THE Q SECTION ON JOHN THE BAPTIST AND THE *SHEMONEH ESREH*[1]

BENJAMIN W. BACON
YALE UNIVERSITY

IF there be any problem of vital interest in the domain of New Testament research it is The Question of Q. The normal method of procedure for recovery of the pre-canonical source we have come to designate Q has been, inevitably, the juxtaposition, sometimes in Matthean, sometimes (with better reason) in Lukan order, of those sections of gospel material which coincide verbally in the two later Synoptic Gospels, but are not found in Mark. As a first step this procedure is correct. By general consent these sections must be derived from some pre-canonical source, because the verbal identity they exhibit between Matthew and Luke is closer than between Mark and either transcriber. If Mark was the 'First' source of Matthew and Luke this other was also a document, and their 'Second.' To escape the inference we should have to maintain the extreme improbability that one of the two has borrowed directly from the other.

The 'Second Source' exists. It was a real document. To avoid ambiguity let us speak of it as S, reserving the symbol Q to designate the Mattheo-Lukan blocks, or paragraphs, drawn from it, sometimes called 'double-tradition' material. Harnack counts fifty-nine indisputable fragments of this material, besides a few which might be questioned. Fifty-nine acknowledged fragments would seem to offer a fairly secure basis for the reconstruction of S. The *Didachê* was reconstructed by Kra-

[1] Read at the meeting of the SBLE in New York, Dec. 28, 1925.

wutsky out of parallel extracts in *The Apostolic Constitutions* and *The Apostolic Epitome*, in advance of its discovery by Bryennios. Zahn had a similarly gratifying experience after reconstructing *The Acts of John* from the *Vita* by Pionius. Both Zahn and Harnack have reconstructed Marcion's *Evangelion* from Tertullian's refutation, and Rendel Harris has found *The Apology of Aristides* underlying *Barlaam and Josaphat*. Why cannot we have similar successes in the most vital instance of all, the primitive record of the teaching of Jesus? But no; with vastly greater effort on the part of a host of scholars, results here have been disappointing in the extreme. Mere juxtaposition of the Q fragments does not produce S, nor anything like it. The fragments survive. Their sequence appears hopelessly lost. Primitive tradition, corroborated by the Preface of Luke, indicates that Mark's order was not highly esteemed. But Matthew and Luke have treated it as almost sacro-sanct as compared with their ruthless destruction of the order of their Q material. S they have torn limb from limb. Moffatt's *Introduction* tabulates no less than sixteen vain attempts to solve the riddle, and several more "reconstructions" have since appeared. The verdict pronounced on one applies fitly to all: "We are promised a writing: we are presented with a heap of ruins."

To none of these attempts at synthesis does the verdict more justly apply than to Harnack's in his well known *Beitrag* entitled *Sprüche und Reden Jesu, oder Die Zweite Synoptische Quelle.* (Engl. *Sayings and Discourses of Jesus*). This is the most systematic and elaborate of the reconstructions. It is also the most frankly pessimistic. Harnack is sure that S was "not a gospel." It began, he admits, with an introduction to the sacred drama, wherein the Baptist played the part of forerunner, and the principal figure was seen in the act of receiving and interpreting his vocation. There was a prologue, but no corresponding epilogue. The hero was brought on the stage, but no "exit" was provided. He was left there to disappear, perhaps by evaporation. The Q Temptation story foreshadows the sort of fate a Christ "according to the things of God" must expect to suffer. But Harnack holds that S had no account of the ministry,

above all "no passion story." In the business world such a confession of voluntary bankruptcy could hardly be made without exciting the suspicion of "concealed assets." Why is it that gospel critics are so singularly willing to acknowledge that they can analyze but cannot reconstruct? The truth is they have not found that which more or less consciously they had set their hearts on discovering.

Against the almost unanimous protest of Continental scholars, ranging in ecclesiastical standing from Loisy to Zahn, appeal is made by nearly all our searchers in defense of their verdict of *non liquet* to an alleged statement of Papias. Harnack no less than the rest informs us that Papias described this Source as a "Compend of the Oracles of the Lord" (*σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων*). Ergo we must think of it as a formless agglomeration of apothegms. This was Schleiermacher's application of the famous Papias fragment. Refuted by Hilgenfeld, Schleiermacher was nevertheless followed in the main by Lightfoot; then Sanday gave new impetus to the reaction, and has been followed by Moffatt, Streeter, and the rest. Oxford, they tell us, is the place where German theories go when they die. In this case the moribund theory took refuge first in Cambridge, then Oxford, then rejuvenated spread its wings for Scotland, America and the ends of the earth.

Who, then, was this Papias; and what was his testimony?—Papias was a corrector of Gnostic misinterpretations of "the commandments (*ἐντολαί*) delivered by the Lord to the Faith." The false interpreters may be exemplified by Basilides of Alexandria, who wrote about 130–135 twenty-four books of 'Εξηγητικά on the Gospel of Luke. Papias wrote in 140–150, relying for his more orthodox "exegesis" on the "living and abiding voice" of apostolic tradition, obtained from "elders" who in Papias' youth, when he probably had personal contact with them, and subsequently while two survivors of the group could still be consulted at second hand, could report actual "words of Apostles." In the preface to his *Interpretation(s) of the Lord's Oracles* ('Εξηγήσεις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων) Papias asserted that the 'Oracles' (λόγια) in question were to be found by Greek readers in authentic compilation in the Gospel of

Matthew. This 'compend of the oracles,' though no longer extant in the original language of Jesus and the Twelve, nor even in an 'authorized version' such as Mark had provided for the utterances of Peter, was really the work of Matthew himself. For while Peter in his preaching had had "no design of making a compend of the Lord's precepts" (*οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων*), Matthew had actually "compiled the precepts" (*συνέταξεν τὰ λόγια*) in the original language.

The compend here referred to by Papias was unquestionably our canonical Gospel of Matthew, nothing else. No other terms can more exactly describe what this Gospel was to his generation. To imagine an orthodox writer in this period aiming to correct what Irenaeus calls the "bad interpreters of things well said" (Irenaeus is referring to these very "oracles of the Lord" [*λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*]), and applying these terms: "Compend of the Oracles," "compiled the oracles," to any other work than our own canonical Matthew, is an absurdity; a double absurdity when we further observe that no single early writer ever dreamed of any other application for Papias' words, though many possessed his work entire, and most depended on it for all they knew regarding gospel origins. It was reserved for nineteenth century critics to discover, on the basis of the single phrase just quoted, that Papias was not speaking of the well known Gospel of Matthew, which in his time is the supreme reliance of all Church writers for the Lord's "commandments" (*ἐντολαί*) or "precepts" (*λόγια*), but of the Source which modern critics have unearthed as a substructure of the Gospels! Hilgenfeld promptly pointed out this absurdity, and Continental critics, including those as opposed otherwise to Hilgenfeld as the conservative Zahn, are keenly alive to it. But advocates of the 'two-document' theory of gospel origins have been loath to lose so splendid a witness for their discovery. They shifted their ground, maintaining that while Papias personally might perhaps have had only our Matthew in view, yet his informant "the Elder" must have been speaking of S.

As a 'blue-sky' foundation for the theory this might have served fairly well save for one unfortunate fact, viz, that Papias does *not* give the statement about Matthew as a tradition received

from "the Elder," or from any body else. He merely asserts it as a bit of current information which no-one would think of contradicting. *Mis*information it certainly is, embodied in the title which we can trace to Papias' time, but no earlier. *Why* this Gospel, composed in Greek, on Greek *un*apostolic foundations was ascribed to the Apostle Matthew, the difference of language being accounted for by a theory of translation, is not our present concern. We merely deny the alleged reference to S. Neither Papias nor his informant knows of its existence. There is no trace of any utterance of "the Elder" regarding any writing whatever save Mark (our own Greek Mark), also very correctly described by the Elder from the current point of view. Papias refers to our canonical Matthew. In all antiquity there is not the faintest trace of a suspicion of the existence of S. Conceptions of it, therefore, which rest, avowedly or otherwise, on ancient utterances *intended to apply to another writing* are simply a delusion and a snare. Take, for example, the three assertions which Papias is supposed to have made about it. We are told (1) that it was an Aramaic document; (2) that it was a collection of apothegms, or *logia*; (3) that it was the work of the Apostle Matthew. All we know about S is derived from the intrinsic evidence of the Q fragments. Our systematic study of these is still to come, but they already afford enough to contradict squarely every one of the above three assumptions. Here is what we can *know*.

