

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

"PROTO-LUKE" AND THE "CHICAGO THEORY" OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

ALFRED M. PERRY
BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

IT is one of the great misfortunes of American Biblical scholarship that President E. D. Burton never gave adequate presentation of his solution of the Synoptic Problem. His fullest treatment, in the Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago, deals quite largely with the general aspects of the problem, while his specific presentations of his own theory, in a presidential address before this Society and elsewhere, were none of them built upon that cumulation of minute bits of evidence which often helps to carry conviction. It is gratifying, therefore, to one of his pupils, to find in the notable work of Canon Streeter a tacit acceptance of Dr. Burton's cardinal principles. These may be summarized, briefly.

First, Dr. Burton started with the premise, not new with him, that the key to the Synoptic Problem is to be found, not in Matthew, but in Luke. Proceeding thence, by observation of Luke's use of Mark, he deduced two further propositions:— (second), that Luke used his sources in order; and (third), that these sources were incorporated so far as possible in blocks. These three propositions are fundamental to Canon Streeter's work, likewise; but he has advanced the solution of the Problem measurably with the further proposition that Luke's primary source is to be found, not in Mark, but in an earlier edition of his non-Markan sources.

At first sight, this last observation is entirely destructive of Dr. Burton's theory. If all the non-Markan sources were

united in a single composition, before the addition of Mark, it is obvious that we no longer have any objective clue to the manner in which *these* sources were combined,—and we must fall back either upon the precarious conclusions to be drawn from the Matthew parallels, or upon the uncertain declarations of the *Formgeschichtliche* school. This objection, however, may be overstated. If, as Canon Streeter and Dr. Vincent Taylor suppose, the same hand guided the composition both of Proto-Luke and of the complete Gospel, the presumption will remain, after all, that not only were Mark and Proto-Luke interwoven in blocks, but that the more primitive sources were employed in a like fashion, in the composition of Proto-Luke itself. Canon Streeter himself recognizes the cogency of this conclusion, and applies it tentatively in the Great Interpolation to four blocks of material which he derives from Q. It is along a similar line that I wish in this paper to proceed to a reexamination of Dr. Burton's solution, testing the assumption which he and Canon Streeter have both made,—with good reason, I believe,—that the sources of Proto-Luke were employed in blocks, so far as possible.

I

The first point to be examined is the unity of the section which Burton designated G; that is, to answer the question whether the non-Markan materials of Luke 3-7 represent the interweaving of two sources, Q and L, as most scholars have supposed, or whether the phenomena of single and double tradition here are to be ascribed to the selection by Matthew of portions of a narrative which betrays internal coherence throughout. I believe there is evidence to support the latter view.

1. My first example is from Luke 4, the non-Markan portions of which include the narratives of the Temptation and the Rejection at Nazareth.

The Temptation narrative (Lk. 4 1-13) shows unmistakably a common literary dependence of Matthew and Luke, and is regularly assigned to Q. Like the corresponding narrative in Mark, the story must have Messianic significance, and some

bearing, therefore, upon the character which Jesus' ministry is supposed to have taken. This is here presented in a negative aspect: the three temptations represent three popular conceptions of the program of the Messiah,—that offering material prosperity (cf. Joel 2 19-27, etc.), that of imperialism (cf. Ps. Sol. 17 22-42, etc.), and that of the supernatural restoration of Israel (cf., e. g., Enoch 45-51). These three popular Messianic ideas are all rejected,—a point of some value, not only in the definition of the program of Jesus, but equally in the early Christian apologetic. As an introduction to the completed gospel the rejection of the miraculous (in the temptation to leap from the Temple pinnacle) is difficult, but it will soon appear that this is characteristic of the source.

The order of Luke seems the original one, both in the dramatic introduction of Scripture by the Tempter also, and in the conclusive character of the final quotation, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Matthew, by his changes, has secured an arrangement much better homiletically;—the spiritual view of life, reverent trust in God, absolute fidelity to God. The introductory verses in Luke, vv. 1-2 a, seem to be an editorial preface largely based on reminiscence of Mark.

Luke 4 14-15 are likewise an editorial transition, on the basis of three verses of Mark (Mk. 1 14; 1 28; 1 39). They are, however, unnecessary; for the transition from v. 13 to v. 16 is easy, despite the change of subject.

It should now be observed that the narrative of the Rejection at Nazareth, Luke 4 16-30, forms the exact complement of the Temptation narrative. While the latter defines the program of Jesus negatively, it is here set forth explicitly. This program is announced to be that of bringing in the Kingdom, not by material benefits or healing, not by the prestige of miraculous signs, not by insurrection against the Roman imperium, but by preaching and persuading the hearts of men. So we have the prominent use of the passage from Isaiah, with its emphasis upon evangelization and preaching,—a use which is paralleled in Q materials elsewhere in the reference to the "sign of Jonah" (Lk. 11 29-30) and in the reference to this same passage in the answer to John the Baptist (Lk. 7 22). The same thought seems

to be carried out in the later reference to the miracles of Elijah and Elisha (vv. 25-27), which ought to be interpreted, not of the rejection of Israel (as Luke did), but as meaning, "Though signs and wonders may be necessary for the Gentiles in their ignorance, for the Chosen People the Messianic appeal is one of preaching." It is true that v. 23 seems to prevent this interpretation by its implication of a definite refusal to work miracles but it is probable that this verse is an editorial interpolation,¹ since it interrupts the connection between the challenge of v. 22, "Is not this the son of Joseph?" and its answer in v. 24, "no prophet without honor." Moreover the connection of this verse with the context is poor, its reference to previous miracles betrays both a different viewpoint and a faulty setting, and it bears several marks of "Lukan" style,² εἶπεν πρὸς, πάντως, and possibly also the "medical" proverb.

