JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE.

III. The Idealised Picture of Luke.

Luke is the only one of the synoptical Evangelists who takes his readers into his confidence as to the aim and plan which guided him in writing his Gospel. From the statement which he makes in the opening sentence of his work, the following inferences may be drawn:

1. That he lived late in the day, after many attempts had already been made to give an account more or less complete of the public ministry of Jesus.

2. That he had not himself been an eye-witness of any part of that ministry, or even had an opportunity of hearing particulars concerning it from any of the men who "had been with Jesus."

3. That his sources of information were mainly books, written accounts, memoirs of the life of Jesus.

4. That in writing his Gospel he earnestly endeavoured to make a careful, judicious use of these sources.

5. That his aim in writing was to confirm faith in the evangelic tradition in the mind of the friend whose benefit he had chiefly in view: in his own words, "that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed."

Luke, we see, had the spirit of research, and desired to base his narrative on the sure ground of historic fact.

It is quite compatible with this that the Evangelist should be to a certain extent controlled in the construction of his story by his own religious feelings, or by the religious feelings of the time in which he lived, or by the spiritual state of his first readers, whether we include in that category merely the one person named, Theophilus, or a circle in which he was the prominent figure. He might have to

consider what they were likely to be interested in, what they could understand, what they could bear, and his own tastes and sympathies might be very much like theirs.

Compared with the first two Gospels, the third presents characteristics which answer to this hypothetical state of matters. A large number of particulars can be collected from its pages which, taken together, convey the impression of a story told under the influence of certain preconceived ideas or predilections. They are too many to be accidental, and too marked to be the result of the unconscious action of the stream of tradition rolling evangelic incidents down its course, and polishing them into smoothness as it carried them along. One cannot help feeling that there must have been intention at work, at some point, either in our Evangelist, or in those who prepared the sources from which he drew his information.

The features of the narrative which most plainly bear traces of editorial discretion with a view to edification relate to the person and character of our Lord and also of His apostles. The writer seems never to forget the present position of those of whom he has occasion to speak, as the Risen Lord of the Church, and its earthly Heads. The frequent use of the title "Lord" and "apostles" where the other two Evangelists say "Jesus," and "disciples" at once exemplifies and symbolises the reverential attitude. To that attitude it is probably further due that some things related in Matthew and Mark are omitted, some things strongly emphasised, some things set in a subdued light, and, finally, some things introduced for the first time into the evangelic story: all making for one end, giving prominence to certain aspects of the Saviour's career and character that strongly appeal to faith and love, and throwing into the shade others making severer demands on the power of appreciation. In the sections of the narrative relating to the disciples the apparent tendency is to gentle handling

of their weaknesses, while letting it be seen that the weaknesses were there.

It is in view of such characteristics as those above referred to that I apply the epithet "idealised" to the picture of Jesus presented in the Third Gospel. The term needs to be guarded against possible misapprehension. It might suggest the idea of a narrative dominated by a theological idea, or by a controversial tendency, say a keen interest in a universal Gentile, Pauline Christianity. Such a bias has indeed been ascribed to Luke, but dispassionate investigation finds little trace of it. The Evangelist is doubtless Pauline and universalist in his attitude, and it gives him pleasure to record words and acts of Jesus going to prove that He had the Gentiles in view as ultimate participants in the blessings of His gospel. But his interest in such elements of the evangelic tradition is religious, not controversial, and even as such it is by no means keen, absorbing, predominant. If he had been a controversial Paulinist, as imagined by the famous Tübingen school, he would have taken pains to let the twelve appear in as unfavourable a light as possible, whereas the fact is he "ever spares" them. If he had been a keen universalist, he would have reported certain words of our Lord pointing in that direction, given both in Matthew and in Mark, which he nevertheless omits.[1] When therefore the picture of Jesus given by Luke is described as "idealised," the meaning is that his presentation is dominated, not by theological ideas or controversial tendency, but by religious sentiment having its root either in the personal idiosyncrasy of the writer, or in his considerate regard to the edification of his first readers.