1) When used by Matthew and Luke S was not an Aramaic but a *Greek* document. *Ultimately*, of course, all gospel material goes back to the language spoken by Jesus and his Galilean followers. It may therefore be expected to retain more or less recognizable traces of translation from Aramaic. Professor Torrey's services in the recovery of such evidences have been conspicuous. But the phenomenon we are dealing with at present is word for word coincidence in two mutually independent Greek writers for whole paragraphs of their material. For that there is no other possible explanation than dependence by each on the same *Greek* document.

2) S was *not* a compend of *logia*. Besides its *Vorgeschichte* relating the ministry of John as introductory to that of Jesus,

it contained stories of healings like that of the Centurion's Servant (Mt. 8 5–10 = Lk. 7 1–9), which are indistinguishable, as respects narrative character, from the πραχθέντα of Mark. The characteristic feature of S was not apothegms, but discourses on set subjects; not λόγια, but διατριβαί.

3) S was *not* the work of the Apostle Matthew, nor of any authoritative eye-witness. Had it been so, its relative neglect by Mark, and its subordination to Mark by the two later Synoptists, would be inexplicable.

Let us return, then, to the Q fragments, freed from the handicap of false assumptions.

I have said that the order of the Q fragments in Luke had been found on the whole preferable to that of Matthew. Harnack, under the spell of the Papias delusion, adopted as his working hypothesis that our Gospel of Matthew (so-called) would naturally reflect more nearly the character and order of S, because (on this false assumption) it inherited its name from it. Streeter and other critics, though still under the same delusion, have found this hypothesis to be negatived by the facts. The result should have been foreseen. Notoriously Matthew's order is artificial. For the sake of presenting the "commandments," which for Matthew constitute the essence of the message (19 17; 28 20), this evangelist assembles his material in the form of five agglutinations which we may call Sermons (cc. 5–7; 10; 13; 18; 23—25), each of which has its appropriate narrative introduction. In the interest of this arrangement Matthew has reduced Mark's order for the Galilean ministry to chaos. The "mighty works" are all combined in a single group of ten (cc. 7—9), which introduce The Mission Charge to the Twelve (c. 10). Matthew's treatment of S has been equally arbitrary. His agglutinated Sermons destroy what little Luke retains of the historical settings of the discourses. These are reduced to fragments in order to be rebuilt into the five books of "commandments."

Luke, on the other hand, has been faithful to the engagement of his Preface to present an orderly narrative of the course of events. We may have occasion more than once to wish that he had not attempted corrections of the order of his sources; but on the whole we must admit that he has shown extraordinary

conservatism in correcting that of Mark, and that if he has changed that of S, it has been in the *bona fide* effort to tell things in chronological sequence. He gives the teaching of Jesus in the form of discourses (not "oracles," commandments, or precepts), uttered on various appropriate historical occasions. His knowledge of the actual course of events is obviously deficient, and he is timid about deserting Mark; but so far as he can Luke does tell his story "in order." As between the two it should have been our working hypothesis from the start, that Luke, who presents most of his Q material in two great blocks inserted at two separate points of the Markan narrative, has done less violence to the order of his sources than Matthew. Having tried the détour it may be hoped that critics will henceforth keep to the straight road.

But as yet our devotees in the Quest of Q have not worked themselves free from the Papias delusion, and the high example of Harnack has unfortunately served only to rivet their fetters. Nothing will suit unless it can be called in some sense "Matthean." Moffatt tells of "the Logia spoken of by Papias." W. C. Allen talks about "the Matthean Logia" meaning the Second Source. Streeter continues to affirm that this was "not a gospel," and contained no account of the final scenes in Jerusalem. All are bent on finding *logia*!

On the other hand B. Weiss advanced a theory of a pre-canonical source traceable in all three Synoptists, only more freely employed by Matthew and Luke. It met no favor. The same grounds were justly urged against it as against the old *Urevangelium* theory. How, it was asked, could a document of such standing, an apostolic record, have been later eclipsed by our canonical Gospels; and so completely as to vanish without a trace? The objection is fatal—to Weiss' theory. An *apostolic* proto-gospel could hardly have disappeared without trace. But what if S were *not* apostolic? We may suppose, if we like, that its author was that friend of Paul at Caesarea known to Luke as "Philip the evangelist" (Acts 21 8). A *non-apostolic* record of the teachings of Jesus in the form of *διατριβαί* connected by a very slender thread of story could easily be displaced by a Gospel emanating from Rome under the august name of Peter

(to Justin Martyr Mark is "the Memoirs of Peter"), understood to be an authoritative report of "both sayings and doings of the Lord" (ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα), by Mark, once a "minister of the word" (Lk. 1 2; Acts 13 5) under Peter, and afterwards under Paul (2 Tim. 4 11). The more vital elements of the *Urevangelium* would then survive only as later evangelists might rescue them from oblivion by combining them with Mark. Certain phenomena of Luke and Acts lead me to believe that Luke knew S not only in its original Caesarean form, but in a later, Jerusalem form, which had received expansions from Mark. Matthew, perhaps, knew only the Caesarean form. That, of course, is merely a working hypothesis. I am only concerned now to show that the eclipse undergone by S after utilization by our three Synoptic evangelists furnishes no argument against its being a true "gospel," so long as we do not assume it to have carried dominant authority.

And it is high time that we had both a working hypothesis and a method, if our efforts at reconstruction of S are not to issue in the old bankruptcy. What I desire to present is a sample of such a method, making application of it to a single typical case.

Criticism must begin with simple juxtaposition of the Q fragments, by preference in the Lukan order. Analysis must precede synthesis. But we have no need to stop there. The method of reconstruction does not displace analysis, but supplements it. The blocks of Q are its raw material. We may call it the Method of Implication.

It is not really new. Even Harnack gives it limited application. But it has habitually been held subordinate to ideas inherited from, if not avowedly imposed by, the delusion of "Matthean Logia." The newness has reference only to the critic's right to apply it without reference to these 'idols of the cave.'

Harnack, too, applies Implication when he admits that between the Q section on The Preaching of the Baptist and its sequel relating the Temptation there must have stood in S some account of the Baptism and Vocation of Jesus; because the temptations, which begin "If thou art the Son of God" imply such a vision and heavenly Voice as Mark actually relates. We cannot suppose, however, that Harnack would allow the application of

analogous reasoning to Q section 3 9, where Jesus promises to the Twelve "the thrones of the House of David" (Ps. 122 5), apparently as part of the story of The Institution of the Supper. That might easily lead on to the supposition that something of the final scenes in Jerusalem *was* related in S. One might begin to question whether the final tragedy was not related in S also, Matthew following what he regarded as the more authoritative record of Mark, while Luke preserves the ancient Source in that very large element of his passion narrative which has no parallel in Mark. All this is dubious. I am not attempting to demonstrate the fact, but only the possibility. Implication will be more or less cogent. Each case must stand or fall on its own merits. It is enough to show that there are *some* cases in which it must be admitted. All we now ask is complete freedom from the Papias delusion. S is there. It is proved by the Q fragments. What do these fragments imply, *on intrinsic evidence alone*, as to their original context?

I may turn to Streeter for two further examples to show why it is illogical to stop with the mere juxtaposition of Q fragments. Incidentally the examples will show how needful it is to distinguish between Q and S, as Streeter unfortunately fails to do.

