

not as the acorn holds the oak, but as a box holds properties, ready for use whenever it pleases the Pope to order the lid to be removed.

We come to the last and worst feature of the Encyclical. It is the suspicion with which its authors regard the laity of the Church. Nothing is more ominous than this. Nothing is more indicative to Professor Swete of coming disaster. The Pope speaks of 'that most pernicious doctrine which would make of the laity the factor of progress

in the Church.' Beyond all other things he dreads and detests what he calls 'laicism.' Professor Swete believes that, in England at least, the educated laity may prove to be the factor of progress in the Church. If they seem to move too rapidly, the clergy will always be there to guide, to check, and, if necessary, to restrain. But, in any case, the laity mean to make themselves heard in the future, and Professor Swete believes that henceforth any attempt to impose doctrine from above will fail.

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

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

PROFESSOR HARNACK'S remarkable vindication of the Lukan authorship of the Third Gospel and the Acts has been followed by a further volume, in which he examines the second source common to St. Matthew and St. Luke.¹ The first source is, of course, the Gospel of St. Mark, in whatever form it may have been used by the two later Evangelists. Of this Harnack has nothing to say here; he confines his attention strictly to the matter common to the other two Gospels alone. His purpose is by a careful comparison of the two versions, as given in St. Matthew and St. Luke, to obtain a hypothetical reconstruction of 'Q,' the common source which it is generally agreed must *in some form and in some sense* lie behind both.

He renews the protest which we find in *Lukas der Arzt* against flashy *à priori* theorizing, and asks for more 'spade-work,' a detailed examination of the actual data. 'What happens in many other of the main questions of gospel criticism, happens here; critics launch out into sublime questions as to the meaning of the "Kingdom of God," as to the "Son of Man," "Messiahship," etc., or into inquiries of "religious history," and questions of authenticity decided on "higher" considerations . . . but they avoid the "lower" problems, which involve spade-work and trouble-

some research (bei deren Behandlung Kärnerarbeit zu leisten und Staub zu schlucken ist)' (p. 3). He acknowledges the complications of the problem, the probability of an early harmonizing of the text of the two Gospels, the doubts whether Q was used by both in the same form, or whether one or the other may not have gone back at times to an Aramaic original, and the difficulty of deciding on the scope of Q. But the right method puts these questions aside for the moment and 'must first confine itself exclusively and strictly to the parts common to Matthew and Luke as against Mark, must examine these from the point of view of grammar, style, and literary history, and starting from this firm basis see how far we can go.' Not till such an inquiry has failed, need the problem be given up as hopeless (p. 2).

The common sections which are the material of the study, comprise about one-sixth of the third Gospel, and two-elevenths of the first. Harnack divides them into three groups: (1) Numerous passages where the resemblance is often almost verbal; these are treated of first, and must form the basis of any theory or reconstruction of Q. (2) Cases where the divergence is so great that it becomes very doubtful whether there was any common source at all; they include only Mt 21³² and Lk 7^{29, 30}, and the parables of

¹ *Sprüche und Reden Jesu* (Leipzig, 1907).

the Great Feast, and of the Pounds (or Talents), and are dealt with separately in an appendix. (3) The numerous and important sections where striking resemblances are combined with no less striking differences. The student does not need to be reminded that these form the real crux of the problem.

We note that Harnack starts from the *resemblances*; this fact is important as explaining his conclusions. It is perhaps true to say that Mr. Allen in his *Commentary on St. Matthew* is more impressed with the *divergencies*, and therefore, as we should expect, reaches a correspondingly different solution of the problem. We shall have something to say later on of the relation between the two views.

Harnack's critical method will be best shown by an example of its actual working:

<i>Text of Mt.</i>	<i>Variations in Lk.</i>
Mt 13 ¹⁶ . ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, ὅτι βλέπουσιν, καὶ τὰ ὦτα [ὑμῶν] ὅτι ἀκούουσιν. (17) ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν· καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.	Lk 10 ^{23, 24} . ὑμῶν δὲ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε καὶ τὰ bis ἀκούουσιν om. ἀμὴν om. λέγω γὰρ [καὶ βασιλεῖς] for καὶ δίκαιοι ἠθέλησαν ὑμεῖς βλέπετε [καὶ ἀκ. bis ἤκουσαν om.]

