

SYNOPTIC STUDIES.

III. SOME CRITICISMS ON PROFESSOR HARNACK'S "SAYINGS OF JESUS."

CIRCUMSTANCES too strong for the best of good intentions have made it impossible to continue these occasional studies on any sort of plan ; and I make no further apology for deserting the subject proposed at the end of my last paper (July, 1907). Professor Harnack's *Sprüche*¹ has raised afresh the most difficult of all Synoptic problems, and I propose to set down some of the questionings that have come up in the study of his book, as a small contribution towards settling the form of Q. What I have to say will be mainly confined to the earlier part of the book, in which Harnack reconstructs the text of Q. That such a reconstruction must be tentative at best is obvious, but we may get a little nearer to our goal by discussing principles.

Harnack's general method proceeds on the theory that Luke altered Q very freely on stylistic grounds, the alterations of "Matthew" being of a more material character though less frequent. There are one or two general criticisms that may be passed upon this theory before we take some definite examples. In deciding what is linguistically more primitive Harnack has made some assumptions which can no longer be taken for granted. One is that if either Matthew or Luke has a compound verb where the other has the simplex, we must assume that Q had the latter. No attempt is made to prove this, and we are ultimately shown what simple Greek the author of Q used because of the great predominance of uncompounded verbs in his vocabulary. But

¹ The quotations throughout are from the English edition. What a pity it is, by the way, that more care has not been taken with the proof-reading ! The Greek accents are shocking ; and a misprint like " casual " for " causal " (p. 306—original " begründend ") might give trouble.

it does not seem to have been observed before that Mark, who writes the least cultured Greek to be found in the New Testament (outside the Apocalypse), has an extraordinary affection for compound verbs. In proportion to the length of his Gospel, he has exactly as many compound verbs as Luke, and he is only surpassed in this respect by the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Book of Acts, the latter only by a small amount. Passing from the New Testament to the papyri, we find that the pre-Christian private letters in Witkowski's useful little collection¹ show a considerably higher proportion of compounds, and the letters there which are marked as illiterate have this characteristic nearly as strongly as the educated ones. There are other papyrus letters which dislike the compounds as much as the Fourth Gospel does; but this does not affect the point—the connexion between culture and compound verbs must go,² and with it a criterion on the strength of which Harnack decides for Matthew against Luke in dozens of places. Matthew's preference for the simplex is as likely to have ousted Q's compounds as Luke's preference for compounds is to have altered Q's simplicia: we must judge each case on its merits.

Another important note to make is that Harnack sometimes determines what is literary Greek (and therefore presumably an emendation of the rougher text of Q) by canons drawn from the literature alone. But here the papyri must have their say. *Ἐπηρεάζειν* looks literary enough, and Harnack assumes it to be Luke's emendation accordingly (p. 61); but it and its noun *ἐπήρεια* occur in papyrus petitions that owe nothing to the schoolmaster. This is not

¹ *Epistulae Privatae Graecae* (Teubner, 1906).

² Professor Burkitt remarks in a letter to me, after seeing my figures, that in English "Come with me" is literary, "Come along with me" is colloquial. This is, in fact, a thoroughly typical example.

the only word which takes a different literary complexion when the vernacular documents are compared. *Τματισμός* may or may not be original in Luke vii. 25, but it is a good popular word. So are *ἐνώπιον* and *ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι* (p. 84), *σουδάριον* (p. 125), *παραγίνεσθαι* (p. 86), and the phrase *ἐὰν γένηται*, c. inf. (p. 92—cf. my *Prolegomena*, p. 17); while *σιτομέτριον* occurs in the Petrie Papyri and the LXX, and the fact that its verb is censured by Phrynichus shows that it was good colloquial Greek. Whether *ψυχὴν ἀπολέσαι* appeared to Luke the Hellene "too paradoxical" (p. 114), we may question when we find *σῶσαι ψυχὰς πολλὰς* in a papyrus of pre-Christian date (TbP 45=Witkowski, p. 74).

