appointed bread and wine (or even grape-juice) as its outward and visible sign. But such speculations, of course incapable of verification, cannot count as argument.

To sum up:

Our Articles repudiate all demands of Church Councils in regard to human duty which cannot be supported from Scripture; and the want of such support for the ban of the unfermented Cup by the 1888 Conference seems to deprive it of any imperative claim on the obedience of Church members.

Pending suggestions for modifying its application, from some quarter to which all would defer, it seems desirable that no change should be made in the ordinary practice of most of our churches.

Where, however, very special circumstances exist—as, for example, in the case of a parish where a greatly preponderating number of the communicants strongly desire the change—it is for the Ordinary to consider whether a congregation adopting the unfermented Cup should in any way be penalized.

It seems exceedingly desirable that it should be ascertained whether it is practicable to supply genuine and unadulterated grape-juice, unfermented, at reasonable cost, in a form suited for convenient use in our churches. Should that prove to be the case, the writer is inclined to think that in course of time the unfermented Cup will slowly survive theoretical objection, and emerge eventually into universal preference and adoption in the Anglican Communion.

A New View of the Synoptic Problem.

By the REV. G. BLADON, M.A.

IT has again and again happened that help towards the solution of problems which have puzzled men's minds for long periods has come from some comparatively small matter, which has been overlooked. Like the lion in Æsop's fable, release from the net has come from a mouse.

And it may be that the synoptic problem of undying interest may find—I will not say solution, that is not in the least likely; but light, if only that important factor in early Church life—the work of the catechists—receive fuller consideration.

Before, however, I speak of that work, I would point out that the problem is year by year becoming simplified; on certain matters there is now practical agreement, and even where this is not the case, the points of difference are better defined, and the limitations are better understood.

It is now almost universally admitted that there are three main sources: (1) St. Mark, even if not precisely our present second Gospel, an *Urmarcus* not materially different; (2) a collection, principally of discourses known to, and used by, both St. Matthew and St. Luke, commonly known by the symbol of Q; and (3) certain special sources, collected from different persons and from various places, some known only to one of the three Synoptists, some to two, and a few, perhaps, known to all. These three form what is commonly called the documentary bases; but the theory of an oral transmission of parts at any rate is not dead, though its exponents are quantitatively, though certainly not qualitatively, in a small minority. It once had the weighty name of Bishop Westcott; it still has that of Dr. Arthur Wright, and to some extent that of Sir J. C. Hawkins. And both Dr. Sanday and Harnack admit an element of truth.

Still, however, the problem remains of likeness combined with so much variation — a variation often apparently so purposeless.

And now, I think, more light comes from that much-neglected quarter—from the influence, that is, of the catechist. Teaching must have occupied an important place in the work of the Church in early days, and the influence of the teacher must therefore have been very great. We know that wherever St. Paul went he established Churches and ordained elders; if Corinth is an exception, as Dr. Charles Bigg thought, it is the only one. And such elders, even if not Jews, as in many cases

they would be, would for all that be largely under Synagogue influence, and we know that in the Synagogue teaching took a high position. Even when such elders were not Jews, the Greek influence would be quite as strong in the same direction. New Testament evidence on the subject is abundant, and is none the less decisive for being in the main indirect. The Beræans are praised as more noble than those in Thessalonica, because they searched the Scriptures—*i.e.*, they studied the writings. In Ephesus we read of St. Paul not disputing but holding argument (διαλεγόμενος) daily in the lecture-room of Tyrannus. Strongest of all is St. Luke's preface. Not only is the very word used, but as we read between the lines we see clearly that St. Luke felt that many of the catechists were not so competent as they ought to be, and that there was need of thoroughness. St. Paul also felt this need, as his Epistles clearly show.

The sense of the need of teaching, and the consequent presence of the teacher or catechist, will not, I think, be denied; now comes the question, What did the catechists teach? Oh that the archæologists may dig up for us a first-century equivalent of "Archdeacon Wilson's Notes," or the *Church Sunday School Magazine*. They may do; it is quite possible. In the meantime, until we get so fortunate a "find," we must make the best of such material as we have.

Is it not possible that we are richer than we know, and that we have already got in Q an early copy, not to say the very standard and model, of catechists' notes? No one, I must begin by admitting, has exactly so defined it. Professor Sanday, in his most valuable Oxford Lecture published in the *Expository Times* for December, 1908, regards it as "not a narrative Gospel, but mainly a collection of discourses." Sir William Ramsay ("Luke the Physician, and other Studies") also thinks it was mainly discourses and sayings, but thinks there was narrative, perhaps a good deal. Professor Burkitt, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, goes farther and holds that there was an account of the Passion; Sir William Ramsay also thinks this quite possible. But Professor Harnack, in his "Sayings of

Jesus," argues for discourses and sayings only, and thinks that it contained neither an account of the Passion, nor even such discourses as necessarily led up thereto.

