

and insincerity, and hardness of heart, as He did in the days of His flesh to the men who could not understand because they would not be true: 'Neither tell I you, by what authority I do these things.' And so He remains an enigma. He does not commit Himself to them, because they will not commit themselves to Him. But to those who do, there comes that revelation of Christ which is a revelation within the man, and which makes us one with Him in a fellowship which death itself cannot sever, and so in Him we have eternal life.

There is one other thought that springs out of the passage before us. It comes to us with the greater acceptance because we know ourselves deficient in that which to us seems worthy of so great a response. Our Lord reveals Himself, commits Himself, to men and women who to us seem scarcely worthy of His response. 'A proud old Pharisee,' we say, and there is always a touch of something like contempt when we speak of him 'who came to Jesus by night.' 'A woman that was a sinner,' and her allegiance seems as lightly given as all her love had been. The nobleman is concerned, but it is scarcely to obtain some spiritual gift for himself; it is rather to get his son healed if he can, and he comes to Christ as he would have come to any man who seemed to hold out anything like hope to him. Are these the proper recipients of so great a spiritual revelation? But the answer is, 'They are; for he knew what was in man.' We are too near to one another's lives to see into them, and to read the true issues of that which moves within them. The angle of refraction is too great: we cannot see beneath the deceitful

surface. But not so with Him. Lifted far above us in His exalted life, He looks down upon, and down into, the secret sources of our life. His eye travels over the deeps where thought and purpose are born. He sees the confusion created by our past years of sin and sloth, but in all the tangled drift and wreckage of our past He sees also some smallest gem of truth: the one thing of worth within us; the willingness to respond to the truth that appeals in Him; the submission of spirit, the obedience that makes us His. That He accepts; to that He responds; responds with the generous overflow of love which we call 'the grace of God.' He gives Himself to us, until His self-surrender shames us of our own; our love once more is cradled in humility, and we cry, 'The grace of God hath overflowed (*ὑπερπλέονασε*, 1 Ti 1¹⁴), and with my faith and love which is in Christ Jesus makes the full river of my life.'

Faith is the surrender of the soul to God in Jesus Christ; it is the giving of oneself up to Him; it has its counterpart in the gift of grace that brings God in Christ down into the heart of man.

It is small wonder that that which follows upon such divine communion is no less than eternal life in Jesus Christ our Lord.

Strong Son of God, immortal Love,
Whom we, that have not seen Thy face,
By faith, and faith alone, embrace,
Believing where we cannot prove;

We have but faith: we cannot know;
For knowledge is of things we see;
And yet we trust it comes from Thee,
A beam in darkness: let it grow.

Professor Harnack on the Second Source of the First and Third Gospels.

BY THE REV. CYRIL W. EMMET, M.A., VICAR OF WEST HENDRED.

II.

IN a previous article we dealt with the Evangelists' treatment of their material. We pass now to the question of 'Q,' the supposed common source. The variations in the text of St. Matthew are sufficient to forbid the idea that St. Luke used his Gospel (p. 78). On the other hand, the resemblances in

the first group of parallel sections prove that 'in the parts we are concerned with the connexion between the two evangelists (neither of whom was the source of the other) must be *literary*; i.e. it is not enough to go back to common oral sources' (p. 32). In particular oral tradition is not enough

to explain the phenomena of the Sermon on the Mount (p. 80 *n.*). The conclusion is that 'one and the same Greek translation of an Aramaic original lies behind the two Gospels' (p. 80). As to the supposed traces of differences of translation from this Aramaic, Harnack is not nearly so certain as Wellhausen and Nestle. He admits that the actual copies of Q used by St. Matthew and St. Luke may have differed in detail, but finds it hopeless to reconstruct a Q¹ and a Q². *E.g.* the editor of the first Gospel may have found the amplification of the 'sign of Jonah' in the copy he used, and St. Luke may have taken the 'egg and the scorpion' from another version of the saying. 'In a few cases we might doubt whether there is any common source underlying Matthew and Luke (Lk 6⁴⁶⁻⁴⁹ 7¹⁻¹⁰ 11^{41, 44} 14²⁶)' (p. 80); and with regard to the short sayings in particular, 'Matthew and Luke may well have had more than one common source besides Mark' (p. 126). The admission of these possibilities does not prevent Harnack from giving us an interesting reconstruction of Q (pp. 88 ff.); needless to say it is hypothetical both in text and in compass. According to this reconstruction, Q included 7 narratives, 12 parables, 13 collections of sayings, and 29 longer or shorter sayings.

