

## MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(continued).

### IV. *Paranetical clauses in Mark.*

ANCIENT manuscripts were written without signs of punctuation or even of interrogation. In the hands of a master of the Greek language its highly developed structure and its numerous particles made punctuation to a large extent superfluous, and enabled any intelligent reader to punctuate for himself as he read. But St Mark was not a master of the Greek language: and his fondness for brief co-ordinate clauses, not helped out by appropriate particles, often leaves us in doubt whether, for instance, we should read a clause interrogatively or not. Take a simple case, where both Matthew and Luke already felt the difficulty, and took care to insert words to shew which interpretation they adopted—and, in fact, one interpreted one way, and one the other: xvi 6 μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε | Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηθὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον | ἠγέρθη | οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε. Here the second clause can be punctuated either as a statement of fact (with Vulgate, A.V., R.V., and Westcott-Hort) 'Ye seek Jesus the Nazarene the Crucified', or as a question 'Are you seeking Jesus the Nazarene the Crucified?': and Matthew by prefixing the words οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι shews that he takes the former view, while Luke, writing τί ζητεῖτε, shews us as clearly that he takes the latter.<sup>1</sup>

The present note envisages a special group of cases where St Mark employs paranetical clauses, and a modern writer or printer would place these within dashes or brackets. In some cases the parenthesis is so brief and so obvious that no real difficulty arises. If in vii 2 Mark writes κοιναῖς χερσίν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνόμοις, ἐσθίουσιν τοῦς ἄρτους, 'they eat their bread with defiled, i. e. unwashed, hands', we understand of course that the Pharisees used the Aramaic equivalent of κοινός 'defiled' and that the Evangelist explains to his Gentile readers in what the defilement consisted. But in many more cases, as I think, Mark has made use of this expedient in a way which has misled scribes or commentators or both. The process of my argument would be more cogent and more logical if the clearer cases were cited first, and advance was then made from the more to the less certain. But convenience of reference appears to dictate the simpler course of taking the passages in the order of the Gospel.

<sup>1</sup> For a similar difficulty as to the second of three clauses see Mark i 24.

I. Mark i 1-4 Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ (καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἠσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ Ἰδοὺ . . . τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ) ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

Here the *text* of Westcott-Hort (apart from the insertion of the words υἱοῦ θεοῦ, which do not concern the problem before us) is followed, but not their *punctuation*. Westcott-Hort place a full stop before καθὼς γέγραπται, and a comma after αὐτοῦ: Swete prints a full-stop in both places; Tischendorf a comma before καθὼς, a full-stop after αὐτοῦ. Wellhausen wants to remove the whole of the quotation (verses 2 and 3) as not genuine, but retains the full-stop after verse 1. And in general modern exegetes are more or less agreed in segregating verse 1 as a sort of title,<sup>1</sup> though it is hard to see what real meaning ἀρχὴ has on this supposition.

But ancient exegetes had at least this advantage over modern, that they were accustomed to read unpunctuated Greek MSS, and therefore in problems of this sort especial weight attaches to their interpretation. We have only to remember how the true meaning of Mark vii 19 (no. 10 below) was rescued by Field from Origen and Chrysostom (to whom Burgon added Gregory Thaumaturgus) where modern interpreters had been baffled, and we shall be prepared on the present problem to listen respectfully to Origen, Basil, and Victor of Antioch. The two latter are quoted by Swete: Basil *c. Eunomium* ii 15 ὁ δὲ Μάρκος ἀρχὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τὸ Ἰωάννου πεποιήκε κήρυγμα, Victor Ἰωάννην ὄν τελευταῖον τῶν προφητῶν ἀρχὴν εἶναι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου φησίν. And Origen should, I believe, be cited on the same side: *in Io.* i 13 ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου . . . ἦτο πᾶσα ἐστὶν ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη, τύπου αὐτῆς ὄντος Ἰωάννου, ἡ . . . τὰ τέλη τῆς παλαιᾶς διὰ Ἰωάννου παριστάμενα, and a few lines further on ὅθεν θαυμάζειν μοι ἔπεισι πῶς δυσὶ θεοῖς προσάπτουσιν ἀμφοτέρας τὰς διαθήκας οἱ ἑτερόδοξοι, οὐκ ἔλαττον καὶ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ῥητοῦ ἐλεγχόμενοι. πῶς γὰρ δύναται ἀρχὴ εἶναι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (ὡς αὐτοὶ οἰοῦνται ἑτέρου τυγχάνων θεοῦ) Ἰωάννης, ὁ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ ἄνθρωπος; (Brooke i 17. 26, 18. 2). Place then verses 2 and 3 within brackets as a parenthesis, and construct ἀρχὴ with ἐγένετο. 'The beginning of the proclamation of good news about Jesus as Messiah and Son of God, was John the Baptizer's preaching in the wilderness of a baptism of repentance for remission of sins.'

2. ii 10, 11 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ) Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε.

The parenthesis is so obvious that it is retained with practically no change by both Matthew and Luke. We could express it in English '(he turns to the paralytic)'.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lagrange *Évangile selon Saint Marc* ad loc. cites Zahn, Nestle, J. Weiss, on this side.

3. ii 15, 16 και πολλοὶ τελῶναι και ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ και τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ—ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοί, και ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ—και οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν και τελωνῶν . . .