'At the beginning Luke inserts an improvement of the style, and a pedantic explanation of the meaning. Blass has rightly struck out from Luke the last seven words of Matthew, following several MS. "Hearing" is not found in v.¹⁶, and if the last clause of v.¹⁷ were Lukan it must have run ὑμεῖς ἀκούετε (cf. the Lukan text immediately before). Probably Luke did not care to say that the prophets had not heard it; they only had not *seen* it. Luke's insertion of the ὑμεῖς is striking, as he usually omits Q's pleonastic personal pronouns. In this case he had at the beginning omitted the ὑμῶν, and where he inserts it, the ὑμεῖς is not pleonastic. ἀμὴν may belong to the source, but may also have been inserted by Matthew. καὶ βασιλεῖς must be retained in Luke in spite of the indecisive attestation, since its later insertion is not easily explained, while the omission is easy to understand. But if it stood in Luke, it also stood in Q, and δίκαιοι in Mt. is a correction by Matthew, who had a special fondness for δικαιοσύνη. ἠθέλησαν for ἐπεθύμησαν is an obvious improvement in style (ἐπιθυμεῖν only occurs once elsewhere in Mt.).

In Q the saying will have run just as in Mt., except for the δίκαιοι (and perhaps the ἀμὴν). We notice also the parallelism in Mt.' (p. 22).

The extract has been chosen more or less at random, simply as a fair illustration of the principles adopted in the investigation.

1. As regards *text*, Harnack does not deal directly with questions of textual criticism. He takes the view that Blass and Wellhausen have overestimated the value of D, and of unsupported variants in general, as well as the influence of the Lukan text on Matthew. He prefers Westcott and Hort (p. 5). At the same time we find him abandoning that text in several startling instances, and, as in the case before us, preferring the 'western' text (the evidence for the omission of the final clause of Lk 10²⁴ is three old Latin MSS). Similarly, he omits the close of Lk 11⁴², as interpolated from Mt 23²³, the third (or second) Beatitude from Mt 5⁵, and not merely the third, but also the first two petitions from the Lukan version of the Lord's Prayer, in favour of the petition for the Holy Ghost found in Tertullian, Gregory of Nyssa, and Cod. Ev. 604. We may admit that the text of the Gospels is not yet finally settled, and with Mr. Allen we may be 'inclined to believe that the second century readings, attested by the ecclesiastical writers of that century, and by the Syriac and Latin versions, are often deserving of preference.'¹ At the same time, in the present state of knowledge, one feels a little uncomfortable at conclusions founded on readings which have been adopted by but few, if any, of the acknowledged leaders of textual criticism.

2. It will have been noticed that in the example cited, nothing is said of the *difference of context* in which the words occur, in Mt. in the explanation of teaching by parables, in Lk. after the return of the Seventy. In the same way the section on the aspirants to discipleship (Mt 8¹⁹, Lk 9⁵⁷; p. 12) contains no hint of the fact that St. Luke mentions a third aspirant; and the two versions of the 'Lost Sheep' (p. 65) are discussed without the least reference to St. Luke's closely connected Parable of the Lost Coin. As we have seen, Harnack's method is to isolate the parallel sections in the two Gospels, but it is at least questionable whether divergencies such as these are not too essential to be ignored.

¹ *Op. cit.* p. lxxxvii.

3. We proceed to the explanation of *differences in language*. St. Luke's variants in the passage before us are explained by considerations of style; St. Matthew's by the influence of certain dominating-ideas. This is, in fact, the general conclusion arrived at.