Did Q include more? It is *à priori* probable enough that parts of Q may have been utilized by one of the Evangelists alone (as has happened in their reproduction of St. Mark), but have we any criterion by which we can assign to Q matter found in *one Gospel only*? The examination of the material which has so far been supposed to come from Q, fails to disclose any marked peculiarity of style, unless extreme simplicity can be so described. Herein N.T. criticism differs from that of the O.T.; in the Hexateuch the style, *e.g.*, of P enables us to trace it with a high degree of certainty. With regard to Q the double version is practically our only criterion, hence the conclusion is that there is practically nothing peculiar to the first or third Gospel which can *definitely* be assigned to Q (p. 130).

The question is particularly important with regard to the *Passion Narrative*. As is well known, St. Matthew and St. Luke practically never agree against St. Mark in this; our one certain criterion accordingly fails us. Is there any ground for supposing that either, in particular St. Luke, used Q? *Did Q include a Passion narrative at*

all? Probably not. If it did so, why should either of the Evangelists desert it at the critical point, when they have both used it so freely before? Further, a glance at any list of the passages common to the two Gospels will show that, except for Mt 23. 24, the common source is hardly used by either in the latter half of their Gospels. The conclusion can hardly be resisted that they must have exhausted all it had to give them in the course of their earlier chapters (p. 120).

A similar 'not proven' must be the verdict with regard to the *supposed traces of Q outside the Gospels*. The agrapha of other books of the N.T., of MSS, and of the Fathers, or versions of Christ's sayings in the Fathers which do not seem to rest directly on our Canonical Gospels, have been ascribed to Q. In particular Clemens Romanus and Polycarp have been supposed to quote from a definite collection of *Λόγοι τοῦ κυρίου* (cf. Ac 20³⁵), which has further been identified with Q or the Logia. The hypothesis is a tempting one, but if we follow Harnack, it must be resisted. 'The burden of proof in each case rests on those who support the claims of Q, but we look in vain for real proofs in the pages of Resch and others' (p. 135).¹

So much with regard to the contents of Q; can we arrive at any conclusions as to the *order* in which its contents stood? The apparently hopeless divergencies of their arrangement in our Gospels have usually been a stumbling-block to the would-

¹ It is of interest to compare Harnack's view with one of the latest considerable investigations of the subject in England, Mr. Allen's *Commentary on St. Matthew*. At first sight the divergence seems great, and is discouraging to those who are hoping for assured results in the investigation of the Synoptic problem. It would be impertinent for the amateur to attempt to decide between the two, but it may be permissible to point out that on looking closer the difference tends to diminish. Mr. Allen's view is conditioned by his stress on the divergencies between St. Matthew and St. Luke; Harnack fastens on the resemblances. Mr. Allen turns the edge of the latter by keeping before him the possibility that St. Luke may have seen the first Gospel, though not writing with it before him. His Q consists of the Judaic sayings peculiar to St. Matthew, together with some of the sayings which are found also in St. Luke. The common narrative portions he assigns to X; *i.e.* Harnack's Q=part of Allen's Q+X. It will be remembered that Harnack does not deny that some of the matter peculiar to St. Matthew may have stood in Q; he merely refrains from saying so in any definite case. And while Mr. Allen holds that the two Evangelists had very rarely a common written source, he admits that much of the common matter may go back to one source ultimately, reaching St. Luke at a later stage.

be believer in the reality of a common source, but Harnack makes a bold attempt to bring order out of this seeming chaos. In fact, an unobtrusive note on p. 125 tells us that it was the similar order of the sections in St. Matthew and St. Luke which conquered his own long-continued scepticism as to the existence of such a source as Q. The investigation is complicated (pp. 121 ff.), and it is impossible to do justice to it without elaborate tables. The result may be summed up as follows. St. Luke's first 13 sections are reproduced in St. Matthew in practically the same order though interspersed with sayings found later in St. Luke (=St. Matthew's Sermon on the Mount). The material in Mt 8-10 is found in nearly the same order in St. Luke, but it is scattered over a larger number of chapters. Generally speaking, the order of the important sections in Q is identical in both Gospels, the main exceptions being the message of the Baptist, and the division by St. Luke of Mt 23, 24. The other differences of order are usually confined to short logia or to passages which on other grounds may not belong to Q. Harnack takes the view that St. Matthew's order is more primitive, and that his 'conflations' had their basis in the source; he supposes that even in the Sermon the common matter stood together in Q, as we find it in St. Matthew, and that it was deliberately displaced by St. Luke. This, of course, is not the prevalent view, and in face of St. Matthew's disturbance of St. Mark's order in the first half of his gospel, it is doubtful. But, again, the main conclusion is unaffected. Whatever be the explanation of the differences, we can reconstruct the order of the common source in its outline. It commenced with the Baptism and Temptation, followed by a large number of discourses in a more or less probable, though, it is true, not a very significant, order, and concluded with final warnings and eschatological matter.