Further indications that the remainder of the section is allied to the adjacent Q materials are to be found in the Semitic coloring of the narrative, noted by Wellhausen (*Lukasevangelium*, S. 11), and in the presence of the Old Testament quotation and in the way it is used (cf. Lk. 3 3-5, and, for the subject, 7 22; cf. also use of the O. T. in 4 3-12). Finally, Matthew gives a hint that he had this passage in his source, in his use of the name "Nazara" and his reference to Jesus' removal to Capernaum (Mt. 4 13; cf. Lk. 4 16, 31). Assuming Matthew's acquaintance with the passage, some reasons for his omission of it can be given: first, he was following Mark as his principal source, and would naturally choose the Markan version of two parallel accounts, especially when (as in this case) it was the shorter, as he regularly compresses narratives. Moreover, it is quite possible that he recognized some of the difficulties of the passage, such as the contradictory attitudes to miracles, and the apparent emphasis on the rejection of Israel. We may conclude, therefore, that there are sufficient indications, not

¹ Parsons, E. W., *Historical Examination of some Non-Markan Elements in Luke*, p. 74 n.; Bultmann, R., *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, S. 16.

² Hawkins, J. C., *Horae Synopticae*², pp. 35-51.

only that Luke 4 1-13 and 4 16-30 stood in the same source, but that Matthew seems to have found them so.

2. We turn now to the Preaching of John, Luke 3 1-18, which Canon Streeter has already shown³ stood at the beginning of a block of materials of which only a few editorial touches are derivable from Mark, and most of which must be derived from, or paralleled by, Q.

Harnack⁴ derives Lk. 3 3 a, 7-9, 16-17 from Q. In addition to these verses Q must have had some equivalent for vv. 2, 3 b (probably as in Mt. 3 1-2), and apparently also an equivalent for v. 4, as in Matt. 3 3 (where Matthew agrees with Luke in the omission of the Malachi quotation). The hand of the editor, either of Proto-Luke or of the complete gospel, is apparent in the chronological summary (vv. 1-2 a), in the assimilation to Mark of vv. 3 b-4, 16, and in the transitional sentences, vv. 7 a, 15, 18. Seven verses of single tradition, Lk. 3 5-6, 10-14, still remain: do they belong to the same source as the sections ascribed to Q?

Of Lk. 3 5-6 there is little to say. It is quite possible that Luke himself carried on the quotation in order to reach the Messianic promise of v. 6, which announces more clearly what is already implicit in the second clause of the quotation. But it should be noted that this is not Luke's usual procedure: the Old Testament quotations in Q are given by Luke and Matthew in close agreement, except in the next section, where Lk. 4 3 has the *shorter* form. In making use of the Old Testament quotations in Mark, Luke abridges in five cases (Lk. 8 10; 19 46; 20 17; 21 27; 22 69) and in some ten cases⁵ includes the quotation in the omission of other Markan materials. I can find no other place where he has expanded an Old Testament quotation; but full quotation of the older Scripture does seem to be a characteristic of the non-Markan source.

Lk. 3 10-14 present a greater problem. They have been both doubtfully assigned to Q (as by Streeter, p. 291) and rigorously excluded from that document. But they do give

³ Streeter, B. H., *The Four Gospels*, pp. 205-207.

⁴ Harnack, A., *The Sayings of Jesus*, Eng. tr., p. 127.

⁵ Cf. Mark 7 6-7; 8 10; 10 7-8; 13 12, 19, 22, 24; 14 27, 24; 15 24.

evidence of relationship to the rest of the block. First of all (merely negative proof) it should be noted that they do not *create* a break in John's discourse, — that break is there already. Assuming, if you please, that Matthew presents the original form of Q, the demand for fruit in the last clause of Mt. 3 10 makes but a poor connection with the personal reference to baptism in the first clause of v. 11 (and the common order of Matthew and Luke must be that of their source), although the mention of the axe in the *first* clause of v. 10 might lead up to the announcement of the Coming One in the *second* clause of v. 11. No argument against these verses, therefore, can be drawn from the want of connection. On the contrary, the question of Lk. 3 10, "What shall we do?" is the natural response to the exhortation of the hearers and the demand for "good fruit" which precede, and the connection remains even though the words be merely an editorial inference from the reply of the Baptist in v. 11. As for more positive evidence, v. 11, ("give your shirt") has a parallel in thought in a later Q passage (Lk. 6 29-30; but cf. Mk. 6 9); and v. 12, the baptism of publicans, is referred to later in 7 29-30 (peculiar to Lk. in a Q context), while the general tenor of the verses, "the poor are evangelized" is the theme of the Old Testament quotation in Lk. 4 18 (which we have already assigned to the Common Source), and reflects the general emphasis of that passage on the prophetic and ethical character of Jesus' mission. These verses also, therefore, may be considered to have stood in the common source, and to have been omitted by Matthew, — perhaps for want of interest in John's ethical mission, since the Baptist has become for him simply the Forerunner (cf. his use of Q and Mark materials, Mt. 11 12-15).

Between Lk. 3 14 and 16, however, there still remains a break, and v. 15 may well be an editorial insertion to disguise the omission of some more definite announcement, originally in Q, to prepare for the off-hand reference to the "Coming One" in v. 16. Aside from this omission and the editorial modifications already noted, it is probable that Lk. 3 2 b-18 represents a block corresponding to the material as it was presented in the common source of Luke and Matthew, — though the original language

of the source may well be better preserved by Matthew at several points.

3. The same is probably true, in perhaps lesser degree, of the rest of the chapter. Lk. 3 19-20 have an obviously editorial flavor, and may well have been imported to anticipate or replace a fuller account of the Baptist's fate (cf. also Mk. 1 14).

Lk. 3 21-22 represent an event that must have been narrated in Q; and the suggestion made by Harnack and by Streeter⁶ that the "Western text" represents the original reading of Luke and of Q is attractive. Note, further, the common alteration, ἀνερχθῆναι. The stylistic peculiarities of Luke are numerous, however, and the section as it stands must be largely editorial, on the basis of Mark.

As to the Genealogy, Lk. 3 23-38, little can be said. The editorial phrase, ὡς ἐνομιζέτο, reveals the use of a source whose point of view Luke realizes to be different from his own, and which he seems, furthermore, to be somewhat reluctant to insert. The explanation would be that Luke found the genealogy in his principal source at just this point. Again, the reference to Adam as "son of God" in v. 38, may be compared with the naming of God as "our Father" (11 2) or "your Father" (6 36; 11 13; 12 30, 32), and the mention of men as "sons of the Highest" (6 35) and "sons of God" (20 36),—it will be noted that all but the last of these references are to Q passages. Matthew, of course, preferred his own more pretentious and better schematized version of the genealogy.

