mutual dependency, which will give any   
 account of, or be consistent with, the various minute discrepancies of   
 arrangement and narration which we find in the Gospels. It is (e) that   
 (see last paragraph) they fraudulently plagiarized from them, slightly   
 disguising the common matter so as to make it appear their own. One   
 man wishing to publish the matter of another’s work as his own, may be   
 conceived as altering its arrangement and minutiz, to destroy its dis-   
 tinctive character. But how utterly inapplicable is any such view to   
 either of our three Evangelists! And even supposing it for a moment   
 entertained,—how imperfectly and anomalously are the changes made,   
 —and how little would they be likely to answer their purpose !   
 4. Let us consider the others in order. If (a) was the case, J main- ~   
 tain that no possible arrangement of our Gospels will suit its require-   
 ments. Let the reader refer to the last note, and follow me through its   
 divisions. (1), (2), (5), (6) are clearly out of the question, because   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 advances, and sometimes maintains with considerable ingenuity, the of a   
 supplemental relation of three taken in order.   
 2. Matthew, Luke, Mark.—So Griesbach, Fritzsche, De Wette, and others.   
 3. Mark, Matthew, Luke.—So Storr and others, and recently, Smith of Jordan-   
 bill.   
 4. Mark, Luke, Matthew.—So Weisse, Wilke, Hitzig, &c.   
 5. Luke, Matthew, Mark.—So Busching and Evanson.   
 6. Luke, Mark, Matthew.—So Vagel.   
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