

**NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES,
II. THE SAYINGS OF JESUS;
THE SECOND SOURCE OF
ST. MATTHEW AND ST. LUKE**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649746439

New Testament Studies, II. The Sayings of Jesus; The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke
by Adolf Harnack & J. R. Wilkinson

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

ADOLF HARNACK & J. R. WILKINSON

**NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES,
II. THE SAYINGS OF JESUS;
THE SECOND SOURCE OF
ST. MATTHEW AND ST. LUKE**

CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

HARNACK'S THE SAYINGS OF JESUS

New Testament Studies

II

THE SAYINGS OF JESUS

THE SECOND SOURCE OF ST. MATTHEW
AND ST. LUKE

BY

ADOLF HARNACK

PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. J. R. WILKINSON, M.A.

LATE SCHOLAR OF WORCESTER COLLEGE,
OXFORD; RECTOR OF WINFORD



NEW YORK: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
LONDON: WILLIAMS & NORGATE

1908

PREFACE

IN the following pages an attempt is made to determine exactly the second source of St. Matthew and St. Luke (Q) both in regard to its extent and its contents, and to estimate its value both in itself and relatively to the Gospel of St. Mark. I have been moved to complete and to publish these investigations by Wellhausen's "Introduction to the First Three Gospels" (1905). The attitude of opposition I am driven to adopt towards an important result of Wellhausen's researches, does not detract from my high appreciation of the merit of this work.

A supplementary observation which I have made may serve as an additional proof of the unity of the source Q. In St. Matthew are found about 112 words, and in St. Luke (without the Acts) about 261, which occur in these gospels and do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. Now of these 373 words, the reconstructed text of Q given on pp. 127 ff. contains at the most 16—*i.e.* 13 (12) from St. Matthew (*βιαστής, βροχή, διχάζειν [ἐγκρύπτειν], εὐνοεῖν, ἰῶτα, νοσσίον, οἰκετεία, οἰκιακός, παρομοιάζειν, παροψίς, πλατύς, ραπίζειν*), and 3 from St. Luke (*ἀπομάσσεσθαι, βαλλάντιον, κόραξ*); yet it is questionable whether three of these really belong to Q. That it is thus possible to construct the fairly extensive text of Q without making a further demand than of 12 to 16 words upon

the copious and distinctive vocabularies of St. Matthew and St. Luke, is a welcome additional proof of the distinct individuality of Q. On the other hand, the variety of the stylistic, rhetorical, and poetic forms in which the discourses and sayings in Q are thus seen to be cast, is no argument against its distinctive unity, but even serves to confirm our confidence in the individuality as well as in the genuineness and originality of this source.

If in the following investigation I have correctly defined the limits and have justly estimated the value of Q, I have only given fresh utterance to the long-established judgment of competent scholars, though it is to be hoped that I have established it upon a more secure foundation than that upon which it has rested hitherto. No words of mine are needed to explain what this means for our knowledge of the history of our Lord. And yet one can scarcely hope that there will be an end of wild hypotheses in regard to that history. The temptation to confine one's gaze to isolated details, and to view these as reflected in the distorting mirror of prepossession and prejudice, without deep and reverent study of tradition, is too great for us to expect that these strivings will ever cease.

I offer my hearty thanks to my friend Professor von Dobschütz for the active and kindly interest which he has devoted to this undertaking of mine while it was passing through the press.

A. H.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	PAGE ix
------------------------	------------

CHAPTER I

THE ANALYSIS AND TEXTUAL INVESTIGATION OF THE NON-MARKAN SECTIONS COMMON TO ST. MATTHEW AND ST. LUKE

I. The sections almost verbally identical	1
II. The sections where the differences are greater	40
Appendix. The sections where the differences are very great.	118

CHAPTER II

LINGUISTIC AND HISTORICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE NON-MARKAN SECTIONS COMMON TO ST. MATTHEW AND ST. LUKE (Q)

I. The text	127
II. (a) Vocabulary (Verbs p. 147 <i>f.</i> ; Substantives and Adjectives, 152 <i>f.</i> ; Prepositions, 157 <i>f.</i>)	147
(b) Grammar and style	159
III. The formal characteristics of the subject-matter	163
IV. The order of the sections	172
V. Can we discover any trace of Q in the matter that is peculiar to St. Matthew or to St. Luke, or in indirect Evangelic tradition?	182

	PAGE
VI. The essential characteristics of the contents of Q. A comparison of Q with the Gospel of St. Mark	193
VII. The origin and historical value of Q	246
Appendix. Translation of Q	253
EXCURSUS I. St. Matt. xi. 25-27 (St. Luke x. 21, 22) and St. Matt. xi. 28, 29	272
EXCURSUS II. The Voice from Heaven at the Baptism (St. Luke iii. 22)	310
INDEX TO THE RECONSTRUCTED TEXT OF Q	315

INTRODUCTION

THE sections which are common to St. Matthew and St. Luke, excluding those which they share with St. Mark, are, as is well known, very considerable both in number and content. They amount altogether to about one-sixth of the text of St. Luke and two-elevenths of the text of St. Matthew.¹ The researches of very many scholars have led them to the unanimous conclusion that neither St. Matthew nor St. Luke have copied the one from the other, and that these sections are thus dependent upon either one or several common sources. The former alternative is generally preferred, and rightly so; and yet one does not thereby conceal from oneself the possibility that it may well have been otherwise, and that in regard to many points of detail and many passages there is still room for the hypothesis of several written sources and even of dependence upon oral tradition. In this connection a great number of other questions arise which cannot be passed by. The most important are the following:—

1. Is it not possible that after the publication of the

¹ Here of course difficulties begin at once. It is not always a simple matter to determine the limits of these sections; different opinions may be held as to the origin of the doublets which are found both in St. Matthew and St. Luke; and in regard to a few important sections, it must remain doubtful whether they are not mutually dependent upon a much earlier source, which is thus not identical with the main source.