

The Special Source of the Third Gospel

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

NASHOTAH HOUSE

THE following article is a continuation of the study published in this JOURNAL, vol. 29, pp. 139-180, under the title *Linguistic Evidence for the Lucan Source L*. References in what follows to the pages of that study are enclosed in brackets. References to "Weiss" are to the pages of *Die Quellen der synoptischen Überlieferung*, by Bernhard Weiss, Leipsic, 1908. As was the case with the former study, the present article aims to systematize the arguments of Dr. Weiss rather than to contribute original matter, except in details.

The material in the Third Gospel may be divided into classes as follows:—

(A)

The following sections of Lc. correspond so closely with the corresponding sections of Mc. that direct dependence of Lc. on Mc. must be assumed. If Lc. had any other sources here, he has used them only for the most minor matters.

1. 4 31-44, Mc. 1 21-39. A day in Capernaum.
2. 6 1-2, Mc. 2 23-24. Walk through fields.
3. 6 6-11, Mc. 3 1-6. Man with withered hand.
4. 8 9-18, Mc. 4 10-25. Parable of sower (interpretation, etc.).
5. 8 22-39, Mc. 4 35-5 20. Gadarene demoniac.
6. 8 40-56, Mc. 5 21-43. Jairus' daughter, etc.
7. 9 1-6, Mc. 6 7-13. Mission of Twelve.
8. 9 7-9, Mc. 6 14-16. Herod's opinion.
9. 9 10 a, Mc. 6 30. Return of Twelve.

10. 9 18-20, Mc. 8 27-30. St. Peter's confession.
11. 9 21-27, Mc. 8 31-9 1. Prediction of Passion, etc.
12. 9 46-50, Mc. 9 33-40. Controversy over precedence.
13. 18 15-30, Mc. 10 13-31. Little children, rich man.
14. 18 35 b-43 a, Mc. 10 46-52. Bartimæus.
15. 19 29 b-36, Mc. 11 1-8. Palm Sunday.
16. 19 45-46, Mc. 11 15-17. Cleansing of Temple.
17. 20 1-8, Mc. 11 27-33. Question of authority.
18. 20 19, Mc. 12 12. Conspiracy of rulers.
19. 20 27-33, Mc. 12 18-23. Question of Sadducees.
20. 20 39-44, Mc. 12 28-37. David's Son.
21. 20 45-47, Mc. 12 38-40. Warnings against scribes.
22. 21 1-4, Mc. 12 41-44. Widow's mite.
23. 21 6-7, Mc. 13 2-4. Introduction to Parousia Discourse.
24. 22 7-13, Mc. 14 12-16. Choice of upper room.

After this point Lc.'s resemblances to Mc. rarely extend closely for even a verse at a time, and are often mere linguistic touches.

(B)

In the following sections, the resemblances to Mc. are so close that Mc. evidently was Lc.'s authority, but yet there are divergences from Mc. and agreements with Mt. that cannot readily be explained by editorial considerations.

1. 3 2 b-4, Mc. 1 2-4, Mt. 3 1-3. 5. Appearance of Baptist.
2. 3 16, Mc. 1 8, Mt. 3 11. Baptism of the Greater One.
3. 3 21-22, Mc. 1 9-11, Mt. 3 13-17. Baptism of Christ.
4. 5 17-26, Mc. 2 1-12, Mt. 9 1-8. Healing of paralytic.
5. 6 3-5, Mc. 2 25-28, Mt. 12 3-8. David and shew-bread.
6. 8 4-8, Mc. 4 1-9, Mt. 13 1-9. Parable of sower.
7. 8 19-21, Mc. 3 31-35, Mt. 12 46-50. Christ's relatives.
8. 9 10 b-17 Mc. 6 31-44, Mt. 14 13-21. Feeding of Five Thousand.
9. 20 9-18, Mc. 12 1-11, Mt. 21 33-44. Parable of vineyard.
10. 21 8-11, Mc. 13 5-8, Mt. 24 4-7. Last Woes.
11. 21 29-33, Mc. 13 28-31, Mt. 24 32-35. The fig-tree.

(C)

Passages similar to those in (B) but without the agreements with Mt. : —

1. 5 27-39, Mc. 2 13-22. The question of fasting.
2. 6 12-19, Mc. 3 7-19. List of Apostles, etc.
3. 9 28-42, Mc. 9 2-29. The Transfiguration.
4. 18 31-34, Mc. 10 32-34. Prediction of Passion.
5. 20 20-28, Mc. 12 13-17. Question of tribute.
6. 20 34-38, Mc. 12 24-27. Marriage and resurrection.

(D)

Passages where Lc. and Mt. agree closely in non-Marcian matter, — *i.e.* the “shorter Q” : —

1. 3 7-9, 17, Mt. 3 7-10, 12. The Baptist's preaching.
2. 4 1-13, Mt. 4 1-11. The Temptation.
3. 6 39, Mt. 15 14. Blind leading the blind.
4. 6 40, Mt. 10 24. Servant and master.
5. 6 41-42, Mt. 7 3-5. Mote and beam.
6. 6 43-44, Mt. 7 18-19, 16 b, Mt. 12 33. Tree and fruit.
7. 6 45, Mt. 12 35. Treasure and heart.
8. 7 6 b-9, Mt. 8 8-10. The centurion's faith.
9. 7 22-35, Mt. 11 4-11, 16-19. Christ and the Baptist.
10. 9 57-60, Mt. 8 19-22. Demands on followers.
11. 10 2, Mt. 9 37-38. Laborers and harvest.
12. 10 3-12, Mt. 10 7-16. Mission Charge.
13. 10 13-15, Mt. 11 21-23 a. Woes on cities.
14. 10 21-22, Mt. 11 25-27. Christ's Thanksgiving.
15. 10 23-24, Mt. 13 16-17. Blessedness of sight.
16. 11 2-4, Mt. 6 9-13. Lord's Prayer.
17. 11 9-13, Mt. 7 7-11. Assurance of prayer.
18. 11 15-20, Mt. 12 24-28 (in part). Beelzebub.
19. 11 23-26, Mt. 12 30, 43-45. Return of demon.
20. 11 29-32, Mt. 12 39-42. Demand for a sign.
21. 11 33, Mt. 5 15. Unhidden light.
22. 11 34-35, Mt. 6 22-23. Light and eye.
23. 11 42-43, Mt. 23 23, 6. Woes.
24. 12 2-9, Mt. 10 26-33. Assurance of protection.
25. 12 10, Mt. 12 32. Blasphemy.

