

the Bible is so great that I think it is best to put none of them into the hands of young pupils. Close acquaintance with the text, such as was more common in past generations than in this—whole chapters learnt by heart, bring a power of interpretation which often gives to quite simple-minded and uneducated people a wonderful understanding of the meaning of very difficult passages. The mind soaked in the very words of Scripture creates for itself an atmosphere which is favourable for the apprehension of it; long pondering over words draws out the hidden meaning; it is as when you read over and over a bit of 'unseen' translation till it gradually shapes itself into sense. No child should leave school without having learnt by heart many Psalms, Proverbs 3, Job 28, Isaiah 53, the Beatitudes (or the whole Sermon on the Mount), the great parables, and St. John 14, 15, 16, and as much more as can be managed.

I know that many teachers fear that the Bible, with its very outspoken language, may bring children too soon to a knowledge of things which should only come with riper years. I think that when children are too young to understand, they do not notice these sayings—there is nothing in

their minds to which they can catch on; and when they are older, and have to learn something of the mysteries of the beginning of life, there is no way by which the knowledge can come so wholesomely as by the simple, straight, pure words of Holy Scripture, familiar to them since their childhood, gradually coming to have a meaning for them.

As to passages which one would never wish them to read, they will not come across them unless they search for them, and any child who has so much evil curiosity as to wish to do that, is an abnormal case and would need special treatment, and would certainly get hold of a Bible for wrong use, even if it were not put into her hands for instruction. I am sure that such cases are rare, and need not count for our general principle of dealing with children. I have an unshaken conviction that the Scriptures are able to make our children 'wise unto salvation through the faith which is in Christ Jesus.' Through faith—'Credo ut intellegam'—I believe that I may know; and it is because I believe that I would lead a child fearlessly in pursuit of truth—from whatever source derived—sure that it can only lead us to Him who is the Truth.

St. Luke's Passion-Narrative considered with Reference to the Synoptic Problem.

By THE REV. CANON SIR JOHN C. HAWKINS, BART., M.A., OXFORD.

IF the principle that the Second Gospel is older than the First and Third, and is used in them as a *Grundschrift* and framework, to which introductions, insertions, and conclusions are added by the respective compilers, is ever dislodged from its present position of general acceptance among students of the Synoptic Problem, it will be because its advocates state it too broadly, and without due exceptions and qualifications. It is therefore very important that these should be distinctly recognized and acknowledged. The chief *exceptions* are St. Luke's two 'interpolations' (6²⁰⁻⁸³ and 9⁵¹⁻¹⁸¹⁴), as to which I have been allowed to point out in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (xiv. 18 ff., 90 ff., 137 ff.) that the Marcan source seems to have been entirely disused in them; and his 'great omission' (after Lk 9¹⁷) of all

the matter contained in Mk 6⁴⁵⁻⁸²⁶ may be regarded as an exception of another kind. The chief *qualification* of the principle, as distinguished from actual exceptions to it, is that exhibited in Mt 8-13, where the order of the Marcan narrative is but little regarded, though nearly the whole of its substance is preserved (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xii. 471 ff., xiii. 20 ff.; also Mr. Allen's 'Critical Study' in xi. 279 ff.). I wish now to conclude this series of articles by pointing out that another qualification, though of a less conspicuous kind, is to be found in Lk 22¹⁴⁻²⁴¹⁰, which may be described with sufficient accuracy for our present purpose as St. Luke's Passion-narrative, though it commences with the institution of the Lord's Supper, and includes the visit of the women to the empty

tomb. There the Marcan source is not indeed deserted, as it apparently is in the three divisions of Luke above referred to; nor is its main order departed from, as in Mt 8-13, but that source is used with a freedom, as to details both of matter and of order, to which there is no parallel elsewhere in any considerable department of the two Gospels that are founded upon it.

I propose to give proofs of this statement, and then to suggest a certain significance that it seems to have as bearing upon the authorship and composition of the Third Gospel.

