



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

theory of the author as to its sources. The oral hypothesis as here presented is a very different thing from that which Gieseler put forth, and Westcott and Archbishop Thomson advocated a generation or so ago. Instead of one body of oral tradition from which all the synoptists alike drew, Wright enumerates for Luke six distinct sources (Mark—not the gospel, but the teaching out of which it grew—Matthew's Logia, the Pauline source, the infancy narrative, miscellaneous anonymous contributions, editorial notes), to each of which he ascribes a fixity only less than that of a document. Alike the modifications of the view in the direction of the documentary hypothesis and the conciliatory, reasonable mode of defense adopted by Mr. Wright incline us to agree with him. Yet we confess to some lingering doubts still. That no documentary hypothesis has yet explained all the facts satisfactorily must be admitted. That Mr. Wright has shown that his hypothesis will account for some things which are stumbling-blocks in the way of the documentary hypothesis is equally true. But his theory drives him also to some strangely improbable suggestions (as, for example, in his discussion of the temptation, p. xxii, and of the woes against the Pharisees, p. xxiii), and others of them seem nearly as suitable to a documentary theory as to his own hypothesis. And is not Mr. Wright a little prone to believe that scholarship has established the things he would have established? Does he not speak too confidently of the abandonment of the "Urmatthäus," and of the general recognition of the Lukan authorship of the gospel and Acts?

But whether we accept or reject Professor Wright's theory, we cannot be other than grateful for so admirable an instrument for the study of Luke's gospel, and for the many acute suggestions respecting the relation of it to the other gospels. We hope his volume is to be followed by a similar one for Matthew.

ERNEST D. BURTON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE SYNOPTISCHE FRAGE. Von PAUL WERNLE, Privatdocent an der Universität Basel. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1899. Pp. xii + 256. M. 4.50.

WERNLE's theory of the interrelation of the synoptical gospels is in substance that which has been advocated by Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, and Weiss, and which now has wide currency in the ranks of New Testament critics. A part of the representation of Weiss respecting the source styled the "Logia" he regards as properly subject to

correction. From Holtzmann and Weizsäcker he differs in discrediting the supposition of an original gospel of Mark back of our second gospel, and also in rejecting the notion of an Ebionite working over of the "Logia" before it passed under the review of Matthew and Luke.

Beginning with the third gospel, Wernle notices that it is confessedly based on written sources; and he proceeds to indicate the evidences that among these sources the gospel of Mark held a prominent place, especially as regards the element of narrative. Luke, as he observes, has three great passages, 3:1—6:19; 8:4—9:50, and 18:15—24:10, comprising in all about eleven chapters, the contents of which are derived almost entirely from Mark. While he omits a dozen items recorded by the earlier evangelist, he does not pass them by because they had no place in the document before him, but rather for the sake of avoiding repetitions, or on account of the small significance of the items in question for his readers. Rarely is it necessary to suppose a dogmatic ground for an omission. As for the matter of his narratives, and also for their order, Luke shows himself beholden to Mark. In connection with most of the seven instances in which he deviates from the order followed by his brother-evangelist plausible reasons can be offered for the variation. Though taking largely from Mark, Luke was no servile copyist. He studied his materials from beginning to end before embarking upon the task of composition, and used them as a painstaking historian who did not regard himself as debarred from a margin of editorial discretion. In relation to reported words of Christ, he was careful to retain their meaning; with the narrative portions in his documents he dealt somewhat freely. In general he used very considerable liberty in matters of vocabulary. He might be said to have reproduced Mark in a new Greek dress. The supposition that the parallelisms between the two gospels can be explained by making Mark indebted to Luke is unworthy of serious attention. Important narratives in Luke could not have been so completely ignored by a writer conversant with them as they have been by the author of the second gospel.

If we compare Luke with Matthew, we find that both take up the larger part of the narratives of Mark, and have besides some narratives not contained in Mark. The number of this latter class of narratives, however, is small in comparison with additions to Mark that are special either to Matthew or to Luke. While the two evangelists agree in going back of Mark's history and introducing an account of the birth and infancy of Christ, they are far from putting an identical

content into these introductory portions. It is to be noticed also that they differ in respect of the order in which they reproduce the matter which they have in common with Mark. Moreover, they give in verbal respects a different rendering of this matter, such as is well explained on the supposition that each, independently of the other, worked over the text of Mark. Specially noticeable variations from Mark's dialect do not appear to have passed over from the one to the other. Putting these considerations together, we are compelled to conclude that Matthew and Luke both drew from Mark's narratives, but that neither of the two could have been conversant with the gospel of the other.

Beyond the copartnership of Matthew and Luke with Mark, they have points of contact in reports of sayings or discourses of Christ which both incorporate. At some points these reports approach very closely to verbal identity; at others they diverge considerably. In individual instances a fair explanation of the existing combination of correspondence and difference might be found in the supposition that one of the two gospels supplies the original text, and that the other exhibits the same with more or less modification. But, if the whole body of these resembling discourses is brought under consideration, the only truly satisfactory conclusion is that the two evangelists took the discourses from a source no longer extant, from a collection of the sayings of Christ to which they had access independently. Aside from the combination of this source with Mark, Luke employed various supplementary sources of which no account can be given. The same may also be said of Matthew.