There are, I believe, a fair number of places where we can demonstrate stylistic alteration on the part of the first Evangelist: the presence of these must naturally affect our judgement as to the principles of reconstruction. Matthew certainly dropped some vulgar forms which the literary Luke retained: that Luke *introduced* them is surely improbable in the extreme. Thus in Matthew vi. 30 the literary *ἀμφιένυσσω* is obviously, on Harnack's own principles, less original than the Lukan *ἀμφιάξει*, which, however, Harnack ignores (pp. 5, 140). In Matthew xxiii. 37 (p. 29) no one will suppose that the literary Hellene deliberately altered the correct *ἐπισυναγαγεῖν* of Q (so Harnack, p. 143) into the vulgar *ἐπισυνάξαι* (Luke xiii. 34), which is at home in the quite uneducated papyri. And this obvious consideration—which we may be quite sure Dr. Harnack would acknowledge when brought to his notice—suggests what seems to me a much more probable account of the relation between Matthew iii. 12 and Luke iii. 17 than that which is given on p. 2. In Luke *l.c.* N^a reads *συνάξαι*, of which one can hardly doubt both *συναγαγεῖν* of N^{*B} and *συνάξει* of Matthew are alternative and independent corrections. It accordingly stood in Q, with *διακαθάραι*; and

this construction was very simply mended by Matthew, to whom it seemed cumbrous. Harnack declares it to be an improvement on the two indicatives. This is clearly a matter of taste : the opposite conclusion seems more natural to me. Anyhow I must claim *συνάξαι* as self-evidencing, and this reading is only in Luke.

Difference of taste indeed rather frequently makes itself apparent in these questions ; and one has a natural shrinking from confession of a difference, where the opposite judgement comes from so consummate an authority as Harnack. One can only record the point and leave other students to choose. On p. 26 we read that *ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν* in Luke x. 24 "is an obvious stylistic improvement" on Matthew's *ἐπεθύμησαν*. I have tried hard to see the obviousness, but cannot resist the conclusion that "longed to see" is more forcible than "wished to see," which last I feel sure would never have been admitted by an artist like Luke, if it had not stood in his source. In Matthew iv. 6 we miss *ἐντεῦθεν* after *βάλε σεαυτὸν*, and we are told (p. 46) that is "a Lukan interpolation." What conceivable reason had Luke for inserting it ? "The word is found elsewhere in St. Luke." Yes, *once* ! Is it not more reasonable to say that Matthew dropped it as otiose, and Luke kept it because it was in Q ? There are other points in the restoration of Q in the Temptation story where I cannot feel confidence in the result. Would not Matthew xii. 40 justify us in claiming that "forty nights" is a Matthaean phrase and therefore interpolated ? Dr. Harnack himself declares that "the genuine text is the shortest" here ; and there are many places where one or two parallels are enough to make him claim a phrase as Lukan and therefore interpolated. Are we justified in crediting Q with the "exceeding high mountain," when the very vague *ἀναγαγών* so obviously demanded expansion ? That Matthew does thus interpret

is demonstrable in many passages. When Harnack asks (p. 45) why Matthew should have changed the one stone into "stones," it might fairly be replied that a single loaf would be absurdly insufficient to satisfy hunger, if the loaves were like those they make in Palestine to-day. A motive for Matthew's transposition of "the glory of them" into the introductory line (iv. 8) might be found in the fact that *αὐτῶν* refers back to *βασιλείας* in a very clumsy way: Luke left it as it stood in Q, but would never have introduced it. As to Luke's "extravagant" *οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδέν*, does not he use a similar phrase in just the same sense in Acts xxvii. 33? it would be absurd to suppose that the sailors had literally taken no food for a fortnight! I should seek further instances of Matthew's habit of abbreviating—which indeed is what he constantly does with the narrative of Mark—in iii. 11, where *βαστάσαι* "remove"¹ neatly concentrates the whole content of "stoop down and unloose"; and in xi. 27, where *ἐπιγινώσκει* exactly expresses the meaning of the longer phrase *γινώσκει τίς ἐστίν* found in Luke, and (as I am convinced) Q.² That Matthew paraphrases hard sayings when necessary I should show from x. 37, as one conspicuous example among many: the paradoxical *μισεῖν* is supported by the Fourth Gospel (in the parallel to ver. 39 and Luke xiv. 26), and would never have been introduced by a Gentile Evangelist. That Luke actually ousted the clear phrase of Matthew (cf. p. 87) in favour of one which he knew would make readers stumble, is a view which only conformity to a theory would suggest.

A few miscellaneous points may be collected. On p. 19 Harnack notes that *πᾶς* is "a favourite word" of Luke's.³

¹ A meaning recognized by R.V. in John xii. 6, and abundantly witnessed in papyri.

² This depends on the interpretation of *ἐπιγινώσκειν*, which I now think Dean Armitage Robinson has proved in his excursus in *Ephesians*. See my *Prolegomena*,² p. 113.

³ Cf. Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 85.

