

review of the *Dictionary of the Bible* and *Encyclopædia Biblica*. It is pleasant to read this able reviewer's estimate of Nestle's work: 'This article [it is the article on the TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT], it is needless to say, is admirable. The author is as genial as he is fine a scholar, and he sets out the principles of textual criticism in the clearest and most readable manner.' This also is worth noting: 'In the article on SIMON MAGUS it seems to be conclusively shown that the identification of Simon Magus with St. Paul in early Christian literature, on which so much of the

depreciation of Acts depends, is a mere modern fancy.'

A new quarterly has appeared in America—the *Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly*. It is described as 'a Magazine of Religion, Philosophy, Science, and Literature.' The first article in the first number is written by Professor R. V. Foster. It consists of 'Thoughts' on God and Human Nature. The second number is opened by Professor Goodspeed with a very clear article on a very puzzling subject, 'Sennacherib's Invasion of Judah.'

## The Disuse of the Marcan Source in St. Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14.

BY THE REV. CANON SIR JOHN C. HAWKINS, BART., M.A., OXFORD.

### III.

OF the 35 verses, constituting about one-tenth of Lk 9<sup>51-1814</sup>, which alone contain any matter which is in any way parallel to Mark, 13 still remain to be examined. They are found in three passages, two of which are longer and more complex than any that have been hitherto discussed, and all of which deserve careful and minute attention, for it is from them chiefly that a cursory reader might gain the impression that Luke's disuse of the Marcan source was not entire in this division of his Gospel, and that consequently what we have here is not simply and completely a 'great interpolation' into the Marcan *Grundchrift*.

#### 1. Luke x. 25-28.

This passage, which is the earliest of the three, has to be brought into comparison with Mk 12<sup>28-34</sup>, with which Mt 22<sup>34-40</sup> is exactly parallel in position and in general substance. For the two latter passages describe one of four brief discussions which appear to be represented as occurring consecutively on the Tuesday before the death of Jesus (Mt 22<sup>15-40</sup>, Mk 12<sup>18-37</sup>; cf. Lk 20<sup>20-44</sup>). But Luke has there three only of those discussions, for he omits the question of the scribe (Mark) or Pharisaic lawyer (Matthew) as to the first or great commandment, and the reply which that question

received. His only account of such a dialogue is that given in the passage now before us (10<sup>25-28</sup>), which forms part of the great interpolation. But the contrasts between it and the Marco-Matthæan account are very considerable: (a) the incident is attributed to a much earlier time and to a quite different locality, and it leads up to the Parable of the Good Samaritan; (b) the lawyer does not, as in Mark and Matthew, ask about the 'first' or 'great commandment,' but (as in Mk 10<sup>17</sup>, Lk 18<sup>18</sup>, and cf. Mt 19<sup>16</sup>) about the way to 'inherit eternal life'; and (c) by the interrogative form of the response to the lawyer, he himself is made to be the quoter of the well-known passage from Deuteronomy, which in Mark and Matthew forms the direct reply given by Jesus. These three alterations—or, at any rate, the first and third of them,—could hardly have been made by a writer who had the Marcan document before him as one of his sources, and who relied upon it, and especially upon its order, as Luke did usually. And they constitute divergences which very far outweigh two Marco-Lucan correspondences which have now to be noted and allowed for.

These correspondences occur in the same verse, Lk 10<sup>27</sup> compared with Mk 12<sup>30</sup>. (a) The first of them is important. To the three elements of man's being which are to be exercised in the love

of God these two evangelists add a fourth, viz. ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου (Mark) and ἐν ὅλη τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου (Luke). This coincidence is not very likely to have been accidental, although it is possible that the use of ἰσχύς in this connexion may have come naturally to both writers from a reminiscence of its occurrence in 4 (2) K 23<sup>25</sup>, where in the Deuteronomic language used in extolling the character of Josiah, ἰσχύς is adopted as the rendering of חֵזק, instead of δύναμις, as in Dt 6<sup>5</sup>. (β) The other such correspondence is certainly insignificant. It is true that Mark and Luke agree in having ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδιάς σου against Matthew's ἐν with the dative, but this is only because the two former adhere more closely than the latter to the usage of prepositions in Dt 6<sup>5</sup>, LXX. It may be well to place that passage side by side with these quotations, adding to them the scribe's reply in Mk 12<sup>33</sup>, which is practically a second quotation in that Gospel, so that the numerous variations may be clearly seen; though indeed there is no passage of the O.T. i. quotations from which we should so little expect to find variations as the leading portion of the familiar 'Shema' (Dt 6<sup>4-9</sup> 11<sup>13-21</sup>, Nu 15<sup>37-41</sup>).

