

REVIEWS

THE LOST SOURCE OF OUR LORD'S SAYINGS.

Sprüche und Reden Jesu, Die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas,
von ADOLF HARNACK. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1907.)

IN Dr Abbott's charming book *Silanus the Christian* we are shewn a glimpse of Justin Martyr coming away cross and flustered from a dispute with some Jews about Isaiah vii 14. It is of course an undignified state of mind for a Christian and a Philosopher, but I am sure all our sympathies go out to him, when we are told in the next paragraph that he had committed himself in writing upon the subject in dispute and that there was nothing for him but to retract or face it out. My own sympathies are especially vivid, for I find myself in St Justin's place. I cannot but remember, when I attempt to review Dr Harnack's *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, that I have already committed myself to the doctrine that it is hazardous to attempt to reconstruct the lost common Source of Matthew and Luke. Dr Harnack's book is a most courageous attempt to reconstruct this Source; it would be unseemly, therefore, not to warn the readers of this JOURNAL beforehand that I dare not claim to be an impartial critic.

That *Sprüche und Reden Jesu* is extraordinarily fresh and constructive, is only what we should expect. Besides this it is exceedingly sane. 'Wir miissen uns bescheiden,' says Harnack (p. 130), and he is indeed exceedingly discreet in his reconstruction of the lost Source (Q). He will put hardly anything into it but what is preserved both by Matthew and by Luke. No doubt this is the safest course, but those who adopt it are bound to be exceedingly discreet in pronouncing upon the general character of their final reconstruction. With some reserves we may accept Harnack's arguments for regarding Q as a single source (pp. 125, 126); and that granted, we may go on with some confidence to accept all the 59 sections, some long and some short, which Harnack accepts. But I must confess that I am not equally persuaded by his arguments to prove that these 59 fragments include all the essential features of the lost document.

According to Harnack 'Q is a collection of Discourses and Sayings of Jesus, not arranged so as to lead up to the Passion but having almost

exclusively a Galilean horizon, a document free from special bias, whether apologetic, doctrinal, political, national or anti-national' (p. 121). It begins with the Preaching of John, describes the Baptism of Jesus and His Temptation, then gives large portions of the Sermon on the Mount, then the stories of the Centurion's servant, the missionary discourse to the Disciples, the discourses about the Baptist and about Chorazin, the saying 'I thank Thee, Father', the discourses about Beelzebul and about Jonah, the Woes upon the Pharisees, the warning about false Messiahs and about the Coming of the Son of Man as a thief in the night, and finally the sayings 'He that hath, to him shall be given', and that the Disciples shall rule the Twelve Tribes of Israel (p. 126).¹ To quote Harnack's own words (p. 120): 'That therefore which in the Synoptic Gospels, following the pattern set by Mark, is the principal thing—viz. the preparation for the Passion, the discourses which have the Passion for theme, and finally the story of the Passion itself,—all this, so far as we can judge, is entirely wanting in Q. In this lies the fundamental difference between the Gospels and Q: it is not a Gospel at all.'

'By the fruit the tree is known' (Q § 11): I find it difficult to believe that a critical method is wholly to be trusted, which presents us with a document that starts off with the story of our Lord's Baptism, and then gives us His Words but not the story of the Cross and Resurrection. According to Harnack, Q was intended for a Christian community, which therefore did not need the proof that their Master was the Son of God (p. 163). We might answer, why was it worth while in that case to insert the story of the Baptism of Jesus? I venture to think there is a deep-seated defect in Professor Harnack's method, and further that his restoration of Q is imperfect, because he has attempted a task for which sufficient materials do not survive.

The main question can be very well discussed with reference to the Lord's Prayer (Q § 27 : p. 47 f). Harnack gives his reasons for thinking it had a place in Q, and that it ran as follows: 'Father, our bread for the coming day give us to-day, and forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors, and bring us not into temptation.'

Here indeed the axe has come to the root of the tree! We may perhaps agree that 'Our Father, which art in heaven' is in the manner of Matthew, and that Luke's entire omission of 'Thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth' and of 'Deliver us from the Evil One' is a valid argument that these clauses, whatever their origin, did not stand in the common source. We may even go on to concede to Harnack that St Luke according to the true text began the Prayer thus: 'Father, Thy holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us,' instead of 'Father, Thy

¹ That this is the conclusion of Q is again affirmed on p. 155.