In support of his theory he makes a thorough examination of the contents of what he believes to have been the original, and the result of such examination is as follows :

Q contained about sixty sections. Seven are narratives—the temptation, the centurion at Capernaum, the embassy of John the Baptist, the man who would follow if he might first bury his father, the Beelzebub controversy, the demand for a sign, and the question how often one ought to forgive. Eleven or twelve are parables and similitudes—blind leaders of the blind, good and corrupt tree, the house on the rock, the querulous children at play, the sheep and the wolves, the light under the bushel, the thief by night and the faithful and unfaithful steward, behaviour towards the adversary, the leaven, the mustard, the strait and narrow gate, and the lost sheep. To these he adds thirteen collections of sayings, such as the Lord's Prayer, the Beatitudes, the great thanksgiving to the Father, the denunciation of the Pharisees and others, and about twenty-nine single sayings, mostly ethical, such as the Golden Rule, "He that findeth his life," etc., and some words of encouragement to the disciples. This, he thinks, was the whole of Q, or at any rate practically the whole ; he allows no more. Q, he says, was not a Gospel ; it was a compilation of discourses and sayings of our Lord, the arrangement of which has no reference to the Passion, with an horizon which is as good as absolutely bounded by Galilee, with no clearly discernible purpose beyond that of imparting catechetical instruction.

And this conclusion agrees in the main with that of Dr. Sanday's, who says : "Q is the picture of the Christian ideal and of the character of Christ." And the opinion of Sir J. C. Hawkins in Section 5 of "Horæ Synopticæ" is *practically* to the same effect.

Both Professor Burkitt and Sir William Ramsay decline to accept Harnack's verdict. The former does indeed grant that

Q was "a single source," but is unpersuaded that Harnack's fragments included all the essential features of the lost document, and thinks Q was a real Gospel, and that it contained a story of the Passion.

Sir William Ramsay maintains that Harnack's verdict is seriously affected by his theological opinions; he thinks that Q contained far more than Harnack allows—probably much narrative, perhaps including that of the Passion, which both St. Luke and St. Matthew may have used.

Now, as each of these very seriously damages my theory of catechists' notes, I must examine them both for a minute or two.

I take Professor Burkitt first, who declares himself "not an impartial critic," and stands to his guns against Harnack. I also, if I may presumptuously compare myself, am "not impartial," and intend to stand to my guns against him.

First, I would say, if Q contained a Passion narrative, it must also have contained a Resurrection narrative. To separate the Resurrection from the Passion in a Gospel seems to me unthinkable. And if it did, why not that very Resurrection narrative, or rather those very evidentials of the fact of the Resurrection, which St. Paul has incorporated in 1 Cor. xv.? I am obstinately sure that the appearances there recorded were those which catechists always gave to their catechumens; the additional appearances given in each of the four Gospels were such supplements as the writer thought suitable for such readers as those for whom his own Gospel was especially designed. But let that pass.

Again, if Q was a Gospel, and so *valuable* a Gospel, and one so early in circulation that both St. Luke and St. Matthew knew it well, how is it that it has not only perished—*that* has been the fate of much early Christian literature—but is completely ignored by the Church historians? Four Gospels, and only four, is the universal tradition; Irenæus even founds an elaborate argument on the number. But here, according to Professor Burkitt, is a *fifth*, so good that both St. Luke and St. Matthew

incorporate large parts into their own Gospels, and that systematically.

Professor Burkitt says, indeed, that Q was "taken to pieces by St. Matthew and St. Luke, and now it has been put together again by Dr. Harnack." But "taken to pieces" is not quite a fair way of putting it, for Harnack shows that both St. Matthew and St. Luke have disturbed the order in Q very little indeed—that in the first thirteen sections they absolutely coincide in order, and that in the later sections they again agree. In other words, they treated Q with great respect. And as regards St. Matthew this is the more noticeable, because he does not scruple to group Christ's discourses and parables. Yet, if Professor Burkitt is right, so long as Q is only concerned with narratives, discourses, and sayings, they treat Q with the utmost deference; but when it comes to the Passion—and I would add the Resurrection—they treat it with no deference at all. Is this probable? I think not. And I venture to go farther, and say that Q was not a Gospel. If it were, then the difficulties of the synoptic problem are almost hopelessly increased; while if Q was catechists' notes—and not impossibly the earliest form of catechists' notes, as I maintain it was—you throw considerable light on the problem.