26. 12 22-32, Mt. 6 25-34. Carelessness for earthly things.
27. 12 39-46, Mt. 24 43-51. Watchfulness.
28. 12 58-59, Mt. 5 25-26. Agreement with adversary.
29. 13 18-21, Mt. 13 31-33. Mustard-seed and leaven.
30. 12 28-29, Mt. 8 11-12. Rejection from Kingdom.
81. 12 34-35, Mt. 23 37-39. Woes on Jerusalem.
32. 16 13, Mt. 6 24. Two masters.
33. 16 16, Mt. 11 12-13. Law and Baptist.
34. 16 17, Mt. 5 18. Permanence of Law.
35. 16 18, Mt. 5 32. Divorce.
36. 17 1-2, Mt. 18 6-7. Offences.
37. 17 23-27, Mt. 24 23-27. 37-39. Parousia.
38. 17 34-35, Mt. 24 40-41. Suddenness of Parousia.
39. 17 37, Mt. 24 28. Place of Parousia.
40. 22 28-30, Mt. 19 28. Reward of Twelve.

(E)

Passages in Lc., paralleled in thought in Mt. but with a wording more divergent than mutual editing of a common source will readily explain:—

1. 6 20-23, Mt. 5 1-12. Beatitudes.
2. 6 27-36, Mt. 5 38-48. Love of neighbor.
3. 6 37-38, Mt. 7 1-2. Judging.
4. 6 47-7 1, Mt. 7 24 8 1. Epilogue to Sermon.
5. 7 2-6 a, Mt. 8 5-7. The centurion's request.
6. 7 18-21, Mt. 11 2-3. The Baptist's envoys.
7. 11 37-52 (in part), Mt. 23 (in part). Woes.
8. 12 33-34, Mt. 6 19-21. Treasure and heart.
9. 12 49-53, Mt. 10 34-36. Division.
10. 14 15-24, Mt. 22 1-14. Great Supper.
11. 14 25-27, Mt. 10 37-39. Demands of discipleship.
12. 15 4-10, Mt. 18 11-14. Lost sheep and coin.
13. 17 3-4, Mt. 18 15. 21. Forgiveness.
14. 17 5-6, Mt. 17 20. Faith.
15. 19 11-27, Mt. 25 14-30. The minas (talents).

The above lists aim only at presenting the general statement of the situation and do not profess to be complete. There are many verses and parts of verses that should be

included in each of them that have been omitted. In many cases there is room for distinct difference of opinion as to which list should include a given passage, but a detailed consideration of the arguments lies entirely outside of the purpose of this article.

(F)

Passages that are peculiar to Lc. but where reasons of vocabulary, style, or other considerations (especially adaptation to the context or obviousness of motive that led Mt. to omit) make it probable that the passage belonged to Q:—

1. 10 17-20. Return of the disciples.
2. 11 5-8. Importunate friend.
3. 11 21-22. Strong man.
4. 11 36. Light.
5. 12 11-12. Defense at trial.
6. 12 13-21. Rich fool.
7. 12 47-48. Stripes for disobedience.
8. 13 31-33. Herod's threat.
9. 16 1-12. Knavish steward.
10. 18 1-8. Unjust Judge.
11. 22 24-30. Controversy as to rank.
12. 22 35-38. Approaching stress.

In a critical study of Lc.'s special matter, the passages above in (A), (B), (D) do not enter into consideration. For reasons that must be justified in some other place the passages in (F) are omitted here, besides. From the passages in (D) it is easy to remove what has clearly come from Mc., and similar palpable Marcan touches can be cut out in other parts of Lc. From the passages in (E) and elsewhere in the Gospel Q-matter can be removed in a similar way. This process may be supposed completed.

Then, it is the present contention that substantially all the remaining matter was taken by Lc. from a single written source.

Reliance is placed on the following arguments: This matter is a complete summary of Evangelic tradition, with-

out doublets (pp. 95-100 below). It was written by a Jewish Christian for Jewish Christians, disregarding Gentile Christianity altogether, and so in sharp contrast to Lc.'s own point of view (pp. 87-90). It was written under primitive Palestinian conditions (pp. 100-103) and shows certain real affinities with the Johannine Gospel, *infra*. At many points within the Third Gospel the redactorial process can be seen by which Lc. united this source with Mc. or Q (pp. 90-94). To this evidence is to be added that collected in the preceding article by the present writer, where argument was offered that the vocabulary and style of this source can be distinguished clearly from the vocabulary and style of Lc. [pp. 145-167]. The linguistic data are distributed fairly evenly throughout the source [pp. 168-170], contain proportionally twice as many "purely ecclesiastical" words as does Lc.'s own vocabulary [pp. 170-174], and are marked by strong Semitisms of various sorts [pp. 175-178]. And, moreover, the use of this source by Lc. explains remarkably well certain differences that have been noted between the Third Gospel and Acts [pp. 178-180].

A list of the material in question will be found on pp. 95 f., below. Naturally, no attempt is made to assert a dogmatic conclusion as to its precise limits. And, of course, a discussion of the more minute points involved would be possible only in a full critical commentary on the whole Gospel. But it may be submitted that, substantially, a very plausible case has been made out.

L AND THE JOHANNINE TRADITION

A. Probable Cases

1. Lc. 4 29-30; cf. J. 8 59. An attempt by the people to do violence to Christ, from which He escapes by obscure means. In Lc. the attack is not sufficiently motivated.

2. Lc. 5 1-11; cf. J. 21. A miraculous draught of fishes by St. Peter and other disciples. The impression is certainly conveyed that Lc. has somehow confused a post-resurrection appearance of Christ with the call of St. Peter. Note the latter's contrition.