The character of Christ had heights and depths fitted to test severely the powers of comprehension not merely of crude disciples, but even of experienced, mature Apostles

[1] *E.g.*, the remarkable word in *Matthew* xxvi. 13, *Mark* xiv. 9: "Whereso-ever this gospel shall be preached in all the world," etc.

and Evangelists. Two ways of dealing with the harder sayings and doings are conceivable. An Evangelist might relate all he knew as it happened, and leave his story to make its own impression, loyally trusting that the character described, even though it should be in some respects above his own comprehension, would eventually in its every feature commend itself to the minds and consciences of all believers. Or he might, so to speak, take the character of Jesus in charge, and allow nothing to appear which was "over the head" of the reporter, or which he feared might prove a stumbling-block to those whose religious benefit he had primarily in view in writing. Which of these two ways of discharging the Evangelist's very responsible function is the wiser, it is needless to discuss; perhaps both are justifiable in given circumstances. Anyhow, the fact is that Mark (and Matthew also) has chosen the former way, and Luke, so far as one can judge, the latter. At all events, the phenomena of his Gospel are such as fit into that hypothesis. There are many facts bearing that complexion, however they are to be explained. I shall exhibit them with some measure of fulness, believing that in this case also a fearless discussion will be found to make for the historicity of the evangelic tradition. And for the more complete inductive verification of Luke's method, I shall briefly note also some instances of his discreet manner of dealing with materials relating to the disciples, though not they, but their Master be our theme. It may be best to dispose of them first.

Luke, it has been said by a very reverent commentator,[1] "ever spares the twelve." As a matter of fact his narratives, compared with those of Matthew and Mark, uniformly treat the disciples with considerate gentleness. How true this is, cannot be adequately shown by a cursory reference to illustrative instances; the passages must be carefully

[1] Schanz, a Catholic professor in Tübingen.

perused and compared with the parallels in the other Gospels. Yet even the hastiest glance will suffice to make a *primâ facie* impression in the direction of our thesis.

Take then, to begin with, the treatment of *Peter*. The stern word, "Get thee behind me, Satan," is omitted. But most characteristic is the manner in which the most humiliating event in Peter's disciple life, his denial of his Lord, is dealt with. The pre-intimation of the coming fall is most gently handled. The harshness of the announcement, "thou shalt deny me thrice," is softened by a prefatory statement, in which by an allusion to Satan Peter's case is virtually placed beside that of Job, and the experience is likened to a sifting process whereby a saintly character will be purged of its weak, chaff-like elements, the result of all to be that the sifted man shall become the strongest man of the apostolic band, having it for his honourable vocation to succour weaker brethren.[1] And what a benignant understatement is the account of the denial! No mention of cursing and swearing. The three denials form an anti-climax each succeeding one weaker than the one going before. In the first, Peter denies all knowledge of Jesus; in the second, only *intimate* knowledge, *discipleship*; and the last, occurring an hour later than the one preceding, is rather an *evasion* than a denial: A Galilean, say you? Yes, I am, and I don't understand what you are saying.[2]

The whole body of the Twelve are treated with equal consideration. Their faults, ignorance, weak faith, mutual rivalries, while acknowledged in loyalty to truth, are touched with a very sparing hand. Some narratives in which these appear in a glaring manner are conspicuous by their absence. To the omitted incidents belong the conversation concerning the leaven of the Pharisees, in which, as Mark reports it, Jesus complains of the hardness of their hearts, and asks

[1] *Luke* xxii. 31, 32.

[2] *Luke* xxii. 54–62; compare with *Mark* xiv. 66–72.