Name be hallowed, Thy Kingdom come', although I venture to think there are serious difficulties about this concession. But what forbids us to regard 'Thy holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us' as having been from the beginning St Luke's *alternative* to 'Thy Name be hallowed, Thy Kingdom come'? That the familiar clauses are eminently Jewish in tone is true, but is it not from every point of view likely that Jesus taught the Disciples to pray to the Father that His Kingdom might come? That is, from every point of view except that of those who were inclined to teach that the Kingdom had come already. The most we can say is that Dr Harnack makes out a plausible case for omitting 'Thy Kingdom come' and that an equally plausible case can be made for retaining the words.

But if the matter stands so, what solid argument can be drawn from the absence of the clause in Harnack's reconstruction?

I cannot but ask myself what kind of a document St Mark's Gospel would appear to have been, if it had been reconstructed on Harnack's principles from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Should we not miss just the most striking characteristics of Mark? We should miss the unclean devil in the synagogue at Capernaum followed by our Lord's departure next day to a desert place to pray (Mk. i 23-28, 35-38), and we should miss the story of the Widow's Mite (Mk. xii 41-44), for they have no attestation from St Matthew. The latter story indeed would have seemed characteristic of the special tendencies of Luke with its contempt for the rich and its sympathy with widows. The language is definitely Lucan; out of the 58 words in which the story is told, four (ὁ ἄγιος, ἡ Χωρὸς, ΤΙΣ with nouns, *yyipa*) figure in Sir John Hawkins's list of words characteristic of St Luke's Gospel, not to speak of the phrase δαΐς & ος *\iya>* which is actually peculiar to Luke. If we did not know to the contrary, should we not have felt perfectly justified in assigning the Widow's Mite to the 'Sondergut des dritten Ev.'? To come to still more important matters, what right should we have to assign to the lost common Source of Matthew and Luke those extensive sections which Luke altogether omits? The murder of John the Baptist (Mk. vi 21-29), Christ walking on the water (Mk. vi 45-56), the whole of Mk. vii and viii 1-29, so important historically as giving the outline of our Lord's long exile to the north of Galilee, all these sections of Mark would appear as peculiarities of Matthew. And as Matthew is well known to be much given to 'doublets', he would have been a rash man who would have ventured to assign the Feeding of the 4000 a place in the common document underlying Luke as well as Matthew.

Besides these and similar passages, where the reconstructor of Mark from Matthew and Luke might fail to recognize genuine portions of

the source when preserved only in one of his documents, there remain those elements which as a matter of fact he could not reproduce, because they have been preserved in neither source. But when we are trying to estimate the tendencies and characteristics of St Mark's Gospel it is just by the peculiarities of that Gospel that the tendencies and characteristics are especially revealed. The historical picture of our Lord and His work which would be presented by a reconstruction of Mark out of what Matthew and Luke had in common would not be a caricature, but in comparison with the real Mark it would be a headless, armless torso. Indeed it would be less than a torso, for it would be composed of fragments, many of which did not even fit together. And it would be just the individual features which would be worst preserved. We should not know that in the real Mark our Lord had said 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath' or that His friends thought that He was mad. We should not have any idea that Mark contained the Parable of the Ear of Corn growing of itself. We should not know that it contained the Aramaic sayings *Talitha cumi* and *Ephphatha*, sayings which greatly raise its historical credit. We could not have reconstructed out of Matthew and Luke the important historical notice that Jesus when He last passed through Galilee 'would not that any man should know it', or that He began His answer about the Great Commandment with the 'Hear, O Israel!' All these things are features really characteristic of Mark; it is the presence of these strongly individual features in the Gospel of Mark which gives it its pre-eminence as a historical document. But not one of them would be found in a Mark reconstructed out of Matthew and Luke according to Harnack's method.

When therefore we find Harnack telling us that Q is 'von apologetischen und partikularen Tendenzen frei', I cannot help wondering whether this venerable document may not have lost some of its more individual property in the process of reconstruction. First it was taken to pieces by St Matthew and St Luke, and now it has been put together again by Dr Harnack. I find it very difficult to believe that it is all there, or even that enough is there to enable us to judge it as a literary whole. As I said at the beginning of this review, I cannot claim to be impartial. I have convinced myself that Q is a real 'Gospel' and that it contained a story of the Passion, and I still cling to my prejudices even after reading Dr Harnack's arguments on the other side.