What, then, was the character of Q? It was mainly a collection of sayings of the Lord. It is true it included a small proportion of narratives, but their presence may be easily accounted for (p. 127, n. 2). The Baptism and Temptation define at the very beginning the person of Jesus and His Messianic character, which is henceforth assumed. Incidents such as John's message to Christ, the questions of the aspirants, the casting out of a devil, and the demand for a sign, are in each case

subordinate to the teaching of which they were the occasion. The healing of the centurion's servant has always been a difficulty to those who regard the source as *Logia* in the usual sense. Harnack suggests that the point was not the healing in itself, which, indeed, may not have been mentioned in Q, but the faith of the heathen and the lessons drawn from it (p. 146).

As we have seen, Q probably did not include a Passion narrative, the climax and, in a sense, the *raison d'être* of the Gospels as we have them¹; i.e. 'Q was not a Gospel at all as they were' (p. 120). It was rather a collection of sayings drawn up for catechetical purposes. Such a collection is *à priori* probable, both on account of Jewish ways of thought, and from the actual stress which early Christians laid on the 'words of the Lord' (pp. 127, 159). It had a method, but the principle of its arrangement was not chronological; e.g. the position of the Sermon is probably due to the desire for emphasis (p. 142). The style is not very distinctive, the vocabulary being of small compass and simple (see lists on pp. 103-115). In face of the marked features of the Synoptists' style, this does, in fact, give Q a certain distinctive character and unity. So with the contents, the main feature is simplicity. Its Christology is simple, 'Jesus' being the almost invariable title of Our Lord, and the teaching is informal and largely ethical. We find none of the 'tendencies' which are so characteristic of our Gospels: St. Mark's emphasis on the supernatural, and the Divine Sonship; St. Matthew's interest in the needs of the Church, and apologetic attitude towards Judaism; St. Luke's Hellenic wideness of outlook, presenting Christ as the Healer (p. 118). Its horizon is even more definitely Galilean than theirs. Harnack follows Schmiedel (and Loisy) in seeing in the often-quoted lament over Jerusalem a continuation of the quotation from the 'Wisdom of God.'²

¹ Harnack finds it necessary to insert a warning (p. 162, n.) against the 'folly' (*Unsin*) of those who would argue on this ground that the Passion never took place! We may add that the 'argument from silence' is always precarious; when it bases itself on a document which is hypothetical and fragmentary, it becomes ludicrous.

² The facts are these. In Mt 23³⁴ the lament over Jerusalem follows immediately on the saying about the blood of the prophets. In Lk 11⁴⁰ this is introduced by the words, 'Therefore the wisdom of God said' (? a quotation from an unknown source); the lament follows in a different context

The same simple and undeveloped attitude appears in Q's relation to Judaism. Palestinian features are prominent; the work of the Baptist is strongly emphasized. There is a clearly marked opposition to 'the evil and adulterous generation' of the day, but no anti-Judaic polemic or apologetic, or criticism of the law (p. 160).¹

Arguing from these marks of primitive simplicity, Harnack draws the important conclusion that Q is prior to St. Mark. St. Mark's few points of contact with Q are not enough to establish a direct connexion; he probably knew *some* collection of sayings, and a double tradition is in itself probable. Those who have maintained, as Wellhausen does, the priority of the second Gospel, have done so because they have ascribed to Q the secondary traits of St. Matthew and St. Luke (p. 136). The detailed examination of the second Gospel and Q, in which Harnack suggests that St. Mark is secondary throughout and marks a later stage, is perhaps not very convincing. Once more we try to disentangle the important point, which is the absence of any real contradiction between the two. The suggestion on p. 159 is worthy of note; Q could not have arisen after St. Mark had fixed the Gospel type, in which he was followed by all subsequent writers, canonical and uncanonical alike. 'Q stands midway between a formless collection of the sayings of Jesus, and the Gospels as fixed in writing.' We have, in fact, in Q and St. Mark the true 'double tradition,' to which St. Luke may perhaps refer in Ac 1.¹ 'Our knowledge of the preaching and life of Jesus depends on two sources, of nearly the same date, but independent, at least in their main features. Where they agree their evidence is strong, and they do agree in many and important points. Destructive critical inquiries . . . break themselves in vain against the rock of their united testimony' (p. 172).