3. Lc. 6 16; cf. J. 14 22. A second Judas in the Apostolic College.

4. Lc. 7 36-38; cf. J. 11 2 12 1-8. The similarities in the anointings are well known. Cf. especially: *τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς θριξίν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασσε* in Lc. 7 38 with *καὶ ἐξέμαξεν ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ* in Jn. 12 3. The resemblance is much too close to be accidental.

5. Lc. 10 38 b-42; cf. J. 11 1. The two sisters, Mary and Martha.

6. Lc. 22 3; cf. J. 13 21. *εἰσῆλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν, — τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ σατανᾶς.*

7. Lc. 22 34; cf. J. 13 38. St. Peter's denial predicted at the Last Supper, *not* on the way to the Mount of Olives as in Mc. and Mt.

8. Lc. 22 50; cf. J. 18 10. St. Peter cuts off the *right* ear of the servant (or wounds it).

9. Lc. 23 16. 22; cf. J. 19 1-4. Scourging offered as a substitute for crucifixion.

10. Lc. 23 49; cf. J. 19 25. Christ's friends present at crucifixion.

11. Lc. 23 53; cf. J. 19 41. No body had ever been placed in Joseph's tomb. (Mt. 27 60 does not necessarily imply this.)

12. Lc. 24 4; cf. J. 20 12. *Two* angels at the tomb.

13. Lc. 24 24; cf. J. 20 3-10. The report of the woman (Mary) causes disciples to visit the empty tomb.

14. Lc. 24 36; cf. J. 20 19. Appearance to Apostles on Easter evening.

15. The term *Κύριος* for Christ in the Evangelist's narrative.

B. Evidence probably Corroborative

16. Lc. 4 21; cf. Jn., *passim*. Christ proclaims His Messianic office publicly.

17. Lc. 6 47 14 26, *ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με*, metaphorical, of Christ. Common in J., not in Mc. and Mt. [Cf. p. 161.]

18. Lc. 13 14. 16 14 5; cf. J. 19 31. *ἡμέρα τοῦ σαββάτου*. Not elsewhere in the New Testament. [Cf. p. 155.]

19. Lc. 6 38 16 22. 23; cf. J. 1 18 13 23. *κόλπος*. Elsewhere only A 27 39, with different meaning. [Cf. p. 162.]

20. Lc. 6 20 16 23 18 13; cf. J. 4 35 6 5 17 1. *ἐπαίρειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς*. Elsewhere only Mt. 17 8. [Cf. p. 154.]

21. Lc. 16 31; cf. J. 11 47. The resurrection of a dead man (named Lazarus) not sufficient to convert the leaders of the Jews.

22. Lc. 14 27; cf. J. 19 17. *βαστάζειν τὸν σταυρόν*. Not elsewhere.

23. Lc. 14 28; cf. J. 12 25. *Μισεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν*. Not elsewhere.

24. In L there was no temple-cleansing at the last visit to Jerusalem, — the account in Lc. 19 45-46 is a summary reproduction of Mc. 11 15-17.

25. According to Lc. Christ is taken from Gethsemane to the house of the high-priest (22 54) and thence to the council (22 66). According to Jn., first to Annas (18 13) and then to Caiaphas (18 24), before whom, evidently the trial (passed over by Jn.) was held. According to Mc. (14 53), Christ was taken immediately to the council from Gethsemane.

26. Lc. 23 4; cf. J. 18 38. The first charge brought against Christ before Pilate breaks down.

27. Lc. 23 2; cf. Jn. 18 36. This first charge is a claim to kingship, which Pilate understands in a harmless sense.

28. As in Jn., there are probably no exorcisms in L. The sole reference (in 13 11) is almost certainly a misunderstanding on Lc.'s part of the "binding by Satan" in 13 16, for the narrative evidently is not a description of an exorcism.

C. Other Instances cited by Weiss

29. Lc. 7 3. 6; cf. Jn. 4 51. 57. At a healing at a distance, there are *two* sets of messengers. (Weiss, p. 108.) (This seems fanciful.)

30. *ἐρωτᾶν* as "make request." (118.) [Cf. p. 161.]

31. The parable of the Good Samaritan shows that Christ had received kindly treatment from the Samaritans. (122.) (This seems wholly gratuitous.)

82. Lc. 15 24. 32. ζῆν as "become alive." Jn. 5 25 11 25. (125.) Not much stress, if any, can be laid on this, especially as in Lc. 15 24 ἀνέζησεν is the better attested reading. The aorist form that Weiss quotes is not found in the Fourth Gospel at all but only in Rev. (2 8 13 14 20 4. 5) in the Johannine writings. Cf. also Rom. 14 9, the only other use of this aorist in the NT.

83. Lc. 22 58. 58. The two questions: καὶ οὗτος σὺν αὐτῷ ἦν, — καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ, require that the second be translated "Thou also art among them that were with him," and so supposes that another disciple besides Peter was in the court. (155.) (This is much too refined.)

84. Nos. 26-27, above, presuppose a preliminary hearing of Christ by Pilate. (158.)

85. The people take no part in the process. (158.) (This depends on literary pruning, but is almost certainly right and is discussed in the next part.)

86. Lc. 23 28; cf. Jn. 19 16. The hierarchs, not the soldiers, lead Christ to crucifixion. (160.) (Much too refined and almost incredible.)

87. In L Christ bore His cross, not the Cyrenian. (161.) Cf. Jn. 19 17. (This is possible, as Lc. 23 28 is from Mc. 15 21, but Weiss admits its uncertainty.)

88. Lc. 23 46; cf. Jn. 19 30. Christ's last words are peaceful (163).

89. The Ascension covered by the Resurrection. (166.) (This is too refined, not only for L but also for Jn.).

SUMMARY. — While these instances are of very different degrees of weight, yet taken *en bloc* they yield more evidence than can well be accidental. A detailed appraisalment of the exact significance of each case, however, belongs to the Johannine Problem and not to the Synoptic. For present purposes it is enough to say that real affinities between L and Jn. exist.

Such affinities could not have arisen from a use by Jn. of Lc. or of L, apart from other tradition. The divergencies in the account of the draught of fishes alone are so great as

to set this possibility definitely on one side. A reverse dependence of Lc. or L on Jn. is of course not to be thought of. It is enough to say with Weiss that relations of some kind exist between the tradition of L and the tradition of Jn. As far as Lc. is concerned, the relations are all in L, and this is the important point for present purposes.

