

FRESH LIGHT ON THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

IN the *Hibbert Journal* for October last an interesting article appears by Canon Streeter, in which he argues that Mark is not a primary, but only a secondary source of Luke's Gospel. He says: 'The non-Marcan sections form the framework of the Third Gospel, and into this framework are inserted at convenient places extracts from the Gospel of Mark.' He believes that the Third Gospel first took shape lacking the Nativity stories and all the Marcan material. This Proto-Luke (as well as the completed Gospel) was probably the work of Luke himself, compiled at Caesarea during the time of Paul's imprisonment there, and expanded, perhaps twenty years later, into the Gospel as known to us. It is claimed for this theory that it gives us a new primary authority for the life of our Lord, independent of Mark, and of quite equal importance.

This theory, as the writer shews, does not run counter to the widely accepted 'Two-Document' theory. It merely interpolates a stage in which Q and Luke's special material had been worked into a unity prior to the incorporation of Mark. The present paper attempts an examination of the points touched on by Canon Streeter, with all of which there is agreement, except on that of the secondary character of Mark.

It is interesting to note that the value of Luke as a historian is being more and more vindicated by recent scholarship. Canon Streeter's theory helps to that end, whether Luke be the compiler of the special material or not. If he did not himself put together the special record, he knew good material when he saw it. For those who believe the final form of the Third Gospel to be later than A. D. 80 the argument will be of importance. For those who think it was completed fifteen or twenty years earlier, it will make no difference.

The present writer is fully in agreement with the argument that Q and Luke's special material (L) had been combined into a unity before they were united to Mark, but he would hesitate to follow Canon Streeter in relegating Mark to a secondary position. At any rate the matter is worth some scrutiny.

In support of his contention Canon Streeter compares Matthew's use of Mark with that of Luke, noting that Matthew uses practically all of Mark, whereas Luke omits a good deal. But if Matthew uses most of Mark, he treats his *order* with the greatest freedom, at least up to Mk. vi 13. On the other hand, Luke not only omits a good deal of Mark, but also (almost certainly) a good deal of Q. It would appear

that Matthew used up all his material, or nearly all, but dealt very freely with it, in rearranging its position. Luke, on the other hand, with much fuller materials at disposal, had to omit from all his sources, but only changed the order occasionally, and so in Matthew we get, in the main, subject-groups, and in Luke source-groups.

I imagine that when Luke went up with Paul to Jerusalem, and afterwards had the great opportunity afforded him by the two years' residence in Caesarea, he carefully collected all first-hand information which he could get about our Lord's life and teaching, from many sources, as his preface indicates. As Q is probably the oldest of the major sources, this probably reached him (in some recension) as a whole, and his first work would be to fit into it the other material. Seeing that Q is far short of being a gospel, the resulting whole would still be very incomplete; but when, in the last place, Mark's Gospel came to hand, a very much more adequate work became possible, with something like coherence in it. Since, however, some standard of length had probably to be observed, a good deal of omission was necessary. Of Q much was omitted which was of minor interest to Gentile readers, and of Mark much that was practically duplicated, either in L or Q or in Mark itself; so that, as far as precedence is concerned, Mark and Q may both be fairly regarded as primary sources of Luke's Gospel. Both received the same sort of treatment.

That Q and L were amalgamated as a first step is made very probable because they come together in the Gospel in sections which have almost entire independence of Mark. This was brought out in Sir John Hawkins's essay in the Oxford Studies. However, it is neither necessary nor desirable to insist on complete independence. Luke was not a slave to his own methods, and some short passages in the 'Great Insertion', such as Lk. xii 1 b, xvii 25, 31, 33, probably are taken from Mark.

On occasion, Luke's *retention* of a duplicate instance may point in the same direction. For instance, in Lk. xiii 10-17 and Lk. xiv 1-4 we have two examples of Sabbath cures, which raise the same questions as Mk. ii 23-iii 6, which Luke has already copied in ch. vi 1-11. According to his general habit Luke would have omitted some of these examples; but if he had, with some difficulty, already combined Q and L in chs. xiii and xiv, he may have seen some reason for not disturbing the arrangement. To have omitted the Mark-sections would certainly have been undesirable. At any rate, had all the material been dealt with simultaneously, this is exactly the place where we should have expected selection and omission to happen.

The question may now be discussed as to how far Q + L, or both of them separately, could be regarded as a complete gospel. If Mark is

in fact a secondary source, Q + L ought to be obviously a more complete and coherent whole. As to Q, Canon Streeter would agree that Q could hardly be called a gospel. It had an account of the Preaching of the Baptist, the Temptation, the Sermon on the Mount, the Discourse about the Baptist, the Instructions to the Twelve and the Seventy, the Discourse on Casting out Devils, the Discourse against the Scribes and Pharisees, and other similar material; but taken all together they do not form a history.