It would be ungracious to conclude without pointing out one or two of the many excellent sayings and judgements to be found by the way in Harnack's book. A great deal of discussion is devoted to the relative fidelity of Matthew and Luke to their authority. On the whole

Harnack's conclusions are that Matthew is the more faithful both in language and arrangement, but he has seriously altered Q in certain very important passages (e.g. Matt, v 32, vi 33, xii 40). Luke has changed more for reasons of style, and has split up some of the Discourses in order to fit them into his historical scheme, but on the other hand has preserved much of the original freshness and unconventionality of the Sayings (pp. 30, 174). It is noteworthy that Harnack (p. 20) thinks 'Spirit of God' more original than 'Finger of God' in the Discourse about Beelzebul (Matt, xii 28 more original than Lk. xi 20): according to his view 'Finger' comes from St Luke's study of Exod. viii 19.

On p. 9 the interesting observation is made, based on an examination of several passages, that Luke avoids rhetorical questions, e.g., where Matthew has 'is not the life more than the meat?' we find in Luke 'for the life is more than meat'. It is perhaps worth while to notice that Lk. xiii 20 (p. 23) and Lk. vi 39 (p. 24) shew that this tendency is not consistently carried out.

Harnack has of course no doubt that Q contained the story of the Centurion's servant, and he makes the remark that the true parallel in Mark is not the raising of Jairus's daughter, as Wellhausen suggests, but the story of the Syrophenician Woman (p. 147). He does not discuss the genuineness of the words 'when He was entered into Capernaum' in Matt, viii 5. In their place the Latin Codex Bobiensis (*k*) and the Sinai Palimpsest have simply 'after these things': probably therefore the mention of Capernaum is due to Luke alone, and no place was named in Q at all.

Even more important for the theological dialect of Q is the omission of *KCU TTTtoxl caye AifjTcu* by *k* and Syr. *sin* in Matt, xi 5, this time supported by Clement 151. I venture to think there can be little doubt that the clause is St Luke's own insertion, and that it gives his quite correct interpretation of the inner meaning of the rest of this Saying of our Lord.¹

All these questions, however, yield in importance to the main question of the general contents of Q, whether our materials are sufficient for us to reconstruct it substantially as a whole. Dr Harnack in this book gives us a clear answer, and with commendable courage he puts before us his picture of Q. As he conceives it, it is a work like one of the old prophecies, opening with the account of how Jesus was consecrated by Baptism to deliver His Father's Message, and then proceeding to tell the Christian Community what that Message was. But just those parts of the Evangelical Tradition which St Paul found

¹ For a fuller discussion of these important readings may I be permitted to refer the reader to *Evangelion da-Mephaneshe* vol. ii pp. 237-239 ? . -

occasion expressly to hand on to his converts were, according to Harnack, absent. I do not think such a work is totally inconceivable, but I am not convinced that Harnack's Q is a demonstrated entity. Once again, I confess that I am not an impartial critic, but where shall such an one be found ?

F. C. BURKITT.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: the Greek Text with Notes and Addenda by the late BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Lord Bishop of Durham. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1906.)

A FIRST general impression which this volume will make, I think, upon the student will be that the editor, the Rev. J. M. Schulhof, has done his difficult part remarkably well. He has had to finish a work left unfinished by its author, and he has done this with the reverent devotion which Bishop Westcott was able to awaken in his friends and pupils. He has spared no expenditure of pains or of time, and the additions he has made to what the Bishop left written—for there is no indication of any omissions—are marked by modesty and intelligence. To a considerable extent Mr Schulhof has been able to draw upon other writings of Bishop Westcott for matter illustrating the Epistle to the Ephesians. His aim has been to present 'the total ascertainable result of Bishop Westcott's meditation' on this Epistle.

The volume belongs to the class of large and abundant commentaries, of which Westcott's own works on St John and Hebrews are good examples. In the preparing of such editions the writer's object is not to limit what he gives us to direct explanation and illustration of the text, but to accumulate whatever seems to him interesting in connexion with it. In this volume the running notes, which the bishop seems to have left in a fairly completed state, and which are characteristically full, are preceded by some fifty pages of introductory matter, and followed by the Latin Vulgate and the two English versions of Wiclif and Tyndale, Appendices on Heads of Doctrine, and on Special Words and Topics, and a Greek vocabulary of the Epistle. The editor has most appropriately made use of illustrative passages from Hort and from Lightfoot; but the form and the substance of all the additions may be said to be Westcott's throughout. Whatever is not Westcott's is Westcottian.

It need not be said to those who are familiar with Bishop Westcott's Commentaries that he delighted in verbal analysis. He may be described