JEWISH CHARACTER OF THE MATERIAL

1. Most noteworthy is the absence of any direct mention of the Gentile Mission, for the words in 24 47 are an insertion of Lc.'s (cf. Weiss, p. 167). The only direct reference to benefits conferred on the Gentiles is in 2 32, where the Gentiles receive *φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν*, while Israel receives *δόξα*. In other words, the position of the Gentiles in the Kingdom is to be subordinate (and probably their conversion to Judaism is presupposed). At all events, the words do no advance in the least on a fairly common Jewish apocalyptic thought, as found, *e.g.*, in Enoch 90 33. 37.

Of indirect references, 14 22-23 probably does refer to the call of the Gentiles (so Weiss), but (a) the reference is uncertain; (b) their admission is described as a last resort; (c) we quite possibly have to do with an allegorizing addition by Lc.

Naturally, the references in 4 26-27 have nothing more to do with the call of the Gentiles (whatever Lc. may have thought) than the parable of the Good Samaritan has to do with a call of the Samaritans.

2. Indeed, there is an attitude of hostility to the Gentiles in L. On p. 155, vol. xxix, attention was called to the use of *ἔχθροι* as meaning Gentiles in 1 71. 74 19 43. The idea of release from Gentile oppression permeates the first two chapters of Lc. and finds acute expression in the Magnificat. The meaning in 2 25. 38 of the terms *παράκλησις τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*, — *λύτρωσις Ἰερουσαλήμ* is obvious. And cf. 24 21.

Especially significant here is the eschatological discourse in c. 21. Nothing is said here of conversions of the Gentiles being effected. Here Mc. (13 9) has *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς*, while Lc. (21 13.-L) reads *ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον*.

No hint is given that the persecutors are to receive benefit, or that the spread of the Gospel is to be accomplished in the persecutions. According to 21 24 ff., Jerusalem is trodden down of the Gentiles, ἀχρι οὐ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. Then follow natural portents, men's hearts fail, "but ye are to lift up your heads." In other words, the "times of the Gentiles" are not regarded as times in which they receive benefit, but a season in which they will do violence to holy things,—a time to be terminated by judgment on them, while Israel receives salvation. Nothing is commoner than just this idea in the apocalypses,—indeed, such an idea has given most of the apocalypses their reason for existence.

It is probably worth adding that in 7 2 ff., the centurion, as a Gentile, does not dare to come personally to Christ, but sends Jewish dignitaries, who plead in his favor the services that he has rendered to the Jewish nation. (That this can be a Lucan revision of Q is almost incredible.)

3. The very "nationalistic" Messianic theology in cc. 1-2 hardly needs summary. In 1 16-17, the work of the Baptist (which is predicted as being *successful* in v. 16), is to prepare Israel. According to 1 32 the Messiah is to sit on the throne of David and rule over the house of Jacob. The covenant to Abraham is the theme in 1 53. 73. The Child is to try Israel and find who are true in it (2. 34). And so on. Precisely this point of view is found at the end of the Gospel (24 21). The two disciples have their error corrected as to the sufferings of the Messiah, but no hint is given that they were wrong in supposing that His mission was not λητροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ. The woman with an infirmity has the right to attention because she is a daughter of Abraham (13 16), and Zacchæus (19 9) can claim salvation, because he also is a son of Abraham, even though his sonship has been in abeyance. (Naturally, it is quite gratuitous to conceive that Zacchæus was a Gentile.) Worth noting, also, is the language in 22 18, where the drinking of the wine is deferred ἕως οὐ ἡ βασ. τ. θ. ἔλθῃ. Mc. and Mt. have here ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκέλευσθαι ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τ. β. τ. θ. The form in Lc. seems to point much more definitely to a "chilastic" King-

dom on this earth. Cf. the allegory in 19 12-13. And it is worth noting once more that the highest state of blessedness is Abraham's bosom (16 22), a very distinct advance on 13 28 (Q).

4. Christ's approval of the Law is taken so thoroughly for granted that it is not even discussed. Moses and the prophets are enough to enable any man to escape reprobation, and if they do not suffice, nothing will (16 31, — there is a strong suspicion here of an L addition to genuine words of Christ). No Gentile Christian would have written 1 6, especially with the addition of the quite unequivocal ἀμεμπτοι at the end.

5. Of smaller details, the value placed on almsgiving is familiar. In 11 41 is the strongest statement, which of course does not imply, *e.g.*, that pork may be eaten if alms are given. (Weiss, however, pp. 181-182, is perfectly right in saying that the fondness for asceticism so often attributed to L — or Lc. — simply does not exist.)

In 6 34 it is taken quite for granted that even sinners in lending to sinners will not exact interest. This would be an impossible illustration in Gentile conditions.

18 1-3 supposes a considerable familiarity with the minor happenings in Jerusalem, — note the article in v. 1 and the demonstrative in v. 4.

In 12 38 we find the night divided into the Jewish *three* watches — contrast Mc. 13 35.

In Lc. 20 36 (not in Mc.-Mt.) the cessation of death is given as the reason of the cessation of marriage, — *i.e.*, marriage serves only to replenish the world; if there are no deaths, marriage is no longer needed. (Weiss has some interesting additional notes on p. 185, but the exegesis is rather fine, although very plausible.)

In Lc. 19 12 the departure of the prince to receive a kingdom could not have been formed under Gentile influence.

In Lc. 22 16 the typology of the Passover is taken for granted.

In Lc. 23 56 the Sabbath rest of the women is emphasized (or is the purpose only to explain why they did not visit the Tomb on Saturday?).

6. Finally, the Jewish character of the vocabulary and style was considered fully in the preceding article. On actual quotations from the Old Testament and references to it not much stress can be laid as indicating necessarily a Jewish Christian source.

REDACTORIAL EVIDENCE

It is in no way the plan of the following discussion to be exhaustive. The sole purpose is to point out additional and corroborative evidence that in the matter included in L we are dealing not with Lc.'s free composition, based on facts orally transmitted, but with definite redaction of a written source.