And now I turn to Sir William Ramsay. He agrees with Professor Burkitt in maintaining that Q contained more, both of narrative, discourses, and sayings, than Harnack puts into his recension. He holds, with Dr. Sanday, that Q was known to St. Mark and St. Paul; and he assigns to it a very early date, and even apostolic origin. "There is," he says, "only one possibility: the lost common source of Luke and Matthew (to which, as [Harnack] says, Luke attached even higher value than he did to Mark) was written while Christ was still living. It gives us the view which one of His disciples entertained of Him and His teaching during His lifetime, and may be regarded as authoritative for the view of the disciples generally. This extremely early date was what gave the lost source the high value that it had in the estimation of Matthew and Luke, and

yet justified the freedom with which they handled it and modified it by addition and explanation (for [Harnack's] comparison of the passages as they appear in Luke and Matthew shows that the lost common source was very freely treated by them). On the one hand, it was a document practically contemporary with the facts, and it registered the impression made on eye-witnesses by the words and acts of Christ; on the other hand, it was written before those words and acts had begun to be properly understood by even the most intelligent eye-witnesses" ("Luke the Physician, and other Studies," p. 89).

Now, I am quite willing to admit that it is not impossible that one, or more than one, of Christ's disciples may have taken notes of His sayings. But Sir William Ramsay seems to be on the horns of a dilemma. If such notes of sayings and discourses were combined after Pentecost with a narrative of the Passion and Resurrection, then Q was a Gospel, like the Synoptists, and all the objections which I have urged against Professor Burkitt apply, with the additional fact that it was the earliest and the most undoubtedly apostolic Gospel, of which no one knows anything, which is unaccountably lost, and to which no ecclesiastical writer even refers. If, on the other hand, there was no such combination of notes with a Passion and Resurrection narrative, then Sir William Ramsay only really differs from Harnack as regards the date and the purpose of such notes.

But the difficulties are very great. Why should Christ's disciples have taken notes, *except of His sayings*, during His lifetime? If they did, they would take them in Aramaic, as Harnack thinks Q originally was written; but Sir William Ramsay holds that Q was in Greek. And during His lifetime Christ's Apostles needed no *narrative*—no record of place and time, that is; but all—Dr. Sanday, Harnack, Professor Burkitt, and Sir William Ramsay himself—allow *some* narrative; Professor Burkitt says very much.

Altogether, I confess that I find Sir William Ramsay very hard to follow. And when he goes on to say (p. 97) that "it is

impossible to regard Q, or the original common source, as a practical catechetical manual drawn up about A.D. 60–70 for the use of teachers and pupils in the Christian doctrine, which is the view taken by esteemed friends, especially Dr. Sanday," I agree as regards the date. Q is *earlier* than A.D. 60—probably much earlier.

Q was catechists' notes, so I maintain, and for these reasons :

First, its original language, as Harnack thinks, though not Sir William Ramsay, was Aramaic. Harnack argues this from the usage and non-usage of certain prepositions, from the constant connection of sentences by *καὶ*, and from many other traits of style. Now, for catechists' notes Aramaic is exactly what we should expect. Gospels would be composed for ecclesiastical use, or for persons, like Theophilus, sufficiently important to be addressed as *κράτιστε*. They therefore would, generally at any rate, be in Greek. But those *πτωχοὶ* to whom the Gospel was preached, and who, just as much as Theophilus, needed catechetical instruction, had to put up with something less elaborate—with the teaching of some earlier *ἰδιώτης*—of a first-century Sunday-school teacher. If such a teacher was one who was most impressed by the works of Christ—the things which Jesus began to *do*—his notes took very much the form of what St. Peter said to Cornelius in Acts x., and which afterwards developed into St. Mark's Gospel. If, on the other hand, he had been most impressed by Christ's discourses—the things which Jesus began to *say*—then he used, not exactly Q, but *λόγια*, which may not have been, but probably were, *Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ*. Often catechists would learn whole passages by heart : with the oral theory thus held, as it is by Dr. Wright, I quite agree, and it best accounts for the small differences which we find in the common matter of the Synoptists. The catechists, as Dr. Sanday puts it, "would not have the rules or traditions of the professional scribes ; they would be intent on the record of what Jesus said or did, and they would think little of minute exactness in the reproduction of the text as it lay

before them." They would enrich their text, Dr. Sanday thinks, by interesting additions, such as the story of the woman taken in adultery, the anecdote of the man working on the Sabbath, found in Codex D., and such-like.

Secondly, catechists would very largely come from amongst earnest men who had found no spiritual help in the formalities and trivialities of the Scribes, who saw the folly and the hopelessness of the efforts of the Zealots, but who longed all the more eagerly for the redemption of Israel.