This may be, though as a matter of fact *πάς* occurs 128 times in the W.H. text of Matthew and only 157 times in Luke: this is respectively 1.88 per page and 2.18—not a very striking disparity. But Harnack at least twice accepts *πάς* (or *ἅπας*) for Q because it stands in Matthew (pp. 5 and 73), though Luke there does not use this pet word of his. We are told (pp. 20 and 274) that *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὄρα* “is a specifically Lukan expression,” on the strength of six¹ occurrences: “on the other hand, *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ* is only found in St. Matthew (twice again), and most probably comes from Q.” I cannot understand why the latter phrase is not on this showing “a specifically Matthaean expression.” When Luke uses “the finger of God” and Matthew “the spirit of God,” we find (p. 21) that the former “substitutes the Biblical expression”: why then are we “not certain” whether the same account should be given of Matthew’s “birds of the heaven” as against Luke’s “ravens” (p. 36)? Similarly (p. 49) Harnack rejects Luke’s *κλαίοντες* in the Beatitudes in favour of Matthew’s *πενθοῦντες*, which, however, strongly suggests assimilation to Isaiah lxi. 1.

In the well-known difficulty of Matthew v. 40=Luke vi. 29 Harnack takes for granted that the idea of judicial action is more primitive than that of the robber clutching at the garment that comes first. I am afraid I cannot regard this as self-evident, though I am not going to argue for the opposite view. I could quite imagine that Matthew has after his manner conformed the precept to the Old Testament, and made it refer to taking the poor man’s garment as a pledge. On the same page (60) we find Harnack’s treatment of the Lord’s Prayer. That the Prayer in Matthew’s form

¹ Harnack says seven on p. 274. Taking Luke’s two books together, the Lukan *αὐτῇ τῇ ὄρα* (with or without *ἐν*) occurs eight times, which would answer to 3.8 times in a book of the length of Matthew.

has been affected by liturgical use seems to me extremely probable.¹ I prefer this to the assumption that Matthew has made the additions himself. But if this is so, why not regard the *δίδου* as original, the *δός* as an assimilation to the other aorists, appropriate when the Prayer has passed into daily use? The isolation of this present imperative seems to me a strong plea for its originality.² In that case Luke has the Prayer very nearly as it stood in Q: that the reading "Let Thy Holy Spirit come on us and cleanse us" is the true text of Luke is a decision we must be allowed to doubt,³ and otherwise Luke's form approves itself in almost everything.

It seems fair to plead that Harnack is hardly consistent when he lays so much stress on Luke's stylistic alterations and then credits him with "a feeble word" which he was "fond of using" (*ἐγγιζέειν*, p. 66). When this same word occurs in Matthew, it is original (p. 81). Now in this place (Matthew vi. 20) the phrase "dig through" may very well be repeated from xxiv. 43, where the verb occurs in a Q passage: Matthew is fond of repeating his phraseology. And with all deference to the instinct of a great scholar like Harnack, might I suggest a doubt as to the "feebleness" of the phrase in Luke xii. 33—"where thief never comes near it, nor does the moth destroy it"? We are told on p. 73 that "the falling was great" (Matt. vii. 27) is a "solecism," so that Luke's "great breach" is a correction. Possibly, but I demur to the "solecism." Perhaps in Germany they have no analogue to "Humpty Dumpty had a great fall," which in English at any rate is idiomatic enough.

¹ I may refer here to an excellent article by Mgr. A. S. Barnes in the *Contemporary Review* for August, 1906.

² In *Prolegomena*, p. 119, I expressed a different opinion: it is altered in ed.³

³ Chase (*The Lord's Prayer*, pp. 25 ff.), after citing the scanty but widespread evidence for the clause, suggests a liturgical origin ultimately based on passages in *Acts*.

Turning a few pages, we have a criticism of the order of clauses in Matthew viii. 11, 12, and Luke xiii. 28, 29. It is said that the clause "There (ἐκεῖ) shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth" is out of place in Luke, because the ἐκεῖ is out of connexion. "The change of order in St. Luke is due to the transposition of ἐκεῖ κ.τ.λ. to the beginning, for which the reason is not obvious." Exactly—but is not the very fact that the transposition is *ex hypothesi* meaningless a sufficient reason why the literary Luke should not have ventured upon it? That Matthew's order is better is a reason against its being original, if we are to apply the reasoning by which Harnack is constantly refusing originality to Luke.