In the first place, telling strongly against the theory of much use of oral tradition, is the fact that, with the exception of 2 32, 24 47, there is absolutely nothing definite in the Third Gospel on the subject of Gentile conversion, although Lc. was intended for Gentile readers. Matter of that sort in oral tradition existed (or grew) beyond the possibility of question; it is enough to note the ascending scale in Mt. 10 18, Mc. 13 10, Mt. 24 14. Its omission by Lc., if he were not strictly following documents, seems practically inexplicable.

In the second place, there is the geographical confusion in the Third Gospel after 9 50. It is customary to speak of 9 51-18 14 (or about this much of Lc.) as the "Peræan Ministry." And yet, as far as Lc. is concerned, there is not the least hint that this part of the ministry was in Peræa, except for the fact that Christ is finally found at Jericho (18 35), and this is taken from Mc. (10 46). Indeed, the only geographical hints given are most puzzling. In 9 52 Christ is entering Samaria from Galilee. Then, after nearly eight chapters of journeyings toward Jerusalem, we suddenly find in 17 11 that He has not moved at all. If Lc. were following faithfully a rather extended written source in which the material was arranged without reference to geographical order, this confusion would be explained. Still simpler is the explanation that Lc. computed the place in 17 11 out of the contents of

the narrative (Jews and a Samaritan were together). But it seems scarcely probable that the author of Acts, with his really able handling of broad geographical features there, should write in so confused a manner if he were not hampered by his sources.

The above considerations are quite general. In particular examples, some very interesting data can be gathered by a study of the passages where fragments of Mc. appear isolated in a non-Marcian context.

A remarkably clear case is seen in cp. 21 20-28. When Jerusalem "is being compassed about" with armies (present participle), those in *Judea* are to flee to the mountains, and those in the midst of *her* are to depart out. The second clause here is verbally from Mc., the first and third are non-Marcian. The result is impossible,—what had those armies been doing to Judea and her inhabitants long before they reached Jerusalem? If the Marcian clause be dropped, then "her" refers to Jerusalem and the passage is perfectly clear, "when the investment is beginning, leave the city while there is yet time." Evidently confusion has been caused by the introduction of a Mc.-clause into a narrative that was already complete. This is redaction, not composition.

Again, v. 23 refers not to v. 27 but to vv. 25-26 a, and v. 26 b is a duplication of v. 25 a. As the narrative stands, the duplication and the awkwardness are obvious,—but the obviousness is explained when it is observed that vv. 26 b-27 are simply taken from Mc. (13 25 b-26) and inserted here. If they are omitted from the account as it stands in Lc., the passage again becomes smooth and natural. V. 23 a, once more, is taken exactly from Mc. (13 17) and has a result of making "those who give suck" be those who "fall by the edge of the sword," etc. Evidently there has been a conscientious working of two sources together here, of which one is Mc. and the other—as is seen if vv. 20-28 be read with the Marcian matter omitted—a complete account in itself.

Moreover, it is to be noted that the situation for the eschatological discourse, as it stands in Lc., is again impossible; for,

according to 21 v. 37, it was delivered ~~in~~ the temple. Free composition or editing on Lc.'s part will not explain this departure from Mc.'s account, for the result has been to make what in Mc. is a natural situation (on the Mount of Olives) into one that is very difficult (in the Temple). What happened seems to have been this: In L there was an account of Christ's last day in Jerusalem without any elaborate eschatological discourse, but with some remark about the impending destruction of the Temple, uttered *inside* of it, and based on an observation regarding the beauty of the *ἀναθήματα*. (These would not have been visible from Olivet.) The Marcan parallel then led Lc. to insert his eschatological discourse here, drawn in part from Mc. and in part from L in other places. At all events we have not Lc.'s free composition.

Similarly, it will be found often to be the case that, wherever a reminiscence of Mc. is found in an L section, there will be an awkwardness that indicates that the reminiscence has been incorporated into a completed narrative. A few of the more interesting examples may be given:—

4 24 (Marcan) is intensely awkward with 4 25-27. And 4 23 before 4 31 makes a sort of anachronism that we may well suppose that Lc. would have avoided had 4 23 been his free composition.

5 10a (Marcan, Mc. 1 19) brings James and John awkwardly into a narrative in which they play no part.

7 49 (cf. Mc. 2 7) imports a foreign idea into the narrative. It is to be noted, moreover, that Lc.'s conclusion as a whole seems rather to miss the point; cf. Holtzmann, *ad loc.*

Why 23 4 follows from 23 3 is anything but clear; but 23 3 is Marcan (Mc. 15 2). Probably something like "Pilate examined him" stood in its place in L, but the narrative is clearer even if the verse be cancelled entirely and nothing substituted. 23 18 is quite impossible after 23 16. In 23 16 Pilate dismisses the charge; in 23 18 the "release" is taken to mean an act of grace to the Jews. (The introduction of the spurious v. 17 into the text here seems to have been motivated by a sense of the awkwardness.) V. 18 is of course based on

Mc. — indeed, L does not seem to have mentioned Barabbas. 23 38 is from Mc. (15 26) and in an awkward place. 23 49 b and 23 55 a are doublets. The former is from Mc. (15 41). The admixture of Marcan elements in 23 50-53 has resulted in probably the most awkward sentence in the New Testament. If the Marcan elements be cancelled (with Lc.'s "a city of Judea"), the sentence becomes simple.

Of a little different type are cases where the Marcan narrative has been simplified in such a way that redactorial processes are excluded and where the influence of oral tradition would have been in the opposite direction. One instance will suffice, the great simplification in the prediction of the Passion in 9 44 from the Marcan parallel in Mc. 9 31.

Mixtures of Q and L are more difficult to demonstrate but there are some clear instances. Very striking is the case 11 38-41. The Pharisee speaks of the outside of the *man* (washing hands), Christ's rejoinder begins with the outside of a *cup*, which is contrasted with the inside of a *man*, and then the Pharisee is told to give alms from the inside of the *cup*. To make the confusion still worse, v. 40, as it stands after v. 39, makes God the maker of the outside of the *cup*, — while the cup is precisely what man made and not God. The result is hopeless. If it be noted, though, that several words in v. 39 and the words "the inside" in v. 41 are practically identical with words in Mt. 23 25-26, and if these words be deleted, the whole becomes perfectly clear. In L Christ treated of the contrast between clean hands and a clean heart, in Q of the contrast between a clean vessel and its contents. Lc. has laboriously worked the two accounts together.