The same thing may be said about L; for although there are many incidents and parables, they have not much coherence. The Visit to Nazareth, the Call of Simon, the Raising of the Young Man at Nain, the Anointing by a Woman, and nearly all the special matter of the 'Great Insertion' have few precise indications of connexion or chronology. At any rate, though there may be sets of incidents interlaced with parables, main lines of history are absent.

In both sources a few sections approximately date themselves, such as the Call of Simon, in L, and the Preaching of the Baptist and the Temptation, in Q. Any one combining these sources, without any first-hand information, would group them more or less correctly; but out of two such amorphous entities we are not going to get a gospel. Burton, in his 'Principles of Literary Criticism and their Application to the Synoptic Problem', worked out a theory in which most of Lk. iii 1-iv 30, v 1-11, and vi 20-viii 3 were assigned to a special *Galilean* source, as Lk. ix 51-xviii 14, xix 1-28 to a special *Peraean* source, which came into Luke's hands separately. This 'Galilean' source would generally be regarded as composed of Q-material, combined with four incidents from L. It could, at the best, be regarded only as a fragment of a gospel. And even if, with Canon Streeter, we combine Burton's Galilean and Peraean sources, we get no nearer to a coherent whole. Nor would the fact that L has special incidents about the Passion and Resurrection affect one's view of the presentation of the Ministry.

It is not at all certain that where Luke deserts Mark's order in his placing of duplicate accounts he is always following the order of his source. He may have special reasons for adopting an order of his own. The two outstanding instances are the Visit to Nazareth and the Call of Disciples. As regards the Visit to Nazareth, it is every way likely that its true chronological position is given in Mark. The version in L was probably preferred because it gave the prophetic outline of the Lord's ministry; and it has been brought forward, partly for that reason, and partly because it foreshadowed the whole issue of His work. The transposition of the Call of Disciples is a direct result of the former transposition. The story of the Call in Lk. v 1-11 could

not suitably have followed ch. iv 16-30, for the immense interest in the teaching of Jesus at Capernaum indicated in ch. v 1 needed some explanation. This is supplied in ch. iv 31 ff, taken from Mk. i 21 ff. The story in Mark shews how, after a crowded day at Capernaum, Jesus left the town with His disciples, for a tour amongst other Galilean villages. The Call of Disciples could not be put later, and so is inserted here. There was also a good reason for allowing iv 31 ff to come immediately after iv 30. Jesus is driven out of Nazareth, and it is convenient to continue the narrative where Mark records an entry into Capernaum. Luke has linked the two paragraphs together with great skill. He has altered Mark's *εἰσπορεύονται*, which referred to the journey from the lake-side to the town, into *κατῆλθεν*, which suits better the journey from Nazareth down to the lake. The junction of iv 31-44 with v 1-11, however, was not so easy, and, in fact, no transitional formula is used. Luke leaves the paragraphs side by side, content with the best available arrangement of his sources, but entirely sacrificing chronological order, first bringing forward the Nazareth episode, and then postponing the Story of the Call. The reference to Capernaum in iv 23 is evidence that in the source L the incident followed some record of work in that town. Luke is therefore deserting the order not only of Mark, but of his other source also.

Just as Luke brought forward the Nazareth episode, he put to a later place than in Mark the incident of the Mother and Brethren. In this case he does not give an alternative version. The reasons appear to have been quite similar to those just examined. It would not come in suitably at viii 3, and it is used to conclude the section of the Gospel which treats of Christ's first work as a teacher. He begins that section with the Rejection at Nazareth, closing it with the Rejection by Christ's own Family, thus throwing into high relief the spiritual significance of both incidents. It looks as if he had rather toned down the latter incident, to give it a form suitable to its position following the parable of the Sower.

It is interesting to note that Matthew has also displaced the Nazareth episode. It was not wanted in the Miracle-section, nor in the discourse on Mission-work. It really belongs to the next main division, giving Inquiries and Criticisms; and there seems to be no reason why it should not be included in it: possibly it was overlooked. At any rate, having got to the end of the Parable-section, Matthew found he had worked in all of Mark up to ch. vi 13, with the exception of this piece. He now appends it, and, after his fashion, welds it on so closely that it appears as if Jesus went straight to Nazareth after the parables had been spoken. This procedure is a great contrast to that of Luke.