There are a great many points in which I cannot feel satisfied that Harnack has justly set aside Luke's phraseology; but it is not worth while to mention them where it is only a case of taste against taste. Two or three more instances might be given in which the case does not seem proven. Why on p. 83 is *μὴ φοβηθῆτε* in Luke xii. 4 said to be "more elegant than *μὴ φοβεῖσθε*" of Matthew x. 28? Because it is more appropriate—"Do not be afraid (in the future)" followed in verse 7 by "Do not be afraid (as this prophecy prompts you to be)"? Is it not more likely that Matthew, with his love for uniformity, levelled a distinction that seemed otiose? Later on in the same section there is an "enigma" which seems to me fairly easy—"the existence of the variants, 'two sparrows for a farthing' and 'five sparrows for two farthings.'" I have always assumed the working of the ordinary commercial principle of reduction on taking a quantity. "Had sparrows become cheaper?" is Harnack's answer, on the strength of which, as usual, he votes for Matthew's form. But surely if we are to choose between the complex price and the simpler one here, it is easier to assume that Matthew got rid of a superfluity than that Luke invented one for no apparent purpose; for the two prices

must be regarded as equivalent to one another on ordinary rules. In the Woes on the Pharisees I find it hard to see "the cold, matter-of-fact tone of" Luke xi. 47, 48 (p. 102); while in assuming that Luke has introduced "greater precision" in writing *οἴκου* for *ναοῦ* Harnack appears to overlook the distinction between *ναός* and *ἱερόν*. As a matter of fact *ναός* is a better Greek equivalent of *οἶκος*, which was a piece of literalism that Luke would never have admitted had he not found it in his source. That Luke has avoided the word *παρουσία* (p. 107) as belonging "to the sphere of Jewish Messianic dogma," and "an unsuitable term for that Second Coming in which Christians believed," appears very strange in view of Paul's frequent use of the word. It has become clear that the word was a current vernacular term for a *royal visitation*,¹ and so a most suggestive and natural word on Paul's lips for the Return of the King of heaven. Why should a disciple of Paul avoid the word except because it was not in his source?

Nearly three years ago, in a paper on the Beatitudes (EXPOSITOR, August, 1906) I pleaded for the superior originality of Luke in this section, and I feel bound to maintain this still. In that connexion I called attention to the way in which Matthew is inclined to heighten parallelism: I compared the tendency of the Oxyrhynchus Logia, in which this is carried yet further. Now Professor Harnack notes (p. 18) that parallelism is frequent in Q, and that Matthew "has often destroyed it from a desire for brevity." If this is so, I am convinced that he has also not infrequently mended his source so as to show poetical symmetry. It is hard to understand how Luke, with his sense for literary form, should deliberately destroy such a perfectly balanced series of parallel clauses as we find in Matthew vii. 24-27. It is Harnack himself who has laid such stress on Luke's author-

¹ See Milligan's *Thessalonians*, pp. 145 f.

ship of the canticles in chapters i. and ii. The various motives which Harnack suggests (pp. 72-4) for Luke's marring of this passage seem to me beside the mark: it is much more probable that Matthew worked up a Q passage which Luke has retained with little alteration. I should, on the same ground, differ from Harnack's decision (p. 29) that Matthew xviii. 7*b* is better than Luke xvii. 1*b*, "because of the parallelism." We may cite Matthew vii. 9, 10 as another example: in Luke (and Q) we have Fish and Serpent, Egg and Scorpion—two *harmful* things given instead of necessary food; while in Matthew the parallelism is heightened by prefixing Loaf and Stone, from which merely *useless* substitution there is a climactic rise to the harmful. (Matthew got it probably from the similar association in iv. 3, and of course he rejected the superfluous third clause in consequence.) In the same chapter we notice also verses 15-20 with their beautifully balanced sequence. Now the essence of this passage appears in xii. 33, which answers to Luke vi. 43, 44; the correspondence of verse 45 there with Matthew xii. 35 shows that Matthew's second presentation of the passage properly belongs to the Sermon, rather than the first. Matthew has apparently worked up the rough and disconnected saying of Q to fit its place in the Sermon, and has then repeated it in a later discourse, with a form less differing from Q: Luke has kept it nearly as he found it. Such an account harmonizes with all we find in the First Evangelist's setting of the Sermon. Recognizing the fragmentary character of the discourse as it stood in Q, he gathered together kindred matter from other sources and from other parts of Q and arranged them with wonderful skill round a connected sequence of thought. He found the pearls scattered, and he provided a string whereon to display them. Few would care to say that Luke found the necklace complete, but broke the string and let half of the pearls be scattered.