It is evident, then, that the investigation is of the highest value from the point of view of the evidence on which our knowledge of Christ's teaching rests. One knows, indeed, that there is an unwise and a somewhat unfair readiness to quote admissions of a German critic on the orthodox side, apart from their context, and with the omission of qualifications which would be much less readily accepted. Harnack himself has protested against this procedure in his preface to *Lukas der Arzt*. It is then only right to say that his treatment of the Gospel story will not in all respects satisfy the conservative. We cannot help being conscious of the implied assumptions, that whatever has to do with 'a Church' is 'secondary,' and that whatever is 'Pauline' or developed is further from the truth than primitive first impressions. As Dr. Sanday has lately put it, 'he [Harnack] feels the prevalent *Geist des Verneinens* dragging at his skirts, and has yielded to it more than he ought.' What Mr. Allen has said on this subject is entirely to the point.¹ 'The historian . . . will shrink from the conclusion that . . . the teaching of Christ was *altogether* and *exclusively* what the editor of the first Gospel represents it to have been, to the exclusion of representations of it to be found in other parts of the New Testament. . . . That teaching was no doubt many-sided. Much of it may have been uttered in the form of paradox and symbol. The earliest tradition of it, at first oral and then written, was that of a local Church, that of Jerusalem, which drew from the treasure-house of Christ's sayings such utterances as seemed to bear most immediately upon the lives of its members, who were at first all Jews or proselytes. In this process of selection the teaching of Christ was only partially represented, because choice involved over-emphasis.

As we have had occasion to criticise the somewhat truncated version of the Lord's Prayer, which is all that Harnack allows to come from Q, *i.e.* to be original, it may be well to add that he makes no question that some such form was actually given by Christ. 'I doubt whether a prophet or teacher of the East ever gave injunctions to prayer, without also giving a pattern prayer' (p. 145).

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 320.

Paradox may sometimes have been interpreted as an expression of literal truth, symbol as reality, and to some extent, though not, I think, to any great extent, the sayings in process of transmission may have received accretions arising out of the necessities of the Palestinian Church life. Thus the representation of Christ's teaching in this Gospel, though early in date, suffers probably from being local in character. In the meantime, much of Christ's teaching remained uncommitted to writing; and not until St. Paul's teaching had made men see that Palestinian Christianity suffered in some respects from a too one-sided representation of Christ's teaching, did they go back to the utterances of Christ, and reinterpret them from a wider point of view; seeking out also other traditions of different aspects of His teaching which had been neglected by the Palestinian guardians of His words.' The remarks refer to the first Gospel, but they apply equally to any attempt to over-emphasize the value of Q to the exclusion of the later teaching of other parts of the New Testament.

Further, Harnack's conclusions as to the scope, use, and the very existence of Q are still admittedly in the region of hypothesis; by the nature of the case such inquiries can rarely rise above a high degree of probability. But one of the objects of this paper is to call attention to his results, as affecting the reliability of the Gospel story, and to suggest that they do not entirely depend on a particular view of Q and its use by our Evangelists, nor need they be rejected on account of a possible overestimate of its value as compared with other writings. We have already seen that his inquiry has made it clear that our varying versions of Christ's words do not show signs of any serious manipulation, whether on the part of our Evangelists or their predecessors. A further conclusion is that we can take the matter common to St. Matthew and St. Luke, call it Q, or what we like, and from it we can construct a picture of our Lord and His teaching, primitive and simple, essentially in harmony with that of St. Mark, and containing the germ of much that was to follow.

We have said that Q's Christology was simple, yet it is also profoundly significant. The person of Jesus holds throughout the central place in the picture. His Messiahship is emphasized in the opening paragraphs of the Baptism and Temptation, and is henceforth assumed. The absence of proof or attempted argument on this point shows 'that

this collection was exclusively intended for the Church, and had in mind those who needed no assurance that their teacher was also the Son of God' (p. 163). It included the title 'Son of Man,' and, above all, the antithesis between 'the Father' and 'the Son' in the famous passage Mt 11²⁵, Lk 10²¹. This passage is crucial, with regard both to our Lord's self-consciousness, and to the relations between the Synoptics and St. John; Harnack devotes a long appendix to it. He admits that the canonical wording is 'Johannine' (p. 210), but by a careful examination of MS. variations, and of the numerous patristic quotations of the passages, he restores what he regards as the original text, as it ran in Q, and probably also in St. Luke.