Dt 6<sup>5</sup> ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου.

Mt 22<sup>37</sup> ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ἐν ὅλη καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλη τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλη τῇ διανοίᾳ σου.

Mk 12<sup>30</sup> ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης καρδιάς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου.

Lk 10<sup>27</sup> ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης καρδιάς σου καὶ ἐν ὅλη τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλη τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλη τῇ διανοίᾳ σου.

Mk 12<sup>33</sup> τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης καρδιάς καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος . . . περισσώτερον ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.

To which passages may be added for further comparison, 4 (2) K 23<sup>25</sup>, above referred to: ὃς ἐπέστρεψεν πρὸς Κύριον ἐν ὅλη καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν ὅλη ἰσχύϊ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν ὅλη ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ (so in B; in A ἰσχύϊ follows ψυχῇ).

On the whole, then, and after giving due weight to the coincidence as to ἰσχύς, there is no sufficient ground for supposing that Luke was here using Mark as one of his authorities. It seems much more reasonable to assume either (α) that the two writers were referring to two distinct incidents—and it is by no means unlikely that the Shema, which as an often-repeated formula 'undoubtedly belongs to the time of Christ' (Schürer, *H.J.P.* ii. 2. p. 77; cf. p. 84) might more than once enter into His discussions with Jewish νομοκοί—, or else (β) that one incident had in the course of oral tradition been deflected into these two forms.

On the other hand, and by way of contrast, it

deserves notice that while Matthew agrees with Mark as to the time and place of this incident, the verbal correspondences between him and Luke only are very considerable, viz. νομικός (used here only by Matthew, but often by Luke), πειράζων (for which, however, Luke characteristically has ἐκπειράζων), διδάσκαλε, and ἐν τῷ νομῷ, besides the use of ἐν with ψυχῇ and διανοία, which more than balances the Marco-Lucan use of ἐξ with καρδιάς which has been mentioned. These identities seem sufficient to show either that Matthew and Luke were influenced by some non-Marcian source, or else that one of them was familiar with the other's Gospel in some form. There is not much here to guide us towards a decision between these alternatives, but that the former of them is by far the more probable will, I think, be suggested by the analogy of the passage which we have next to consider.

## 2. Luke xi. 15, 17-23.

These seven verses have to be brought into comparison with Mk 3<sup>22-27</sup>. And it is at once evident that the verbal resemblances in which Mark and Luke stand alone are of the slightest

kind. There are but three of them at the utmost.

(α) There is the use of ἐπί for 'against' twice in Mk 3<sup>24, 25</sup>, and in Lk 11<sup>17</sup>, where Matthew (12<sup>25</sup>) has κατά; but we have already seen that κατά with this meaning is a favourite usage of his (see on Lk 12<sup>10</sup> in the previous part of this article, and cf. especially Mt 10<sup>35</sup> with Lk 12<sup>53</sup>); and even he agrees with the others in having ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν in the very next verse (12<sup>26</sup>=Mk 3<sup>26</sup>=Lk 11<sup>18</sup>). (β) There is the parallel use of the participial forms εἰσελθὼν in Mk 3<sup>27</sup> and ἐπελθὼν in Lk 11<sup>22</sup>; but this little grammatical resemblance can count for nothing in comparison with the mass of exclusively Marco-Matthæan identities which distinguish the records of this saying about the 'strong man armed.' (γ) And it is not impossible that ὅτι λέγετε κ.τ.λ. in Lk 11<sup>18</sup> may be a reminiscence of Mark's brief concluding comment, ὅτι ἔλεγον κ.τ.λ., in 3<sup>30</sup> or vice versa.