That these 123 verses of Passion-narrative are rightly reckoned among those portions of Luke, forming 469 verses out of 1149, or about two-fifths of the Gospel, which are to be regarded as in some sense founded upon the Marcan basis, will be generally admitted. The proof of this lies not only or chiefly in the main sequence of events, which indeed could not be very different in the Passion-narratives, and which is to a large extent paralleled in the Fourth Gospel also, but also and most forcibly in the smaller structural and verbal similarities to Mark (who is here closely followed throughout by Matthew) which appear in such verses as Lk 22¹⁸. 22. 42. 46. 47. 52f. 54b. 61. 71. 23²². 26. 34b. 44f. 46. 52f. 24^{6a}.

Our attention therefore may be mainly directed to the other task of showing the unusual and remarkable freedom with which Luke here uses his fundamental source. This may be best exhibited by way of contrast (I.) with Matthew's procedure in his parallel Passion-narrative, and (II.) with Luke's own procedure in the other parts of his Gospel which rest upon the same basis.

I.

i. The degrees of closeness with which Mark's wording is followed in any parts of the First and Third Gospels respectively may be ascertained with a very near approach to accuracy by a method which Mr. Rushbrooke's invaluable *Synopticon* makes practicable. There it may be seen how many of the words used in any passage of any one Gospel are reproduced, wholly or in part, in the corresponding passage of any other Gospel. Thus, to take one short verse as an illustration, in Lk 22⁴², which contains 19 words, 12 words are either wholly or in part printed in red or in spaced type, thus showing that those 12 words are, either in their entirety as *παρένευχε* and the 5 following words,

or in part as the *θελ* in *θέλημα*, found also in Mk 14³⁶. Now if we examine in that way both the 123 verses of Luke's Passion-narrative and also the 130 verses of Matthew's parallel narrative, which extend from 26²⁰ to 28⁶, and if we tabulate and compare the results of those examinations, so as to show the amount of agreement with Mark's wording which those narratives respectively show, a very striking contrast presents itself. Matthew's narrative contains 2083 words; and of these we find that 1070 words, being about 51 per cent., or a trifle more than half, agree either wholly or in part with the words used in Mark. Luke's narrative contains 1906 words; but of these only 507 words, being not much more than a quarter, or about 27 per cent., are found either wholly or partially in Mark. That is to say, *Matthew adheres to Mark's language very nearly twice as closely as Luke does*—surely a very notable and significant contrast, as implying very different ways of dealing with the same source. And to those who hold—as it seems to me impossible to avoid holding—that both oral and documentary transmission had shares in the formation of the First and Third Gospels, the natural inference will be that in this part of Matthew the documentary mode of transmission, and in this part of Luke the oral mode, very largely preponderated.

ii. The same inference may be drawn, though less definitely and less directly, if we compare the two Passion-narratives in a less mechanical way, paying attention, not to the amount of verbal alteration from Mark shown in them, but to the amount of distinctly new matter which they respectively add to that source, thus supplying us with additional information. No doubt opinions will differ to a certain extent as to what should thus be classed as distinctly new matter, but I think that in Matthew we may thus label 25 complete verses and 2 half verses, viz. 26²⁵. 50a. 52-54. 27³⁻¹⁰. 19. 24f. 43. 51b. 52f. 62-66. 28². 4, besides a few brief phrases, of which *εις ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* (26²⁸) is perhaps the most important. In Luke, on the other hand, the new information given us (excluding 22²⁴⁻²⁷ as being probably transferred from Mk 9^{34f.} and 10⁴²⁻⁴⁵) may be fairly estimated as filling 33 verses and 3 half verses, viz. 22^{28f.} 30 (cf., however, Mt 19²⁸) 31f. 35-38. 48f. 51. 61a. 67b. 68. 23². 5-12. 15. 27-31. 40-43. 46b. 48, besides some briefer additions, such as *ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα* (22⁶⁶). There are also 3 such verses and 2 half verses which have not

been reckoned here, being those which are double-bracketed by W.H. as probably insertions by a later hand than Luke's (22^{19b}, 20, 48f. 23^{34a}). And it has not been thought necessary to complicate the comparison by referring to additions to Mark which are identical in Matthew and Luke, for these, so far as they have any importance at all, are limited to two, viz. *τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε* in Mt 26⁶⁸, Lk 22⁶⁴, and *ἐξέλωθ' ἑξέω . . . πικρῶς* in Mt 26⁷⁵, Lk 22⁶²; cf. also Mt 27⁵⁴ with Lk 23⁴⁷. It may be remarked in passing that the extreme fewness and slightness of these correspondences seems to show that the (? Logian) source upon which Matthew and Luke had previously drawn so largely did not extend over the period of the Passion.

