§ 1v.] THEIR DISCREPANCIES. [uvrRopuction.   
   
 Church, —partly also from written documents embodying portions of that   
 teaching : that there is however no reason from their internal structure to   
 believe, but every reason to disbelieve, that any one of the three Evange-   
 lists had access to either of the other two Gospels in its form.   
   
   
   
   
 SECTION Iv.   
 THE DISCREPANCIES, APPARENT AND REAL, OF THE THREE GOSPELS.   
   
   
 1. In our Three Narratives, many events and sayings do not hold the   
 same relative place in one as in another: and hence difficulties have   
 arisen, and the faith of some has been weakened ; while the adversaries   
 of our religion have made the most of these differences to impugn the   
 veracity of the writers themselves. And hence also Christian commen-   
 tators have been driven to a system of harmonizing which condescends   
 to adopt the weakest compromises, and to do the utmost violence to   
 probability and fairness, in its zeal for the veracity of the Evangelists.   
 It becomes important therefore critically to discriminate between real   
 and apparent discrepancy, and while with all fairness we acknowledge   
 the former where it exists, to lay down certain common-sense rules   
 whereby the latter may be also ascertained.   
 2. The real discrepancies between our Evangelistic histories are very   
 few, and those nearly all of one kind. They are simply the results   
 of the entire independence of the accounts. They consist mainly in   
 different chronological arrangements, expressed or implied. Such for   
 instance is the transposition, before noticed, of the history of the passage   
 into the country of the Gadarenes, which in Matt. viii. 28 ff. precedes   
 a whole course of events which in Mark v. 1 ff.: Luke viii. 26 ff. it   
 follows. Such again is the difference in position between the pair of   
 incidents related Matt. viii. 19—22, and the same pair of incidents   
 found in Luke ix. 57—61. And such are some other varieties of   
 arrangement and position, which will be brought before the readers of   
 the following Commentary. Now the way of dealing with such discre-   
 pancies has been twofold,—as remarked above. The enemies of the faith   
 have of course recognized them, and pushed them to the utmost ; often   
 attempting to create them where they do not exist, and where they do,   
 using them to overthrow the narrative in which they occur. While this   
 has been their course,—equally unworthy of the Evangelists and their   
 subject has been that of those who are usually thought the orthodox   
 Harmonists. They have usually taken upon them to state, that such   
 variously placed narratives do not refer to the same incidents, and 80 to   
 save (as they imagine) the credit of the Evangelists, at the expense of   
 common fairness and candour. Who, for example, can for a moment   
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