Thus, a review of the material, in detail, confirms the hypothesis that the entire block, Lk. 3 1-4 30, may reasonably be referred to the use of a single source, with editorial improvements and reminiscences of Mark.

4. With Lk. 5 1-11 the case is different. The marks of "Lukan" vocabulary⁷ are more numerous than in any previous section of these materials, except the clearly editorial 3 21-22; and to those listed by Hawkins others might be added, e. g., θάμβος περιέσχεν αὐτὸν (v. 9, cf. 4 36). Here, too, the emphasis

⁶ Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 310-314; Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

⁷ Hawkins, *loc. cit.*

upon the prophetic side of Jesus' ministry which all the preceding sections have sustained (save in John's mistaken view) is wanting, and Jesus appears primarily as a miracle worker: the effect of his discourse is unnoticed, it takes a miracle to get results!

This, together with the fact that this narrative is interpolated as an *independent* block, in no wise connected with the preceding, indicates that this section does not belong to the source of 3 1-4 30, nor indeed even to Proto-Luke; but that it is an independent insertion in the final compilation of the gospel. The presence of non-Lukan words and of Semitisms, however, is to be noted,⁸ so that some independent source is perhaps to be premised.

Lk. 5 36, 39 may be similar independent insertions by the evangelist, perhaps on the basis of oral tradition. Lk. 5 36, in particular, shows strong coloring of "Lukan" vocabulary; but there is no reason for connecting any of this material with the Common Source.

5. The problem of the Great Sermon (Lk. 6 20-49) and of its relation to the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew is notoriously difficult. Full treatment of it must be postponed: yet the corroboration of our premises in the preceding block will perhaps warrant us in assuming, with both President Burton and Canon Streeter,⁹ that Luke's sermon is drawn *in extenso* from the common source. A few additional considerations may be noted:

a) There are two passages without Matthew parallels. The first of these, the Woes of Lk. 6 24-26, balances the Beatitudes of Luke too well to have been ever independent of them: if not editorial, it must come from the same source as the rest of the Sermon. Matthew's "spiritualization" of the Beatitudes shows clearly why he omitted these woes, which are, moreover, a particularization of the philippic of Lk. 3 7-9. The same exact balance appears in the other passage, Lk. 6 33-35 a, which must certainly form a literary unit with vv. 32, 35 b: v. 34 moreover

⁸ Easton, B. S., *Gospel acc. to St. Luke*, pp. 60-62.

⁹ Burton, *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 44, 63; Streeter, *op. cit.*; see also Castor, G. D., *Matthew's Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 25-40.

has a definitely Palestinian setting, and could, therefore, hardly be attributed to the evangelist himself. We may accordingly affirm that the single tradition, at least, does not break the unity of the Sermon.

b) The general interest of the Common Source in a prophetic type of Messianic ministry is, of course, fully exemplified in such a discourse as this; and it receives specific attestation in 6 40, "a disciple not above his master." Lesser links between this section and the preceding block of the Common Source are found in the materialistic outlook of the eschatology (vv. 20-21, 24-25, cf. 3 9, 17), in the references to hunger (vv. 21, 25) which betray the perpetual interest of the peasant class (cf. 4 3-4), in the reference to the giving up of the *chiton* (v. 29, cf. 3 11, though the point of the illustration is different), in that to men as "sons of God" (vv. 35-36, see above on 3 38) and to "tree" and "good fruit" (v. 43, cf. 3 7-9), and in the strong ethical insistence (esp. v. 38, "with what measure ye mete," cf. 3 10-14).

c) It may be objected that the filling of the hungry promised in the beatitude (v. 21) is just what is rejected in the first temptation (4 3-4). It will be noted, however, quite aside from any Hebraistic and metaphorical use of the terms "hungry," etc., that the two passages are agreed in postponing the fulfilment of the eschatological program to a later date, and in interpreting the function of Jesus' earthly ministry as prophetic. And it will be recalled that this is exactly the movement of early Christian apologetic thought as reflected in the primitive sources of Acts. That the eschatology of John should look to the immediate coming of the Messiah where Christian thought had learned to look for a Second Coming, or that his ethical teaching should be more practical and less idealistic, need occasion no difficulty, if any historical contact with the tradition of the Baptist be allowed.

d) It would appear, from the agreement of Matthew with Luke in the position of the Sermon, that some setting for it was found in the Source. This may well have been, as Streeter supposes,¹⁰ the list of the Chosen Twelve. In this list, moreover,

¹⁰ *ibid.*, pp. 214-215.

Matthew and Luke agree in joining the names of Simon and Andrew, — which *may* indicate again a difference in source from Lk. 5 1–11, where Andrew is omitted and Simon is brought into conjunction with James and John, as in Mark's list. This being the case, this list would be the *first* narrative, in the Common Source, of the call of disciples.

6. The Healing of the Centurion's Servant, Lk. 7 1–10, must have stood in the Common Source, else Luke and Matthew would hardly have agreed in its location. As Castor remarks, "It is hard to doubt that wherever Luke and Matthew found this narrative of healing, they also found just before it a discourse of Jesus beginning with the Beatitudes and closing with the parable of the Two Builders."¹¹ Adding to this the evidence of close agreement in language, Lk. 7 7–9, there can be no doubt of a common source, nor, indeed of the Common Source of the preceding sections. The opening scene, also, in which a Gentile is represented as unworthy to approach Jesus, could hardly have been composed by the evangelist; but it does accord with the generally Palestinian outlook of the Common Source (to which Lk. 4 25–27 is no exception, as we have seen). Matthew may well have omitted these verses in his customary compression of narrative.

It should be noted that the "prophetic" Christology is still apparent in this section. Although there is a healing miracle, the interest is not centered upon it and the result is told only in an editorial afterthought, while the chief point of the story is in the faith manifested by the centurion, which is regarded as the more remarkable since its possessor is a Gentile.

7. Even in the Healing at Nain, Lk. 7 11–17, the prophetic element is not entirely lost; for the miracle is ascribed by the people to God (cf. 11 20), and Jesus is hailed as a great prophet in language reminiscent of the hymns in the first chapter of the gospel. Attribution to a source, however, is somewhat problematical. On the one hand there are coincidences with the Common Source, especially with 4 16–30:—the parallel to Elijah's miracle for the widow of Sarepta (cf. Lk. 4 25), the use of Old Testament

¹¹ Castor, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

language (v. 15 b), and the Hebraistic quality of the style.¹² On the other hand, marks of "Lukan" style are rather numerous, eleven in the seven verses (though six of these are designated by Easton as characteristic of the Source L). The narrative may be provisionally assigned to the Common Source, since it stands in a block with materials from that source. Matthew has broken with the order of the Source at this point and in so doing omitted the section, either by accident, or as being an unnecessary duplication of the Raising of Jairus' Daughter, to which he has given a somewhat similar position.¹³

8. The Place of John the Baptist, Lk. 7 18-35. This section is regularly assigned to Q. Four verses, however, are peculiar to Luke: vv. 20-21, 29-30. The former are probably an editorial summary: the latter may be editorial, also; but it should be noted that Wellhausen and Streeter, followed by Easton,¹⁴ all assign them to Q, and that they refer back definitely to 3 10-14. The peculiar vocabulary of Luke, however, is prominent.

The section as a whole relates closely to the previous account of John the Baptist. He is here introduced as well known and honored, but it is again affirmed that Jesus is greater (7 28 b, cf. 3 15-17). The query which John puts (v. 19) is entirely natural in view of the contradiction between his own expectation of a Messianic Judgement (3 9, 17) and the prophetic program of Jesus' actual ministry (cf. 4 1-30, and the discussion above). The answer to his question gives an explicit resolution of the problem, by reference to two messianic prophecies from Isaiah, the first of which makes contact with John's point of view and corrects it, while the second is that already quoted in Jesus' own announcement of his program (cf. 4 18-19). A further link with previous sections is found in the manner in which the Old Testament quotation is employed in v. 27.

9. The section on the Anointing of Jesus, Lk. 7 36-50, again, is difficult to assign with certainty. Wellhausen had already analysed it into constituent pericopes; but the com-

¹² Easton, *Luke*, p. 98.

¹³ Parsons, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

¹⁴ Wellhausen, *J., Lukasevangelium*, S. 30; Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 291; Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

bination of these can hardly have been the work of the evangelist; for marks of his own style are relatively few. Some of the characteristics of the common source appear. There is a polemic against the wealthy Pharisee (vv. 44-46) much milder than the Woes upon the Rich (6 24-26); there is an interest in loans (v. 41, cf. 6 34; Mt. 5 42), and in sinners (vv. 37, 39, cf. 6 32-34, etc.,—only here is the woman a "sinner"), and Jesus is regarded as a prophet (v. 39, cf. esp. 7 16). Only in non-Markan sections of Luke is Jesus represented as being on friendly terms with Pharisees, though perhaps patronized (v. 36, cf. 11 37; 14 1, etc.).

The ideas of the forgiveness of sins and of the saving quality of faith, which appear in the second conclusion (vv. 48-50) are, however, new to the Common Source, and a closer inspection shows that they may well be of Markan derivation, here. Indeed, "Lukan" characteristics are more numerous in these verses, and they would appear to be an editorial addition based upon Mk. 2 5-7 (= Lk. 5 20-21) and Mk. 5 34 (= Lk. 8 48), where the same words are addressed again to a *woman*. Other Mark contacts are confined to a few words in the introductory verses (vv. 37-38) and the name, "Simon." Apart from vv. 48-50, then, this section might be attributed to the Common Source. Matthew's omission of it could be laid to his usual preference for the shorter version in narrative.

10. Lk. 8 1-3 is a generalized summary of Jesus' activity, and contains numerous "Lukan" characteristics. It is probably editorial in its present form. The list of names, however, like that of 6 13-16, differs from any Markan list, and it is reasonable to suppose that the section is based upon some non-Markan tradition. There are contacts, also, with later sections of the Common Source; but attribution to it, though probable, cannot be made with certainty.

The result of the foregoing review of the materials has been to confirm the hypothesis of President Burton with which we started,—that the non-Markan materials of Luke 3 1-8 3 are in the main derivable from a single source. It has been shown that the two blocks of material, Lk. 3 1-4 30 and 6 20-7 50

are so similar in general viewpoint and character and so linked with one another, that with due allowance for editorial additions and modifications derivation from a single source is probable. The editorial sections 6 12-19 and 8 1-3 seem also to adhere to the second block. The narrative of the Call of Simon, Lk. 5 1-11, however, seems to bear another character, and, moreover, it stands alone in the midst of Markan materials; it has therefore been excluded from the present list. A few other scattered verses in Markan material, Lk. 5 33, 36; 9 31-32, cannot be allocated. Local coloring is largely lacking in the source; but it will be convenient to retain the designation "G," or "Galilean," given by Dr. Burton, as its few geographical hints (aside from the Baptism and Temptation narratives) seem to be Galilean,—Nazareth (4 16), Nain (7 11), Capernaum (7 1), and the Galilean women, Mary of Magdala and Joanna (of Tiberias?, 8 2-3).

Attention should again be called to the fact that in these two blocks Matthew and Luke agree in the order of the sections:—

1. The Preaching of John	Lk. 3 1-20 =	Mt. 3 7-10, 12
2. (The Baptism of Jesus)	3 21-22	
3. The Genealogy of Jesus	3 23-38	
4. The Temptation	4 1-13 =	4 2-11
5. (Jesus' Return to Galilee)	4 14-15 =	4 23
6. The Rejection at Nazareth	4 16-30	
7. (The Hearers of the Sermon)	6 12-19	cf. 4 24-25
8. The Beatitudes	6 20-26 =	5 2-12
9. On the Law of Love	6 27-36 =	5 39-48, 7 12
10. On Judging	6 37-42 =	7 1-5, etc.
11. On Doing Righteousness	6 43-49 =	7 16-27, 12 35
12. Healing of the Centurion's Boy	7 1-10 =	8 5-13
13. Raising of the Widow's Son	7 11-17	
14. On John the Baptist	7 18-35 =	11 2-19
15. Jesus Anointed	7 36-50	
16. (The Companions of Jesus)	8 1-3	

It will be noted that in all this material there are only four verses whose Matthew parallels stand outside the limits of the corresponding section (Mt. 7 12, 10 24; 12 35; 15 14), and these

are all brief sayings, easily transposed. In addition there is some confusion *within* the section, especially section 9, which seems to argue conflation with another source by Matthew (so Streeter, p. 252). It should also be noted that Matthew has likewise removed section 14 from its original proximity to section 12, in order not to interrupt his collection of ten great miracles in chapters 8 and 9.

Slight evidence is also to be found for Matthew's knowledge of some of the omitted sections. It has already been noted that Mt. 4 13 has contacts with section 6. Section 13, which would have found a place in Mt. 8-9 has been omitted in favor of the Raising of 'Jairus' Daughter, which is brought forward to a much earlier position than in Mark; but the concluding sentence (Lk. 7 17) is closely paralleled in the editorial conclusion which Matthew has added to his Markan material. Section 15 also finds parallels to its foremost themes,—"Her sins are forgiven" (vv. 47-48), and "Thy faith hath made thee whole" (v. 50),—in other incidents of this same chapter in Matthew. Even section 16, though largely editorial, seems to have caused the insertion τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κόμας in Mt. 9 35 (which in other respects is identical with Mt. 4 23), and it *may* also be reflected in the editorial introduction and conclusion of the transposed section 14 (Mt. 11 1, 20: κηρύσσει ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν, τὰς πόλεις).

Too much weight cannot, of course, be attached to these last hints; but at least it may be assumed as established that in the two blocks of material, Lk. 3 1-4 30; 6 12 (or 20)-8 3, Luke is reproducing nearly in full and in its original order a source which was largely excerpted by Matthew, in his chapters 3 to 8; though there are a few scattered verses to which Matthew has given new contexts, and one section which he has removed bodily to chapter 11.

II

The next step in this study we owe to Canon Streeter's observation that in the Great Interpolation of Luke the use of sources in blocks is still apparent, and to his further observation (partly anticipated by Harnack and others) that for a part of

this material Luke and Matthew still preserve a common order. This raises two questions: Ought any of these blocks to be added to the "G" source? Can we by so doing reduce the number of common sources?

It must first be observed that Burton, assuming that the other sources were interpolated into Mark, was compelled to make his blocks coterminous with the non-Markan sections. Upon the Proto-Luke hypothesis this restriction vanishes; if Proto-Luke existed as an independent work, then Mark might easily be interpolated into it without regard to the sutures of its earlier sources.

Since it was Matthew's agreement with the Lukan order which served to confirm our previous conclusion regarding the unity of the G source, the first inquiry must be, In what further sections of this material do Matthew and Luke agree in order? These may be listed as follows, as they are described by Canon Streeter (pp. 273-274):—

"Block I": a)	Lk. 9 56-60 =	Mt. 8 19-22	
b)	10 2-3 =	9 37-38, 10 16	
c)	10 4-12 =	10 7-15, rearranged.	
d)	10 13-15 =	11 20-23	
e)	10 21-22 =	11 25-27	
"Block II": f)	11 14-23 =	12 22-30	
g)	11 24-26 =	12 43-45	} (these two reversed).
h)	11 29-32 =	12 38-42	

Here are 38 verses, at a minimum, in which a common order can be traced, and not more than 15 verses in this section of Luke can be paralleled elsewhere in Matthew. Moreover, this series of agreements follows immediately upon the G series in Matthew, allowing for the transposition of section 14 (Mt. 11 2-10). A further series of agreements has been noted by Harnack (p. 177), including the following:

i)	Lk. 11 30-52 =	Mt. 23 4-36, rearranged.
j)	12 39-46 =	24 43-51
k)	[13 34-35 =	23 37-39]
l)	17 20-37 =	24 17-41, rearranged.
m)	19 24-26 =	25 28-29.

This series, however, is so broken, and the Matthaean parallels are located so far from the corresponding Lukan position, and indeed from the earlier Matthew sections, that they cannot be grouped with the first list (a-h) without some further reasons. We may proceed, therefore, to a study of the block of material, Lk. 9 51-11 32, examining first the homogeneity of the sections listed above (a-h) with the G source, and then the relation of the intervening sections peculiar to Luke.

i) Block I, Lk. 9 57-10 24.

1) Section "a", on the Unwilling Disciples, Lk. 9 57-62, recounts three instances, two of which were evidently in Q (= Mt. 8 18-22). Their relation to G is uncertain; but the interest in the poor, and particularly in the poverty of Jesus should be noted (v. 58, cf. 6 20-21; 4 3-4). The phrase "birds of the heavens" (v. 58) is used by Matthew in Q material of the Great Sermon (Mt. 6 26), and in other Q material by Luke (13 19), but it appears elsewhere in Luke as well (8 5). It will be observed that this section connects well with Section 17 (Lk. 8 1-3), which names some of the disciples who traveled with Jesus.

9 61-62 stand in the same relation to their context as do 6 33-34, or as the Woes to the Beatitudes (6 20-27):—they cannot be independent. Either they stood in the Source, or the evangelist himself has here formed an "apophthegma" from some fugitive "logion." But G has several groups of three (e. g.: 3 10-14; 4 3-12; 6 20-21, 32-34); and the allusion to Elijah and Elisha (v. 61 b cf. 1 Kings 19 20), while not sufficient to have produced the logion of v. 62, does accord with the interest of G in these prophets (cf. 4 25-27; 7 15). These verses, then, may be included with the rest of the section in G. Matthew would have omitted them because a legalistic interpretation would seem to exclude any possibility of repentance or forgiveness for sins committed after baptism,—least of all, any hope for the "lapsed."

2) The Commission of the Seventy, Lk. 10 1-12 (sec. "b" and "c"), is conflated with Markan materials by Matthew in his Missionary Discourse (Mt. 9 37-10 16), which accounts for

the free handling of the material, in the way of minor omissions and of rearrangement. Lk. 10 1 may be editorial; but vv. 8-9, though very freely treated by Matthew, are a part of the section. Several hints in the discourse show the viewpoint of G. The "prophetic" conception of Jesus appears not only in the anticipation that he himself will follow up the preaching of the Seventy (v. 1), but in the content of their message (vv. 9, 11, cf. 4 21; 6 20; 9 60). This excludes an interest in the miraculous,—even in v. 9 *θεραπεύετε* is probably to be taken in its more usual sense of "care for (the sick)" (cf. Monlton-Milligan, *Vocab.*, s. v.). Interest in the poor appears in the direction to the missionaries to maintain even the outward semblance of poverty, "no purse, nor even sandals" (v. 4). There may be, also, an allusion to Elisha, again, in the injunction against salutations (v. 4, cf. 2 Ki. 4 29, see above on 9 61). There is no reason for refusing to assign this to G. If the number seventy be historical, the population of Galilee (Josephus, *Life*, 45, says there were 204 cities and villages) would warrant such a mission (and cf. Mt. 10 23).

3. The Woes upon the Cities, Lk. 10 13-15 (section "d") is appended by Matthew to the end of Section 14,—i. e., at the next available location. Assignment to G is not so clear. The cities named are Galilean, and the reference to Tyre and Sidon recalls that of 4 28; but emphasis on miracles is strange in G, except as signs to the *Gentiles* (so here?). This section, therefore, cannot by itself be assigned to G, but it will go with the block in which it stands.

4. The obscure Confession of Jesus, Lk 10 21-22 (sec. "e"), which follows closely in both Matthew and Luke, shows G's interest in the lowly. Its Christology is obscure. Harnack,¹⁵ after a careful study of the textual evidence omits the words, *τίς ἐστὶν ὁ Υἱός* . . . and so reaches an "ethical" relationship of Jesus to the Father. Easton¹⁶ reviewing Harnack's evidence, omits the alternate clause, *τίς ἐστὶν ὁ Πατήρ* . . . and interprets of the secret of the (prophetic) character of the Messianic

¹⁵ Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-310.

¹⁶ Easton, *op. cit.*, pp. 164-165 n., 166-168.

mission. Either of these would be possible for G, the latter especially.

It would appear, therefore, that the common materials of Block I show such homogeneity that they may be assumed to have come from a single source, and that source was G. Can we assign the peculiar materials of Luke also to the same source?

5. The Inhospitable Samaritans, Lk. 9 51-56, does not interrupt the connection of 8 3 and 9 57; but, rather, the mention of a journey in 8 1 leads up to the journey here described, as noted by Easton.¹⁷ Verse 51, with many "Lukan characteristics" may be editorial. There are some definite G characteristics in the section,—it inculcates non-resistance (v. 55, cf. 6 29-30); it shows again an interest in Elijah (v. 54, and explicit in the Received Text, cf. on 9 61); and it mentions non-Jews without much prejudice, but also without favor (cf. 4 25-27). Matthew naturally omits it, because it puts the disciples in an unfavorable light. We may therefore assign it, with its context, to G.

6. The Return of the Missionaries, Lk. 10 17-20, exhibits the interests of G, also. The central interest here seems to lie in the success of the prophetic side of the Messianic program, which is said to have brought Satan low already (v. 17). As a result of this latter fact the Christian is (unexpectedly) able to exorcise or even to "tread on serpents" in the Name of his Lord (vv. 17, 19); but these features are regarded as purely incidental, as elsewhere in G (v. 20). The section, moreover, fills a place in the ascending interest of a group of narratives:—the mission of the Seventy (vv. 1-12), the condemnation of the cities that reject them (vv. 13-15), their return (vv. 17-20), Jesus' joy over the faith of the lowly (vv. 21-22), and the final commendation of the missionaries (vv. 23-24). Matthew, who looked for a future fall of Satan, would quite naturally have passed over these words.

Lk. 10 16 may have a literary relationship to Mt. 10 40, which is in the same general context; but the parallel is not

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

beyond the limits of oral tradition of such an epigram as this. The "prophetic" interest of the Lukan version should be noted, in the use of the verb *ἀκούω* to describe the disciple.

Lk. 10 23-24 continues the thought of v. 18, and shows again G's interest in the humble and lowly, here contrasted with prophets and kings (v. 24). In its Lukan location it forms an effective climax to the preceding narrative; Matthew however has transferred it (as he did some short sayings from the Great Sermon, cf. Lk. 6 31, 39, 40, 45) to a context where it has much less force. It may be assumed, therefore, to belong to the block.

Thus it is apparent that not only do 9 51-10 24 form a single block of materials, as Canon Streeter holds, but that the block is a continuation of the G source.

ii) Block II, Lk. 11 9-12 10. It has already been noted that only in the first part of this block (11 14-32) do Matthew and Luke have a common order. We must therefore examine this portion first, together with the materials intervening between the two blocks.

7. The Beelzebul incident, Lk. 11 14-23 (sec. "f"), is now generally agreed to have stood in Q as well as in Mark.¹⁹ Luke here gives the non-Markan version, and Matthew follows this, in the main, for both location and language, though as usual he conflates more or less with Mark, and prefers the Markan version of the saying about the "strong man armed." The section shows the viewpoint of G in its dislike of exorcism. The demand for a sign appears as a temptation (v. 16, cf. 4 9-12); the exorcism, however, is not a sign, but is merely on a plane with that of numerous Jewish exorcists (v. 19),—in any case the power is that of God, not inherent in Jesus himself (v. 20, cf. 7 16), which accords with the "prophetic" conception of Jesus.

8. The section ("g") on the Return of the Demon (Lk. 11 24-26) appears in Matthew in a different context, but it is quite apt at this point. Its attitude is the same, with apparently a sarcastic contempt for the results of exorcism.

¹⁹ Hawkins, J. C., in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 45-49.

9. The Sign of Jonah, Lk. 11 29-32 (sec. "h"), appears in the same context in Matthew, but just *before* section "g." It connects well with the demand for a sign above (v. 16,—hence Matthew's change of order), and its thought is still consonant with that of G. Here, too, Jesus is compared with a prophet, either as to his preaching function or as the herald of God's judgement, and with Solomon as a teacher,—a Christology so primitive that Matthew has naturally changed the point of the "sign of Jonah," adding the reference to three days. Here also there is a reference to the books of Kings, though not indeed to the Elijah-Elisha stories.

10. The Great Commandment, Lk. 10 25-28, has no immediate parallel in Matthew, and differs in several respects from the corresponding Markan account, with which it has little in common except the Old Testament quotations. Matthew, however, though he follows the Mark account in the main has added to it a number of significant touches common to Luke,—*νομικός, πειράζων, διδάσκαλε, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*, and the instrumental *ἐν* in the quotation. This would seem to indicate a common source, although v. 25 has certainly no immediate connection with the preceding section of Luke. There are, however, contacts with G, in the Old Testament quotation, in the acceptance of the Old Testament as containing the rule of life, and in the designation of Jesus as "teacher" (v. 25).

11. The Parable of the Good Samaritan, Lk. 10 29-37, however, does not connect closely with the preceding section. The question by which the two are linked, "Who is my neighbor?" (v. 29) seems to require the answer, "The man in need," but this is not the answer given (v. 37). Had the parable stood in any common source, moreover, it is difficult to account for its omission by Matthew, who twice of his own accord has added the words of Hosea, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice" (Mt. 9 13; 12 7). The Judean setting (v. 30), with its reference to priest and Levite, and the choice of a Samaritan for especially favorable mention, are not characteristics of G. This parable, then, must have come from some other source.

12. Mary and Martha, Lk. 10 38-42, also has few signs of derivation from G. The attitude toward good living seems

rather to reflect an ascetic interest than a recognition of the mere fact that the followers of Christ *are* poor, such as G manifests. It is possible, also, if the Johannine identification of Mary and Martha with Bethany has some foundation, that this also, like the preceding, is a Judean tradition.

13. The Lord's Prayer, Lk. 11 1-4, appears in a version differing very considerably from that in Matthew, and Canon Streeter has reviewed the reasons for assigning it to a different source.¹⁹ As a matter of fact, there is no reason to look for documentary relationship here; for liturgical use must have preserved independent versions of such a passage as this, as it still does (cf. "debts" and "trespasses"). Luke's version may be that of G; for the simple "Father" (which Matthew greatly modifies by adding "in the heavens") fits G's description of men as "sons of the Highest" (6 35, 36), and the prayer for "bread for today" seems to reflect the conditions of the very poor as do other sections of G.

The introductory verse (v. 1) must be partly editorial; but the comparison of Jesus with John the Baptist could hardly have been added by the evangelist, and it is in the manner of G (but the only other reference to John's *prayers* is an editorial addition by Luke to the Markan narrative, Lk. 5 33). It should be noted that the section Lk. 11 1-13 forms a clearly defined block on the single subject of prayer,—first a form of prayer (vv. 2-4), then a parable on persistence in prayer (vv. 5-8), with its application (vv. 9-13),—and that the last was known to Matthew also. It is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that he knew all three. He would most certainly have preferred the version of the Lord's Prayer which was familiar to him in liturgical use.

14. The parable of the Friend at Midnight, Lk. 11 5-8, must have stood in the source immediately preceding the injunction to "knock" (v. 9), which is unintelligible without it. Matthew had reason enough to omit it: a parable would have seriously interrupted the Sermon on the Mount, the thought of this one seemed at variance with the warning against "vain

¹⁹ Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 275-278.

repetitions" (Mt. 6 7-8), and he may have felt the humor irreverent. But the parable fairly reeks of the life of the Palestinian peasant, which is so frequently the background of G.

15. The section On Asking and Seeking, Lk. 11 9-13, has been transferred by Matthew to a much earlier context, in the Sermon on the Mount; and this is the largest block of G anywhere so transferred. A common source, however, is unquestionable, for the agreement is unusually close; and the passage must be assigned to G in spite of the difference in order. Lk. xv. 11-12 gives a different pair of figures from those in Matthew: it seems probable that G (which has triplets elsewhere,—v. 9, and see on 9 61) had a triple comparison here also, from which Matthew has omitted the egg and scorpion, Luke the bread and stone. The latter item is reminiscent of the First Temptation (4 3-4), another G link. It should be noted that the reference to the Holy Spirit as given in answer to prayer is very primitive (v. 13),²⁰ but accords well with the "Western" reading preferred by Canon Streeter in v. 2 above. The reference to the "Father *from* heaven" is likewise more primitive than Matthew's corresponding phrase, and is again reminiscent (like v. 2) of G.

16. The Cry of the Woman, Lk. 11 27-28, seriously interrupts the G context in which it stands, where v. 29 takes up the demand of v. 16; Prof. Easton's connection of these verses with 10 42 is quite apt. They *may*, however, have stood in G, since even here the emphasis is thrown upon "hearing the word" (cf. 6 43-49), and unique honor for Jesus is apparently disclaimed. The latter would account for Matthew's omission.

It is now apparent that the two blocks of material, Luke 9 51-10 24, and 11 1-32 are to be assigned to a common source, which must further be identified with the G source of Luke's earlier interpolations. The intervening materials, Lk. 10 25-42, with the possible exception of vv. 25-28, cannot be assigned to G, but are, like Lk. 5 1-11, an interpolated block. The same

²⁰ Cf. Parsons, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

is true of the rest of the Great Interpolation of Luke: beyond Lk. 11 32 there is no material which can be assigned to the Galilean Source with any certainty. In these chapters the amount of material common to Matthew and Luke is not large (some 75 verses only), and the character of most of it is quite different. It seems hardly probable that G would have had even the eschatology of such sections as Lk. 12 49-59 and 17 20-37. This does, it is true, leave G without a fitting conclusion; but the existing Mark and Acts warn us not expect too much of an earlier source.

III

The passages thus far assigned to the G source consist of the four blocks of material, Luke 3 1-4 30; 6 20-8 3; 9 51-10 24; 11 1-32. It is possible that 6 12-18 (17-19) and 10 25-28 should also be added. The blocks contain, of course, more or less of editorial redaction, especially where the G source may have run parallel with Mark or some other document.

It will be noted at once that the G document combines a considerable amount of narrative with discourse materials. Thus, there are six narrative sections, and 11 sections of narrative with dialogue, as against only six of the latter only, in the remainder of the Great Interpolation of Luke; while G has but 5 sections of pure discourse and 9 of discourse with narrative setting, as against 7 and 16 respectively in the rest of the Great Interpolation. However, of the thirteen parables in the Great Interpolation, G contains only one, that of the Friend at Midnight.²¹

G's feeling for form is notable. It appears sometimes in the exact balancing of sentences, or even paragraphs,—as in the Beatitudes and Woes (6 20-26), the miracles of Elijah and Elisha (4 25-27), the chiasmic order of the Baptist's announcement (3 16), and perhaps in the pairing of the disciples

²¹ Bultmann's classification (*op. cit.*) shows the same features;—of the G materials he classifies 4 sections as pure narratives, 6 as apophthegmata, and 47 as sayings; while for the rest of the Great Interpolation the figures are 0, 10, 79.

in the list of 6 14-18. Most notable, however, are the triads of events or statements, which are numerous in this source,—three temptations (4 3-12), three classes moved by John's preaching (3 10-14), three short Beatitudes and three short woes (6 20-21, 24-25), three comparisons with the "sinners" (6 32-34), three unwilling disciples (9 57-62), and perhaps three short parables (11 11-12, TR, cf. Mt. 7 9). In all of these groups, it will be noted, the three members have very great similarity, if not identity, of structure.

