

rose from the dead. The devil did his best against Christ, and was beaten. He is for ever playing the part of one condemned.

These three, then, are the works of the Paraclete in the world. They are not successive stages. They are simply three ways of express-

ing the same thing, three roads of reaching the same goal. They are the ways in which the Church, the fellowship of the children of God, bears witness, through the Spirit (or the Spirit through the Church), to the undying reality of Christ.

Proto-Luke.

BY THE REVEREND VINCENT TAYLOR, B.D., PH.D., KEIGHLEY.

B. H. STREETER's extremely interesting suggestion in the October number of *The Hibbert Journal* (1921), that the Third Gospel was preceded by an earlier edition (Proto-Luke or QL), which probably was itself the work of St. Luke, is a theory which calls for serious consideration. In certain respects Streeter has followed in the footsteps of such scholars as Feine, Joh. Weiss, V. H. Stanton, and J. Vernon Bartlet. What is distinctive in his theory is the suggestion that Proto-Luke was practically a complete gospel, compiled about 60 A.D. at Cæsarea, and was the framework into which the 'Markan Sections' were afterwards fitted to form our present Third Gospel.

It is no part of the present article to discuss the theory in detail. To do that careful and extensive research must be undertaken upon the Gospel as a whole. What I should like to attempt is to test the theory by examining the Passion-Narrative in Lk 22¹⁴-24¹¹. Streeter would claim this section as a part of Proto-Luke. He says that it 'looks more like an originally independent version of the story enriched by certain additions from St. Mark than like a modification of Mark's version.' It is obvious that, if Streeter's theory can be sustained, we have in the Third Gospel a Passion Story which must be traced back within St. Paul's lifetime.

It has, of course, long been recognized that in his Passion-Narrative the author sits much less closely to St. Mark than he does in such passages as Lk 4³¹⁻⁴⁴ 5¹²⁻⁶¹⁹ 8⁴⁻⁹⁵⁰ 18¹⁵⁻⁴³ 19²⁹⁻²²¹³.

[Sir John Hawkins has pointed out that the Passion-Narrative, although only two-fifths the length of the passages just cited, contains twice as much 'peculiar' matter. On the other hand, the Passion-Narrative, as compared with the earlier

sections, has only half the percentage of verbal correspondence with St. Mark; the percentage is 27 as compared with 53. Transpositions of material, moreover, occur four times as freely as in the earlier passages.]

Such is the relationship that F. C. Burkitt was led to deny that Luke's account of the Passion was based upon St. Mark at all, and to affirm that it was drawn from that source containing the sayings of Jesus which is commonly known as Q. If Streeter is right, we must agree with Burkitt's negative conclusion, but we must differ from him in finding the source of Lk 22¹⁴-24¹¹ not in Q, but in Proto-Luke (QL).

In spite of the great value of Sir John Hawkins' analysis of Luke's Passion-Narrative, it may be doubted if even in his statement we have the full facts of the case. Sir John says that in St. Luke's story out of 1906 words 507 (about 27 per cent.) are found wholly or partly in St. Mark. But the question we must ask is, How many of these 507 words may reasonably be supposed to *depend* on St. Mark's Gospel? Obviously the number is capable of considerable reduction. Different writers may coincide in using the same word, or the same phrase might be supplied independently to each by the character of the incident or saying quoted. Agreement does not always mean dependence on one side or the other.

Reviewing the Lukan Passion-Narrative in the light of these principles, I have been able to mark 228 words only, as being probably dependent upon words in the Second Gospel. Of these 88 occur in two narratives—those of Peter's Denial and the Burial of Jesus—the remaining 140 being distributed throughout the section in fifteen verses and half-verses. If we use the shorter Westcott and Hort

text, this means that the percentage of words dependent on St. Mark is only about 12.3 per cent. This percentage is admittedly small, but the nature of the evidence is such that there can be no question that St. Mark really is used as a source.

But in what sense? That is the important question. Is St. Mark used as a fundamental source, or only as a secondary source? Streeter's contention is, of course, the latter, and it must be confessed that we have been so much obsessed with the undoubted fact that in so large a part of his Gospel St. Luke has used St. Mark as a primary source, that we have tended to neglect the possibility that in the Passion-Narrative the opposite is true.

In order to see how the Markan Source is used, I will give a list of those passages in Lk 22¹⁴-24¹¹ which show clear signs of dependence upon the Second Gospel.

Passages in St. Luke's Passion-Narrative which have been taken from the Markan Source.		No. of words or parts of words in Lk. which are parallel to those in Mk.
1	Lk 22 ¹⁸	14 out of 21
2	Lk 22 ²²	13 " " 18
3	Lk 22 ^{46b}	6 " " 7
4	Lk 22 ⁴⁷ (?)	12 " " 20
5	Lk 22 ^{52, 53a}	24 " " 39
6	Lk 22 ^{54b-62} (Peter's Denial)	62 " " 131
7	Lk 23 ³	16 " " 19
8	Lk 23 ^{22b}	4 " " 5
9	Lk 23 ²⁶	3 " " 3
10	Lk 23 ^{34b}	6 " " 7
11	Lk 23 ³⁸	7 " " 11
12	Lk 23 ^{44f.}	17 " " 26
13	Lk 23 ⁴⁹	9 " " 18
14	Lk 23 ⁵⁰⁻⁵³ (Burial).	26 " " 58
15	Lk 24 ^{10a}	9 " " 11
		228

In this list I have not felt possible to include the section giving the Trial before the High Priest, or, to speak more accurately (since the High Priest is not mentioned), the Trial before the Chief Priests and Scribes. Although the percentage of words in common with St. Mark is fairly high (it is 35 per cent.), no phrase seems sufficiently distinctive to show dependence. Moreover, the difference in the time to which the incident is assigned (the morning) as well as the 'movement'

of the section itself, seem to show that the passage is independent of St. Mark. Nor have I felt able to include the Resurrection-Narrative of Lk 24¹⁻¹¹, with the exception of v. 10^a. But even if these two sections need to be added to the above list, as well as a few isolated words and phrases in other sections, the argument of the present article would not seriously be altered.