reproachfully, Do not ye yet understand?[1] the ambitious request of the two sons of Zebedee, in which the discord within the disciple-circle appears in its most acute form,[2] and the anointing in Bethany, in which the Twelve show a prosaic incapacity to appreciate the pathetic, poetic deed of Mary.[3] To be noted also in this connection is Luke's silence concerning the flight of the disciples at the apprehension of their Master. Even more instructive than this silence is the mild, delicate way in which the faults of the future apostles are dealt with by the Evangelist when he is compelled to speak of them. Take, *e.g.*, their weak faith. In the storm on the lake, on the eastward voyage towards Gerasa, as reported by Matthew and Mark, Jesus characterises the behaviour of His disciples as cowardly, and as exhibiting a lack of faith.[4] In Luke's report, with just the slightest accent of reproach in His tone, He asks, "Where is your faith?"[5] Again, at the foot of the hill of Transfiguration, the disciples, in Matthew, ask, Why could not we cast it out? and receive for reply, Because of your little faith; the Master going on to indicate what mighty deeds could be wrought by the smallest grain of faith, as if to insinuate that they had none at all.[6] This conversation, connected with the case of the epileptic boy, Luke omits. The saying concerning faith as a grain of mustard seed he does report, but in a characteristically different setting. The Apostles say unto their Lord, Increase our faith; and He replies, "If (as is the case) ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this sycamore tree, Be thou rooted up and be thou planted in the sea, and it would have obeyed you,"[7] the implied assertion being that they have already

[1] *Mark* viii. 11–21; for another strong reflection on the ignorance of the disciples, *vide* chap. vii. 18.

[2] *Mark* x. 35–44; *Matt.* xx. 20–28.

[3] *Mark* xiv. 3–11; *Matt.* xxvi. 6–13.

[4] *Matt.* viii. 26; *Mark* iv. 40.

[5] *Luke* viii. 25.

[6] *Matt.* xvii. 19, 20.

[7] *Luke* xvii. 5, 6.

enough to achieve marvels. Note again how the Evangelist disposes of the rivalry among the companions of Jesus. He selects as the place for mentioning it the story of the Last Supper on the eve of the Passion. Truly a most unseemly time for disciples to indulge in ambitious passions! How then is the outbreak dealt with? Jesus first utters the words of admonition which, according to Matthew and Mark, He spoke on the occasion when James and John made their ambitious request. Then He goes on immediately after to pronounce a generous eulogy on the contending disciples: "Ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations";[1] so, as it were, dwarfing into insignificance the petty fault of temper in comparison with the heroic fidelity. Just one point more I barely mention here: Luke's apology for the failure of the disciples to keep awake when their Master was in Gethsemane. "Sleeping *for sorrow*!"[2] How true it is that he ever spares the Twelve! Doubtless the fact was so, but he is careful to note it.

But it is with Luke's portraiture of our Lord that we are mainly concerned; I proceed, therefore, to indicate some of the things in his Gospel which lend distinctiveness to his picture.

1. Among these fall to be mentioned some notable *omissions*, more especially some of the more remarkable words reported by the other Evangelists as having been spoken by Jesus. Some have been referred to already in a previous paper, such as the realistic word concerning that which defileth,[3] the seemingly harsh word about "dogs" spoken to the woman of Canaan,[4] and the stern rebuke administered to Peter: "Get thee behind me, Satan." Another very noticeable omission is the saying concerning *eunuchism* for the kingdom of heaven, for

[1] *Luke* xxii. 28. [2] *Luke* xxii. 45.
[3] *Matt.* xv. 17, 18; *Mark* vii. 18, 19.
[4] *Matt.* xv. 26; *Mark* vii. 27.

which we are indebted to Matthew.[1] Still more remarkable is the omission of the awful cry of Jesus on the cross: "My God, My God!"[2] In some respects the most surprising omission of all is the very important word spoken by Jesus on the occasion of the ambitious request of James and John: "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."[3] What gives this omission special claims on our attention is the fact that it seems on first view one of those words which, assuming his acquaintance with it, Luke would have taken pains to preserve. Its omission is a problem to be solved in connection with his Gospel. But this is only a part of the problem. This particular saying is one of four containing Christ's teaching concerning the significance of His death, *all* of which, with one very doubtful exception, are wanting in the Third Gospel. This is a fact the reason and meaning of which deserve careful consideration, and they will be considered in a future paper. Meantime I simply note this as one of the peculiarities of Luke, and pass on to a second class of phenomena which make this Evangelist's picture of Jesus so distinctive.

