

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.

IV.

3. Luke xiii. 18, 19.

THERE remains a passage which is much briefer in itself, and can be treated very much more briefly, than the 'defensive discourse,' but which supplies evidence pointing in the same direction. It is the Parable of the Mustard Seed, which Matthew (13^{31f.}) and Mark (4^{30ff.}) place in their collections of seven and three parables respectively, as spoken by the sea of Galilee somewhat early in the ministry, but which Luke places much later, 'subjoining it to, and seeming by ἔλεγεν οὖν to connect it with, the deep impression made in a synagogue by the healing of a woman 'which had a spirit of infirmity.' On the other hand, Luke agrees with Matthew in annexing to it the companion parable of the Leaven—the only parable recorded by those two evangelists but not by Mark, unless we take the Talents and the Pounds, and the Marriage Feast and the Great Supper, as versions of the same two parables respectively.

Here again, as in the last case, it will be observed—

i. That Matthew's language has much in common with Mark only, viz. μικρότερον πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, ὅταν, μείζον τῶν λαχάνων, ὥστε with infinitives instead of finite verbs following καί, besides the unimportant because natural use of forms of the verb σπείρειν instead of Luke's verb βάλλειν, which is much less usual in this particular sense.

ii. That on the other hand Matthew has also not a little in common with Luke only, viz. λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος, αὐτοῦ or ἑαυτοῦ with the same meaning, forms of ἀξάνειν, δένδρον, ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ (cf., however, κλάδους in Mk 4³²), similarities which, though not being very distinctive in themselves severally, are too numerous to have occurred accidentally in this short passage.

iii. That there remains nothing peculiar to Matthew himself except some quite unimportant words of connexion and his usual substitution of τῶν οὐρανῶν for τοῦ Θεοῦ after βασιλεία.

These three observations show very distinctly that the various forms of the parable are best accounted for by assuming that Matthew combined the two sources which are substantially preserved for us in our Mark and Luke. But we cannot add so confidently as in the preceding case, that these two sources were quite independent of one another. For in the introduction to the parable there is a rather remarkable correspondence in which Mark and Luke stand alone. While Matthew has the simple statement, ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν (cf. Mark's θάμεν) αὐτοῖς, λέγων ὁμοία κ.τ.λ., the others record a doubly interrogative sentence with which the parable was pre-
faced—

Mk 4 ³⁰ καὶ ἔλεγεν, πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θάμεν;	Lk 13 ¹⁸ ἔλεγεν οὖν, τίνι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τίνι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν;	Is 40 ¹⁸ τίνι ὁμοιώσατε Κύριον καὶ τίνι ὁμοιώματι ὁμοιώσατε αὐτόν;
---	---	---

I have placed by the side of the Marcan and Lukan verses that verse of 2 Isaiah,—a part of the O.T. very familiar to the N.T. writers,—because of its remarkable similarity to them in structure and expression, and because there is therefore a possibility that its double interrogation may have become a kind of formula in the introduction of parabolic teaching, and thus may have affected the language of Mark and Luke independently. We find the single question τίνι ὁμοιώσω just below in Lk 13²⁰ and again in Mt 11¹⁶=Lk 7³¹, and there is no doubt that the corresponding query למה הוּא דומה למה, as quoted by Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Mt 13³, or sometimes למה הוּא דומה, as found in *Pirke Aboth* 3²⁷ 4²⁷,²⁸, was both ancient and usual as a Jewish preface to parables. But there seems to be no evidence for such a use of the double interrogation, so it must be owned that some sort of derivation from one Gospel or another is a more natural explanation of the coincidence.

