

In the light of our present knowledge, the following lines read strangely :

On many questions of capital moment—such, *e.g.*, as the dates at which the documents composing the Pentateuch were written down . . . there is practical unanimity among men whose knowledge entitles them to judge. This agreement has been slowly attained : it has been severely tested by discussion, nor is there the slightest ground for thinking that it will ever be seriously disturbed.¹

Is it too much to hope that the day may come when Mr. Addis will recognize that this statement is a good deal *too* clear ?



Harnack on the Synoptic Problem.²

BY THE REV. T. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A.

DR. HARNACK, in his monograph on "Lukas der Arzt," dealt a heavy blow to those who impugn the early date and historicity of the writings of "the beloved physician." In his new book he discusses with his accustomed fullness the "second source"—known as Q of the Synoptic Gospels. As is well known, St. Mark forms the crown of the Synoptic record of our Lord's life and teaching, but many of the richest jewels in the crown are derived from a document which largely, although not entirely, consists of the sayings and addresses of our Lord. The portion of the non-Marcian text common to the other Synoptics constitutes one-sixth of St. Luke's Gospel and two-elevenths of the first Gospel. With the second Gospel in our possession, we are able to determine the method and character of the use made of it by the other Synoptists, and Harnack endeavours, from an exhaustive analysis and discussion of the non-Marcian common part of St. Matthew and St. Luke, to reconstruct the foundation document, and to determine its date and historic value.

¹ H. R., pp. 11, 12.

² "Sprüche und Reden Jesu," von A. Harnack. Leipzig, 1907.

The task is difficult but fascinating. Many have made the attempt with varying results, and it must be confessed that the foundation on which they relied is precarious. It would be impossible to restore St. Mark from the other Synoptics, but it is possible to discover broadly what he wrote from an analysis of the events narrated by St. Matthew and St. Luke. We are in a better position in the case of the "second source," for we have the basis of the work of the other Synoptists, and by most careful analysis their personal equations have, so to speak, been disclosed, and by the application of these to the common non-Marcan element, under the guidance of Dr. Harnack, we are able to reach conclusions which form, as it were, the nucleus of this lost document, erroneously called "The Logia."

Dr. Harnack sets out at length the undoubtedly common non-Marcan element of the two Gospels, and uses the Matthew text as basis, for he is convinced that St. Matthew preserves more accurately the words of the foundation narrative, and it is hard to resist his conclusion. The first Gospel appears to have been more conservatively composed as far as language is concerned, and its author, in Harnack's opinion, has a tendency to make his Gospel acceptable to the Jewish Christian communities of Palestine. It deviates less than that of St. Luke from the "second source," for St. Luke is an historian with a sense of the importance of style. In proof of this we may instance their treatment of the common portion of the Lord's Prayer—"Father, give us to-day our bread for the coming day; and forgive us our trespasses, as we have forgiven those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation."¹ Here St. Matthew preserves the prayer as it was used in the Christian communities. St. Luke, on the other hand, gives the meaning of the prayer. He does not hesitate to change its wording. St. Matthew reproduced it verbally, and if St. Luke had found in the source the first three petitions and the last ("deliver us from evil"), he certainly would not have omitted them. The

¹ Harnack considers that the true reading of St. Luke is: "Father, let Thy Holy Spirit come on us and purify us. Give us day by day," etc.

Matthæan additions are either taken from the Jewish Christian liturgy or are the work of St. Matthew himself. This is a fair example of Harnack's method. After dissecting the sections of the Synoptics derived from the common source, he concludes that the changes made by St. Matthew in the text are due to a tendency to construct a Gospel for Jewish Christians, and (as St. Matthew is the only theologian among the Synoptists) to a desire to establish his dogmatic views. On the other hand, St. Luke deals with the text more freely, but almost entirely from a stylist's point of view. Both Evangelists used one and the same Greek translation of an Aramaic source. More than this cannot be said concerning the unity and extent of the "source," whose Aramaic character often appears.

The words and grammar of the common portion are reviewed, and, as usual, nothing seems to be omitted to make the word-study complete. He shows the unity of the "source," and proves its linguistic differences from the other parts of the Synoptics. Considerations of language and style cannot establish certain conclusions, but there is no doubt about the grammatical and stylistic character and colour of this source. At first sight it would seem that this document does not hang together (*Zusammenhanglos*), but in this respect it does not differ from the Synoptics, and it has as definite a unity as they have. In contrast with them, it has no historical standpoint or tendency. St. Mark shows us the superhuman element ("the Son of God") in our Lord; St. Matthew, with the early Christian community in view, has an apologetic interest in presenting the Gospel in a "Jewish-anti-Jewish" form; and St. Luke, with his wider Hellenic outlook, displays the Saviour. Our "source" has none of these marks, and its horizon is even more Palestinian than that of the Synoptics.

The absence of narrative constitutes the fundamental difference between the Synoptics and the "source." It is not a Gospel in their sense, and its contents have not their bearing on the culmination of His life in the Crucifixion and Resurrection. A sceptic might assert that, as this is the oldest authority for

our Lord's history, it knows nothing of His Crucifixion. It begins with John the Baptist's preaching, and the temptation, and it should naturally end with the narrative of the Passion. This is bound up with the Resurrection, and it follows that the latter is unhistorical and the result of dogmatic presuppositions. Thus criticism wins its victory, for this source teaches in a few puzzling sentences that Jesus suddenly came to an end, and St. Matt. xxiii. 39 points in the same direction, for it says: "Ye shall not see Me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." Harnack makes short work of this position, which is to him senseless. In his opinion, all our knowledge of this source is too uncertain for any man to build thereon a critical structure.