2. The things which are strongly *emphasised.* First, let it be remarked in general that there *are* such phenomena in the Third Gospel. Luke does not always tone down and deal in mitigated statements. He can be as emphatic and realistic as either of his brother Evangelists when it suits his purpose, and this very occasional emphasis gives added significance to the opposite quality of subdued expression observable in some of his narratives. Among the instances in which he does not shrink from strong sayings are his reports of words spoken by our Lord in reference to wealth and its possessors. The hard

[1] *Matt.* xix. 12. [2] *Matt.* xxvii. 46; *Mark* xv. 34.
[3] *Matt.* xx. 28; *Mark* x. 45.

saying concerning the camel and the needle's eye finds a place in his pages.[1] It is in his Gospel we find the woes pronounced on the rich, the full, and the merry.[2] In the parables of the *Unjust Steward* and *Dives*[3] riches almost seem to be in themselves evil, and the bare fact of possessing them appears to be represented as a ground of perdition. It may be only an appearance, but it is there, requiring explanation; and the thing to be noted is that the Evangelist takes no pains in this case to prevent misapprehension. The fact may be due in part to the nature of his own social sympathies, partly to his knowing that there was no risk of any of his readers stumbling over such sayings of the Lord.

Luke emphasises whatever tends to bring out into strong relief the *power*, the *benevolence*, and the *saintliness* of Jesus. His desire to make prominent the two former of these attributes is apparent in his narratives of healing acts. Peter's mother-in-law is ill of a *great* fever,[4] and the leper is *full* of leprosy,[5] and in the story of the blind man at Jericho care is taken to make it appear a case of *total* blindness by representing the sufferer as needing some one to conduct him to the presence of Jesus.[6] There is no good ground for regarding these statements as exaggerations, but it is legitimate to see in them a wish to make the cure effected stand out in the full measure of its marvellousness. The greatness of the benefit conferred, that is the benevolence of the Healer, is also rendered prominent by many a slight but significant touch. The withered hand restored on a Sabbath is the *right*[7] hand, most useful for labour; the centurion's servant is one *dear* to him;[8] the son of the widow of Nain is an *only* son;[9]

[1] *Luke* xviii. 24.
[2] *Luke* vi. 24, 25.
[3] *Luke* xvi.
[4] *Luke* iv. 38.
[5] *Luke* v. 12.
[6] *Luke* xviii. 40.
[7] *Luke* vi. 6.
[8] *Luke* vii. 2.
[9] *Luke* vii. 12.

the daughter of Jairus an *only* daughter;[1] the epileptic boy at the foot of the hill of Transfiguration is also an only child.[2]

The *holiness* of the Lord Jesus is carefully accentuated in this Gospel. The call of Peter to discipleship, which here assumes larger proportions and greater significance than it possesses in Matthew and Mark, is made to contribute to this end. Here Peter is the great disciple, the representative man among the Twelve, therefore his call is related with much circumstantiality, while that of the others, James, John, and Andrew, is thrown into the shade. Yet even he, the pillar-Apostle of future years, in view of the marvellous take of fishes, exclaims, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." The foremost of the disciples feels himself unworthy to join the society of the Holy One.[3]

In every saintly character *prayer*, a devotional spirit, forms a prominent feature. This trait in the character of the Lord Jesus is accordingly made very prominent in Luke's Gospel. After the healing of the leper Jesus withdraws into lonely spots to pray.[4] The teaching on the hill is inaugurated by a night spent in prayer.[5] Prayer formed the prelude to the momentous communications on the Messiahship and the approaching Passion;[6] likewise to the mysterious Transfiguration scene.[7] Sometimes the Master prayed alone, sometimes in the presence of His disciples. Hearing Him pray in a certain place awoke in them a desire for instruction in an art in which they felt the Master left them far behind.[8] He prayed *for* them as well as in their hearing; for Peter, for example, when the hour of his trial was nigh.[9]

[1] *Luke* viii. 42.
[2] *Luke* ix. 38.
[3] *Luke* v. 8.
[4] *Luke* v. 16.
[5] *Luke* vi. 12.
[6] *Luke* ix. 18.
[7] *Luke* ix. 29.
[8] *Luke* xi. 1.
[9] *Luke* xxii. 32.

