INTRODUCTION. ] THE THREE GOSPELS. (cu. 1.   
   
 the shorter Gospel of St. Mark follows upon the fuller one of St. Matthew,   
 or St. Luke, or both. We have then only to examine those in which   
 St. Mark stands first. Either then St. Luke supplemented St. Matthew,   
 —or St. Matthew, St. Luke. But first, both of these are inconceivable   
 as being expansions of St. Mark; for his Gospel, although shorter, and   
 narrating fewer events and discourses, is, in those which he does narrate,   
 the fullest and most particular of the three. And again, St. Luke could   
 not have supplemented St. Matthew; for there are most important   
 portions of Matthew which he has altogether omitted (e. g. ch.   
 xxv. much of ch. xiii. ch. xv.) ;—nor could St. Matthew have sup-   
 plemented St. Luke, for the same reason, having omitted almost all   
 of the important section, Luke ix. 51—xviii. 15, besides very much   
 matter in other parts. I may also mention that this supposition leaves   
 all the difficulties of diferent arrangement and minute discrepancy   
 unaccounted for.   
 5. We pass to (5), on which much need not be said. If it were 80,   
 nothing could have been done /ess calculated to answer the end, than that   
 which our Evangelists have done. For in no material point do their   
 accounts differ, but only in arrangement and completeness ;—and this   
 latter difference is such, that no one of them can be cited as taking any   
 pains to make it appear that his own arrangement is chronologically   
 accurate. No fixed dates are found in those parts where the differences   
 exist ; no word to indicate that any other arrangement had ever been   
 published. Does this look like the work of a corrector? Even sup-   
 posing him to have suppressed the charge of inaccuracy on others,—   
 would he not have been precise and definite in the parts where his own   
 corrections appeared, if it were merely to justify them to his readers ?   
 6. Neither does the supposition represented by (c) in any way ac-   
 count for the phenomena of our present Gospels. For,—even taking   
 for granted the usual assumption, that St. Matthew wrote for Hebrew   
 Christians, St. Mark for Latins, and St. Luke for Gentiles in general,—we   
 do not find any such consistency in these purposes, as a revision and   
 alteration of another’s narrative would necessarily presuppose. We   
 have the visit of the Gentile Magi exclusively related by the Hebraizing   
 Matthew ;—the circumcision of the child Jesus, and His frequenting   
 the passovers at Jcrusalem, exclusively by the Gentile Evangelist Luke.   
 Had the above purposes been steadily kept in view in the revision   
 of the narratives before them, the respective Evangelists could not have   
 omitted incidents so entirely subservient to their respective designs.   
 7. Our supposition (d) is, that receiving the Gospel or Gospels before   
 them as authentic, the Evangelists borrowed from them such parts as   
 they purposed to narrate in common with them. But this does not   
 represent the matter of fact. In no one case does any Evangelist borrow   
 from another any considerable part of even a single narrative. For   
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