But to most people it will seem far more probable that none of these three little similarities betoken a common source. At any rate, it will be admitted that their testimony in favour of the dependence of Luke upon Mark would be outweighed by any fairly good arguments for the independence of the two accounts. And a careful study of those accounts in their relation to the parallel passage of Matthew (12<sup>24-30</sup>) will be found to supply such an argument.

That study may be best commenced by a reference to the incident of asking for a sign, which in Matthew follows upon, and in Luke is actually bound up with, the controversy which produced this 'defensive discourse' (as it has been aptly named) on the subject of casting out demons. We find that Matthew, and he alone, has *two* accounts of such a request for a sign and of the answer with which it was met, one of those accounts being found in Mt 16<sup>1-4</sup> (vv.<sup>2</sup> and <sup>3</sup> are almost certainly spurious), and being parallel to, and presumably derived from, Mk 8<sup>11, 12</sup>, and the other occurring here (Mt 12<sup>38-40</sup>), and being parallel to Lk 11<sup>16</sup> and <sup>20f</sup>. So these two incidents which come before us in Mark and Luke respectively, and are by them attributed to different occasions, are treated by Matthew as doublets, which may be taken as an indication that he drew them from two distinct sources. He does not, however, take this course as to the 'defensive discourse' which is now under our consideration; though it happens that he does twice record miracles which might have led up to such a discourse (with Mt 12<sup>22, 23</sup>; cf. Mt 9<sup>32-34</sup>, remember that v.<sup>34</sup> is bracketed by WH as perhaps a 'Western non-interpolation'), he does not twice append any sayings of this defensive kind. Probably it may have seemed to him too distinctive and striking a discourse to have been delivered twice, — or at any rate too distinctive and striking to need to be recorded twice in the Gospel. So, instead of giving in one place the Marcan account and in another place the (probably Logian) account used by Luke, he combines or 'conflates' them into a single account here. That this was almost certainly the genesis of the Matthean passage as we have it, may be seen most conveniently and convincingly in Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, or less easily in any ordinary Harmony of the Gospels (though, indeed, the arrangement of these parallel passages by Tischendorf in secs. 47

and 91 of his *Harmonia Evangelica* is not as simple and helpful as usual). For the following phenomena will be observed in the course of a close comparison of Mt 12<sup>24-30</sup>, Mk 3<sup>22-27</sup>, Lk 11<sup>15, 17-23</sup>:—

i. Mark's record is considerably the shortest of the three, the number of words being in Matthew 136, in Mark 98, in Luke 139.

ii. The chief cause of this disparity in length lies in three entire verses which are found almost word for word in Matthew and Luke, so that they must have had a common origin, but to which Mark has no parallel at all (Mt 12<sup>27, 28</sup> and <sup>30</sup>, Lk 11<sup>19, 20</sup> and <sup>23</sup>).

iii. And, besides those three complete verses, Matthew has some detached words and phrases which are found also in Luke but not in Mark, and as to which it is hard to believe that they were all adopted independently by the compilers of the First and Third Gospels, viz. (a) *εἰδὼς . . . αὐτῶν* (with *ἐνθυμήσεις* in Matthew here as in 9<sup>4</sup>, and with *διανοήματα* in Luke); (b) the participial forms *μερισθείσα* in Matthew, and, according to the Lucan habit of prefixing prepositions, *διαμερισθείσα* in Luke; (c) the verb *ἐρρημόν*, which is found in N.T. only here and in Rev 17<sup>16</sup> 18<sup>16, 19</sup>; and (d) the interrogative form of the sentence *πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ*;

iv. And Matthew further agrees with Luke in introducing this discourse by means of the record of a miracle which had just been wrought, whereas Mark only speaks of it as resulting from the inference which 'scribes which came down from Jerusalem' had drawn from such miracles generally. The exclusive agreement of Matthew and Luke in this point is particularly noteworthy, because as a rule such agreement is not found to exist in records of acts, but only in records of discourses. The only other two exceptions to this rule are the accounts of the Temptation and of the Healing of the Centurion's Servant (Mt 8<sup>5-13</sup>, Lk 7<sup>2-10</sup>). But, indeed, the former of these can hardly be called an exception, for it could only have been regarded as embodying what Jesus had revealed.