A trace of the compendium of sayings or discourses common to Matthew and Luke has been supposed to be contained in this sentence of Papias: "Matthew composed τὰ λόγια in the Hebrew tongue, and everyone translated it as he was able" (*Eusebius*, III, 29). Wernle notices that the authority of the Septuagint, of the New Testament, and of early patristic literature can be cited for taking τὰ λόγια in the sense of sayings or discourses. A certain support is thus given to the supposition that Papias could not have referred to the complete gospel of Matthew, including, as it does, a very considerable proportion of narrative, but rather to a collection of sayings, the composition of which was antecedent to the gospel of Matthew as known to us. We are warned, however, not to make too much of this consideration, since we find that Papias himself, in referring to Mark's gospel, seems to have included the record both of the words and the deeds of Christ

under the phrase *κυριακὸν λόγῳι*. His language, therefore, is no sure token that in referring to Matthew's "Logia" he may not have intended to designate the complete gospel bearing the name of Matthew. In that event it must be said that he was mistaken in supposing it to have been written primarily in Hebrew. Our Matthew gives no sign of being a translation. On the contrary, its linguistic characteristics may be said distinctly to exclude the supposition that it was written in any other than the Greek tongue.

The composite character of Matthew's gospel, which has been indicated by the comparison of it with the second and third gospels, is revealed still further in certain special characteristics. Among these is the proportion of doublets, or apparent instances of repetition of a given saying of Christ. Something of this sort might appear in an uncompounded writing; but when in Matthew we find twelve instances of doublets, as against nine in the composite gospel of Luke, we naturally conclude that this feature is largely due to the fact that a plurality of sources was employed in the composition of Matthew. Most of the instances of repetition are explained as resulting from the combination of Mark with the Logia. The composite character of Matthew is also evinced by the union of Jewish particularism with what might be termed an anti-Jewish universalism. No other gospel has so much of the former element, so much that reflects a distinctively Jewish consciousness; and yet, none goes farther in expression of the latter element. The union of these contrasted features in the same writing is most reasonably explained on the supposition that the one feature was due to one or more of the sources employed, and the other to the standpoint of the writer.

In using Mark's gospel the author of the first gospel proceeded in some instances more conservatively than did Luke. The difference, however, in this respect is not very wide. Both used the earlier narrative of Christ's life with a freedom which implies that, while they attached to it a high value, they did not regard it as a strictly authoritative rendering of the Christian tradition. Matthew's reproduction of the Logia very likely comes nearer to the original text than does Luke's, but the latter offers a compensation in the more probable association with historical situations which he gives to the Logia. As respects the relative age of the two gospels, adequate means of determination are wanting.

In relation to Mark's gospel, our author finds no fault with the ancient tradition which associates the evangelist with Peter. Even if

we were destitute of the report of Papias, the character of the gospel would lead us to conclude that it was based on the testimony of one of the Twelve, and that Peter most likely was the apostolic witness in question.

It was but a short time since that Theodor Zahn, in his *Einleitung*, made a stalwart attempt to support the traditional theory of the priority of Matthew's gospel to all others. Wernle's book presents with great clearness and cogency the grounds for the opposing theory. It is our opinion that the majority of New Testament critics will agree that the balance of evidence is on the side of Wernle.

HENRY C. SHELDON.

BOSTON, MASS.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE BOOKS. A Work of Collaboration by HERBERT L. WILLETT and JAMES M. CAMPBELL. Chicago, New York, and Toronto: The Fleming H. Revell Co., 1899. Pp. 337. \$1.25.

THIS is a popular manual, "prepared especially for advanced Bible-class work." It takes up the books of the New Testament in succession, and aims to state succinctly their sources, authorship, environment, characteristics, arrangement, and teachings. It gives evidence of painstaking, and contains material which will be useful for the Bible-class teacher; but it is, of course, not a book to be criticised from the point of view of higher New Testament scholarship. Like all such manuals it is, from the very nature of the case, compelled to deal in broad, general statements and summary conclusions on points which are still hotly contested. This is not done in a dogmatic or offensive manner. The authors recognize differences of opinion among critics and state them frankly. Whether they always recognize *all* the differences, and always allow them their due weight, is another question. The general drift of the book is toward conservative conclusions. It is said that the Johannine authorship of the fourth gospel "may be safely assumed." The residence of John in Ephesus is also assumed, and no hint is given of any difference of opinion on that point. Concerning the pastoral epistles it is said that "the weight of probability lies on the side of their Pauline authorship." Then it is added that "it is not improbable that in their present form they are the work of a later hand, based, however, upon Pauline writings of the latest period." Can this be called Pauline authorship? Their "present form" is the point which particularly concerns us. The second