We have also, probably, an exactly similar transposition by Luke at

the beginning of the 'Great Insertion', in the Rejection by a Samaritan Village, ix 51-56. This incident, presumably from L, does not follow on at all naturally from viii 3. The wording of the incident unequivocally points to the last journey to Jerusalem, and appears to connect all the material that follows with that journey. Yet in xiii 22 and xvii 11 we have references to journeys to Jerusalem, where no such urgency and solemnity are suggested. Moreover, to go no further than the first section that follows, we have a series of calls to discipleship, ix 57-62, which suggest the early stages of the ministry, and are not very likely to have happened in the midst of suspicious Samaria. The proper position of ix 51-56, chronologically, would appear to be just before xvii 11, where another incident in the same region is reported. Rebuffed as He purposed to go through Samaria, Jesus may have skirted the borders, and there encountered the ten lepers (cf. Kent *Biblical Geography and History* p. 258). The Rejection by the Samaritans may have been thrown to the head of the section, in order to give the same clue to the section as in the case of the Nazareth story. Moreover, a glance at Mark, where the insertion is made, helps to explain both the choice of this point for the 'Great Insertion', and the throwing forward of the first incident. Mk. ix 30-32 gives a similar foreshadowing of the end, and Mk. x 1 mentions a Peraean journey which was the prelude to the final journey to Jerusalem. Later, the insertion could not come.

But if ix 51-56 has been brought forward, we are left with a very easy explanation of the connexion of ix 57-62. It follows directly upon Lk. viii 3 in L, and belongs to the earlier part of the ministry and to Galilee. The circle of the disciples is by no means closed as yet. In viii 1-3 the Twelve and a small company are engaged in a preaching tour with Jesus. Lk. ix 57-62 may be incidents of that tour. In ch. x the work still further widens.

An examination of the whole body of Q+L shews that Q is treated as the primary source. This is quite obviously so in the two sections iii 1-iv 30 and vi 20-viii 3. In the 'Great Insertion' (ix 51-xviii 14), up to the end of ch. xii there is very little that does not belong to Q. From ch. xiii onwards L-material predominates. An orderly sequence of subjects can be traced throughout the whole, though the precise place in the scheme as given by Mark is lost to us, and seems not to have been known by Luke himself. If this point is conceded, it follows that Q+L is rather amorphous, chronologically. In some cases Luke prefers the Q-account to Mark, as the Discourse about Casting out Demons, and then also adheres to the Q-position; but all these are cases in which the chronological order is a matter of very little importance.

Perhaps, after all, it makes no difference whether we say that Luke fitted Q + L into Mark as a framework, or Mark into Q + L as a framework. What I should *not* say is that he fitted Q and Mark into L; but that would not in the least detract from my respect for the high value of L, as a source of the Gospel. And I should regard Mark as the backbone of Luke's Gospel, just as it is of Matthew's; but to establish this would not in the least invalidate the other arguments of Canon Streeter's illuminating essay.

T. STEPHENSON.

π

THE PROBLEM OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

IF critical students must take Dr Parry's work on the Pastoral Epistles seriously, traditionists will certainly have to give heed to Mr Harrison's masterly codification of the linguistic evidence, his clear exposition of its bearing on the question of authorship, and his other contributions, valuable if less complete and convincing, towards the final solution of the whole problem raised by these letters.¹

It has, of course, long been matter of common knowledge that 'the language of the Pastorals shews on the face of it certain strongly marked peculiarities as compared with the other Paulines'. Mr Harrison has shewn us that close and methodical examination very greatly accentuates this contrast. His statistics and curves shew (1) that the ten Pauline Epistles 'maintain among themselves a close and unmistakeable family likeness'. Each letter and group has its characteristic expressions, but they form a series. The Pastoral Epistles stand apart from that series. In each curve a sharp rise separates them from the ten. Judged by their vocabulary the Pastoral Epistles find their place in the second century series and not in the Pauline series. Mr Harrison has also shewn that certain alleged analogies in the works of Shakespeare may be shewn by closer examination not to support the conclusions which have been based on them. Take the three groups, of the ten Pauline Epistles, the Pastorals, and the Apostolic Fathers, and we find that of the Pauline words not found in the Apostolic Fathers 94 per cent. are absent from the Pastorals. Put the whole New Testament on one side, and the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists on the other; the Pastorals have more words in common with the latter than the former group of writings. Thus Mr Harrison completes the work begun by Holtzmann. Dr Hort was right when he said that the real difficulty of

¹ *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, by P. N. Harrison, M.A., D.D., Oxford University Press, 1921.