

ence. Harmonistic has been but too often a field for perverse ingenuity. I do not say that in any serious matter of fact there is any irreconcilable discrepancy between the several witnesses. Far from it. The agreement is quite remarkable; and if we knew more of the background of the narratives, we would probably see the explanation of much that is now perplexing. But the differences are such that we must be content to be uncertain on some small points.

The bearing upon faith of such criticism: that is my text. In brief, it seems to be this: The broad facts of the life and work and words of Jesus Christ seem to be more firmly established the more we search out the foundations of the Gospels. In some details—as to the order of His deeds, or the phrasing of some of His gracious words—we may find it impossible to speak with the same confidence. But it is not upon these details that faith rests, but upon Him who spoke the Sermon on the Mount; who went about doing good; who lived, and died, and rose again for our sakes.

ADDRESS

REV. CANON J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON D. D.

It is now certain that none of the Gospels is a translation from Hebrew or Aramaic. St. Matthew's Gospel was formerly thought to be so; but we are now clear that it is a composite document, in which there are at least two Greek elements. One of these is a Greek Gospel, which was also used by St. Luke, and was either St. Mark, or else a book so like St. Mark that we cannot securely distinguish between the two. Another element was a collection of reminiscences, mainly of the Lord's teaching, which again was used in a Greek form by St. Luke as well as by St. Matthew. A third element was peculiar to St. Matthew; it was the hand of the final compiler of the Gospel, and was certainly a Greek hand. St. Luke again was no translator, but an original Greek writer, with a marked style, which was to be clearly traced in his modifications of the documents which he embodied. The Hebraistic style of his first two chapters seems to be due to his intimate familiarity with the Greek Old Testament, which he looked to as a model of sacred narrative in the earlier part in which he had no Greek documents to embody. St. Mark appears to be an original document, not composite, so far as we can tell. There is no ground