

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

message bears the same burden to us—it bids us *thole*, that we may overcome. It bids us be faithful, that we may be partakers of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God. It is a figure which carries us back in thought to the first Paradise and to the tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the promise cannot mean less than perfect

restoration to all the blessings and privileges which Adam lost. But it means more. To eat of the tree of life in the Paradise of God is better than to eat of the Symbolical tree of Eden. For Christ Himself is the true 'Tree of Life,' and to be a partaker of Him is to have life for evermore.

Recent Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels.

BY THE REV. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., PRINCIPAL OF EGERTON HALL, MANCHESTER.

THE criticism of the Synoptic Gospels seems to have reached this point. It is very generally agreed that Matt. and Luke have edited and enlarged the Second Gospel. The points still debated in this connexion are details. The main fact is, as it would seem, undeniable. There is further a very widely held belief that Matt. and Luke had also before them a second source, consisting mainly of discourses; and for some years attempts have been made to reconstruct it, none of which have met with much approval.

It was at one time usual to call this alleged discourse source *the Logia*, but as that term seemed to beg disputable questions connected with a statement of Papias about *the Logia* written by Matthew, recent writers have preferred to adopt for it a colourless symbol Q (= Quelle). Harnack¹ has recently set himself to the reconstruction of Q, and as his results are likely to be widely accepted, it is the purpose of this paper to offer some criticism to both his methods and his results.²

A. Methods.—Briefly put, his method is to place in the source any section or saying that is found in both Matt. and Luke, but not in Mark. The assumption behind this is that wherever two writers agree closely in their records they are borrowing from a common source. As regards this I would only say that I am not prepared to contest the general position that the literary agreement between Matt. and Luke in sections common to them is so great that literary dependence in some form must be assumed.

But I would only urge that it does not follow from the fact that these two writers agree closely in many sections, that all these sections must have come

from a single source. They agree, *e.g.*, closely in the case of the Sermon on the Mount. They also agree closely in the account of St. John's preaching. It does not follow that the sermon and the account of John were found in the same common source. They may have been found there. They may also have been in two separate sources. So far as St. Luke is concerned, he expressly tells us that he was acquainted with the works of many gospel writers.

On this method of collecting together passages common to Matt. and Luke in which there is close verbal agreement, Harnack builds up a document which he supposes that these writers used. It contains:

1. An account of John's preaching.
2. The Temptation and perhaps the Baptism.
3. A good deal of the Sermon on the Mount, followed by the healing of the Centurion's servant.
4. The two aspirants.
5. Sayings to the disciples about their mission.
6. The discourse about the Baptist, with the two sequels, Woes against Bethsaida and Chorazin, and the Thanksgiving to the Father.
7. The Beelzebub section and sign of Jonah.
8. Woes against the Pharisees.
9. Discourse about the Parousia, and other sayings.

Now a document which contained the material above tabulated would be a very curious sort of gospel writing. Presumably the purpose of the writer was to collect noteworthy sayings of Christ, and most of the material is of that nature. But what then has the record of the preaching of the Baptist to do in such a work? This would be intelligible enough as an introduction in any historical or biographical narrative of Christ's

¹ *The Sayings of Jesus* ('Crown Theological Library').

² For criticisms of Harnack from a different point of view, see Dr. Moulton in the *Expositor*, May 1909.

life, but what has it to do with a collection of Christ's sayings?

Again, the document thus reconstructed contains for the most part sayings or groups of sayings. In the midst of this appears quite unexpectedly a miracle, that of *the Centurion's Servant*. What has this to do in a collection of sayings? A little later there is another miracle, the healing of a dumb demoniac before the Beelzebub discourse. But the two cases are not parallel. Q, as reconstructed by Harnack, contains several instances of a very slight narrative setting to a series of sayings; cf., for example, *the Two Aspirants*, or *the Sending of John's disciples*, or *the Demand for a Sign*. Harnack, by linking together these and one or two other such references to fact, makes up what he calls seven narrative sections, but in reality only one is a narrative section, namely, *the Centurion's Servant*; and the others, including the Beelzebub miracle, are quite different in nature, being not self-contained narratives, but mere allusions to fact which serve as an introduction to sayings or groups of sayings. The narrative of *the Centurion's Servant* is therefore really isolated in Q. And we cannot help asking what right has it to be there? The central point of the story is not Christ's saying, 'Not even in Israel have I found such faith' (for as a saying apart from its context, that has no meaning), but the facts that Christ could heal by a word, and that He had done such a healing for the servant of a centurion.

What has a compilation of discourses in common with a narrative section like this? Or if the compiler admitted it, then surely his book must have contained other miracles and narratives and have been of a very different character from the source as Harnack reconstructs it.

Further, Harnack puts into his source eleven instances of what he calls Parables. But just as he uses the word *narrative* to cover mere references to fact, so he here uses *parable* to cover analogies, similes, etc. Of his eleven cases only four are formal parables. They are *the Two Builders*, *the Leaven*, *the Mustard Seed*, and *the Children in the Market-Place*. The rest are metaphors or allegorical allusions. Now here is a strange thing that in a document professing to be a collection of some of Christ's sayings there should be only four parables. The inference is obvious. Harnack's reconstructed source is at least incomplete. If there really was a collection of Christ's

sayings, it must have contained more parables than these four, and those that are missing might very materially affect our judgment of the nature of the document.

Again, the reconstructed source brings with it almost as many difficulties as it solves, for it is only possible to explain the text of our two Gospels as reproductions of it by allowing the two Evangelists a freedom of dealing with it which is hard to reconcile with the probability admitted by Harnack, that it was of Apostolic origin. How explain, for example, the two presentations of the *Beatitudes*, or of the *Lord's Prayer*, on the supposition that the Evangelists had before them in an Apostolic document one and the same record of each of these items? Surely the inference here is irresistible that the differences in these sections between the two writers is not due to the fact that they are arbitrarily altering words, which they both had before them in the same form, but that they are reproducing different traditions of the Lord's words.

However, we might perhaps assent that the principle of putting into a common source all that is common to Matt. and Luke alone is not very likely to be far wrong, and that there is some probability that most of the above material occurred in a document lying behind our First and Third Gospels.

But two other words of caution are here needed. Before we proceed to discuss the character of this source and its theology we ought to be sure that we really have sufficient data for so doing. This is just where Harnack's method seems to me to break down.

For (1) we cannot be sure that the source did not contain much more than the material collected above. Either Matt. alone, or Luke alone, may contain material which belonged to it; or the source may have contained much which neither of these writers have borrowed from it.

(2) If so, this lost material, or this material found in only one Gospel, if added to that which Harnack puts into his Q, might very considerably modify our impression of its general characteristics and of its theology.

B. Results.—Now Harnack, after reconstructing his document, attempts to characterize its theology, and draws inferences from that as to its date.

There is in it no reference to the Passion. Therefore the central feature of the gospel message

was not Christ as Redeemer, but Christ as Teacher and Prophet of the Kingdom. Therefore the book was compiled before Mark wrote his Gospel, but not too early, or Mark would have used it.

Ramsay¹ tries to improve on Harnack here. He assumes that Harnack's conception of Q is right in the main, but argues that no Christian disciple could have written such a book after Christ's death, or at any rate after Pentecost. It must therefore have been composed during Christ's lifetime.

Ramsay is no doubt right that Harnack's Q is inexplicable as a production of a Christian disciple in the first thirty years after the Lord's death, but this fact should lead us, not to try and find a possible date during Christ's lifetime for the work, but to ask whether such a document as Harnack gives us ever existed at all. The inference again presses: the source must have contained much more than is given in Harnack's reconstruction, and the missing material might give quite a different character to the work, and make it an intelligible production of the early days of Christianity.

And the data exist for the discovery of the missing material. It is not far to seek, for it lies embedded in the First Gospel. Harnack gives as characteristic features of the source as reconstructed by him, 'Jewish horizon and sentiment' and 'conflict against the Pharisees.' He also says that the conception of the 'Kingdom of God' is that of a future kingdom in Mt 8¹¹ = Lk 13²⁸; Mt 23¹³ = Lk 11⁵²; Mt 7²¹ = Lk 6⁴⁶; Mt 10⁷ = Lk 9² and Mt 6³³ = Lk 12³¹; whilst in four other places, namely, Mt 12²⁸ = Lk 11²⁰; Mt 13^{33, 31} = Lk 13^{20, 18}; Mt 11¹¹ = Lk 7²⁸; and Mt 11¹² = Lk 16¹⁶, the Kingdom is regarded as already present.

Now the exact phrases in these passages are these:

MT.	LK.	HARNACK.
8 ¹¹ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
23 ¹³ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	otherwise	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
7 ²¹ " "	otherwise	" "
10 ⁷ " "	βασιλεία τῶν θεῶν	" "
6 ³³ βασιλεία	βασιλεία αὐτοῦ	βασιλεία αὐτοῦ
12 ²⁸ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
13 ³³ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
13 ³¹ " "	" "	" "
11 ¹¹ " "	" "	" "
11 ¹² " "	" "	" "

It will be seen that so far as these passages are

¹ *Luke the Physician*, p. 89.

concerned, Matt. eight times has βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν where Luke has βασιλ. τοῦ θεοῦ (if he has any equivalent words), while Matt. only once has βασιλ. τοῦ θεοῦ. Harnack assumes that Luke has retained the phrase of the source, while Matt. has altered it in every case save one. But it is far more probable that Matt. retains the phraseology of his source, which Harnack admits was Jewish in character, and that Luke or a previous editor of Q has substituted for the Jewish βασιλ. τῶν οὐρανῶν a phrase which would be more natural to Western ears.²

As regards Harnack's distinction between the kingdom as present and future, all the cases where Matt. has τῶν οὐρανῶν, or simply βασιλεία, probably denoted the future Kingdom, an idea which is specially characteristic of the source. If Mt 12²⁸ has τοῦ θεοῦ, that only shows that the source exceptionally used this phrase, the reason here probably being the influence of the preceding πνεύματι θεοῦ.

We find, then, amongst the characteristics of the source (a) 'Jewish horizon and sentiment'; (b) 'conflict against the Pharisees'; (c) 'the eschatological conception of the Kingdom.' Now if we apply these criteria to some of the sayings in Matt. which Harnack does not admit into his source, we shall find that they have a claim to admission there. *E.g.* 5²⁰ is anti-Pharisaic. So are 6¹⁻¹⁸ and 15¹²⁻¹⁴. The following are marked by Jewish horizon and sentiment: 6^{10b}, 'Thy will be done'; 7⁶, 'swine' = Gentiles, 10^{5b-8, 23} 15²³⁻²⁴ and 24³⁰; and the following by Jewish phraseology: 16¹⁷⁻¹⁹ 18^{14, 16-20}.

I give here only a few verses which ought to be admitted into the source, although Luke has no parallel to them. I have elsewhere tried to make a more complete list of passages which were probably in the source, and have shown how the source, when so enlarged, presents a character very different from the description which Harnack gives of his

² Here, as elsewhere, Harnack obscures the theological tendencies of the source by blotting out of it phrases which were fundamentally characteristic of it as a Jewish-Christian collection of the Messiah's sayings. *E.g.* Harnack omits ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς or ὁ οὐράνιος after πατήρ, and the first three aspirations of the Lord's Prayer. The compiler of the source writing in the early days of Jewish-Christian Church life might (probably not) have added these clauses to the traditional prayer. But it is little likely that an editor so late as 'Matt.' would here and elsewhere have Judaized his material.

limited Q. (See *St. Matthew* [‘Intern. Crit. Com.’], lvii–lviii, lxxvi–lxxix.)¹ This source, as the writer of the First Gospel had it before him, was a collection of sayings and groups of sayings which had strongly marked Jewish-Christian features. It was very anti-Pharisaic, and many of the sayings were couched in very Jewish language, as, e.g., Mt 16¹⁷⁻¹⁹. Being a collection of notable sayings of Christ, it naturally represented Him mainly on the side of His teaching, i.e. as a prophet of the Kingdom of Heaven. But it identified Him with the Son of Man of whom He had spoken, and represented Him as teaching that the Kingdom would be inaugurated when, in the near future, He returned as Son of Man. The ethical teaching which the book contained was therefore understood to be intended for His disciples, who were the true Israel, during the period of expectation of His return. Other characteristics of the book were its emphasis on the belief that Christ had not abrogated the Mosaic Law, which was still binding on His disciples, and its hostility to the Pharisees. They had misused their privileges, had rejected the Messiah, and, in consequence, the inheritance of the Kingdom had passed from them to the community (*ἐκκλησία*) of the disciples of the Messiah, to whom many proselytes from amongst the Gentiles would attach themselves (8¹²).

The source as thus reconstructed may well be Apostolic (cf. Papias). It must be early in date, and it may well have been written in the early days of Christianity in Palestine, but certainly not during Christ’s lifetime (Ramsay).

The later history of this book of sayings is full of interest. In the first place, the editor of the First Gospel got hold of it and combined it with St. Mark. He wrote in its spirit, was influenced by its conception, and adopted its phraseology. That is why he modifies St. Mark’s record in such a way, e.g., as to make it clear that Christ had not abolished the Mosaic distinction between clean and unclean meats,² and that His teaching on divorce was not antagonistic to Deuteronomy.³ For the same reason he modifies Mk 9¹ (cf. Mt 16²⁸) in such a way as to show that the Kingdom of God will come with power when the Son of Man comes in His

Kingdom, and that this will take place within the generation of Christ’s contemporaries. The influence of the phraseology of the source upon the editor is shown, too, by the way in which he almost invariably substitutes *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* for Mark’s *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*.⁴ The Gospel which he thus composed out of Mark and the discourse source is as Jewish in horizon and sentiment, as anti-Pharisaic, as primitive in its expectation of the nearness of the Parousia as was the source. For there is nothing in the Gospel which could not be accepted by one who believed that the new Israel, to whom the Kingdom was coming when the Son of Man returned, consisted of those Jewish-Christians who believed in Him, and of Gentiles who joined themselves to them. The parables in the Gospel are all capable of interpretation eschatologically, and the verses in which there is reference to admission of Gentiles to the new society would suggest nothing more startling to a pious Jewish-Christian than many passages in the Jewish prophets.

That the Church adopted this Gospel with its Jewish atmosphere into the list of its sacred books proves, not that the editor wrote it in a Pauline spirit of universalism, but that much that he has inserted can be interpreted in a sense very different from that which he and his contemporaries gave to it. The strange thing is that modern writers should fail to recognize the Jewish and primitive atmosphere of the book, and should continue to speak of it as though it had been written by a Churchman who wished to represent Christ as having sanctioned the doctrines and usages of the Christian Church as they existed a generation or two after His lifetime.

At a somewhat later date St. Luke came across some of the contents of this discourse source. Harnack and others write as though he had before him the original book in the same form in which the editor of the First Gospel used it. But this is very unlikely. The supposition that Matt. and Luke both used substantially the same discourse document forces us to suppose that Luke has used great freedom in editing it, altering its phraseology, and breaking up its groups of sayings. And it is unlikely that he would have so treated a primitive and perhaps apostolic work. It would be easier to think that he had seen our First Gospel and sometimes been influenced by it. In that

¹ I have ready for immediate publication a full text of the source reconstructed on the lines laid down in this paper.

² Mt 15²⁰, Mk 7¹⁹. Cf. *St. Matthew*, p. 167, n.

³ Mt 19⁹, Mk 10¹¹.

⁴ Cf. *St. Matthew*, p. lxxvii.

case the First Gospel was one of the 'many' secondary gospel writings to which he refers in his Prologue.

On the other hand, the view, that whilst Matt. had a Greek translation of the original book, Luke knew some of its contents, not directly but inter-

mediately, scattered through some of the works to which he refers in his preface, explains both the large amount of agreement between Matt. and Luke in sayings of Christ, and at the same time their disagreement in the phraseology, order, and setting of these sayings.

In the Study.

Was St. Peter ever in Rome?

THE report of Monsignor Duchesne's great scholarship has penetrated even to this country, and the translation of his *Early History of the Christian Church* (Murray; 9s. net), which has been made from the fourth edition of that work, will find a welcome. It is true that his name is more associated with the history of Church institutions. But it would be strange if the historian of Church institutions were incapable of writing a history of the Church. Certainly the history of the early Church can be written only by one who is intimately acquainted with its institutions.

The distinctive features of Mgr. Duchesne's History are simplicity of style, simplicity of purpose, and conscientious painstaking research. In some parts of the work every page testifies to the abundance of discovery in recent years of early Church literature and to Mgr. Duchesne's acquaintance with it. The period covered is from the Burning of Rome in 64 A.D. to the end of the third century. But there are four chapters of preparation, summarizing the history of events recorded in the New Testament.

Mgr. Duchesne's simplicity of purpose may be tested by his handling of the question whether St. Peter was ever in Rome. It is a question which Roman Catholics answer with a unanimous Yes. Mgr. Duchesne answers Yes. It is even possible that he would be distressed if he were told that his evidence left it open to Protestants to answer No. But he is not the man to twist the evidence in order to secure a verdict. What does it amount to?

In the first place, there is no information whatever as to anything St. Peter did in Rome. All that even tradition affirms is that in Rome he died

and left his chair. Mgr. Duchesne makes nothing of possible references in the Apocalypse or the Epistle to the Hebrews; and of the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel he says merely that it contains an extremely clear allusion to the way in which St. Peter met his death. In the first Epistle which bears his name a greeting is sent from the Church of Babylon, which Mgr. Duchesne has no doubt is the Church of Rome. But he is not sure that St. Peter wrote that First Epistle. He is sure, however, that the author, writing under Peter's name, would only write from a place where it was known Peter had stayed.

Outside the New Testament he comes first to Clement of Rome, who in his reference to Nero's persecution (1 Clem. 5, 6) connects Peter and Paul with the Danaïdes, the Dirces, and other victims who suffered as a result of the burning of Rome. There is Ignatius also, but his reference is quite indefinite. 'I do not command you,' he says to the Roman Christians, 'as Peter and Paul did: they were apostles, I am only a condemned criminal.' Upon which Mgr. Duchesne remarks, rather curiously for him: 'These words do not amount to the assertion, "Peter came to Rome," but supposing he did come, Ignatius would not have spoken otherwise; whereas if he had not, there would have been no point in Ignatius' argument.'

We have to go on now beyond the middle of the second century. And what we find is that St. Peter's visit to Rome is then an accepted fact. Dionysius of Corinth in Greece, Irenæus in Gaul, Clement and Origen in Alexandria, and Tertullian in Africa, all refer to it. In Rome itself, Caius, about 200 A.D., points out the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul. 'By the third century, we find the Popes building on their title of successors of St.