3. I pass now to the category of *under-statement*, things presented in a subdued light. Both words and acts of Jesus fall to be noticed here. To the former belong the words spoken at Capernaum in reference to the discussion that had arisen within the disciple-circle on the question: Who is the greatest? According to the report of Matthew, the Master then spoke two very stern words, one directly addressed to the disciples, the other bearing on the doom due to the man who, in the pursuit of ambitious ends, should cause any little one to stumble. In the former disciples are threatened with exclusion from the kingdom unless their disposition undergo a change, and ambitious passions give place to a childlike spirit. In the latter it is intimated that the fate deserved by the offender of the little ones is that a large millstone (literally one driven by an ass, as opposed to a small one worked by the hand) be hanged about his neck, and that he be drowned in the deepest part of the sea.[1] Words, both, expressive of passionate abhorrence of selfish ambition and the mischief it works, by the utterance of which Jesus commands our admiration and inspires in our hearts holy awe. But Luke has dealt with these solemn sayings in a way which prevents them from having their full effect, toning down the millstone logion so that it loses its note of indignant intensity,[2] and transferring the other to a different occasion, where it loses the personal reference to the disciples, and becomes a general declaration as to the necessity of childlikeness for admission into the kingdom of heaven. The new setting is furnished by the incident of the mothers bringing their little children to be blessed by Jesus,[3] which,

[1] *Matt.* xviii. 3, 6.

[2] *Luke* xvii. 2: The ass-millstone becomes a millstone simply, and "the sea" stands in place of "the depth of the sea." Luke gives neither of the sayings in connection with the Capernaum discourse on humility. *Vide* chap. ix. 46–48.

[3] *Luke* xviii. 15–17.

I may remark in passing, supplies a fresh instance of Luke's habit of sparing the Twelve. Mark tells that Jesus was much displeased with His disciples for trying to keep the children from His presence.[1] Of this the third Evangelist says nothing. The omission has the same effect as the toning down of the words under consideration. Both keep the *indignation* of Jesus out of view, and suggest the idea of one who was always calm in temper and passionlessly didactic in speech. Whether this passionlessness entered into the Evangelist's own idea of sanctity, or whether in so reporting the Lord's words he was considering what his readers could bear, it may be difficult to determine. What is certain is that the character of Jesus thus portrayed gains in amiability at the cost of its power and majesty.

A similar observation is suggested by Luke's treatment of our Lord's anti-Pharisaic protest. Two facts have to be noticed here: extensive omission, and a new setting given to much that is retained. As to the former, so much has been left out that from Luke's Gospel alone it would be quite impossible to obtain any adequate idea of the viciousness of Pharisaic religion, or of the thoroughness and exhaustiveness of the criticism which Jesus directed against it. In proof of this statement it will suffice to mention the omission of the great body of the Sermon on the Mount, consisting of an elaborate contrast between righteousness as conceived by the scribes and the righteousness of the kingdom as conceived by the Preacher, and also of one-half of the great final philippic against Pharisaism as recorded in Matthew xxiii. But it is the setting of what is retained that at present concerns us. It strikes me as most characteristic and instructive. The fact here is that much of what Luke reports of our Lord's anti-Pharisaic discourses appears in his Gospel as spoken

[1] *Mark* x. 14.

not merely *about* Pharisees but *to* them by Jesus sitting as a guest at their tables. On three distinct occasions Jesus appears in his pages as a guest in the houses of Pharisees, and speaks His mind about their ways with urbanity and yet with freedom.[1] Of such semi-friendly social relations there is no trace in Matthew and Mark, and we might easily take away from their narratives the impression that such relations were impossible. That might be a hasty inference. It may be taken for granted that Jesus would not refuse such invitations, and that He would be true to Himself wherever He was. On the other hand, it is equally certain that His attitude towards Pharisaism was uncompromising and His speech about it, especially at the end, crushing and tremendous. And the thing to be noted about Luke is that he mitigates the severity of the sterner utterances by giving as table-talk what in Matthew's Gospel appears as part of a solemn final protest in Jerusalem against the religious guides of Israel and all their ways.[2]

The chief instances of pruned statement concerning the *actions* of Jesus are the narratives of the Cleansing of the Temple and the Agony in the Garden. The latter will fall to be considered at a later stage of these studies; therefore for the present I content myself with a few words on the former. Of the three synoptical Evangelists, Mark describes the scene in the strongest colours, but both Matthew and he tell the story in substantially the same way. In both Jesus not merely speaks in a tone of indignant remonstrance, but acts with a stormy energy that might easily be mistaken for violence, overturning the tables of the money-changers and the seats of them that sold the doves. He makes a clean sweep of the unholy traffic within the sacred precincts, unceremoniously turning out not merely those that