In 1911 Streeter contributed to Sanday's volume of *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* two valuable articles entitled respectively "St. Mark's Knowledge and Use of Q," and "The Original Extent of Q." The term Q is here employed in the sense which I deprecate as ambiguous and misleading, and the author has since modified his views. Nevertheless the two essays give full examples of what I mean by the Method of Implication. "St. Mark's Use of Q" shows at the same time by its self-contradictory title the need for a better nomenclature, since by common definition Q means something "not found in Mark." However, Streeter justly treats it as reasoning in a circle to reconstruct S without regard to material which may have been removed from consideration by the mere accident that Mark had employed it already. The essay proves quite easily that some 'triple-tradition' material (M) also appeared in S. Whether actually derived by Mark from S, as Streeter formerly held, or as he has restated the case in *The Four*

Gospels (pp. 186ff.), by mere coincidence of Mark and S, does not affect reconstruction. In either case S included the material. The Baptism story is a case in point. The formula for S therefore requires to be extended. The equation must read: $S=Q+Mk^s$.

Streeter's second essay entitled "The Original Extent of Q" carries us further still toward an *Urevangelium* theory. It proves the necessity of including in our formula for S some elements peculiar to Matthew (Mt P) and some peculiar to Luke (Lk P), or 'single-tradition' material so-called. The formula must therefore again he extended to read: $S = Q + Mk^s + Mt\,P^s + Lk\,P^s$; and no means exists for the determination of the factor ^{s} save the implications of Q. Of course to avoid circuitous reasoning from S to s utmost caution will be required. Q alone must be the standard. Indeed implication need not always tend to addition. It may compel subtraction also if different elements of Q appear incompatible. Wernle, in his *Synoptisches Problem*, has actually applied such reasoning. Imbued with the idea that S must have consisted of a compend of *logia* (in spite of a vigorous repudiation of the Papias fallacy), he maintains the necessity of distinguishing an S^1 from an S^2 on the ground that the Q material describing the Preaching of John is adapted only to serve as the introduction to a *narrative*. True enough; but why assume that S was not a narrative?

'Triple-tradition' material as well as 'double-tradition,' as we have just seen, may require to be included in our formula for S. Let me return to Streeter's second essay for an example of 'single-tradition' material which we may also be driven to include. Matthew's first Sermon presents certain Antitheses of the Higher Righteousness (Mt. 5 21 ff.) which fail to appear in Luke's account of the same discourse. They form a series of five illustrations ("They of old time said . . . But I say") which lead up to the principle: The Righteousness of Sons should be an imitation of the unlimited goodness of the Father. The five illustrations are not invented by Matthew but transcribed from some source. Proof of this can be found in his editorial supplements, which always interrupt, and frequently distort the sense of the context. Much of this added material being found in

Luke in more appropriate setting it is clear that Matthew is intercalating it in a pre-existing framework. But whence has he the framework? Should we include the Antitheses in S?

We might, of course, postulate another Teaching Source unknown to Luke, and thus escape the necessity for explaining the omission on his part. If explanation of Luke's silence proved impossible we might be driven to such an unwelcome complication. But explanation, in this case at least, is not difficult. Luke habitually omits material which might suggest opposition between the teaching of Jesus and the religion of his fathers. For Luke it was vital to show the falsity of the charge which declared Christianity a *religio illicita*, a *nova superstitio* (Acts 18 12–17; 26 2–7, 22). For this among other reasons Mk. 7 1–23 is omitted in Luke and Mk. 10 1–12 is reduced to a single verse quite altered in application. Objections to the supposition of deliberate omission by Luke thus disappear. The Antitheses may be from S.

But Implication furnishes the positive and conclusive argument. Luke as well as Matthew states the positive principle as to the Righteousness of Sons. What the rabbis call the "ornaments of righteousness" (*gemiluth chesadim*), distinguishing between "the law of holiness" and "the law of goodness," are based on "imitation of the goodness of God." These alone, according to Jesus, are worthy of reward. Luke agrees with Matthew in stating this principle of "thankworthy goodness." But unlike Matthew he fails to describe that contrasted and inferior tit-for-tat morality that passes for righteousness among men, but has no right to be called the righteousness of "sons," nor to expect the rewards of the Kingdom. Luke's version is thus seen to lack the original basis of comparison. It is no adequate substitute for "They of old time said . . . But I say" of the Antitheses, for Luke to proceed after the Beatitudes and Woes: "But *unto you that hear* I say."

I have ventured to restate and reenforce Streeter's reasoning in including this 'single-tradition' material of Matthew in the formula for S. It appears to be valid, and is endorsed by many[2].

[2] In his *Gospels* (p. 185) Streeter expresses "less confidence than before" in some of his conclusions under this head.

Of course it applies equally to 'single-tradition' material in Luke. If cogent reason can be assigned for omission of the section by Matthew, and in addition it is presupposed or implied in one or more of the Q fragments, sound reasoning demands that it be assigned to S. The formula for S must therefore remain as stated, even if it involves an *Urevangelium* theory.

The foregoing examples will suffice to show that there is nothing new in principle in what I have called the Method of Implication. It has always been in use. It has played a great part in Pentateuchal criticism. Only in the Synoptic problem it has been held unduly subservient to the εἴδωλον of "Matthean logia." Under appropriate safeguards, sufficient to exclude unwarranted inference and subjective fancy, it is admissible. More than that. In the *impasse* where we are left after mere juxtaposition of the Q fragments, no other method is available. Let us see how it works in a specific case.

As a test instance I select the two Q fragments 14 and 15 in Harnack's list. Fragment 14 is the longest of the fifty-nine, and is continued by Fragment 15, nearly as long, after a break of four verses in Matthew, two in Luke. The two fragments describe respectively The Question of John's Disciples (Mt. 11 2–11 = Lk. 7 18–28), and Jesus' Complaint of the Rejection of John (Mt. 11 16–19 = Lk. 7 31–35). Taken together the two form a Q section which Matthew and Luke agree in placing toward the close of the Galilean ministry. W. C. Allen (*Intern. Crit. Comm. on Matthew*, p. lviii) assigns it *en bloc* to what he calls "The Matthean Logia," and accounts for the "close verbal agreement" between Matthew and Luke in all parts save the opening description, and the interjected verses not here under consideration, by the supposition that "Luke had seen Matthew" (p. 114). Streeter (*Gospels* p. 183) has finally disposed, we may hope, of the supposition that Luke uses Matthew. A different explanation of the variation in the opening description will be given presently.

In Matthew's Gospel the section we are discussing opens a group of narratives (cc. 11—12) which serves as introduction to his third Sermon, the Discourse in Parables (c. 13), a discourse constructed on the basis of Mark's, and viewed from the

same standpoint as intended to differentiate the teachable disciples from the "outsiders" who "having ears hear not."

In Luke the setting of the section is identical, so far as pragmatic values are concerned. The two fragments form part of a group (Lk. 7 1–8 3) attached after the closing parable of the Sermon on the Mount, and separating it from the Markan Parable chapter, from which Luke transcribes the Parable of the Sower and its interpretation. The closing parable of the Sermon (Lk. 6 47–49) contrasts the man "that heareth and doeth" with the man "that heareth and doeth not." The Parable of the Sower (Lk. 8 4 ff.) is taken (as in Mark) to apply to obdurate Israel, of whom Isaiah had predicted that "seeing they should not see, and hearing they should not understand" (Lk. 8 10). The Q section, pointing to the mighty works which the disciples of John could "see and hear" and recording Jesus' Complaint of the Rejection of God's Messengers, formed thus an appropriate nucleus for the group. Luke did not leave it to stand alone, but prefixes two examples of the "mighty works" which evoked the enquiry, The Healing of the Centurion's Servant (7 1–10), and The Raising of The Widow's Son at Nain (7 11–17). After the section Luke adds a touching example of Jesus' "friendship for sinners" in the story of The Penitent Harlot (7 36–50), and substitutes for Mark's introduction to the Parable chapter an account of Ministering Women (8 1–3). Mark had a version of the saying on Spiritual Kindred, which Luke has placed after the parable instead of before it.