v. On the other hand, it is with Mark rather than with Luke that Matthew agrees as to the period of the ministry in which this discourse was spoken, though he is not here following Mark's order exactly.

vi. And Matthew's v.<sup>29</sup> corresponds almost

precisely with Mark's v.<sup>27</sup> in the presentation of the little parable of the 'strong man armed,' while Luke's vv.<sup>21, 22</sup> differ very widely from them,<sup>1</sup> as has been already noticed.

vii. The use of Mark by Matthew is further supported by the fact that they both subjoin immediately to the verses now under consideration the passage on the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Mt 12<sup>31, 32</sup>, Mk 3<sup>28, 29</sup>), and their versions of it agree not only exactly in position but generally in form and substance, the few and easily accounted for exceptions being (a) the absence in Matthew of the plural *ἰδι τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, which, though common in the O.T., is almost disused in the N.T., being found besides only in Eph 3<sup>5</sup>; (b) the expansion by him of Mark's *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* into the then familiar Jewish eschatological terms *οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι* (see Schürer, *H.J.P.* ii. 2. p. 177, and especially the references there to *Pirqe Aboth*, and 4 Esdras;<sup>2</sup> and (c) his omission of the profound saying *ἕνοχος ἔσται αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος*, the difficulty of which is proved by the later introduction of a *facilior lectio* even into the Marcan text itself. While, on the other hand, we have seen previously that the corresponding Lucan saying is considerably more compressed, besides occupying an entirely different position (12<sup>10</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> Matthew agrees with 23 words or parts of words out of the 26 words used by Mark, but with only 7 words or parts of words of the 33 words used by Luke.

<sup>2</sup> But see also Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, p. 140 (Eng. trans.).

viii. Finally, the few words in Mt 12<sup>24-30</sup> which remain after deducting those which we have seen to be assignable to Mark and Luke (or their sources) respectively, are just such as would be used by a compiler. For almost all of them are either quite colourless and commonplace, as *ἀκούσαντες*, and the use of *πόλις* as a third illustration intermediate between *βασιλεία* and *οἰκία*, or else they are such as we know to be characteristic of the same writer in other parts of his compilation, viz., *ἐνθυμήσεις*, and, at least against Mark, *Φαρισαῖοι*. The only alteration made by Matthew from his presumed sources which would not come under either of these descriptions is his use of *πνεύματι* (v.<sup>28</sup>), which might well seem to him a more easy and intelligible expression for the divine power as exercised against demons than *δακτύλῳ*, which is found in Lk 11<sup>20</sup>, being probably suggested by the language of Ex 8<sup>10</sup>.

These eight observations combine to prove almost irresistibly that Matthew 'conflated' his record of this discourse from two sources, which we have substantially before us in our Luke and Mark. And the insignificance of the only three resemblances which could be found between these two latter, and between them only, shows with almost equal cogency that up to the time of the employment of them by Matthew, they had been quite independent of one another, though they embody traditions either of the same controversy or at least of the same class of controversies.

(To be continued.)

## What I Saw at the Orientalist Congress.

BY AGNES SMITH LEWIS, HON. PH.D. (HALLE), HON. LL.D. (ST. ANDREWS), CAMBRIDGE.

THIRTY-SIX hours from Harwich on a calm sea, and three days in the thriving city of Hamburg, were a fitting prelude to five days of feasting on the best and latest which Germany has to offer in the way of Biblical and Eastern lore for the delectation of her scholar-guests. Many things conspired to make the thirteenth Congress of Orientalists a conspicuous success; so that we shall in future have no difficulty in replying to a

question which was more than once put to us by the intelligent burgesses of Geneva: 'What profit is there in these gatherings?'

To begin: the initial Bureau for the transaction of business, opened on the evening of Thursday, 4th September, was a triumph of German methodical good sense. When we remember the confusion which was rampant in Paris, and how invitations addressed to us and to others remained unposted