In immediate connection with this passage stands 12 1, which creates an extraordinary situation. In the presence of a tremendous and enthusiastic multitude Christ *first* begins to teach His disciples. The situation is clear, — into a narrative from L Lc. has inserted a discourse to the disciples from Q. He inserted it here because it dealt with the leaven of the Pharisees, and the Pharisees were the last topic.

In 19 11-27, if the agreements with Mt. be marked, they will be found to be thick in vv. 20-26 and scanty elsewhere. Moreover, in the matter there are two distinct ideas, — the servants and the rebellious subjects, — and the number of the servants varies from ten to three. Two distinct parables have been worked together, the servants from Q and the rebellious subjects from L.

“Sutures,” where two sources have been united baldly, are visible in other places. *E.g.*, 22 24. The *καί* that effects the transition to an altogether different subject, related to the former only in that it also contained a “dispute,” is very mechanical.

As matters stand, 9 π is altogether too far back in the Gospel. Whatever be the explanation of this, free composition on Lc.’s part seems excluded.

The above examples, even taken by themselves, show something that is of the greatest importance. When Lc. used sources, it can be demonstrated that there are places where he uses them with a fidelity so great as to become mechanical. Indeed, he did not shrink from extreme awkwardness or even obscurity when it was a question of reproducing exactly what his source or sources said. Consequently an *a priori* probability is established that, when we find a departure from a known source (as in 20 33-40 as compared with Mc. 12 24-27), then this departure is not to be referred to Lc.’s editorial freedom.

Indeed, all that has been said about Lc.’s “editorial freedom” (Wernle, *Die Synoptische Frage*, p. 107, is a good case in point) rests on assuming that when there is much departure in his narrative from Mc., then this departure is due to Lc.’s freedom. Quite apart from all the other evidence, it is difficult to believe that a writer who permitted himself much freedom would cling so closely to Mc. in such long stretches as Lc. has done, with variations of only the most trivial kinds. And where much variation has occurred, the explanation is far more probably to be sought in the use of other sources.

CONTENTS AND ORDER OF THE SOURCE

The sections will be given in the order in which they stand in Lc.:

1. The two introductory chapters.
2. The instructions of the Baptist. 3 10-14.
3. The Genealogy. 3 23-38.
4. The rejection at Nazareth. 4 16-30.
5. The call of Simon. 5 1-11.
6. The question of fasting. 5 30. 33. 36. 39, Mc. 2 18-23, Mt. 9 14-17. (x)
7. The list of the Twelve. 6 12 a. 14-16, Mc. 3 16-19 Mt. 10 2-4.
8. Beatitudes and Woes. 6 20-26, Mt. 5 3-12.
9. Love of enemies. 6 27-38, Mt. 5 38-48 7 1-2. 12.
10. House on rock. 6 46-49, Mt. 7 21. 24-27.
11. Centurion's message. 7 2-6 a. 10, Mt. 8 5-7. 13.
12. Widow's son at Nain. 7 11-17.
13. The Baptist's message. 7 18-22 a, Mt. 11 2-4.
14. The penitent woman. 7 36-50.
15. The ministering women. 8 1-3.
16. Prediction of Passion. 9 43-45, Mc. 9 30-32, Mt. 17 22-23.
17. Rejection in Samaria. 9 51-56.
18. Mission of seventy (two). 10 1.
19. Good Samaritan. 10 29 b-37.
20. Mary and Martha. 10 38-42.
21. Praise of the woman. 11 27-28.
22. Woes on Pharisees. 11 37-50 (in part), Mt. 23 (in part).
23. Breach with Pharisees. 11 53-54, Mc. 3 6, Mt. 12 14.
24. Treasure and heart. 12 33-34, Mt. 6 19-21.
25. Watchful servants. 12 35-38.
26. Unfaithful servant. 12 47-48 a.
27. Christ as causing division. 12 49-53, Mt. 10 34-36.
28. Warnings to people. 13 1-5.
29. Barren figtree. 13 6-9.
30. Woman with infirmity. 13 10-17.
31. Man with dropsy. 14 1-6.
32. Choice of places. 14 7-11.

33. Guests at supper. 14 12-14.
 34. Great supper. 14 16-24, Mt. 22 1-10.
 35. Cost of discipleship. 14 25-28, Mt. 10 37.
 36. Bearing cross. 14 27, cf. 9 23, etc.
 37. Counting cost. 14 28-33.
 38. Reception of publicans. 15 1-3, Mc. 2 16, etc.
 39. Prodigal son. 15 12-32.
 40. Mammon of unrighteousness. 16 9.
 41. Dives and Lazarus. 16 15. 19-31.
 42. Occasions of stumbling. 17 1-4, Mt. 18 7. 6. 15. 21.
 43. Power of faith. 17 5-6, Mt. 17 20, Mc. 11 22-23, Mt. 21 21.
 44. Unprofitable servant. 17 7-10.
 45. The ten lepers. 17 11-19.
 46. Pharisee and publican. 18 9-14.
 47. Prediction of Passion. 18 31-34 (in part), Mc. 10 33-34,
 Mt. 20 17-19. (x)
 48. Zacchæus. 19 1-10.
 49. The journeying nobleman. 19 11-27 (in part).
 50. The entry into Jerusalem. 19 29 a. 37 b-44, Mc. 11 9-10.
 51. Indignation of the priests. 19 47-48, Mc. 11 18. (x)
 52. The tribute money. 20 20-26, Mc. 12 13-17, Mt.
 22 15-22. (x)
 53. Declaration on immortality. 20 34-38, Mc. 12 24-27,
 Mt. 22 29-32.
 54. Eschatological matter. Cp. 21 (in part).
 55. Passion and Resurrection matter. Cpp. 22-24 (apart
 from Mc. and Q).