For such Q would be exactly applicable. Its teaching is, that the kingdom of Heaven, foretold by the prophets, had been realized in Jesus of Nazareth. It is catechists' notes to that effect.

Again, Harnack points out that Q is "dominated by the belief in the Messiahship of Jesus; the fact of the Messiahship is proved in the introduction—it is presupposed as self-evident from beginning to end of the work—and in the eschatological discourses it is revealed by Jesus Himself" (p. 243). And again he says: "It is evident that Q was composed in Palestine —its Jewish and Palestinian horizon is quite obvious" (p. 248).

This, again, exactly agrees with the theory of catechists' notes. Art thou ὁ ἐρχόμενος; was John the Baptist's question; and later it was disputed, This is of a truth the prophet: others said, This is the Christ.

Now, proof of this would go on more lines than one, according to the needs and capacities of both teachers and hearers. On the Day of Pentecost St. Peter argued it from the testimony of Psalmist and Prophet. St. Paul proved to the Jews who dwelt at Damascus that this Jesus is the Christ, but here (Acts ix. 22) we are not told how. Probably the arguments were somewhat elaborate, such as would be suitable for those in the Synagogue. For the "man in the street," for the "plain man," something which appealed a little more to an honest and good heart and a little less to a cultivated intellect—something, in a word, simpler —would be more serviceable. Q, according to Harnack's recension, is exactly the thing.

It is so exactly the thing that, combined with the deeds of the "Strong Son of God, Immortal Love," recorded in the primitive Markan basis, it forms—if the Passion and Resurrection and the Birth narratives be left out—the main part of both St. Luke and St. Matthew; where, as Harnack expresses it, it found its grave. But before such honourable interment it had done immense service. Catechist after catechist had copied it, or learnt it, not feeling it necessary to adhere to any exact phraseology; hence synoptic variations. When St. Luke used it he revised its style, as Harnack often points out, for St. Luke was a cultured man, and did not like vulgar idioms. St. Matthew, on the other hand, has treated the discourses with great respect, and has edited them in a very conservative spirit (p. 37). He has done more; he has adopted its methods and followed along its lines. Like Q, his distinct interest is in our Lord's teaching, which he arranges and groups as Q did, only rather more systematically, as would be more suitable for Church use. In other words, St. Matthew's Gospel is a more scholarly and more ecclesiastical Q. But it was not St. Matthew's Gospel only that Q influenced. It did not, indeed, influence St. Mark, though Dr. Sanday (*Expository Times*, December, 1908, p. 111) thinks St. Mark was acquainted with it. But St. Paul knew of it; "possibly," says Dr. Sanday, I would venture to say, certainly. Dr. Sanday refers to Romans xii. 14-21 as showing the influence of Q; surely so also do the Epistles to the Thessalonians, especially 1 iv., v. And the ethical teaching in Ephesians and Colossians is largely Q, only in an epistolatory style. And I think the same may be said of St. Peter's first Epistle. I do not think Q influenced the *Didaché:* before that was written it had found its grave, to quote a second time Harnack's expression.

Why, however, has it, as a single document, so completely disappeared? One might reply that it has only shared the same fate as unnumbered early Christian documents—that during the Diocletian persecution, when kindly provincial governors accepted any MSS. that Church officials handed

for destruction, and asked no questions, it would be delivered up as being less valuable than the Gospels; and that the spade of that benefactor of the little flock of scholars, the archæologist, may yet unearth a copy. But there may be another reason, and if the reason I am going to suggest is a possible one, it is one that the clergy—Bishops especially—might take note of.

The early Church, doctrinally, had a very high ideal; it wanted the best; it did not think that for teaching anything would do; double honour was to be given to those who ruled well, especially to those who laboured in the word and teaching. Now "in the word and teaching" must mean what is now held up to shame and reproach as "dogma." This Q was not, even though it contained the great passage, "No one knoweth the Son, save the Father," etc., and though, as Dr. Sanday points out, it presupposes the Divinity of our Lord, just as St. Mark's Gospel does. Nevertheless, Q does not rise anywhere near the height of Paulinism, still less of the Johannine teaching. It was "milk for babes," and St. Paul's condemnation of teachers who were content to give, and of congregations who were content to receive nothing more, is emphatic. In others words, Q found honourable interment because the early Church had a very high standard, and did not think Q quite came up to the standard.

So simple an explanation as this would not satisfy a learned German Professor, but it quite satisfies me, the more for that it contains a useful lesson.

Prayer-Book Revision.

By the Rev. Prebendary EARDLEY-WILMOT, M.A.

IT might be thought unnecessary again to call attention to the subject of Prayer-Book Revision, since so much has already been written and said to show both the need and the demand for it. The position, however, taken up by a section of Churchmen seems to make it imperative to state again what