We have seen, then, that the new or non-Marcian information given in Luke's Passion-narrative only exceeds in amount that given in Matthew's to a comparatively small extent, the proportion between the two being only about four to three (34½ verses against 26, according to the above approximate estimates). That small excess would in itself be hardly worth our notice. But it is certainly important to observe that the difference between the two narratives *as to the way in which the new matter is introduced*, is very much more marked—so much so that in *Synopticon*, while two of its large pages (195 f.) suffice for exhibiting Matthew's 'single tradition,' fully five of them (from the middle of p. 227 to the middle of p. 232) are required for Luke's 'single tradition.' The cause of this notable difference is that Matthew's additions are, in nearly every case, simply insertions into the Marcan text—insertions generally made without involving any alterations in that text, though occasionally causing slight modifications of a few words at the points where the older narrative is resumed, as in 26⁵⁵ 27^{11.26}. So it will be found—except only in 28²⁻⁴, where the matter is complicated by the previous notice of the setting of the watch—that if one strikes out with a pen the Matthaean insertions, it will need only a few more strokes of that pen in order to remove the few resumptive words, and thus to make the narrative as consecutive and as intelligible as in the original Marcan text. But the case is very different when we turn to Luke's additions, for we find that the Marcan narrative is in many cases very considerably modified for the sake of them. To work out this point in detail would require more space than

can be given here; but striking instances may be seen in the setting and environment of Lk 22^{31f. 67f. 23^{5-12. 40-48}}. The old and the new matter are so blended that the one is often unintelligible without the other. And therefore it was, for the sake of intelligibility, that it was found necessary to print in *Synopticon* so many Lucan verses which are substantially parallel to Mark, besides those which are simply Lucan additions; and thus, as has been already said, while the proportion of actually new Lucan matter to actually new Matthaean matter is only about four to three, the amount of space required to display them respectively is in the proportion of five to two.

Here again, then, we find in Luke a freedom of adaptation which points to just such modifications and expansions of the Marcan source as would occur in the course of continued oral use of it, while Matthew's procedure is that of a man who adhered as closely as he could—or at any rate very closely—to his Marcan MS., even when he had to make insertions into it.

iii. A third distinction which may be observed between the habits of the two compilers points still more decidedly in the same direction. Transpositions or inversions, both verbal and substantial, of Mark's order, are unusually and remarkably frequent in Luke's Passion-narrative. The number of them is no less than 12. With the exceptions of Nos. 1 and 2 in the list, perhaps none of them have any practical importance in the way of giving us different impressions as to the course of events. The others are unimportant in themselves, being chiefly such transpositions of statements as do not necessarily imply any transposition of the facts referred to; but does not their very unimportance make it unlikely that a compiler using a MS. source would have taken the trouble to make such alterations from its order?

The list of the transpositions is as follows (it will be seen that Matthew always follows Mark, except in No. 11, where he does not supply a parallel):—

1. In Lk 22¹⁵⁻²³ the reference to the coming betrayal is recorded *after*, in Mt 14¹⁸⁻²⁵ (so Mt 26²¹⁻²⁹) it is recorded *before*, the institution of the Lord's Supper. This difference is highly important and interesting in its bearing on the question whether Judas was one of those who received the eucharistic bread and wine.

2. (a) If the short Western text preferred by

W.H. is adopted in Lk 22¹⁷⁻²⁰, the only cup mentioned is given *before* the bread at the Last Supper (cf. 1 Cor 10¹⁶ and *Didache* 9), and not *after* it, as in Mk 14²²⁻²⁴ (so Mt 26²⁶⁻²⁸).