In the above list parts of verses have not always been included. They present often a complicated problem of little practical bearing. And for present purposes it has not been thought worth while to subdivide the last two sections. The four sections marked with (x) — Nos. 6, 47, 51, 52 — contain so much Marcan matter that only the vocabulary is of much help in distinguishing the admixture of the other source. No. 53 seems also to have some Marcan admixture, but the form of L is quite clearly discernible and a Lucan redaction of Mc. is hardly to be thought of (cf. p. 89).

To the above list probably should be added an account of

the Transfiguration, as has been said on [pp. 169-170]. Also it is possible that 15 3-10 should be added. Weiss, p. 61, has referred this to Q, but despite the coincidences with Mt. 18 12-14 the variations are too great to be well explained by redactorial differences. Loisy (*Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, 2, pp. 138 ff.) considers a non-Q tradition the most likely explanation.

The matter contained in the above list may be classified as follows:—

Taking the relations with the Jewish leaders first, Christ offends the Pharisees chiefly by His free intercourse with the common people, notably the publicans (38, 48). Against the attitude of pride so taken by His critics we have the parables 39, 46, 32. There are two Sabbath disputes (30, 31), neither of which leads to such a crisis as is indicated in Mc. 3 6 (a sign of the Jewish character of L?), and there is one complaint of neglect of fasting (6) and one of eating with unwashed hands (22). Standing perhaps a little apart is the question of the penitent woman, in which Christ pronounces the forgiveness of sins (14). Now, it is curious that the Marcan accounts of the breach of Christ with the religious leaders assign precisely the same reasons. We find free intercourse in Mc. 2 16, Sabbath disputes (again *two* in number, — if this is anything more than an accident) in 2 23-3 5, neglect of fasting in 2 18, eating with unwashed hands in 7 2, and a pronouncement of the forgiveness of sins in 2 5. And, outside of the Jerusalem events, Mc. contains no other grounds for controversy. This exact coincidence can hardly be accidental. The easiest explanation is that no tradition would be better preserved in the Palestinian Church than that of the points in which Christ dissented from the official religious leaders, so that any document would try to give a full list of typical controversies. A mechanical duplication of the Marcan list by Lc., who, moreover, has retained most of Mc.'s sections, is out of the question. Lc. (22) differs from Mc., however, in making the irremediable breach come from a direct attack on the Pharisees by Christ.

As a matter not so much of direct controversy as of peaceful discussion we have the parable of the Good Samaritan, clearly connected somehow with the question as to the Great Commandment, although the preceding context in Lc. may be from Q. Cf. Mc. 12 28-34 for a similar peaceful discussion on the same topic.

Warnings not to the religious leaders but to the people themselves are found in 28, 29, 34. This feature lies more in the background in Mc., but is expressed with perfect clearness in Mc. 4 12-13 9 19. Curiously enough in both Mc. and L the despair as to the people is given utterance in the face of tremendous popular enthusiasm for Christ. This L carries further than does Mc., for his crowds at the crucifixion simply "stand beholding" (23 35), and only the rulers mock, while in Mc. (15 29), the crowds join in the mockery. Warnings against half-hearted discipleship are found in 27, 35, 36, 37; cf. Mc. 8 34-38. Possibly the faith of the centurion and of the Samaritan leper (11, 45) are to be contrasted here with the wavering faith of the Baptist (13), with a side-glance at Israel's failure to seize its opportunity.

Of more intimate instruction to the disciples, 42-44 may be compared with Mc. 9 33-50 11 22-23. Adjurations to humility and avoidance of "scandals," with a warning against weakness of faith, were a feature in both sources, naturally. L has predictions of the Passion in 16, 47; Mc. has the predictions three times. 17 is a warning against wrath at enemies; Mc. 9 39-40 is an imperfect parallel. The eschatological matter (25, 26, 49) needs no direct discussion, and neither do the parallels to Mt.'s Sermon on the Mount (8, 9, 10, 24).

Apart, then, from the Marcan tradition there stand only two passages, Nos. 33 and 40-41. The first of these does not need discussion. The parable of Dives and Lazarus, however, as it stands in the Gospel does introduce a new feature. The breach with the Pharisees is attributed to a new motive; Christ's attacks on the misuse of money are given as one of the reasons why the Pharisees derided Him. Now in the first place, what is said about the possession of riches actually

falls short of the intensity of Mc. 10 25. In the second place, the connection of what is said of the ridicule of the Pharisees is due to Lc. and, if it be thought necessary, may be attributed to a misunderstanding on his part. But, according to Mc. 10 24, Christ's teaching as to the danger of riches astonished even the disciples, and so ridicule from the Pharisees may be taken as not only probable but quite certain.

L contains the following miracles: Two synagogue healings, one of dropsy (31), one of a woman with an "infirmity" (30); one cleansing of leprosy (45); one healing at a distance (11); one raising of the dead (12). The healing of the ear in 22 51 stands rather by itself. Apart from miracles of healing we have only the draught of fishes in 5, with a possibility that Christ's escape in 4 may have been attributed to miraculous means. With the exception of exorcisms, which *may* be found in No. 80 (but cf. p. 85), and which, in any event, are absent from the Fourth Gospel, this list is about what we should expect to find in any compilation of Evangelic tradition. The one advance on the other Synoptic tradition is No. 45, with its large number of lepers.

SUMMARIZING. — The contents of this source, as tentatively established, shows a remarkable correspondence with the general contents of Mc. The various sides of Christ's teaching and activity are all touched on and illustrated in proportions that are excellent. Duplication of matter is absent, and there seem to be no omissions of any consequence. If an account of the Transfiguration be added, the source represents just about the material that one would expect to find. Overloading seems to exist only in the rather disproportionate amount of space given to the Infancy matter, but this needs no explanation. It has been Lc.'s painstaking working of Mc. and L together that has led to the rather awkward duplication of the material in the finished Gospel, as, *e.g.*, in the matter of the Sabbath disputes, that has so often been noted.

Of course we have no assurance that Lc. has given us the

entire contents of L. Probability is overwhelmingly against his having done so. But if his use of Mc. is a fair criterion, his omissions have not been of very much consequence. The material unity of the recovered matter tells also against any very great omissions.