(a) *Changes in St. Matthew*. According to the summary on p. 28, there are thirty-four cases in the first group of passages in which Mt. may reasonably be supposed to have altered the text of Q; thirteen of these are in the introductions to the sections; fifteen betray his dominating ideas, e.g. 'Heavenly Father,' 'Heaven' for 'God,' etc. These peculiarities are found in all parts of his Gospel, and are therefore presumably not derived from Q. Of a similar character is his fondness for the conception 'righteousness,' as in 6³⁸ and our illustrative passage (13¹⁷). More significant are the additions of *πρῶτον* in 6³³ (limiting and explaining a hard saying), and of 'this is the law, etc.,' to the Golden Rule in 7¹² (emphasizing the editor's respect for the Jewish law), and the expansion of the Jonah passage in 12⁴⁰ (interest in O.T. type and prophecy).

Similar results come from the examination of the second group, where his alterations are about fifty (p. 76). They include the emphasis on 'Heaven' and 'Father' (particularly in 10³², where 'Heavenly Father' takes the place of 'the angels'), and on 'righteousness' (5^{6, 45} 23^{20, 35}; cf. *τέλειος*, 5⁴⁸); favourite expressions such as the closing formulas in 8^{12, 13}, *ἴπαγε* in 4¹⁰ 8¹³ 18¹⁵, *μῶρος* and *φρόνιμος* in 7^{24, 26}; besides more trivial variations in particles, etc. His interest in the O.T. is illustrated by the continuation of the quotation in 4⁴; his Palestinian and Judaic standpoint by the mention of Jerusalem as 'the Holy City' in 4⁵, by the 'Pharisees and Lawyers' (or Sadducees) of 3⁷ 23^{23, 29}, by the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer, and by the addition in 23²³ [see above for the questionable treatment of the text in these two cases]. Hard sayings are softened in 5³² ('except for fornication'), and in 5³ ('poor in spirit'); the strange and unrecognized reference to the 'Wisdom of God' is omitted in 23^{34, 1}

(b) *Changes in St. Luke*. In both groups these

are more numerous, 150 in the first, '8 to 10 times more numerous than Matthew's' in the second. They are nearly all due to considerations of style. These are grouped under nineteen heads (pp. 31 and 78); the list is too long to quote *in extenso*; we may instance (1) the use of literary and favourite expressions such as *κλαίειν* (6²¹ 7³²; 11 times in the third Gospel, twice in the first, once in a quotation from LXX), *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* (16¹⁶), *χάρις* (6^{32, 33}; 25 times in third Gospel and Acts, never in Mt. or Mk.), *ὑποστρέφειν* (4¹; 22 times in third Gospel, 11 times in Acts, never in Mt. or Mk.); (2) constructions such as the genitive absolute, or *ἦν* with the participle; (3) improvements in order and in the connexion of sentences. Indeed, the characteristics of Luke's style are so well known that it is unnecessary to dwell on them here; it is enough to note that they are self-evident in his treatment of the Q passages. More important variations are the 'egg and scorpion' in 11¹² (cf. Mt 7⁹), the rewriting of the obscure Mt 11¹² in 16¹⁶, and the additions in 9⁶⁰ and 12⁴¹ (cf. Mt 8²² 24⁴³). A new version is given of the Parable of the Two Builders (6⁴⁶); the disciples are to heal as well as to preach (9²; cf. Mt 10⁷); in 11⁴² 'love of God' is substituted for 'mercy,' in 11⁴⁹ 'apostles' for 'wise men and scribes,' in 11⁵² 'knowledge' for 'the kingdom' (cf. Mt 23^{23, 34, 14}). The idea of repentance is added to the Parable of the Lost Sheep (15⁷), and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is emphasized in 4¹ 11¹³, and the Lord's Prayer [?].²

What, then, do these alterations show us as to the method which the Evangelists have followed in using their sources? Have they made it appreciably harder for us to reconstruct the *ipsissima verba* of Christ? Harnack's answer is important. 'We may say that Matthew has treated the sayings [of Christ] with great respect, and in a very conservative spirit' (p. 30). 'Special

4]. The editor might have put a prophecy into Christ's mouth, but not a pure anachronism; he could not intend the words 'whom ye slew' to refer to an event which happened in 67 or 68 A.D. On the other side, see Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 343.