[1] *Luke* vii. 36–50, xi. 37–52, xiv. 1–24.
[2] *Vide* in chap. xi. 37 ff.

sold but also those that bought as art and part in the work of desecration. Of this animated transaction, Luke offers a very reduced and unsensational account, telling how Jesus, entering the temple, began to cast out them that *sold*, making no mention of the overturned tables and seats, adding only the complaint: It is written, And My house shall be a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of robbers.[1] His report gives really no idea of the scene; the one vivid feature is the comparison of the desecrated temple to a robber's den. And yet from that strong utterance one might suspect that there was something behind left unsaid. It seems to be a half-told tale, as if adapted to the capacities of spiritual minors, who would find it difficult to reconcile the strenuous conduct of Jesus with their preconceived ideas of His character. Probably what interested Luke himself was not the drastic action of the Lord Jesus, but the verdict He pronounced on the Holy House as no longer holy, justifying beforehand that still more drastic action of Providence by which the temple had been turned into a heap of ruins. Whatever the reason, the fact is that in this case, as in others, the third Evangelist presents a picture of Jesus which lacks the element of *tragic grandeur*.

4. For this defect he amply compensates by the attractive exhibition which he makes of the *grace* of Jesus, especially in the *additions* he contributes to the common stock of evangelic traditions.

Luke's additions, though not exclusively, are predominantly, such as serve this valuable purpose. They may for the most part be described by the happy phrase he employs to indicate the character of Christ's address in the synagogue of Nazareth: "words of grace."[2] He had evidently taken pains to collect material of this kind. There is no

[1] *Luke* xix. 45: the words "them that bought" have no place in the best MS. copies of the Greek Testament, and are omitted in the Revised Version.

[2] *Luke* iv. 22.

reason to doubt the historicity of his collections. The statement in his preface justifies the assumption that for every one of his narratives he had a voucher in oral or in written tradition. Then there is intrinsic probability on the side of his peculiar contributions. Love to the sinful and the social outcasts was unquestionably a most outstanding charism of Jesus. Most authentic sayings of His, such as "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners," and "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost," entitle us to look for illustrative anecdotes in the memorabilia of His public ministry. Instead of questioning the truth of those Luke has preserved, we rather wonder at the paucity of such material in the companion Gospels. We feel sure that interesting stories of the relations of Jesus with the sinful, and of His sayings about them, might be forthcoming, if pains were taken to collect them. Luke happily has taken pains, possibly in part because he noticed a lack in Matthew or in Mark, and felt he must set himself to supply it. What he has given by way of supplement is very welcome as well as very credible. The story of the woman in Simon's house[1] is pure evangelic gold. So are the exquisite parables concerning the joy of finding things lost.[2] The same grace-revealing character belongs to the Parables of the Good Samaritan,[3] the Great Supper,[4] and the Pharisee and the Publican.[5] They foster the saving instinct, and hold out hope to those who need to be succoured and saved. The last-named is described as a parable concerning those who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and *despised others*. Its aim is to condemn not merely the self-complacency, but more especially the contempt, and to encourage the despised by letting them know that they were

[1] *Luke* vii. 36–50.
[2] *Luke* xv.
[3] *Luke* x. 25–37.
[4] *Luke* xiv. 15–24.
[5] *Luke* xviii. 9–14.

at least not beyond the sympathies of *God*. The winsome stories of Zacchæus[1] and the penitent thief[2] worthily crown a collection of gleanings which fully justify the encomium on Luke's Gospel that it is "the Gospel of the sinful."