(b) If the usual and longer text is there followed, there is a transposition of another kind connected with the institution of the Lord's Supper; for the saying, 'I will not drink from henceforth,' etc., in Lk 22¹⁸⁻²⁰ *precedes*, while in Mk 14²²⁻²⁵ (so Mt 26²⁶⁻²⁹) it *follows*, the words of institution.

It is true that both these transpositions are avoided by the arrangement of the narrative in b and e, and very similarly in Syr^{ur} and Syr^{sin}; but almost certainly such arrangement was not original, but made for harmonistic purposes.

3. In Lk 22²¹⁻²³ the intimation that the traitor would be one who was then present at the table, and the woe pronounced upon him, *precede*, in Mk 14¹⁹⁻²¹ (so Mt 26²²⁻²⁴) they *follow*, the questioning of the apostles as to which of them should be the traitor. It is possible, however, that the questioning among themselves in Luke is to be regarded as an incident distinct from the question 'Is it I?' addressed by them to Jesus in Mark and Matthew.

4. In Lk 22^{33f.} Peter's denial is foretold *before*, in Mk 14²⁹⁻³² (so Mt 26³³⁻³⁵) *after*, the departure from the supper room.

5. In Lk 22⁶⁶⁻⁷¹ Peter's denials are recorded *before* the examination before the high priest and the mockery by the soldiers there, but in Mk 14⁵⁵⁻⁷² (so Mt 26⁵⁹⁻⁷⁵) *after* those incidents. Here, however, Luke's reason for making the transposition is obvious; it was in order to bring together in his vv. 55 and 56 the statements which Mark separates in his vv. 54 and 66.

6. And in Lk 22⁶³⁻⁷¹ the mockery is related *before*, but in Mk 14⁵⁵⁻⁶⁵ (so Mt 26⁵⁹⁻⁶⁸) *after*, the examination.

Thus the joint result of the transpositions numbered 6 and 7 is that the three incidents are recorded in these different orders (note yet another arrangement in Jn 18¹²⁻²⁷):—

<p>LUKE.</p> <p>1. Denials.</p> <p>2. Mockery.</p> <p>3. Examination.</p>		<p>MARK (and MATTHEW).</p> <p>1. Examination.</p> <p>2. Mockery.</p> <p>3. Denials.</p>
---	--	---

7. In Lk 23³⁵⁻³⁸ the superscription on the cross is not mentioned until *after* the reviling and mockery by the rulers and soldiers, though *before* that by the one malefactor; but in Mk 15²⁶⁻³² (so

Mt 27³⁷⁻⁴⁴) the mention of the superscription *precedes* the mockery of passers-by and chief priests and soldiers, as well as the reproaches of the two malefactors.

8. In Lk 23³⁶, as has just been said, mockery is ascribed to the soldiers in connexion with offering the vinegar (a connexion perhaps suggested by Ps 69^{21f.}) when Jesus is on the cross; but mockery from soldiers is only mentioned by Mark at a much earlier stage, viz. in chap. 15¹⁶⁻²⁰ (so Mt 27²⁷⁻³¹) referring to the Prætorium. Luke also speaks of Herod's soldiers as mocking (23¹¹). Of course it is possible that three distinct incidents, or at least two, may be referred to; but some amount of transposition seems far more probable, judging from the analogy of other cases in which such transferences of words undoubtedly took place.

9. In Lk 23^{45f.} the rending of the veil is recorded *before*, in Mk 15^{37f.} (so Mt 27^{50f.}) *after*, the death of Jesus.

10. The time of the deposition and burial, viz. the evening of the day of preparation, is only mentioned by Luke (23⁵⁰⁻⁵⁴) *after* his account of the request of Joseph and the entombment, but it is named *before* those incidents in Mk 15⁴²⁻⁴⁶ (so *ὀψίας* in Mt 27⁵⁷). In Luke the notice of time seems also to have reference to the following statement about the women.