We ought, then, in fairness to reckon this introduction to the Parable of the Mustard Seed as forming, together with καλὸν τὸ ἄλας and the use of forms of ἀρτύω in Mk 9⁶⁰, Lk 14³⁴, περικίεται in

Mk 9⁴², Lk 17², and the addition of *ισχυς* in Mk 12³⁰, Lk 10²⁷, a group of five intimations that there had been some kind of bridge of communication between the Marcan and Lucan Gospels as we have them in those parts of the latter Gospel which have now been examined. I have noted in passing ten other similarities or identities between those two Gospels exclusively,¹ but it has seemed to me that all these are expressions which might have suggested themselves, and indeed are likely to have suggested themselves, to the two writers independently as obvious and suitable to the matters which they both had in hand. That however, as I have admitted, cannot be said of the five similarities which have just been recapitulated. But it does not therefore follow that those coincidences—even if reinforced by any significance that may be thought by any one to attach to the other ten or to some of them—are sufficient to prove any *direct use* of one of these Gospels by the other. Their evidence is much more in favour of there having been some more indirect and casual means by which the words or phrases came across from the one document or line of tradition to the other, for it is most unlikely that the venerated Marcan source, the vehicle of Peter's teaching, would have been put into requisition so seldom and so scantily, if it had been in use at all.

Now if we turn to the very large portions of the Synoptic Gospels in which the three stand side by side, and in which Mark is by general consent the chief source used by the other two, we find a constantly recurring phenomenon, well known to all students, which is so curiously parallel in its nature to that which has been before us here, that the one can hardly fail to throw some light upon the other. I refer to the rare and brief, yet occasionally most impressive, resemblances between Matthew and Luke against Mark which have given rise to so much discussion. Some of those correspondences, like the five in the great interpolation, must be admitted to be too distinct and specific to have occurred independently to those two writers. So there, too, it seems there must have been some bridge of com-

¹ These smaller similarities, as well as the five more important ones, have been marked throughout all three parts of this article with Greek letters (α , β , γ , etc.), which have been reserved for this purpose only. So there would be no difficulty in referring back to the places where they are entered.

munication between the two documents. But what kind of bridge? Did the one writer—and if so, Luke was doubtless the one, as has been urged by Simons and others—have access to the other's Gospel? Surely it is most improbable that, if he had thus been able to use it at all, he would have limited himself to such very rare and slight use of it, and would have left without either reconciliation or self-defensive explanation such glaring discrepancies as exist between it and his own work. It seems to me, as to many others, far more reasonable to suppose, as I have elsewhere said after an examination of these small verbal similarities between Matthew and Luke only, and a tabulation of the most striking of them, that 'these supplements and modifications, so far as they imply a common source, were made first in one of these two later Gospels, and then were carried across (whether intentionally or unconsciously) to the other, either by copyists to whom they were familiar, or . . . in the course of . . . oral transmission' (*Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 175). And if that is accepted as the most reasonable account of the comparatively few sporadic Matthæo-Lucan peculiarities in the sections of which Mark supplies the groundwork, there seems to be even better ground for accepting it as the account of the still fewer and more sporadic Marco-Lucan peculiarities which we have found here in Luke's great interpolation.

There seems then, on the whole, very good reason for assuming that Luke's disuse here of his customary Marcan authority was not only comparative but entire, and that even in the 35 verses, which are more or less parallel in substance with what we read in our Second Gospel, he was drawing upon a non-Marcan source or sources.

Less positive and more tentative words must be used in any attempt to answer the question which now naturally arises—Can we go any farther than that negative conclusion? Can we indicate with any tolerable amount of likelihood the sources which Luke did use here, as well as the one source which, whether through inability or unwillingness, he did not use? In particular, can we, if we dislike the multiplication of unknown entities, simply attribute a Logian origin to this whole division of his Gospel as it stands, or (if we except certain references to a journey which will be mentioned presently) nearly as it stands? Can Luke have