² In a certain number of cases we must allow for the influence of *St. Mark*, where he had matter parallel to Q. It appears in St. Matthew in 4¹¹ ('angels came and ministered to Him'); in St. Luke more frequently. It influenced his version of the Temptation in the '40 days tempted,' and the omission of 'and nights'; 14³⁴ ('salt') is nearer to Mk 9⁶⁰ than Mt 5¹³, and 16¹⁸ ('divorce') rests on Mk 10¹¹ as much as on Mt 5³² (Q). See pp. 35, 41, 43.

¹ On the 'Son of Barachiah' in 23³⁵, see pp. 73, 78 n. 1. If genuine in the text of Mt. it is probably an addition of the editor, and did not stand in Q. Harnack does not discuss the origin or explanation of the supposed mistake, but he rejects unhesitatingly the view which sees a reference to the 'Son of Baruch' mentioned by Josephus [*B.J.* iv. v.

tendencies have had no stronger influence over Luke's version than over Matthew's; rather the reverse. He has corrected the text unflinchingly in matters of style, which Matthew has apparently almost entirely avoided doing. But although these stylistic corrections are so numerous, we cannot say that he has entirely obliterated the special features of the original before him. We must rather give him credit for having carried out his revision in a conservative spirit, and for having allowed his readers to obtain an impression of the character of the sayings of Jesus. . . . Almost everywhere we may notice that short and pregnant sayings of the Lord are corrected the least; longer speeches have suffered more; the encroachments reach their height in the narrative portions' (p. 80).

The investigation then proves altogether favourable as establishing the reliability of the Evangelists, *i.e.* the editors of the Gospels as we have them. The question at present is not 'what is the value of their sources?' but 'how have they treated those sources?' Have they manipulated them in such a way as to leave us several degrees further removed from historical fact? Even taking a text, as Harnack practically does, from which all possible traces of harmonizing have been relentlessly

expunged, and assuming for the moment that all variations are due to the Evangelists, and not to their sources, or to the actual repetition of similar sayings on different occasions, it appears that both have treated their source with a high degree of fidelity. The majority of their assumed alterations are unimportant, being, in fact, little more than verbal; very seldom do they allow themselves to tamper with the sense. With regard to the first group of passages in particular, it is not too much to say that, roughly speaking, the text in St. Matthew and in St. Luke is identical (p. 32).

The important point is that this conclusion is valid, apart from any theory of the nature of Q, or of the form in which the material came to the final editors. The variations which have so far been attributed to them may, in fact, go further back, as Harnack admits in some cases. They may be supposed to have arisen in the course of oral tradition, in different versions of an original Aramaic collection, or in a hundred other ways. That will not affect the conclusion that as a whole *the variations themselves are unimportant*, and easily explained; we can go behind them with a high degree of probability and reach a stage perhaps very near to the original.

(To be concluded.)

The Triad of Stars.

By E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S., SUPERINTENDENT OF THE SOLAR DEPARTMENT IN THE ROYAL OBSERVATORY, GREENWICH.

THREE astronomical symbols are found on a great number of the sculptures discovered in Assyria and Babylonia. They are represented in connexion with the worship of the gods; they are carved over the heads of the figures of the kings; and they occupy the crown of the little sculptured pillars which record the transfer of landed property. A visit to the Babylonian Room, and the Assyrian Galleries of the British Museum, will bring quite a number of examples under the notice of the student; and some of these are reproduced in the illustrations to the Official Guide to the Babylonian and Assyrian Antiquities. Thus plate xxii. gives a reproduction of a tablet

'sculptured with a scene representing the worship of the Sun-god in the Temple of

Sippar, and inscribed with a record of the restoration of the temple by Nabu-pal-idinna, king of Babylonia, about B.C. 870. In the upper part of the tablet the Sun-god is seen, seated within a shrine upon a throne, the sides of which are sculptured with figures of mythical beings in relief.'

Above the head of the Sun-god, and under the roof of the shrine, are the three astronomical symbols referred to—the Triad of Stars,—and an inscription gives the commentary, as rendered by Colonel Conder:

'The Moon-god, the Sun-god, and Ištar, dwellers in the abyss, announce to the years what they are to expect.'