Once more Harnack discusses the crucial difficulty of those who believe that the teaching of the Synoptists is in conflict with that of St. John on the Passion of our Lord. Schmiedel, in his last work on the fourth Gospel, boldly declares that the present tense in St. Matt. xi. 28 ("No man knoweth the Son save the Father, and neither doth any know the Father save the Son") was changed from the historic aorist ("knew") by an intentional alteration of a second-century Christian sect. Our author says that the Lucan parallel text with its present tense comes from the "source," and has undergone a similar change. He sees it means, with the present tense, the pre-existence of our Lord, and is essentially Johannine. Irenæus is called as a witness that the aorist was in use in the second century, and he (Irenæus) attributes this to an heretical falsification of the text. Citations are given from Greek Fathers, which prove that they used the present as well as the past tense. Discussing the Lucan text, Harnack has to meet the objection that the historic aorist does not fit in with the saying "knows (aorist 'knew') who the Son is save the Father," and he concludes that these words were not in the "source." His reading is "No man knew the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him." This is a conclusion reached on dogmatic grounds, and it cannot be forgotten that St. Matt. xiii. 32 reads :

“But of that day or that hour knoweth no man, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” This attests our Lord’s special mode of speech concerning “the Father” and “the Son,” using the titles absolutely. In the non-Marcian source we have the same use. It is hard to imagine the change from the present to the historic aorist being made in the Matthew and Luke text, and the fact that different Greek words (*γινώσκει* and *ἐπιγινώσκει*) are used in the Gospels confirms our confidence that the words in our text represent those written by the Evangelists.

Harnack concludes his study of the document by asserting that it was an early Aramaic collection of sayings belonging to the Apostolic age, and is older than St. Mark. The influence of Paulinism, which is so strongly evident in St. Mark, is here absent, and it contains no reference to the ruling ideas of St. Mark—that our Lord, His death and resurrection, are the Gospel. This document was composed in Palestine. St. Mark wrote his Gospel in Rome. Literary relationship between the two cannot be established. St. Mark may have used the “source,” for it was early in circulation, and no conclusion can be drawn as to his ignorance of it. Although its Apostolic origin cannot be proved, the writer deserves the greatest recognition, for to his piety and truthfulness, his ability and carefulness, we owe this invaluable collection of our Lord’s sayings.

Our author declares that for eighteen hundred years it has been decided that the conception of Jesus which is given in this “source” is more valuable than that of St. Mark’s Gospel, which must ever remain in a secondary position. Both have importance, but that of the sayings is paramount. The apocalyptic-eschatological elements of the preaching of Jesus must stand behind His pure morality and religion. The “source” proves that the main content of His teaching is “nothing else than the knowledge of God, and the ethics of repentance and faith, of world renunciation and the gaining of heaven.” Here Harnack the theologian speaks, but from the foundation of the Church Christians have seen in the Marcan

and non-Markan sources consistent records of Him who is their Lord and their God, and whose preaching is confirmed by His life, death, and resurrection.



Literary Notes.

TWO of our younger men have books in the press. One is by Mr. George M. Trevelyan, and the other by Mr. L. W. Vernon Harcourt. Mr. Trevelyan's volume is entitled "Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic." The author is, of course, a very capable writer, and was at one time a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and wrote that able work, "England in the Age of Wycliffe." The present volume is a history of the great political and military events in 1849 which caused the final breach between the Papacy and Italian national aspirations, and made Garibaldi the national hero of Italy. It contains a full military history of the siege of Rome by the French, and of Garibaldi's retreat, and centres entirely round his figure. Mr. Trevelyan has enhanced the value of his volume by the inclusion of a number of good maps and many illustrations. Mr. Harcourt's book is called "His Grace the Steward, and the Trial of Peers," the first part of which contains a history of the origin and development of the Stewardship of England. It is of some interest to note that the position and functions of this (so-called) first great officer of State are carefully considered, and in much detail. The second part of the volume takes in hand the *judicium parium*, and its application in England to the trial of peers of the realm. The development of the principle is traced from early times down to the reign of Henry VIII., when, by means, it is contended, of deliberate forgery, the Court of the Stewards of England had become an established institution. The whole work is based upon original documents, of which many have never before been printed.



The late Rev. George Matheson was engaged upon his posthumous volume, "Representative Women of the Bible," almost up to the very last moment of his life, which, it will be recalled, ended in August of last year. Dr. Matheson had, in fact, already completed the greater part of his task. In his original Preface the author wrote: "I have already published three volumes on the representative men of the Bible. I have been asked to supplement them by a volume of the representative women. By the representative women of the Bible I mean, not the women who represent the Bible, but those women of Scripture who are types of female qualities represented in all time. I have dealt with the women as I did with the men. I have imagined myself standing in a gallery studying the portraits of female forms just as they have been delineated, without inquiring either into their date or the names of their artists."

