The proofreading is good, but in this kind of work slips are inevitable. In the second edition, for which we hope, the following corrections should be made: p. x, 2d column, l. 2, read "versio" for "version"; l. 3, read "massoreticus" for "nasoreticus"; l. 11, read "Winckler" for "Winkler"; l. 17, read "Inscriptionum" for "Inscriptionem"; p. 10, note 31, read "Blayney" for "Blaynay"; p. 51, middle, dele bracket before "Nestle"; p. 291, l. 8 (from bottom), read "Kadesh-barnea" for "Kadesh-Carma"; p. 421, l. 2 (from bottom), read "durchdrang" for "durchrang"; p. 524, note 2, read "und" for "nud"; p. 423, l. 9 (from bottom), read *ουρανου* for *ουρανσυ*.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

OXFORD STUDIES IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

The members of Professor Sanday's seminar in the Synoptic problem have united in a volume of essays dealing with various aspects of the problem.[1] These papers are the outcome of the labors and discussions of the seminar, and give interesting evidence of the method, range, and freedom of its work under the kindly inspiration of Professor Sanday's leadership. The reviewer's task is at once embarrassed and facilitated by the fact that in the introduction (pp. vii–xxvii) Dr. Sanday has himself reviewed the book, discussing each essay with a delightful combination of courtesy and candor. Here, even more perhaps than in his own essay, Professor Sanday reveals some of his conclusions about synoptic matters; he is pleased that Sir John Hawkins urges the connection of Q with the Logia of Papias; he doubts whether Mark was ever issued without 6:45—8:26 and chap. 13. Streeter's contention that Mark knew Q Sanday concedes, but with such qualifications that it becomes a very shadowy acquaintance, hardly to be distinguished from independent tradition of the same facts or sayings. Dr. Sanday's references to the two-document hypothesis are altogether favorable, without, however, committing him or his essayists as a group to that popular position. Each paper is preceded by a very convenient summary of its main contents.

In his own essay Dr. Sanday advances the interesting suggestion that as Matthew, Luke, and Acts are in length just about the maximum size of a papyrus roll convenient for use, considerations of space may have

[1] *Studies in the Synoptic Problem.* By Members of the University of Oxford (W. Sanday, Sir John Hawkins, B. H. Streeter, W. C. Allen, J. V. Bartlet, W. E. Addis, N. P. Williams). Edited by W. Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. xxvii+456 pages. 12*s*. 6*d*.

influenced the first and third evangelists in some of their omissions. There is less to be said for his major contention that the resemblances of Matthew and Luke against Mark in Marcan material are to be explained by their use of an improved recension of Mark differing somewhat from our rather more original form of that gospel. This would require an early re-editing of Mark to provide the improved recension in time for use by Matthew, and the currency of this recension, as Dr. Sanday admits, in the widely different circles in which Matthew and Luke originated, while its failure to leave any trace on the form in which Mark itself was handed down is a further difficulty. On the other hand, a great many of the resemblances which this theory seeks to explain are easily explicable as natural coincidences in rewriting an abrupt narrative, and the remainder as ancient corruptions due to harmonistic assimilation, a force which must have been very freely operative in the second century, especially between the putting-forth of the fourfold gospel, and the founding of the Catholic Church.

Hawkins develops the significant fact of the disuse of Mark in Luke 9:51—18:14. He would explain the relative independence which characterizes Luke's passion narratives on the interesting theory that Luke as a Christian preacher was himself accustomed to relate these matters, and so when he came to write this part of his gospel he naturally employed the material he had so often used in preaching. Hawkins seems to incline to the older form of the two-document theory, which identified the second source with the Logia of Matthew.

In a very interesting paper on "The Literary Evolution of the Gospels," Streeter urges that Q was written in Palestine to supplement an oral tradition as to Jesus' ministry and passion, Mark in Rome to supplement Q, from which it quotes now and then, but only from memory, while Luke and Matthew are sub-apostolic and seek to give full accounts of the life and teaching of Jesus. Matthew's aim is to give in one convenient volume "a complete account of our Lord's life, a systematic view of his teaching, and a conclusive proof of his messiahship." Luke "is writing a biography, avowedly inspired, like a biography by a Tacitus or a Plutarch, with that feeling of *pietas* toward its subject which antiquity praised in a historian but which modern scholars with difficulty condone" (p. 222). To him Jesus is not primarily Messiah but Savior, Healer of soul and body for all the world (p. 224). There is force in Streeter's suggestion that the collected sayings of the prophets would naturally supply the first analogies for Christian writers upon Jesus, and his words would be the first things to be collected in

written form. Yet the primitive interest was less in Jesus as a prophet than as a messianic figure, and this consideration perhaps looks in a different direction.

Streeter maintains that Mark used Q in its original form, while Matthew knew a developed Q, and Luke a still further development of it. Q then proves upon scrutiny to be not one document but three, and the two-document hypothesis involves four documents. As to the evidence for the use of Q by Mark, we may not assume that the ultimate documents of the Synoptic Gospels must be mutually exclusive; indeed, the reverse is probable. "If Mark had been lost but Q preserved," reasons Streeter (p. 185), "and we therefore could only reconstruct Mark by taking all the common matter of Matthew and Luke and deducting that belonging to Q . . . . only those passages of Mark which both Matthew and Luke reproduce could have been identified as belonging to it. But these only amount to about two-thirds of Mark." He goes on to argue that Q was probably longer than the non-Marcan material common to Matthew and Luke. But his hypothesis suggests another. If both Mark and Q had been lost, would not the same critical method which now gives us a two-document theory have given us a one-document hypothesis? Streeter's view that the Great Interpolation (Luke 9:51—18:14) is mainly an extract from Q certainly looks in the right direction; for if the evangelist himself wrought Q and the parables together into this Perean section of his gospel, why does he in it so consistently abstain from the use of Mark?

Bartlet puts forth the interesting but unconvincing theory that all Luke's non-Marcan material came to his hand already combined into one source. That is, the primitive Q, which included the Logia, had taken on such accretions before it reached Luke that he could gather from it all he has that Mark did not supply. One may hesitate at so bold a theory, and yet be disposed to share Bartlet's dissatisfaction with the current two-document position, and, at least as regards the Perean section, his view that material used by Matthew had sustained considerable accretions before coming to the attention of Luke.

Other suggestive views are advanced in the volume, which makes many useful contributions to synoptic study. The diversity of the views represented shows how far the problem still is from a generally acceptable solution. On the whole, the volume leaves the impression that the two-document hypothesis is breaking down, and giving way even in the hands of its own advocates to a less rigorous, more historical solution.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO