

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

in the pale glimmer of light the towers of the ancient city rising up like a benediction.

'And along the roadway this prancing column with stiffened knees and pointed toes dancing heavily to death. Brave men indeed and iron discipline—but can the mind of free man contemplate them without amazement that is near akin to ridicule? If a man must go to death let him go easily. Our soldiers gazed in astonishment, scarce understanding what they saw, and then on a sudden the hail of shells was unloosed upon the Prussian Guard, and the work of butchery was begun.

'They came by the road from Menin—the road that is paved with the bodies of the brave and cemented together by their blood, and though their sublime courage carried them through the lines of our army in some places it was upon the road from Menin that they perished. The guns pounded them, the bullets mowed them down, the bayonets drank of their blood. Broken and withered they were cast back again—the remnant that remained—to the feet of their Imperial Master, whose behest they had so signally, yet so nobly, failed to accomplish.'

The Baptist's Advice to the Several Classes. Luke iii. 10-14.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR WRIGHT, D.D., VICE-PRESIDENT OF QUEENS' COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

THERE seems to be some misunderstanding in the editorial department of Lk 3¹⁰, for we read there that 'The multitudes asked the Baptist, "What must we do?"' and in his answer he gave advice which was not adapted to the multitudes, but to the rich or at least to the well-to-do, for he replied, 'Let him that hath two tunics impart to him that hath none; and let him that hath food in abundance do likewise.'

In the second source of the Gospels, or (as it is now commonly called) 'Q,' the Baptist appears as what we should call in these days a model missionary, and some samples of his preaching are preserved in St. Matthew and in St. Luke. These are of a highly sensational character, teeming with vague threats and terrific alarms. They are much too vehemently exaggerated for an ordinary sermon. A parish priest will do well not to imitate them, but in the mouth of a missionary, who only stays in a place ten days, they are just the thing to arouse the conscience of hardened sinners.

From another source St. Luke represents the Baptist as the same missionary, when he has descended from the pulpit and invites the penitent to meet him for private consultation in the vestry. Terrors are laid aside. There are no threats and no exaggerations. Their place is taken by the simplest practical advice: 'Don't be violent, don't get into debt.' And since the Baptist fully grasps and deals with the special temptations of

the tax-gatherer and of the soldier on service, it is difficult to suppose that he entirely misunderstood the position of the multitudes. It is strange also that they should have consulted him in their thousands. The sermon surely was addressed to thousands; but the consultation to a score or so, who seek him privately, one by one or perhaps in twos or threes when the sermon is over. And did he really believe that the poor suffered from too heavy clothing or too much food? If he had no more acquaintance with the condition of the masses than that, he would not have been the popular preacher which he evidently was.

Let us consider for a moment the question of clothing and food. The high priest 'rent his tunics'—so the Greek distinctly says—upon the night of our Lord's trial (Mk 14⁶³). The plural plainly indicates that he was wearing two tunics, the dual being obsolete in the common dialect. That he was wearing two is probable, for it was a cold night—perhaps rainy—or the police would not have kindled a fire in the courtyard 'to warm themselves.' He was also a rich man who could well afford the comfort. But in Mk 6⁹ the Twelve are forbidden 'to wear two tunics.' They were young and active men, who would be better without such a luxury. In St. Matthew and in St. Luke the rule, as usual, is made more stringent, for the Twelve are forbidden even to possess two tunics, a wash and a wear. As for food, too many

of 'the multitudes' would be in the position of Lazarus, who 'desired to be fed from the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table,' or of the younger son, who 'wished to be fed from the husks which the swine did eat.' To tell such men to give away clothes and food was to mock their destitution. Not one per cent. could follow the advice.

If we regard the conflation as a whole, we can have little doubt that St. Luke derived 'the multitudes' from the seventh verse, where we read that 'He said to the multitudes which came forth to be baptized by him.' But if we turn to the parallel passage, Mt 3⁷, we find that though the sermon which is there given is almost identical with the sermon in St. Luke, the editorial introduction is quite different. Instead of 'the multitudes,' the Baptist is said to have been addressing a small and select body, viz. 'many of the Pharisees and Sadducees.' Not the illiterate rabble, but perhaps half a dozen of the highly educated rulers are implied. Not the poor, but the rich, for the Sadducees were wealthy to a man, and as the Pharisees 'devoured widows' houses,' few of them were in poverty. These half-dozen 'princes' exactly fulfil the requirements of the passage. And if they went in a body to John, they may have thought to overawe him. If so, they were soon undeceived.

To a critic editorial notes are the least trustworthy part of the Gospels. Some of the sources, notably 'Q,' seem to have had no introduction to their sections, or the very briefest, like 'Jesus saith' of the Oxyrhynchus fragment. If the Evangelist wanted to assist his readers by telling them to whom a speech was addressed, he often drew inferences from the words themselves. St. Luke is especially fond of doing this, as for example when he writes, 'He spake this parable to certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others.' A shorter preface would have been, 'He said to the scribes.'