here done nothing more, or very little more, than insert a large block of the Matthaean Logia, because he had been unable to find elsewhere appropriate places in which to insert its component parts, and yet he could not bring himself to omit such highly attested materials? Such a view cannot be dismissed as absolutely impossible. And it is a possible view, not only if with Bishop Lightfoot we take the name *Logia* as denoting sacred writings generally (*Ess. on Supern. Rel.* pp. 170-177; and cf. the *Reply* to him, pp. 124-127; also Sanday and Headlam on Romans 3²), but also if, as seems to me more probable, we regard it as meant by Papias to express 'sayings of the Lord, together with notices of the occasions which led to their being delivered, when such notices were needed for the full understanding of them' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xiii. 22). For there is no part of the great interpolation which does not either consist of, or else lead up to, sayings of Jesus, with the single exception of the record of the inhospitable Samaritan village in 9⁵¹⁻⁵⁶, where the shorter and far better attested text ends by only stating that a rebuke was spoken, and without giving any of the words of it. I do not add 11^{58f.} as another exception, because that description of Pharisaic hostility evidently leads up to the warning against Pharisaic leaven in 12¹, as we may see by disregarding the modern division into chapters and by giving to ἐν οἷς the more simple and natural rendering of 'during which' instead of 'in the meantime.' It must be admitted, however, that the circumstances of the three miracles recorded in 13¹⁰⁻¹⁷ 14¹⁻⁶ (cf. Mt 12⁹⁻¹⁴) and 17¹²⁻¹⁹ (though in a less degree than the other two) are described more fully than was altogether necessary in order to bring out the force of the sayings for which those miracles respectively supply the occasions.

But there are more serious objections than that to the theory of the use of the *Logia* thus *en bloc* and exclusively of all other authorities. (1) We know that Luke was aware of the existence of 'many' attempts to write Gospels, and that these attempts, like his own, were grounded upon original traditions—whether written or oral—which came down from eye-witnesses. From this it seems almost certain that several good sources must have been available for his work; and, if so, it seems very unlikely that he would have confined himself to one of them through nearly one-third of his

Gospel. (2) Again, the eight references (9^{52, 56} 10^{1, 38} 13²² 14²⁵ 17¹¹) to a journey or journeys, during which the recorded events are said to have occurred and the recorded discourses to have been spoken, imply more of a connected history that would come under that definition of 'logia' which was above accepted as the most probable, and to which modern opinion seems on the whole to incline (see, e.g., Hastings' *D.B.* ii. 242b, iii. 296b; *Enc. Bibl.* ii. 1810-1811). Lk 9⁵¹ was not entered as a ninth such reference, because it should perhaps be regarded as parallel in substance, though so different in wording, to Mk 10¹ = Mt 19¹, and therefore as forming a means of introducing the interpolation into the general triple narrative rather than as being part of the interpolated matter.

It would seem, then, that Luke continued here to refer to one or more sources known to him, but completely unknown to us, as well as to the *Logia*, or great *Spruchsammlung*, upon which both he and Matthew so often drew, and that his only change of procedure at chap. 9⁵¹ lay in his ceasing to use the Marcan document as the framework into which his various extracts were inserted.

What caused that important change of procedure, it is of course impossible for us to say. Only conjectures can now be offered, and perhaps they are hardly worth offering. Yet two of them have some plausibility, and the second of them suggests some interesting thoughts.

1. Luke may have drawn up this 'travel-document' with some special purpose, before he knew of, or at least before he began to found a Gospel upon, the Marcan *Grundschrift*, and he may thus have had it ready to his hand for incorporation here. The intention so to incorporate it would probably have affected the arrangement of the previous part of his Gospel in no more than two points: (a) it would have caused him to refrain from inserting (or to strike out if he had already inserted) the defensive discourse in a position parallel to that in which Mark places it; and (b) he would have had to make a consequent change in the position of the incident of the coming of the mother and brethren, which Mark (3³¹; and cf. Mt 12⁴⁶) attaches to that discourse, but for which Luke finds a place by subjoining it to the group of parables which forms the body of discourse that comes next in Mark's order (Lk 8^{19ff.}; the matter, however, is complicated

by the occurrence of a very similar incident in Lk 11^{27f.}, immediately after the 'defensive discourse'. In favour of this supposition that Luke may here have utilized a previously arranged document, it may be suggested that a writer whose *Sparsamkeit* often (though less consistently than some have thought, see Bebb in Hastings' *D.B.* iii. 172b) makes him careful to avoid repetitions of identical or similar matter, would hardly have given so fully the closely parallel charges to the Twelve and to the Seventy in chaps. 9 and 10, if he had drawn up the records of those two missions at or about the same time.