Thus both Matthew and Luke use the Q section as the nucleus for a group introducing Mark's Parable of the Sower, which in all cases is taken as intended to justify the complaint of Isaiah against the people which "having ears heard not" and refused to understand. Fragment 14 (Message of the Baptist) is regarded as a *mise en scène* for the principal subject, the Denunciation of Fragment 15. This is directed against unrepentant Israel, which had turned a deaf ear to God's two messengers, the Baptist with his warning of impending wrath, and Jesus with his winning invitation, rejected by all save Wisdom's children. Each excerptor of S has supplied characteristic supplements, consideration of which we defer. Both

follow Mark in applying the extract to the great problem of early apologetic, the problem treated by Paul in Rom. 9—11 and by Mark in his Parable Discourse (Mk. 4 1–34). In Pauline phrase it is The Stumbling of Israel (Rom. 9 32 f.; 11 7–11), the people who "having eyes see not, and having ears hear not," but always reject the messengers of God.

Matthew and Luke, I repeat, both take the Q section as directed to this rejection of the Messiah by his own people, a serious obstacle to Christian propaganda. They prefix it to Mark's parable chapter which was similarly directed. And in the main the excerptors are right. The closing word of Jesus' message to the Baptist "Blessed is he that shall not be stumbled in me" is not a mere riddling cryptogram for the prisoner. In S it prepared the way for the Discourse. And the Discourse was an arraignment of Israel's blind leaders, who had shut eyes and ears to clear evidences that God's promise of mercy, forgiveness, deliverance, restoration from the grave, given of old to his suffering people, was being visibly fulfilled. Only the lowly and poor, the outcast publicans and sinners, had hearkened to the message. Scribes and Pharisees had taken exception to the person of the messenger. John, they maintained, was possessed, Jesus a loose-liver. Deliverance of Satan's captives, so that he that had had the dumb devil spake, they ascribed to collusion with Beelzebub. The healings and forgiveness, the repentance of publicans and harlots, meant nothing to these blind guides. To win credence from them the Coming One must bring "a sign from heaven." As Paul says, "They were stumbled in him."

The motive of the section, accordingly, as it stood in S, can only have been to show that these objections to the personality of God's agent were no more than the predicted blindness and deafness encountered by all Jehovah's messengers to his people. The divine Wisdom had been justified only in her "children," the penitent outcasts, who rightly perceived in Jesus' works of healing, accompanied by his proclamation of forgiveness and restoration to God's favor, fulfilment of the Isaian prophecies of "the consolation of Israel." John's messengers appear upon the scene in order that the proto-evangelist may have opportunity

to point the moral of his story. Jesus bids them take note for themselves how the Isaian promise is truly being fulfilled in works of healing, cleansing, and forgiveness, glad tidings of peace proclaimed to the nation in its humiliation, release from its captivity, restoration of its national life. Only let not the personality of God's agent prove a stumbling-block. Herewith the speaker turns to his application, or, as the New England divines would have termed it, his "improvement." Mark's parable-chapter is a substitute for this Q discourse.

Permit me to dwell for a moment on the seemingly unimportant matter of the relation of the two consecutive Q fragments to one another: for it has a distinct bearing on the nature and structure of the Source. I have called the brief description of the Coming of John's Disciples a *mise en scène* for the Discourse which follows. No disparagement is meant for its historical character or value. The phrase only aims to express the particular value found in the incident by the precanonical evangelist, whose aim is, not so much to give information to historical critics, as to convince contemporaries that Jesus was the true Christ of God. A few parallels will show that similar introductions were not the exception for the discourses of S but the rule. The parallels are taken mostly from Luke, for the simple reason that Matthew, in combining most of the separate discourses into his five Sermons, has inevitably cancelled their separate settings. But take the Lukan discourses on Prayer, on Wealth, on The Urgency of Repentance—all have settings of the same type, in many cases followed by a story parable, usually omitted by Matthew along with the setting. Let us take a few examples.

1. The Discourse on Prayer in Lk. 11 1*ff.* begins: "It came to pass as he was praying in a certain place that when he ceased his disciples said to him, Lord, teach us to pray, even as John also taught his disciples." Then follows The Lord's Prayer, transcribed by Matthew in 6 9–13, and the homely, humorous story of The Importunate Friend, omitted by Matthew along with the equally homely and humorous companion parable of The Importunate Widow, which Luke for easily traceable reasons has removed to 18 1–8. The brief narrative and story parable(s) form the setting for the sublime assurances of Answer to Prayer

which Matthew inserts further on in his first Sermon (Mt. 7 7–11 = Lk. 11 9–13).

2. The discourse on Abiding Wealth (Lk. 12 13–34) has the setting: "And one out of the multitude said unto him, Teacher, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me." Jesus answers with the story parable of the Rich Fool (omitted by Matthew) followed by the great discourse incorporated by Matthew into his first Sermon (Mt. 6 25–33 = Lk. 12 22–34).

3. The Eschatological Discourse of Lk. 13 begins: "Now there were some present at that very season which told him of the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices." Jesus' answer embodies the story parable of The Barren Fig Tree, which Matthew transmits alone, and only in the form it has been given by Mark of an actual event (Lk. 13 6–9 = Mk. 11 12–14 = Mt. 21 18–22).

4. The discourse on the Urgency of Repentance (Lk. 13 23–30) incorporated piecemeal by Matthew, and rewritten in adaptation to certain characteristic interests of his own, begins in Lk. 13 23: "And one said unto him, Lord, are they few that be saved?" The stock question, a bone of contention to II Esdras also, becomes the text for Jesus' heartsearching warning against false confidence in racial immunity.

5. The Q parable of The Slighted Invitation (Mt. 22 1–10 = Lk. 14 16–24) which Harnack lists only with a (?) in Q because of wide divergence in language between Matthew and Luke, is introduced in Lk. 14 15 by the exclamation of a hearer[3]: "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God."

6. The saying on Spiritual Kinship, used by Mark in combination with The Rebuke of Those who Blasphemed the Spirit (Mk. 3 20–35) to introduce the Preaching in Parables (4 1–34), appears in Lk. 11 27 f. as an introduction to the Denunciation of the Evil Generation who Reject the visible witness of the Divine Spirit, and Demand a Sign from Heaven. In Luke's order, as in Mark's, the saying follows instead of preceding The

[3] Luke describes him as a fellow-guest at a Pharisee's table: we may suspect, however, that the exclamation was originally evoked by the utterance of 13 30, and that the clause "sitting at meat with him" which groups it with the table discourses of 14 1-14 is editorial.

Blasphemy of the Scribes. It takes the form: "And it came to pass, as he said these things, a certain woman out of the multitude lifted up her voice and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck."

I know that our third evangelist is held personally responsible by a number of critics for all these little *mises en scène* whose mutual affinity is so apparent, though in some cases, such as the supper group (Lk. 14 1. 7. 12. 15), their present context is inappropriate. I confess myself too conservative for the theory of editorial fabrication. And if I had the audacity to regard the settings as due solely to literary invention, I should expect more cautious critics to demand that I point to anything similar in those portions of the Lukan writings where we have no reason to suspect the use of S. I might further be asked to explain how the Gentile Luke (he was a Gentile even if his name was not Luke) could be expected to know that a Rab, speaking in the synagogue, would naturally be called upon to decide a disputed application of the law of inheritance, or how he could originate a scene so true to Jewish environment as the pious exclamation (to avert the ill omen of the warning Lk. 13 28–30): "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God," that is, take part in the messianic Feast. But perhaps the hardest question of all to answer would be, why, if these settings belong to our third evangelist, we should meet an instance so closely akin in the Q material. For Matthew, in spite of his rewriting the beginning of Fragment 14, reducing it to about half its length by omitting the needless repetition of the Baptist's question, just as he constantly reduces the redundancies of Mark, has the same setting as Luke for the great Discourse on the Stumbling of Israel. It was introduced by the brief mention of the delegation from John with their question, "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?"