I should like to close with a note on Matthew xi. 16, 17= Luke vii. 31, 32. The key to the form of Q seems to be found in the reading *λέγοντες* for *ἂ λέγει* in Luke. This is attested by D and L, the Ferrar group, six Old Latin MSS. and the Bohairic: since *ἂ λέγει* can be immediately explained from assimilation to Matthew, this reading seems better, despite NB. Now this involves taking *προσφωνοῦσιν* as indicative—"and they call to one another, saying. . . ." In that case Matthew's *προσφωνοῦντα* may be based on a natural misunderstanding, which further caused the *λέγοντες* to be changed to *ἂ . . . λέγουσιν*. Probably also *τοῖς ἑτέροις* is a stylistic alteration for *ἀλλήλοις* of Q: strictly speaking, only *one* party said this to the other. Now note that with Luke's reading the parable comes out right, for the "generation" is represented by the sulky children to whom "they call." The subject is indefinite, and the *ἀλλήλοις* invites mending; but these are roughnesses due to Q, which Luke did not remove. Matthew did—but with the result that the parts in the parable are inverted. For the well-known crux which Matthew presents in the context of this passage (xi. 12)—Luke removes it to a distance, and it can hardly have been connected in Q—I venture to suggest that both Evangelists have tried to interpret by expansion a shorter ambiguous phrase. Suppose that Q had simply *οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος μέχρι (or ἕως) Ἰωάνου ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βιάζεται*, "The prophets, and the law, were until John: from his time the kingdom is being eagerly entered," or "forced on." Matthew had to adapt this saying, which he took from a different context, and he gave his interpretation of the difficult *βιάζεται* by adding a clause. Luke in his turn paraphrases the word independently, using easier language for an idea not likely to be understood by Gentile readers, but makes a minimum of change in the words.

I do not like to close a paper devoted wholly to criticism without a word of whole-hearted appreciation of these "Studies" of the great master to whom theology owes so much. In doctrinal presuppositions he stands more with German scholarship than with British: even the less conservative among us would give much more extended holidays to the word "legend" than they are disposed to do beyond the Rhine! But for that very reason British liberals in theology welcome the more heartily the researches of one who cannot be suspected of bias, and one who writes with authority unequalled among all our living scholars. In this volume Professor Harnack gives us some declarations of high importance, which will be eagerly welcomed by men who try to defend on modern lines the central doctrine of Christianity. The high antiquity and trustworthiness of Q, the argument in favour of our Lord's having used words about Himself implying a unique relation to God, and the crushing condemnations of certain latter-day extravagances of criticism falsely so called, will serve as examples. Nor can one easily forget the excursus in his third volume (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 290-297) in which he states the "weighty considerations" in favour of dating Acts "as early as the beginning of the seventh decade of the first century." He does not adopt this date, as against "the time of Titus or the earlier years of Domitian"; but he leaves it open, and meanwhile gives the case for this astonishingly early date, with arguments greatly weakening the case for the later one. *Acts* in the early sixties and *Luke* of course to precede it—*Mark* therefore in the fifties and Q no one knows how much earlier still! And this comes to us as a recognized possibility not from an "apologist," bound hand and foot to a tradition which itself never pleaded for dates so early, but from the author of *What is Christianity?* and the most famous scholar in the greatest University in the world. It

fairly takes our breath away. Perhaps the "legends" about the Resurrection may yet be studied afresh on modern scientific lines—lines lying, one presumes, at more or less distance alike from Professor Lake's and Professor Orr's—and prove to have some truth in them after all!

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

*THE EXCAVATIONS AT GEZER AND RELIGION
IN ANCIENT PALESTINE.*¹

THE opening years of the present century have been marked by greatly increased activity in the excavation of the ancient sites of Palestine. Down to the close of the last century systematic excavation had been largely left to the English Palestine Exploration Society, and this Society had mainly confined its excavations to Jerusalem, and in the last years of the century to Tell el-Hesy (Lachish) and four other Tells in the Shephelah, which could not be certainly identified with particular places named in the ancient literature.

Since 1900, excavations have been undertaken on five sites of ancient fame—Gezer, Taanach, Megiddo, Samaria, Jericho. At Taanach Dr. Sellin carried through extensive and successful operations under the patronage of the Austrian government and the Vienna Academy of Sciences in 1902 and 1903; he is now superintending the excavations at Jericho, which have not yet gone far enough to produce results entirely commensurate with those of some sites that have been more fully worked over, but which, thanks to the greater fame of Jericho, have lately attracted the attention of our daily Press. The excavations at Samaria, under American direction, are also as yet in an early stage; no site perhaps promises more for our knowledge of Hebrew history in particular, if only the work is thoroughly and

¹ A lecture delivered to the Jews' Literary Society.