A careful study of the passages included in the list suggests that the Markan Source is secondary, not primary, in the Lukan Passion Story; the Markan passages seem to be additions to an already existing narrative. The most telling consideration is not merely the small amount of Markan phraseology, though this is important, but *the nature of its distribution*. It appears in strips, in the main in single verses and half-verses. With the exception of Peter's Denial and the Burial Story, Markan material nowhere enters deeply into the structure of the narrative; it is a question of pendants and touches. Large stretches, as, for instance, the Trial before Pilate and the Account of the Crucifixion, contain no more than a few Markan sprinklings. Moreover, in many cases the Markan passage leaves upon the mind the distinct impression of being an addition or insertion. As examples of this, I would point to 23^{3, 22b, 34b, 38, 44f.} 40 and 24^{10a}. Of these the clearest instances are 23³⁸ (the Superscription passage) and 23^{44f.} (the Miraculous Darkness and the Rending of the Temple Veil). In the other cases one would not like to press what may after all be a subjective impression, but in 23^{38, 44f.} we have something more than this. The words interrupt what appears to be a well-planned passage. After speaking of the crucifying, Luke turns to describe the different classes of spectators. First he mentions the people as a whole: 'And the people stood beholding.' Then he describes the rulers and what they say (v. 35), then the soldiers and their words (v. 36f.), then the malefactors (vv. 39ff.). Finally, after the death of Jesus, we have the reference to the centurion and his words: 'Certainly this was a righteous man' (v. 47), and the picture of the multitudes (v. 48) smiting their breasts.

This passage is a carefully articulated whole, a product of conscious art. But in the Gospel as we have it now the section is broken at two points, at v. 38, where the reference to the superscription is thrust in, and at v. 44f., where we have the account of two 'wonders,' the Darkness and

the Rending of the Veil. That both passages are also taken from St. Mark suggests the view that they are additions to St. Luke's earlier and independent narrative. This suggestion is further strengthened by the fact that Lk 23^{44f.} is a composite passage; that is to say, it is made up of two different parts, the Darkness and the Rending, which appear separately in St. Mark. As a matter of fact, in St. Mark the reference to the Rending follows the description of the Death. It is surely easier to suppose that the two 'wonders' have been brought together and fitted into an already existing narrative, than it is to think that they have been connected first of all and then made a kind of foundation upon which the Lukan account of the Crucifixion is built. It should further be observed that with the omission of Lk 22^{44f.} the dying cry of Jesus follows immediately upon His last words to the Penitent Thief, 'To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise'—a dramatic connexion, which, if our contention is sound, it may have been the original intention of St. Luke to suggest.

In conclusion, attention must be called to the twelve instances of 'displacement' or variation of order in St. Luke's Passion-Narrative when compared with that of St. Mark. No less than half of them appear in our list. I suggest that they are due to the expansion of Proto-Luke by Markan additions. If so, we have in this fact a clue to

St. Luke's procedure. His own Passion-Narrative already exists in writing when he reads the Markan account for the first time. He sees no reason to replace his own record by that of St. Mark, but is willing to enrich his narrative by certain additions from that work. That, in certain cases, 'displacements' are caused is only what antecedently we might expect.

So far, then, as the Passion-Narrative is concerned, the facts give strong support to Canon Streeter's theory. As we have said, the whole Gospel needs to be examined before anything like a final conclusion can be reached. Meantime it is enough to say that so far as the Passion-Narrative is concerned, the evidence points to a Lukan writing which is earlier than St. Mark's Gospel. Clearly, Lukan 'stock' is rising!

Note.—Since writing the above, I have observed that, with the exception of the first two items, the list of Markan additions to St. Luke's Passion-Narrative follows the exact order in which these passages occur in St. Mark's Gospel. This feature, which is in line with St. Luke's treatment of the Second Gospel elsewhere, seems to offer some degree of confirmation to the argument. St. Luke appears to have added the Markan passages one by one in the same order in which they occurred in his source.

Literature.

EDWARD CAIRD.

SIR HENRY JONES and Professor J. H. Muirhead have together written *The Life and Philosophy of Edward Caird, LL.D., D.C.L., F.B.A.* (Maclehose; 25s. net). They do not tell us how they divided the task between them. It seems sometimes as if Sir Henry Jones had written the text and Professor Muirhead the footnotes; but probably Professor Muirhead had a larger share than that. In any case it is a well-written book.

Edward Caird was born in Greenock on the 23rd day of March, 1835, the fifth of seven sons, six of whom lived till they were more than seventy years of age. Four of them took to making money, and made it. John (the eldest) and Edward took to

making men, and made them. John was a preacher, Edward a professor. The preacher could not teach and the teacher could not preach. But both succeeded in their high ambition. John was minister of Errol in Perthshire. He soon became known throughout Scotland as a preacher. So his biographers tell us. But go to Errol and you hear another story. The church was not well filled (it was soon after the Disruption). Some one proposed that a curtain should be drawn across the middle. 'Na, na,' said the beadle, 'just bide a wee till we get a mair pop'lar preacher.'

Edward too had thoughts of entering the ministry of the Church of Scotland. The discovery that he could not preach is given as his reason for turning to teaching. It is evident, however, that