Matters of form, style, and mode of composition are far from negligible when we are studying a fragment with a view to the reconstruction of its original context. But I must not dwell on these. The analogies of the Platonic Dialogues, the Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, the Petrine discourses of Acts, and the discourses of the Fourth Gospel, all using a slender thread

of narrative to bring in set discourses on subjects of religious or philosophic interest, have probably already occurred to your minds. Let me pass to matters of substance. But here the prime requisite is correct exegesis. I must delay you with a few words on the key-phrase of the section, the term "the Coming one."

McNeile, in his recent admirable *Commentary on Matthew*, has done me the honor of referring to, and in part adopting, an article I published in *The Expositor* for July, 1904, entitled "The 'Coming One' of John the Baptist." I have nothing to retract of what I then wrote, but I could wish I had seen twenty years ago the implied Christology of S as clearly as I now see it. For to understand the Christology of a gospel writing is to hold the key to its real nature. The statement (endorsed by McNeile) that the term *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* is not a title traceable in current Jewish literature may stand, even if we concede to Eisler his contention (*ZNW.* XXIV, 3/4, 1925) that its correlate *'aphikomen* (a designation for a fragment of the loaf of Passover *mazzoth* called "Levi" hidden till its consumption after the banquet) probably meaning "He who has come," was already current. We cannot in any case imagine that the reader was meant to understand that the reports of Jesus' ministry of healing and glad tidings reaching the Baptist's ears had suggested to his mind that this might be that dread figure whose "coming" John had himself announced, the Executioner of Judgment, sent to gather in Jehovah's harvest and to burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. As between the two alternatives McNeile concludes (p. 35): "It is only possible to say that John looked forward to an undefined, but divinely sent Personality."

Were it our problem to probe the mind of the Baptist for his real thought we should doubtless have to be satisfied with this vague answer, or perhaps better, renounce the attempt altogether. Fortunately our problem is less remote. The proto-evangelist was not concerned to throw the clearest possible light on the mind of John, but to persuade John's disciples and other contemporaries that Jesus was Israel's God-sent Redeemer. The question raised is the Baptist's only as the Christian writer has availed himself of it for his own purposes, and its phraseo-

logy is dictated by the answer he, the Christian apologist, has in view. The Baptist disappears, once he has served this purpose, just as the man who asks for a division of the inheritance disappears, or the man who asks "Are there few that be saved?". As the *evangelist's* question, or perhaps more exactly the question the evangelist would have liked the disciples of John to ask in order that he might supply the convincing answer, the problem of its meaning is not obscure. It can be solved from the answer itself.

It is impossible to mistake the Isaian type of phraseology in the description of Jesus' ministry placed in the mouth of the Savior himself. The reference to the Servant Songs, with their theme of "the consolation of Israel" is as obvious here as in the "programmatic discourse" prefixed by Luke to his account of the ministry. After his baptism with the Spirit, says Luke, Jesus proceeded to Nazareth where he had been brought up, declaring the fulfilment of the prophecy:

The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me
Because he hath anointed me to proclaim glad tidings to the poor:
He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted,
To preach deliverance to the captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty those that are oppressed,
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.

He met, however, the same rejection of which complaint is made in our Q fragment. Some would go so far as to accuse Luke of repeating in slightly altered form what he found in S. But in that case why include the original section only three chapters further on?

No commentator fails to perceive the Isaian background, either here or in the Message of Jesus to John. Unfortunately for our appreciation of the implied Christology none seem to notice the use of the same conceptions in the so-called Amida prayer, one of the best known examples of ancient Jewish liturgy.

It has long been held by scholars such as Schürer (*GJV.* § 27, Appendix) that at least the first two Blessings (*Berachoth*)

of the eighteen (in the present form nineteen) which give to the litany its title *Shemoneh Esreh* ("Eighteen"), must be older than our era. In point of fact these two seem to form the basis for Jesus' argument against Sadducean rejection of the doctrine of (national) resurrection. Only recently have actual proofs been found of the early use of the Amida prayer in all its essential features. In the Thanksgiving appended to Ecclesiasticus in the recently discovered Hebrew text Jehovah is called "The Shield of Abraham," "the Rock of Isaac," and "the Mighty one (*'Abir*) of Jacob." Thanksgivings 5—8 are offered "to the Redeemer (*Goel*) of Israel," "to Him that gathereth the outcasts of Israel," "to Him that buildeth His City and His Sanctuary," and "to Him that causeth a horn to sprout for the house of David." Abrahams brings these into comparison with the *Shemoneh Esreh* (Amidah) in the following terms (*Companion to the Authorized* (Jewish) *Prayer Book*, p. lvii):

> There can be no doubt that these six Benedictions (the first three and the last three of the *Amidah* or *Shemoneh Esreh*) are very old in their primitive content, perhaps they originated early in the history of the Second temple. The priests recited daily some at least of these six Benedictions with the Decalogue and the Shema . . . It is the opinion of several competent scholars that the Amidah is rather older than that period (the Maccabean age), for the Psalm discovered in the Hebrew text of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus LI 12 ff.) was imitated from, and not the source of the Amidah.

Benedictions 1 and 2 are called in the Mishnah respectively *Fathers* (from the appeal to the "piety" of the patriarchs), and *Powers* (sc. of God). The scriptural passages on which the latter is based are given by Abrahams as Is. 63 3; Ps. 145 14; Ps. 146 7*f.*; Ps. 14 6*f.*; Dan. 12 2 and 1 Sam. 2 6.

We note first of all that the two Benedictions known as The Fathers, and The Powers of God, have as their principal theme the coming "Redeemer," and that their phraseology, like that of the Q fragment, reproduces the symbolism of Isaiah. In fact it is only with respect to the current use of this symbolism of Isaiah and Ezekiel concerning a dead *people* of Jehovah restored to national life by being again made the agent of Jehovah's purpose of blessing to the world, that we can make sure of the sense of the Q fragment. When, therefore, Jesus bids the

messengers of John report that "the dead are raised up," he means more than Luke seems to think; for Luke prefixes the story of the Raising of the Widow's Son (7 11–17). But Jesus' message to the Baptist does not refer primarily to miracles of individual resuscitation, but to the divine restoration of Israel's national life, of which he, the simple mechanic of Nazareth, has been made the agent. The *Shemoneh Esreh* will prove this.—But let me recall to you this most beautiful and most touching of all the surviving prayers of the Synagogue of Jesus' time. Readers familiar with such prayers as these cannot have been in doubt as to the meaning of "he that should come."

1. Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, and our fathers' God, the God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob, the great God, the mighty and dreadful, the Most High God, who bestowest gracious favors and createst all things, and *rememberest the piety of the patriarchs, and wilt bring a Redeemer to their posterity,* for the sake of thy name in love. O King, who bringest help and healing and art a shield.

Response: Blessed art thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham.

2. Thou art a mighty champion (*gibbor*) forever, O Lord. *Thou restorest life to the dead,* Thou art a mighty champion (*gibbor*) to save; who sustainest the living with beneficence, quickenest the dead with great mercy, supporting the fallen and healing the sick, and setting at liberty those that are bound, and *upholding thy faithfulness to those who sleep in the dust.* Who is like unto thee, Lord the Almighty; or who can he compared unto thee, O King, who killest and makest alive again, and causest salvation to spring forth? *And faithful art thou to quicken the dead.*

Response: Blessed art thou, O Lord, who *restorest the dead.*

It can hardly be doubted that Jesus had these two *Berachoth* in mind when he rebuked the unbelief of the Sadducees by recalling the promise to "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," of a God who is not a God of the dead, but of the living. For the point of the argument is that God may be trusted to "uphold his faithfulness to those that sleep in the dust." Similarly in the Q saying Lk. 7 29 f. = Mt. 21 32 he maintains that the Great

Repentance which the religious leaders of Israel were witnessing should have been to them a sign from heaven that the divine restoration of the national life had already begun. "The dead are raised up" means more than merely "I can resuscitate corpses by a touch."