2 Or again, even if Luke was already in possession of the Marcan document upon which he elsewhere places his main reliance as to order, and as to events as distinguished from discourse, he may have deliberately decided to lay it aside here, because for this one portion of his work he may have had other guidance at first-hand towards writing in order (*καθεξῆς*) as he wished to do, whereas Peter's account only came to him at second-hand, and through a writer who is described to us by Papias (*Eus. H.E.* iii. 39) as not extending his carefulness and accuracy to the order in which the words and deeds of Christ had occurred. It may be that, at Cæsarea or Jerusalem (*Ac* 21^{8ff.} 15^{ff.}) or elsewhere, a more exact and chronological account of this final journey had been supplied to him by one who had at the time of the commencement of that journey become an 'eye-witness and minister of the Word.' And when that suggestion is made, the thought at once arises of that large body of seventy such 'eye-witnesses and ministers' (*ἐπηρέται*, a word not used of the ministry of the Twelve) who appear for the first time very soon after the beginning of this division of the Gospel (10¹, and it may be that the preceding verses, 9⁶⁷⁻⁶², refer to a sifting of disciples preparatory to this appointment of so many of them to 'preach the kingdom of God'). One would like to think, if one might, that according to the tradition which we first hear from Epiphanius, Luke himself was one of these Seventy, and that therefore he himself was the eye-witness through this journey which he describes so minutely, thus supplying to us what would be, in effect though not in form, the most precious of all 'we-sections.'

But the distinction which he himself expressly draws between the narrators of whom he was one, and those who were their informants as having been 'from the beginning, eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word,' has made the acceptance of that tradition all but impossible for us. We need not, however, put out of court so decidedly the conjecture that some other disciple, who had been one of the Seventy, subsequently supplied Luke with many or most of the materials for his description of this journey, and especially with the order in which events occurred during it. That supposition is at least opposed by none, if it is directly supported by none, of our data. In particular it may be observed that there is no internal evidence of any weight against all the sayings and doings here recorded having belonged originally to this late period of the ministry, which according to Luke followed the mission of the Seventy. The only plausible objection is that drawn from one scene (13¹⁰⁻¹⁷) being laid in a synagogue; for it would seem that the use of synagogues for teaching was not now open to Jesus as it had been at first (cf., however, *Jn* 18²⁰). But even if they were by this time closed to Him in Galilee or parts of it, this need not necessarily have been the case in every outlying place that was visited in the course of this circuitous journey to Jerusalem. So this conjecture as to Luke's informant may at least be borne in mind as giving some interest—though not the interest originally intended—to the appointment of passages referring to the Seventy as the Gospels for St. Luke's Day both in the Western (*Lk* 10¹⁻⁷ or 1⁰) and in the Eastern (*Lk* 10¹⁶⁻²¹) Church.

But, indeed, all such conjectures and speculations as have been admitted into these last few paragraphs are easily made too much of, and when that is the case they bring discredit upon the serious study of the Synoptic Problem. They are only harmless if they are clearly and constantly and emphatically distinguished from such conclusions or working hypotheses as are supported by a preponderating, or at least a very substantial, amount of evidence. And that may be safely said of the view that Mark's Gospel was entirely disused as a direct authority by Luke in 9⁵¹⁻¹⁸¹⁴, whatever source or sources he may have rested upon in its absence.