Ἐξομολο γούμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπιούσις ναί, ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως ἐγένετο εὐδοκία ἐμπροσθέν σου. πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα (οἱ τίς ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ) εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ (p. 206). Even so, the Logion is of the first importance critically; it implies that in our oldest source, Jesus spoke of Himself absolutely as 'the Son,' and regarded Himself as standing in a peculiar relation to His Father. 'It is indeed quite inconceivable how he could have arrived at the conviction that He was the future Messiah, without first being conscious of standing in a peculiar relation to God' (p. 209). We find, in fact, the same antithesis in Mk 13³² (10³² on p. 152 is an obvious misprint), and Harnack suggests that 1 Co 1¹⁰, 21 may rest on the passage before us. The continuation in St. Matthew ('Come unto me, etc.') stands on a different footing; it is not found in St. Luke, and the connexion with the context is not immediate. But here, again, Harnack pronounces strongly for its authenticity, mainly on internal evidence. 2 Co 10¹ may well be an echo of the saying, and the absence of any reference to death or the Cross shows that it must be prior to St. Mark and the development of Paulinism. It may belong to Q, or to some other source (this would explain its otherwise very strange omission by St. Luke); 'it cannot be shown that it belongs to a secondary tradition.' 'The only alternatives are to ascribe it to the later creation of a prophet of the Jewish Christian Church, who strangely disregarded the death upon the Cross, or to Jesus Himself. There seems to me no doubt which alternative we are to adopt' (p. 216).

Again, with regard to the 'Sermon on the Mount,' Harnack's investigations go to show that it is not a mere compilation. The setting, of course, is different in the two Gospels, but attention is drawn to the fact that both agree in mentioning the presence of the multitude, combined with the fact that the Sermon was addressed to the disciples (p. 122, n.). This points to a real tradition as to its occasion. It is true the Beatitudes speak of persecutions, and persecutions did, in fact, take place afterwards. But that does not prove that the saying was a product of a later age, coloured by the facts. Harnack has some cutting remarks on the folly of regarding everything as an 'anachronism' or artificial prophecy ('hysteron-proteron'), which does, in fact, fit the circumstances of a subsequent generation (p. 143). 'Looked at both in detail, and as a whole, that which is set before us in the Sermon on the Mount as the teaching of Jesus bears the stamp of unalloyed genuineness. We are astonished that in an age in which Paul was active, and burning questions of apologetic and the law were to the fore, the teaching of Jesus was so well remembered and remained so vital as Moral preaching' (p. 146).

Q, then, has given us the abiding picture of Jesus as revealed in His words. It takes our tradition a stage further back, who shall say how near to the actual occasion on which those words were spoken? It obviously arose in Palestine (p. 172)—on the actual scene of the ministry. And Harnack himself concludes, from the well-known words of Papias, that it was in all probability the work of St. Matthew (p. 172)—an eye-witness and a listener. Allowing for a somewhat different view of the Logia, Harnack

would probably endorse the words of Mr. Allen: 'They are perhaps the earliest of all our sources of knowledge for the life of Christ, and rest even more directly than does the second Gospel on Apostolic testimony.' For the Apostle Matthew seems to have written down, for the use of his Palestinian fellow-Christians, some of the sayings of Christ that he could remember, selecting, no doubt, such as would appeal most strongly to his readers and satisfy their needs. Better security that these sayings were uttered by Christ Himself we could hardly desire.'¹

We may add, in conclusion, two similar pronouncements put side by side by Dr. Sanday in his *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 172. The first is a quotation from Sir W. Ramsay. 'The lost common source of Luke and Matthew (*i.e.* Q) . . . was written while Christ was still living. It gives us the view which one of His disciples entertained of Him and His teaching during His lifetime, and may be regarded as authoritative for the view of the disciples generally.' The second is from Dr. Salmon's *Human Elements in the Gospels*, p. 274. 'The more I study the Gospels the more convinced I am that we have in them contemporaneous history; that is to say, that we have in them the stories told of Jesus immediately after His death, and which had been circulated, and, as I am disposed to believe, put in writing while he was yet alive.' These views of the date of Q may indeed be, as Dr. Sanday thinks, somewhat optimistic, but the consensus of opinion as to its value is of good omen to those who are trying to combine the old faith with the new critical methods.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 317.

Literature.

THE CAMBRIDGE MODERN HISTORY.

THE CAMBRIDGE MODERN HISTORY. Vol. v.
The Age of Louis XIV. (Cambridge University Press. 16s. net.)

THE editors of the Cambridge Modern History feel compelled to make an apology for the title of the new volume. For the Age of Louis XIV. 'cannot be held to possess the organic unity which belongs to the theme of our Napoleon volume.'

But it is not a title of their own invention, and it has its advantages. The age of Louis XIV. is the age of absolute government, and Louis himself is the most conspicuous figure in it. And this encourages us to say that the Preface to these volumes should never be missed. It sometimes contains as good reading as anything in the volume. And it always binds the volume together, a most necessary service where so many