I will not pause with *Berachoth* 3 and 4, which are prayers respectively for sanctification of the divine Name, and for the gracious gift of Wisdom, as in Jas. 1 5. I will also merely mention by subject the next two *Berachoth*, which are for "perfect repentance" unto (national) restoration, and for divine pardon. But for the sake of the Isaian imagery, and the certain reflection of the hope of those who in Jesus' time where "waiting for the consolation of Israel" as described in Luke's opening chapters, I must quote in full *Berachoth* 7, 8 and 10:

> 7. Look, we beseech thee, upon our affliction, and plead our cause, and redeem us speedily for the sake of thy name; for thou art a mighty Redeemer (*goel*).
>
> Response: Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Redeemer (*goel*) of Israel.
>
> 8. Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed; save thou us and we shall be saved; for our praise art thou; and bring forth a perfect remedy for all our infirmities; for a God and King, a faithful healer, and most merciful art thou.
>
> Response: Blessed art thou, O Lord, who healest the diseases of thy people Israel.
>
> 10. Sound with the great trumpet to proclaim our freedom, and set up a standard to collect our captives, and gather us together from the four corners of the earth.
>
> Response: Blessed art thou, O Lord, who gatherest the outcasts of thy people Israel.

If there were any question as to the currency in New Testament times of these Isaian figures of the sounding of the great trumpet (the *shophar* of Is. 27 13) and gathering of the scattered exiles to the standard of their Deliverer (Is. 49 22) it would be well to recall Paul's expectation of "the trump of God," and the gathering together of the elect, or (for verbal coincidence) to compare the eucharistic prayer of the *Didaché*:

> As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains

and being gathered together became one, so may thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom.

The figure of the scattering and gathering again of God's people is no less characteristically Isaian than those of healing, deliverance, and restoration to national life. Is. 4 4 and 27 12 are the basic passages reflected both in primitive Christian and contemporary Jewish religious teaching. As Eisler reminds us, this gathering of the scattered elements of Israel is still symbolized in Passover observance by the breaking and eating of the Passover loaf called "Israel." The *gibbus galioth* (*Pesach.* 88/9) is the great "gathering" which precedes the messianic age. One need hardly point to individual passages from the Gospels to prove how fully primitive Christian symbolism reflects the Jewish. The Day of Jehovah of which the Baptist gives warning will witness not only a winnowing which scatters the chaff, but a "gathering" of the wheat into the garner. Jesus summons his first followers to use their nets in a fishery of men, their new object will be to "gather the scattered sheep" of Jehovah's flock. After Calvary this "gathering" is extended world-wide. Above all is the theme made prominent, as we should expect, in the Christian Passover ritual. The "scattering" of the Twelve is to be followed by their reunion effected by Christ himself in Galilee according to Mk. 14 27 *f.* According to the Jerusalem form of the tradition, (Lk. 22 31 ff.) the "scattering" is a winnowing of the Twelve by Satan. *Peter* rallies them to the standard of the risen Christ. The preceding context, vv. 28–30, which embodies the Q fragment 59, speaks of reunion at the messianic feast in the glorified Jerusalem. There the Twelve are to occupy the "thrones of the house of David" of Ps. 122 5. In Jn. 16 32 the "scattering" of the Twelve reappears, but the reunion is spiritual.

It is a noteworthy fact that in the *Shemoneh Esreh,* as in the basic passages of Isaiah and in the Q fragments, the conceptions of the Coming one which have to do with "the Son of David" are disconnected from those which refer to the work of healing, deliverance, forgiveness, and restoration. In this work no attention is paid to the personality of the "Redeemer." He

is simply to be "brought." The primary work is not that of government, but of deliverance and restoration. The righteous rule of the Son of David does not here come into view. So far as the personality of the agent is concerned it is barely possible to see that there is any apart from the divine King, Jehovah himself, who is alone looked to as the Healer and Deliverer. Such is of course the case with the great prophecy of the Consolation, to which the figure of the Son of David, prominent in the pre-exilic Isaiah (Is. 11 1–12), is a stranger, save for the reference to the "sure mercies of David" in 55 3f. In the opening *Berachoth* of the *Shemoneh Esreh*, which deal with Jehovah's deliverance in the very language of the Consolation prophecy, there is in like manner no mention of the righteous Ruler. It is only in *Berachoth* 14f. that prayer is offered for the establishment of "the throne of David," after the conception of Ps. 72 and Pss. 17 and 18 of the *Psalms of Solomon*. These two *Berachoth* are as follows:

> 14. Return with compassion to thy city Jerusalem, and dwell therein as thou hast promised: and rebuild her speedily in our days, a structure everlasting: and establish speedily the throne of David therein.
>
> Response: Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Builder of Jerusalem.
>
> 15. Cause the offspring of David thy servant to flourish speedily, and let his horn be exalted in thy salvation; daily do we hope for thy salvation.
>
> Response: Blessed art thou, O Lord, who causest to flourish the hope of salvation.

Needless to point out the close affinity of these two *Berachoth* with Q fragment 59, and the two prefatory chapters of Luke. Once the Consolation prophecy had become united to the pre-exilic Isaiah we should not expect the two messianic figures of Redeemer and Ruler to remain disconnected. But we are concerned with the work of healing and restoration which Jesus, in harmony with the Amidah, ascribes to God himself.

If, then, we return to the opening Berachoth, comparing these with Fragment 14 of the Q material, we shall have no difficulty in identifying the Isaian Redeemer as the figure the

proto-evangelist has in mind in the phrase "he that should come" (*ὁ ἐρχόμενος*). This will place in our hands the pre-eminently important key to his Christology. At the same time it will be well to observe that in the Discourse of Fragment 15 and the connected dialogue Jesus lays stress upon the distinction between himself as the mere agent of the deliverance, and Jehovah who is the actual Deliverer. Just as in the basic passages of Deutero-Isaiah constant emphasis is laid on the fact that it is Jehovah's "own hand" that accomplishes the deliverance, and that he does not give this glory to another (Is. 41 10, 13 f., 17–20, 28; 42 6, 13 ff.; 43 11, 25; 44 6; 47 4; 48 11; 49 24–26), so Jesus calls blind and deaf Israel to witness what "the Spirit (Luke "finger") of God" is accomplishing in their midst, warning them that their evil imputations against the work are not uttered against any mere Son of man, but against "the Holy One of Israel."

It would be easy to trace back some of the poetic figures of the *Berachoth*, such as the divine champion (*gibbor*) sent to deliver the captives of death from their prison-house, far back of the times of Isaiah, connecting them with the Babylonian figure of Marduk, light-hero of the gods, delivering humanity from captivity under the dragon-power of darkness and death, or even further back to Iranian prototypes. I will leave all that to those better versed than myself in these remote fields of comparative religion. I am concerned now only to prove that in the time of Christ these Isaian figures, of Jehovah as Healer, Restorer, Gatherer and Deliverer of Israel, were in familiar use in the liturgy of the Synagogue in adaptation to the *national* hope of redemption, and that in this contemporary adaptation we may find the key to their meaning in the Q fragments. The proof is not difficult. The material lies ready to hand. All we require is a delicate discrimination of types of messianic expectation which shall not confuse, for example, the conception of the royal Son of David of Ps. 72 and Pss. 17 and 18 of *Psalms of Solomon*, with the "Redeemer" of Deutero-Isaiah and *Berachoth* 1 and 2 of the *Shemoneh Esreh*. For the function of this "Redeemer" differs widely from that of the Righteous Ruler, though it is scarcely distinguishable from that

of the Coming One of the Q fragments. Here, then, in the *Shemoneh Esreh*, lies the key to our exegetical problem. The "Coming One" our proto-evangelist aims to depict in his answer to the question of John's disciples is the vessel of Jehovah's Spirit in the poem of "the consolation of Israel." Whether he also conceived him as "the offspring of David, Jehovah's servant" must be decided from other material.