11. In Lk 23⁵⁶ the preparing of spices and ointments is mentioned *before* the Sabbath is named, and, if we had no other information, we should have supposed that this work was done on the eve of the day of rest; in Mk 16¹ the spices are said to have been bought when the Sabbath was *past*. Matthew has no mention of spices or ointments.

12. Luke, in 24¹⁻¹⁰, does not give the names of the women until *after* he has described their visit to the tomb; Mark, in 16¹⁻⁸ (so Mt 28¹⁻⁸), *commences* his account by naming them.

Thus Luke exhibits twelve transpositions from Mark, where Matthew exhibits none. Now such inversions of order are very much more likely to occur in oral than in documentary transmission. The experience of those who have had personal experience of both these methods of reproduction of sources, on the one hand as extempore preachers or teachers, and on the other hand as authors, or even as copyists of extracts into their own notebooks, will have shown them that writers are very

unlikely to make changes in the order of the materials before them, except for some special purpose, but that such inversions are constantly occurring in the course of *memoriter* narration and instruction. (See Wright, *New Testament Problems*, pp. 91, 136 f.; also the present writer's *Hora Synoptica*, p. 62 f.)

We have seen, then, in three distinct ways, the remarkable freedom with which Luke, as contrasted with Matthew, uses in his Passion-narrative the Marcan *Grundschrift*. And in each case the freedom appeared to be of such a kind as was likely to result from oral use of the source.

(To be continued.)

At the Literary Table.

A HANDBOOK OF CHURCH HISTORY.

Religious Tract Society. 6s. net.

MANY have taken in hand to write short histories of the Church, but few have attained to any success therein. So the man must be desperate for work to do, or else possessed of overmastering desire to do this work, who once more attempts to comprehend the History of the Church in a single volume. Dr. Samuel G. Green has never been in straits for want of occupation. He felt that the History of the Church to the Reformation had to be written by him.

What has he made of it? His first aim seems to have been to be fair. There are two ways of taking a man or a movement. One is to discover the meanness of the man's motives, to see nothing but mischief in the movement. The other way is Dr. Green's. To use words of Canon Henson's this month in speaking of another historian, he has 'something like an intuitive perception of the higher elements in every man, and seeks to divine and utter their often half-understood and clumsily expressed ideals.' Much depends upon the sources an historian uses. However good his personal intention, he cannot be fair if he does not seek the truth on every side. Dr. Green's history is a people's history, and he does not parade his scholarship, but there is no doubt that he has used good authorities and without respect of person or of party.

The other feature of the book to note is this. It is a modern book. The history of the Church is not written in the language of mediævalism, but in modern language; the judgments it expresses are the author's own judgments. For the old way of writing history, by ill-disguised quotation and ill-digested opinion, is obsolete. What is called

the historical imagination, the true historian's first great gift, enables the modern writer to see as the ancients saw, and yet be modern still. And so the History of the Church is a development, the present and the past have no lost links between them, and God is never absent.

This is Dr. Green's best work. He may never do better work than this.

A SHORT HISTORY OF ANCIENT PEOPLES.

Hodder & Stoughton. 12s.

It is something to comprehend a History of the Church in one volume; it is something more to comprehend a History of the Ancient World. Dr. Samuel Green essayed and accomplished the former task. The latter has been attempted by Robinson Souttar, M.A., D.C.L. Has he accomplished it?

For the scholar he has not, but for the general reader he has. His statements are too confident for the scholar; the general reader will have confident statements or none at all. The scholar expects qualifications, authorities, what not; the general reader casts the book aside that contains them. The third chapter on Babylonia opens with 'Khammurabi (the Amraphel of the Old Testament)'—and the scholar is arrested. What proof have you for that parenthesis? Dr. Souttar does not write for the scholar. He writes for the general reader. And if that parenthesis is not proved, it is at least picturesque and possible. The scholar reads the list of authorities prefixed to the history of the Hebrews—The Bible; Josephus and Milman; five volumes by Professor Sayce, one by Professor Hommel, and one by Colonel Conder—and he is aghast. The general