A further formal characteristic is the use of quotations, often extensive, from the Old Testament,—in which respect this source stands second only to Matthew's gospel. Full quotation is found at 3 4-6; 4 18-19; 7 27 and 10 27; briefer reminiscences occupy prominent positions in 4 4-12; 7 22; 9 54; 10 15,—and the majority of these quotations are introduced formally with a skillfully inserted *γέγραπται*. There are few evidences of a peculiar vocabulary; though it may be noted that the verb *ἀγαπάω* occurs 7 times in four different sections of this source and only twice elsewhere in Luke.

The Christology of the source is that of the early chapters of Acts, with minor differences. Jesus is represented as rejecting the popular Messianic ideals (4 3-12, cf. 10 17-20; 11 27-28) held even by John the Baptist (3 9, 17; 7 19), and as choosing the *preaching* of the Kingdom, both personally (4 18-19, 21; 7 22; 9 60; 11 30, cf. 10 1) and through his disciples (9 60; 10 9, 11). In connection with this program he also appears as a teacher (6 20-49; 6 40; 10 18; 11 28, 31), and emphasis is placed upon "hearing" him (but cf. 6 46). Jesus is described as "son of God" (3 22; 4 3, 9; 10 22 *tris*,—half of the occurrences of this title in Luke), or as "son of Man" (6 22; 7 34; 9 58; 11 30) with about equal frequency; but the former term should be interpreted in the light of G's tendency to describe men also as "sons of God" (3 38; 6 35, 36; 11 2, 13,—also in 12 30, 32; 20 36 only).

The most definite title, however, which G gives to Jesus is that of "prophet" (7 16, 39, cf. 10 21-22) which is implicit in many passages. In particular, a parallel is often drawn between the work of Jesus and that of the great legendary prophets.

Comparisons with Elijah and Elisha are drawn explicitly (in 4 25-27 and in 9 54, TR), and are pointed by allusion and reminiscence in other passages (7 12, 15; 9 54, 61; 10 4); and this characteristic is the more significant because so accidental: there are, however, only three other references to the Elijah-Elisha stories in the whole of Luke (9 17; 19 41; 22 43).²² This interest in the narratives *about* the prophets, rather than in their actual words, appears again in the use of Jonah (11 30), and in the interest in John the Baptist (which is considerable, in this source cf. 3 3-18; 7 18-35), and in the comparison of Jesus and John (3 9, 15-17; 7 28; 11 1).

In conformity with the "prophetic" Christology there is also a depreciation of miracles and exorcism. Jesus refuses to use miracles as "signs" or to make them the basis of his ministry (4 9-12, 25-27; 11 16, 29-32), though it is apparently granted that they might be used as signs to the Gentiles (4 25-27; 10 13-15). Elsewhere the supernatural power is ascribed directly to God (7 16; 11 20) and the value of miracles is minimized in various ways (7 1-10; 10 9, 18-20; 11 16-19, 24-26).

The source shows little interest in eschatology or apocalyptic. A future judgment is expected (6 20-26, cf. 3 9, 17; 10 12-15) but there is no particularization of its details. The term "Kingdom of God" is never used in a definitely eschatological sense. The Kingdom is "preached" (8 1; 9 60), it is nigh or already possessed (6 20; 10 9, 11; 11 20), or it is mentioned more vaguely (7 28; 9 62; 11 2); but the concept is in marked contrast with the generally eschatological connotation of the term in the rest of the Great Interpolation. And the ethical emphasis is not upon the passive virtues most often associated with apocalyptic teaching,—watchfulness, trust, faith, patience,—but upon the active principles of love (6 27-35; 7 47; 10 25-27), even to the point of non-resistance (6 29-30; 9 55; 10 3, 11), and upon righteous conduct (3 10-14; 6 39-49; 10 28); and even faith and prayer become active and strenuous virtues in these sections (7 8-10; 11 5-10).

²² According to the excellent marginal references in the Bible Society's edition of Nestle's text.

As to social relations, there is a prominent interest in the poor, or rather, the source itself speaks with the very voice of the poor. It is the poor who are evangelized (3 10-14; 4 18; 7 22; 10 21-22, 23-24). Hunger and privation are ever-present *facts* in the thought of these sections (6 21, 25; 3 11; 4 3-4; 9 58; 11 3, 5-8, 11 TR), and they have no ascetic halo about them! The poor man's single shirt appears in parable and teaching (3 11; 6 29-30), and the missionaries are warned to present themselves as beggars (10 4) that they may share in the meagre gifts of the poor (10 7-8). Class consciousness is apparent occasionally (6 24-26; 7 44-46), and the interest in loans may also be significant (6 34; 7 41, cf. Mt. 5 42; the verb *δανίζεσθαι* appears only here). There is also a certain interest in the "sinners," so-called (3 8-10; 6 32-34; 7 37, 39, 47), and in other unfortunates (4 18; 7 22).

Finally, the exclusively Palestinian outlook of the source must be mentioned. The Old Testament seems to be still the ultimate religious authority (4 4-12; 10 26) as well as the witness to Jesus' person (4 21, etc.). Gentiles and Samaritans are rarely mentioned, and only with a certain condescension, though without a Pharisaic hostility (4 25-27; 7 3-5; 9 51-58; 10 13-15; 11 30, 32).

This latter characteristic is one of the few clues to the date and provenance of the document. With its primitive Christology, and the reflection of a community of the very poor, it seems to have come from a situation when the Gentile controversy had not become sufficiently acute to arouse within the Christian church the old Jewish prejudices and to cause bitterness and strife in the church. If that be true, the date would have to be placed later than the first conversions of Samaritans and Gentiles, but earlier than Galatians. As to provenance, although a Jerusalem origin is the natural hypothesis, there is nothing to suggest association with that city; and it *may* be that not only the scene but the origin of the source are to be found in Galilee.