Historical exegesis has done us no small service in elucidating the key-term of the whole Q section, and incidentally suggesting that the story of the Raising of the Widow's Son, which fails to appear in Matthew, formed no essential part of the original context. But it has a further service to render before we shall be ready to take up the crucial question of what our bit of ancient gospel composition implies by way of presupposition or anticipation. Certainly Mark, whose use of this Q section can be proved for his prologue (Mk. 1 1–13), if not also in the section on the growth of opposition (1 40—3 6), would seem to have misunderstood the meaning of Jesus' reply.

To some extent this would seem to be true of Matthew and Luke also. All three evangelists bring into nearer or remoter connection with the Discourse on the Stumbling of Israel (fragment 15) the Rebuke of the Scribes who said "He hath Beelzebub." At least in the case of Mark the onus of the offence lies in the fact that the blasphemy is uttered against Jesus personally. It was "because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." At least Mark gives no adequate consideration to the distinction Jesus' answer makes between words spoken against himself, which would be pardonable, and words spoken against the Spirit of God, which are not. In the parable of The Strong Man, whose possessions are carried off by the Stronger than He, Jesus convicts the scribes of blasphemy (in which it was needful to show that the utterance involved the divine Name) on the ground that the deliverance of the victims of Satanic possession is not *his* work, but (like that claimed by the Pharisees for their own exorcisms) the work of "the Spirit (Luke "the finger") of God". In other words Jesus personally is only the agent. The beneficent deliverance is from God. In calling it the work of Beelzebub the scribes are speaking not against the Messenger, but

against God himself. Mark unfortunately leads the way to an obliteration of this distinction by omitting an essential link in the logic of S, which the Q material retains, viz, the verse: "And if I exorcize by Beelzebub, by whom do your sons exorcize? But if I exorcize *by the Spirit of God*, then the divine sovereignty has overtaken you unaware." When this is omitted it is pardonable to interpret the parable of the Strong Man Armed as if Jesus were referring to himself as the Mightier than He, who overcomes the Mighty one and spoils his house. So far as I know this is in fact the interpretation uniformly adopted by the commentators. But it is certainly wrong. The context itself should suffice to show the error, but it becomes unmistakable when we turn to the Isaian pattern in Is. 49 24–26, immediately following the paragraph on the gathering of Jehovah's scattered people to the standard he sets up for them. One cannot then fail to see whom Jesus meant by the Stronger than the strong man armed and keeping guard over his captives. This is the Isaian model for the parable:

Shall the prey be taken from the mighty one?
Or the lawful captive be delivered?
But thus saith Jehovah:
Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away,
And the prey of the terrible shall be delivered:
For *I myself* will contend with him that contendeth with thee,
And I will be the Savior of thy children.

. . . . . .

And all flesh shall know that *I, Jehovah, am thy Savior,*
And thy Redeemer the Mighty One of Jacob.

The charge "He casteth out by Beelzebub," answered by the Parable of the Mighty Deliverer, is not one of the two Q fragments we have taken for our specific example of the Method of Implication. It is only a paragraph which all three evangelists bring into close connection with the Q section. It belongs to the Source only by Implication, but may be adduced to show in what way the two fragments under consideration must be understood. Precisely the same distinction between God as the real source of the redemptive power, and Jesus as merely his agent,

underlies the whole, and determines the sense in which the proto-evangelist makes his appeal to the "mighty works." Jesus does not claim them as evidences of his own power or goodness, but of the goodness and power of *God*. This differs widely from the sense in which Mark adduces them; indeed I think we might add from Matthew's and Luke's as well. Only here and there does Luke tell us that the power of God was "with" Jesus to heal. It is only from an exceptional case (Mk. 6 5) that we see it to be the fact, even in Mark, that Jesus did not treat the gift of healing as his own power, and hence felt no embarrassment when its manifestation failed. Failure was simply a consequence of the petitioners' "unbelief." The "mighty works" are, then, indeed, as viewed in S, "signs from heaven." So is the repentance of the publicans and sinners at the warning of John. These are not wonders performed by Jesus, but manifestations of "the Spirit of God." The blindness of Israel's religious leaders to these great "signs of the times" is to Jesus the culminating proof of the disaster that awaits those who submit blindly to their guidance. Hence the Woes on Scribes and Pharisees, blind guides, blind followers, which in Luke's Gospel conclude the section. In our canonical Gospels this important distinction tends to disappear.

We are ready now to turn back to the two consecutive Q fragments chosen for the application of our constructive method. They are (1) the Question of John's Disciples and (2) its sequel, the Arraignment of the Evil Generation, a people which, like sulky children refusing to play either funeral or wedding, rejects both the awesome warning of John and the winning entreaties of that Wisdom of God whose message Jesus conveys. At this bit of ancient gospel composition, universally recognized as pre-canonical by all who admit the right of criticism to distinguish sources at all, we take our stand like excavators beside some block of ancient masonry laid bare beneath the foundations of later structures. For the time being we concentrate attention on this section alone. We note its composition and style, its orientation and apparent purpose with relation to the environment, and lastly its affinity and connection, if any, with blocks of similar structure and kind. There is nothing

half so mysterious about the process as the deciphering of a fragment of message in code. All we need guard against is the delusion of preconceived ideas. If we are guided solely by the implications of the fragments themselves we shall not fail to find among the fifty-nine enough lines of cohesion to guide us to some sure results.

Mere juxtaposition of Q material did not carry us far, even after we had dropped the fallacy of preferring Matthew's order to Luke's. Both these later Synoptists have transposed, supplemented, rearranged their Q material, each with his own conception of how best to combine it with Mark. Both have rewritten certain sections obliterating thus the original identity of language. The fact is disconcerting but not irremediable. Just as the sections of S can be studied for their orientation and structure, so the editorial work of Matthew and Luke can be studied for its characteristic notes. It is not impossible, having before us the actual changes each has made in transcribing Mark, to predict many of the changes each would be apt to make in a Second Source. Some changes betray themselves by their very language. Luke has a vocabulary of bis own. Matthew has certain phrases, borrowed and stereotyped, which he uses over and over again in his editorial recastings. We may be compelled (I am disposed to think we are compelled in the case of Luke) to assume, if not a third source, at least an expanded form of S besides the form known from the Q material. Something analogous seems likely to have occurred in the case of Matthew's transcript of Mark. Matthew has certain supplements which are related to Mark, but (as Streeter well says) can never have stood alone. Their relation to Mark is that of the mistletoe to the oak, not a separate tree. Yet he postulates for Matthew another complete source to be designated M. Streeter inclines us also to think of what Feine long ago called the "precanonical Luke" (*Der vorkanonische Lukas*) as a form of S which had already undergone expansion under influence from Mark, a document L. But to leap from a two-document to a "four-document" theory is a desperate expedient, from which we shall find ourselves preserved, let us hope, by a little better understanding of the known quantities before us. Certainly a better

appreciation of Matthew's methods of editorial composition would eliminate many of the supposed grounds for a document M, leaving the question of L for future determination. New unknown quantities will only complicate our equation. The solution will be reached only as we advance step by step from the known toward the relatively unknown.