As to the order of the sections, not very much can be said. No. 28, apparently, stands much too early. Possibly the same is true of the eschatological matter 25-26, but it must be remembered that our impressions of the late place of the eschatological matter in Christ's teaching depend largely on Mc. 13, where a mechanical combination is certain. In certain cases, such as No. 4, Lc.'s editorial ideas must be charged with dislocation, the place of No. 7 is doubtless due to Mc.'s order, and so on. But reconstruction in this regard is of all things most hypothetical, and the order, even as it stands, is not really impossible. So it does not seem worth while to criticise the elaborate rearrangement of Weiss: 1; 2, 3, 4, 11, 5, 7, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16; 17, 20, 18, 19, 31, 32, 33, 38, 39, 41, 46, 21, 22, 23, 27, 54 (in part), 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 25, 26, 45, 24, 40, 53, 54 (in part); 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55.

THE PRAGMATISM OF L

On p. 363 of *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, Schweitzer writes: "Hat es doch schon Reimarus ausgesprochen, dass die Eschatologie der Urgemeinde mit der jüdischen identisch war, und nur in einer für das Wesen und den Verlauf der erwarteten Ereignisse belanglosen Erkenntniss über sie hinausging, insofern als sie wusste, wer der Menschensohn sein würde." This statement as it stands may have, perhaps, to be taken rather cautiously, but at all events it does accurately describe the Messianic idea in L. According to L, Christ was the predicted Messiah of the Old Testament, Who during His lifetime had performed work that was preliminary only. After His resurrection He had gone to the Father "to receive a kingdom" and was to return again in glory, as the Son of Man, to establish that kingdom. Into it were to be admitted the faithful remnant of Israel. This

programme, apart from the preliminary work on earth, is simply that, *e.g.*, of the Similitudes of Enoch. In detail:—

The bulk of cpp. 1-2 is so devoted to this point of view that a list of the passages is needless. Christ's ministry begins with "To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears" (4 21), He goes up to Jerusalem in order that "all things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished" (18 31, — note that this touch is not in the Mc. and Mt. predictions of the Passion), and His teaching after the Resurrection is based on the argument from prophecy (24 27. 44-46).

The phrase "Kingdom of God" is found in L in 6 20 8 1 9 22 14 15 19 11 22 16. 18 23 51. Of these passages, 14 15 19 11 22 18 23 51 are quite unequivocal, — the Kingdom is regarded as being a fact of the future, — something that is to "come" (19 11 22 18), in which men shall eat (14 15 22 16) and drink (22 18). That it involves the redemption of Israel has been discussed in the last part. The Messiah Who brings this Kingdom has the title "Son of Man" (21 36 22 69 24 7). Otherwise the title is used at the betrayal by Judas (22 48, — an act with an eschatological significance), of Christ as the Determiner of human destiny (6 22), and in a non-eschatological context only in 19 10. (In 6 22 the title is probably due to the author of L or to Lc., as Mt. 5 11 in the Q parallel has "*my* sake.")

No Jewish apocalypse regards the coming of the Kingdom as bringing happiness on *all* of Israel, — in every case certain conditions must be fulfilled by even the Israelite to obtain its blessedness (cf. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, pp. 316 ff.). L, as a Christian document, naturally makes the first of those conditions to be faith in Christ. (A study of the other conditions would carry this discussion too far into the realm of New Testament theology.) Conversely, rejection of Christ involves rejection from the Kingdom. Of those who so rejected the Kingdom, the attitude towards the *Pharisees* is about that of Mc. (hardly as severe as that of Mt.). Cf. 5 30 7 36 ff. 11 37 ff. 14 3 15 2 16 14 (L?) 18 10 ff. 19 39. (But, on the other hand, note that Christ



eats at a Pharisee's table three times, — 7 36 11 37 14 1, — a touch that does not occur in Mc. and Mt. and which certainly softens the opposition.) Much sharper is the antagonism to the *Sadducees*, on whom the entire blame of the crucifixion is thrown, — 19 47 22 4. 52. 68 23 13. 35 24 20, — note especially 23 35. The *scribes*, on the other hand, have become much less prominent and are found only in 11 53 15 2 23 10, apart from the places where the word seems to have been introduced from Mc. Nor is the absence of scribes supplied by the presence of "*lawyers*" who occur only twice, — in 14 3 and the woes of 11 45 ff. The *people*, however, are all and always represented as enthusiastic for Christ, — 5 1 7 12. 16 9 43 12 1 14 25 18 43 19 11. 43 20 26 21 33 23 35. 43 24 19, — even if their enthusiasm is not always "according to knowledge." Eschatologically speaking, this state of affairs is summed up in 14 16-24, they who were invited (the religious leaders) having rejected the message, their place is filled from the common people.

(This attitude towards the various classes of the Jewish nation — hatred of the Sadducees, a lesser dislike for the Pharisees, considerably less feeling towards the professional students of the Law, and a most kindly feeling towards the populace — is exactly what would have been found in the Jewish-Christian communities of early date in Palestine but in no other Christian communities of any time or place.)

The greatest hope seems to be placed in the poor, *i.e.*, those who, literally, have little money. The redaction of the Beatitudes in L emphasizes this most strongly, a part (only!) of the Parable of Dives and Lazarus lies in the same direction, and the extreme emphasis laid on sharing one's possessions (3 11 11 41 12 33 16 9) drives the argument home. Cf. especially the calm tone of Mt. 6 19-20 with the L form in Lc. 12 33. The agreement of all of this with Palestinian conditions (as in the Epistle of St. James?) is again obvious.

SUMMARY. — When the details collected in this part and on pp. 87-90 are considered, there seems to be only one conclusion indicated, — that L was composed by a strict Jewish-Christian, and written for the benefit of other Jewish-

Christians and in order to convert Jews to Jewish Christianity. The author was looking forward to Christ's return as the Messiah-Son-of-Man, to establish the Kingdom for such as had accepted Him. Externally speaking, apart from the moral reform demanded, the faith of the author was a "Way" in Judaism (rather than a distinct religion) in which the Law is still observed, Gentile conversions disregarded (simply, — not condemned), and the conversion of Israel not despaired of. In other words, the point of view that we find in St. Peter's speeches in the first chapters of Acts.

U of M