Little needs to be added by way of summarising the results of the foregoing discussion. The particulars under the four heads of omissions, emphasised statements, understatements, and additions, all conspire to one end, viz., to exhibit the Lord of the Church divine in *Power*, *Holiness*, and *Goodness*. The holiness of Jesus is so zealously guarded that He appears not only without sin but even free from all that bears the most remote resemblance to moral infirmity in temper, word, or action. The result is that the natural individuality of Jesus, so conspicuous in Mark, is seen in Luke only in faded outline. Luke's picture of Jesus is one-sided. The side shown is indeed so attractive that we thank the Evangelist for what he has given rather than blame him for what he has withheld. Yet we ought distinctly to see, and acknowledge to ourselves, that his presentation is defective. We cannot accept as complete a Christ who is simply good and kind. We need a Christ who can be angry, indignant, terrible in passionate abhorrence of evil; who can hurl thunder-bolts of denunciation at the "unwedgeable and gnarled oak" of powerful, privileged, and plausible iniquity. The love of Jesus to the sinful, as it appears in this Gospel, is beautiful; but the hatred of Pharisaism which is somewhat thrown into the background is equally indispensable. So likewise is the stern purpose, at all costs, to purge out of the disciples evil elements of temper which, left unchecked, would soon turn the new society of which they were to form the nucleus into a community little better in spirit than that in which the scribes bore sway. Who that considers to

[1] *Luke* xix. 1–10. [2] *Luke* xxiii. 39–43.

what extent Christianity has been wrecked by priestly assumption can regret that the evangelic records have so faithfully shown how contrary that leaven was to the mind of the Lord Jesus?

The view I have ventured to present of Luke's treatment of the evangelic tradition, in so far as it concerns the persons of Jesus and His disciples, can be turned to some account for apologetic purposes. It makes for the historicity of the Synoptical records. The remark applies even to Luke's omissions. These at first view seem to cast a dark shadow of doubt on the historical value of the material omitted. We are inclined to argue: if Luke had known these things, he would have reported them; and how could a man who took such pains to inform himself fail to know them if they had been actual facts? When the element of intention is introduced, this reasoning falls to the ground. We then perceive that there were classes of facts which the Evangelist would not care to preserve. Things not known, therefore presumably not real, become things probably known which the Evangelist did not choose to introduce into his narrative. At the very least, intentional omission, once established, cancels all presumption against historicity. On the other hand, abridged or qualified reporting bears positive evidence to the reality of the fact reported. Whatever a writer tones down he is tempted to omit. In adopting the course of understating rather than omitting he becomes, so to speak, a reluctant witness to the historicity of the materials so dealt with. Finally, even heightened statements in their own way contribute to the cumulative apologetic argument. If the added elements be the result of fuller information, this is self-evident. Even if they be exaggerations for a purpose, they tend to establish the truth of the basal narrative. They show within what narrow limits editorial discretion was willing to restrict itself. An author who has ideas to embody is tempted to

invent when he cannot find. Luke did not invent, but only at most touched up stories given to his hand by a reliable tradition. This is his method in narratives common to his Gospel with those of Matthew and Mark. Noting this, we can well believe it to have been his method all through, even in those portions of his Gospel where he is our sole authority.

A. B. BRUCE.

ON SOME PHRASES IN THE RAISING OF LAZARUS.

I. (John xi. 33, *ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι*). The regular meaning of the word *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι*[1] is "threaten loudly," "be noisily angry." Yet some of the Synoptists use the word of Jesus as though He "threatened," or "was angry with," those whom He cured.[2] Such a tradition might naturally cause difficulty to educated readers, especially at the beginning of the second century, when people were familiar with the tricks of those exorcists who pretended to drive out evil spirits and to cure diseases by shouting at their patients and terrifying them into a stupor that might seem to be recovery.

Hence the Fourth Evangelist appears to have thought it well to use this misunderstood word in such a context as to demonstrate that it had not the meaning popularly associated with it. How could it mean anger of the common kind, since Jesus (xi. 57) "wept" almost in the same moment? And that it referred to some more inward and suppressed feeling was denoted by the qualification (xi. 33)

[1] Rev., in text, has "groaned." But there is no authority for "groan," and abundant authority for "be angry," "threaten loudly," "bellow," or similar meanings.

[2] Mark says that Jesus (Mark i. 43) "threatened, or reproached (*ἐνεβριμήσατο*)" a leper, that he should not make his cure known to others. Matthew ix. 30 (*ἐνεβριμήθη*) says the same of Jesus addressing two blind men.