In the case of the Q section on the Question of John's Disciples and Jesus' Arraignment of the Generation Blind to the Work of God and Deaf to His Messengers we are dealing with a relatively known quantity. In the introductory fragment, which we have characterised as a *mise en scène*, a considerable narrative is already presupposed. Jesus has already performed many mighty works, the rumor of which has come to the ears of John, evoking his enquiry. The Galilean ministry is not at its beginning, but at, or near, its close. The second fragment proves this; for how could Jesus justly arraign his generation for rejection of Jehovah's messengers, if the rejection has not yet taken place; and how can he have incurred rejection for the reasons stated, if he has not yet shown the genial manner of life which his opponents contrast with the Baptist's asceticism? Possibly the Q fragment on Denunciation of the Cities of Galilee which Believed Not did not form part of this context of S. Matthew attaches it to Fragment 15, but Luke places it elsewhere. In that paragraph we have specific reference to mighty works done "in Bethsaida" as well as Capernaum, and "in Chorazin," which is not even mentioned elsewhere. Are we to suppose that our proto-evangelist was so inept as to leave his readers totally in the dark as to these significant occurrences? Are we to imagine him leaving his readers by tacit reference to pick up what they could from outside report? What we have of Q elsewhere does not indicate such lack of literary skill. Neither does it indicate silence or indifference as to the witness of the "mighty works." The Source once contained them if the proto-evangelist wrote as normal authors write, including doubtless those mighty works, now forever lost from all our narratives, whose scene was Chorazin.

But other Q narratives of healing are not wholly lost. Some of the implications of our fragment are specific. The healings

referred to in Jesus' answer to John are intentionally conformed to the language of Isaiah. The phrases "the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the deaf hear, the poor have glad tidings proclaimed to them" reproduce freely Is. 35 5f.; 61 1. The raising of the dead is also, as we have seen from comparison of the *Shemoneh Esreh*, a current adaptation of the prophetic figure for the restoration of the national life. But where shall we find a parallel to the clause "the lepers are cleansed?" Isaiah has no such prediction. The *Shemoneh Esreh* has nothing of the kind. We might conjecture that the speaker uses the expression to typify the restoration of the outcast element, the publicans and sinners, pariahs of the Jewish social order. But surely Jesus is talking of actual miracles of healing when he says "the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, and the deaf hear." The cases are not less real because treated as *also* symbolic. Nor can we interject between these the statement "the lepers are cleansed" without assuming that some actual case of restoration of a leper outcast had been in fact related.

Turn now to the series of anecdotes briefly summarized in Mk. 1 40—2 20 to illustrate how opposition was kindled against Jesus till "the Pharisees went out and conspired with the Herodians to destroy him" (3 6). The series begins with the Healing (more exactly the "cleansing") of a leper. Next we learn how at the word of Jesus the lame man was made to "walk." With this story Mark interweaves (2 5–10) a parallel to Luke's account of the "sinner" to whom Jesus declared the forgiveness of her sins, scandalizing the Pharisees. Next Mark relates how Jesus "ate and drank with publicans and sinners" (2 13–17). Finally he tells of the protest of "John's disciples and the Pharisees," and of Jesus' reply which compared his disciples to the "sons of the bridechamber" (2 18–20). Is it possible to maintain that the same Mark who can be proved by the language of his citation from Malachi 3 1 (misquoted as "Isaiah,") to have used S in his Prologue, has made no use of it in drawing up this series of instances of the Growth of Opposition? If such use there be, then the cases of The Leper Cleansed and The Lame Man Made to Walk must be regarded as the same healings presupposed in our Q fragment 14. The probability is increased

by a close study of the language. For Mark's more detailed description of the healing of the leper seems less original than the simpler form exhibited in the two later Synoptists. Indeed Matthew and Luke here coincide *against* Mark both in *plus* and *minus* clauses as well as order. For no less than 18 consecutive words the parallels to Mk. 1 40 f. are identical, Mark showing characteristic departures from their simpler form. Similar minor coincidences of Mt—Lk against Mark appear in the story of The Lame Made to Walk, showing that the later Synoptists in their divergences from Mark were not guided merely by their own individual sense of expediency. They had also the Second Source before them in at least these two stories of healing, though they naturally followed in the main their First Source, which they took to reflect more nearly the account of the eye-witness Peter.

Let the above suffice as an example of the application of the Method of Implication to Q-fragment 14. Naturally, since the fragment deals with the past of Jesus' ministry, its outlook is in retrospect. We learn from it that S was not a mere collection of *logia*, but gave an account of Jesus' ministry in Galilee, including both preaching and healing. In several cases the anecdotes were the same as related (in greater detail) by Mark. It also gave account of the way in which this ministry was received by the "people of the land," but rejected by the Synagogue authorities. Moreover John the Baptist played a conspicuous part in the drama, and the writer was concerned to show, perhaps for the benefit of John's disciples, what the true place of John was with reference to "the counsel of God." It is hardly needful to anticipate the results likely to follow the application of the Method of Implication to other Q fragments relating to the Galilean period.

We must turn to Fragment 15, which gives through the mouth of Jesus the proto-evangelist's interpretation of the significance of the ministry of John, and (by virtue of the implied comparison) of that of the still greater messenger of the divine Wisdom who had followed John and met a similar reception. Naturally, since Fragment 15 deals with the rejected "counsel of God," it looks forward as well as backward. It

presents the Christology of S. Our interpretation has already shown its general nature. Jesus was the agent of that Wisdom of God whom the prophets and sages had depicted as vainly pleading with a wayward people, withdrawing at last from her "house" until they should learn to receive her messengers not with stoning and persecution, but with the cry, "Hosanna, blessed is he that cometh in Jehovah's name." Until that day she is justified, not indeed by those who claim to be wise and prudent, but by "her children," the lowly but penitent. What is implied in the Arraignment of Fragment 15 as to the nature and purpose of S?

Certainly the composition was not a mere record of the teaching ministry. If by a "gospel" we mean an attempt to show by the story of Jesus' life and ministry that he was the agent of God for accomplishing the redemption foretold by the prophets, then certainly S was a "gospel" in the fullest sense. Great as John was through the place given him in "the counsel of God," that like Elijah he should come to effect the Great Repentance, preparing Jehovah's way by making ready a people prepared for His coming, he was less (says our proto-evangelist) than the least in the kingdom to which he pointed. For over against him is set "the Son of Man." The Source's use of the title is a strange one. Almost it would seem a substitute for the Isaian title of the rejected Servant. What the fragment does mean by it I shall not now attempt to determine. The problem is even greater than that of the term "the Coming One" of the preceding fragment. But are we to suppose it had no explanation in this primitive gospel?[4] Was the proto-evangelist so incredibly inept as to leave his readers without an explanation of the sense in which he applied this term to Jesus? Can we imagine that he told of the rejection of the supreme agent of the divine Wisdom, and said nothing of his Coming again? No; if this was a normal Christian writer he went on to tell how the Servant, rejected of men, had after his cruel death been "highly exalted."

[4] It appears suddenly in Mk. 2 10 without an explanation. Significantly this is the paragraph which we have just seen reason to think is based on S (above, p. 53).

It is true that the story of the great tragedy is related by Matthew in almost exclusive dependence on Mark. Matthew has no sympathy with what we may call the Servant Christology. That is the special province of Luke. But some Q fragments appear as late as the Institution of the Supper. And in Luke the Markan story of the tragedy at Jerusalem is almost eclipsed by another of unknown derivation. Luke introduces us also to an account of the resurrection appearances so completely contradictory of Mark that the Markan had already disappeared before it when Matthew wrote. Matthew is obliged to piece out an ending for his story of the same type as the so-called Shorter Ending, a mere bit of editorial patching. Why was the original ending of Mark allowed to disappear, if not because of this conflict? And whence came the conflict, if not from the Second Source? These are questions much too large for a single article already transgressing the limits of permissible space, but pregnant of significance. What I hope to do by raising them here is only to show that the true means of solution lies in the application of the Method of Implication unhampered by the delusion of Schleiermacher. We know of the existence of a pre-canonical source. We know some sixty fragments, longer and shorter, which by common consent are admitted to have been drawn from it. Two of these I have attempted to deal with here. Not as expecting to exhaust the implications of even these at one sitting, but by way of example. When application of the method has been made to each and every one of the Q fragments, and each inference weighed and tested, I venture to predict that we shall have begun to see daylight ahead in the much-contested Synoptic problem.[5]

[5] The current *Hibbert Journal* issued as this article goes to press (Jan. 1926) promises a new reconstruction of the Second Source in the April number from Rev. J. M. C. Crum.