Now the present writer has pointed out elsewhere that in no less than four instances St. Luke applies to the rabble what St. Matthew applies to the Pharisees. These are Mt 3⁷ = Lk 3⁷; Mt 12³⁸ = Lk 11²⁹; Mt 9³⁴ + 12²⁴ = Lk 11¹⁶; Mt 16¹ = Lk 12⁵⁴. Plainly there is a 'tendency' here. These changes cannot have been accidental. St. Matthew's Gospel is one long indictment of the Pharisees. Theirs was the guilt of rejecting the

Messiah. Theirs must be the denunciations. They are 'the offspring of vipers.' But in the Acts St. Luke shows a special dread of the mob. They stoned St. Stephen and tried to stone St. Paul. They attacked St. Paul at Ephesus and would have torn him to pieces in the Temple had not the Roman tribune rescued him. They proposed in the shipwreck to cut his throat, lest he should swim out and escape. The mob was never reached by his preaching. They were ever a source of danger. Against them in St. Luke's thought must the strongest reproaches be hurled. They and they only were 'the offspring of vipers.'

Look at the editorial work in this conflation (3¹⁻²⁰) and notice how much there is of it and how little it really helps us. St. Luke begins by giving names and dates to satisfy the historian. These are probably the result of his own researches. Whatever difficulties attach to them must be set down to his account. In the fifth verse he rounds off a quotation by adding two more verses from Isaiah. Of course he quotes from memory, but more successfully than in Lk 4¹⁸, where he has wrongly blended two passages. In the fifteenth verse he gives some literary connecting links which rest on general knowledge. They do not really help us. In the eighteenth verse he concludes with some further reminiscences, but they are so carelessly arranged, that he actually shuts up John in prison before our Lord's baptism! I may quote three further examples.

In 4¹⁶ St. Luke makes our Lord visit Nazareth immediately upon His mission to Galilee, before going to Capernaum. But St. Mark puts the visit to Nazareth much later (6¹), after work in Capernaum. That St. Mark is right is shown by the fact that St. Luke in 4²⁸ refers to works of power already performed in Capernaum. Again, in 22³⁵ he makes our Lord say to the Twelve, 'When I sent you forth without purse or scrip or shoes, lacked ye anything?' though these words according to his own account in 10⁴ were addressed to the Seventy and not to the Twelve. Finally, he declares on his own sole authority, that the darkness at the Crucifixion was caused by an eclipse of the sun, though nature forbids that an eclipse of the sun should take place at the time of the Passover full moon, or that the darkness of an eclipse should last more than eight minutes: indeed, if the sky is clear, the corona is visible and the darkness presently vanishes.

These considerations may make us beware of attaching too much importance to St. Luke's editorial notes. Sir William Ramsay has done much to vindicate St. Luke's trustworthiness as an historian and geographer, but there is another side to the question. St. Luke was not an eye-witness of our Lord's ministry, and the sources upon which he rested for information were not full of details. He would not have made use of such devices as catchwords to connect passages, if he had had complete information. And if his chief authority, St. Mark, was deficient in order, as Papias testifies, St. Luke could not as a rule improve upon him.

It is tempting to suppose that 'Q' simply gave the preface 'John said,' and that St. Matthew filled in the sentence one way, St. Luke in another, both acting by conjecture. But it is quite possible that St. Matthew's preface is original and that in all the four cases which I have mentioned St. Luke has deliberately corrected St. Matthew in accordance with his own prepossessions. For in 7⁸⁰ he expressly asserts that the Pharisees were not baptized by John. And he may have altered all

these passages for the sake of consistency with that assertion, even as St. Matthew altered or suppressed all the passages of St. Mark in which our Lord is said to have been 'at home,' or 'in a house,' presumably out of deference for the assertion that 'the Son of Man had not where to lay his head':—a saying which was true of one part of the ministry, but certainly not of all. The more I study the Gospels, the more convinced I become that enormous pains were taken in preparing them for publication. Of course there need not be any contradiction between St. Matthew and St. Luke in this particular case. For if St. Matthew says that many Pharisees 'came to be baptized,' it does not follow that they were really immersed. The rough reception which they met may well have driven them away. Or St. Luke may only mean that as a class they held aloof from John: a few exceptional cases of baptism by him may have occurred.

The passage will be set right if we read 'the rich' for 'the multitudes,' and if St. Luke was deliberately correcting St. Matthew, he may have inserted 'the multitudes' into both verses, without observing the incongruities.

The Denials of Peter.

BY SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., LITT.D., D.D., EDINBURGH.

III. THE HOUSE OF ANNAS AND THE HOUSE OF ISHBOSHETH.

WHILE Jesus was being questioned inside the house of Annas, there occurred below in the courtyard the scene in which Peter denied his Master three times. Before we go on to this scene, it is necessary to describe the general situation more fully, as some difficulties remain.

Mark alone shows that the courtyard was lower than the room or hall where Jesus was examined in the house: He was taken up to the first floor, and not to a room on the ground floor. In the Turkish houses, which we have seen, the ground floor is reserved for store-rooms and private rooms (and in the country often for horses and animals), while the main reception chamber and public room is upstairs.

In front of the house was an open courtyard, in

which Peter was waiting to see the issue of events¹ along with a crowd of slaves and attendants. Admission to the courtyard from the street was through a gateway, where a woman kept watch and ward; she opened the gate when she chose to admit a stranger, and was therefore able doubtless to scrutinize visitors through the closed gate by a grating or other device. This form of house is practically universal now in Asiatic Turkey, and in Syria (so far as my small experience there serves).

That this was the plan of construction of a Jewish house seems proved by the story of the assassination of Ishbosheth; and is quite natural and probable in itself, for the East changes little. You can very safely use modern customs, where these are unaffected by European influence, to illustrate ancient history. We are here referring to the class of house that is used by families

¹ Mt 26⁶⁸.