The words within dashes are, I am sure, to be taken as strictly parenthetical: if they were removed altogether the main emphasis would remain unaltered—'Many "publicans and sinners"<sup>1</sup> sat at table with Jesus and his disciples, and the Pharisee scribes seeing that Jesus was eating with them . . .', or, as in the logical order we might put it, 'And the Pharisee scribes, seeing that many "publicans and sinners" were at the dinner with Jesus and his disciples, and that he ate freely with them . . .' The parenthesis has nothing to do with the *τελῶναι και ἁμαρτωλοί*. We have no reason to suppose that large numbers of revenue collectors deserted their employment to follow our Lord, nor is there anything in the rest of the Gospel to suggest it. What St Mark really does here is to lay stress on the mention, for the first time, of the word 'disciples'. Before this we have only heard from him of the call of Peter and Andrew, James and John, and perhaps of a growing company in the 'Simon and his friends' of i 36. Now in ii 15 he reminds us by the way that already a considerable body of followers had gathered round Jesus and accompanied him wherever he went: *μαθηταί* is the noun to be supplied with *ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοί*. Weiss and Loisy interpret correctly: Lagrange and Swete are on the other side. Wellhausen gives two alternative explanations, but misses the true one.

4. ii 22 και οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς—εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς, και ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται και οἱ ἀσκοί—ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς.

The arrangement above given (which is that adopted by Swete) is the only possible one if the last six words are genuine. They are omitted by D and many Old Latin MSS (not *e*, which borrows the full form of the verse from Matthew), but the agreement of Matthew and Luke in giving exactly these six words in common, while they provide different forms of *βάλλω* to complete the construction, is a strong argument for their genuineness in Mark. **NB**, therefore, should be followed against the rest: and if *εἰ δὲ μή . . . οἱ ἀσκοί* is printed as a parenthesis, there is no real difficulty about the construction. But Matthew and Luke, not recognizing or not liking the parenthesis, give the final clause a construction of its own with *βάλλει* (Matthew) or *βλητέον* (Luke).

5. ii 26b και τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν (οὓς οὐκ ἔξειστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς) και ἔδωκεν και τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οἴσιν.

The case for parenthesis is less certain here, but I believe that the

<sup>1</sup> I do not enter here into the meaning of *ἁμαρτωλοί*, which requires treatment by itself: I hope later on to devote a section of these Notes to lexical usage.

words 'which only the priests are allowed to eat' is an addition by Peter or Mark to make it clear to Gentile hearers or readers in what way the instance of David and his company afforded parallel and justification for the action of Jesus and his disciples. It looks, at any rate, as if Luke felt that there was something wrong with the Marcan passage, for he transposes the words treated above as parenthetical to the end of the sentence. If they were not parenthetical, that was the natural thing to do.

Commentators have perhaps not sufficiently realized Mark's habit of introducing explanations for those unfamiliar with the details of Jewish customs, see vii 2 ; vii 3, 4 ; vii 26 a ; xiv 36 : compare the note introduced by him in xiii 14.

6. iii 22-30.

It would be misleading to print so long a passage as parenthetical : yet we lose something if the direct connexion of verse 21 with verse 31 escapes our notice. It would seem as though the Evangelist, after he has begun to tell us of the charge about our Lord that he was out of his senses, diverged to put on record the much graver charge that he was possessed by Beelzebub, and then, having dealt with that, recurs to the story he was beginning to tell and goes on to finish it. A similar case is that of the two verses viii 14, 16, which are directly connected with one another, though there it is only a single verse which intervenes. And possibly the same sort of consideration will help to unravel the complicated connexions of ix 33-50, where verses 37 and 42 are the necessary complement to one another.

7. vi 14, 15 καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης (φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν . . . ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἡλείας ἐστίν, ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι προφήτης ὡς εἰς τῶν προφητῶν)· ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἔλεγε· Ὁν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτος ἠγέρθη.

Here ἀκούσας ὁ Ἡρώδης is simply resumptive of ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης, 'Herod then, on hearing about Jesus, said'. The parenthetical arrangement assumes that ἔλεγον is the right reading in verse 14, not ἔλεγε,<sup>1</sup> for the parenthesis gives the vivid popular interest in the personality of Jesus of Nazareth as the reason for his fame coming to Herod's ears.

The whole passage vi 17-29 is parenthetical in the sense that the story of the martyrdom of John the Baptist is inserted here out of its historical place. All that belongs to the period at which St Mark's narrative has arrived is just Herod's knowledge about Jesus. And perhaps it is one of the curious links that connect the Fourth Gospel with the Second, that we learn in John vi 15 (cf. Mark vi 31 b, 33) that

<sup>1</sup> See *J. T. S. July 1924 pp. 380, 381.*

there was at this time a movement, such as might naturally attract 'King' Herod's attention, to make Jesus king.

8. vii 2 ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι κοιναῖς χερσὶν (τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτους) ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους . . .

κοινός in the sense of 'unclean' does not occur elsewhere in the Gospels: but it is used throughout the story of St Peter and Cornelius in Acts x-xi, being there combined with ἀκάθαρτος. The usage is technical and Jewish, and Mark explains to his Gentile readers that it means in this case 'unwashed'. Presumably St Peter in relating the story had employed the word and intended to represent by it the actual phraseology in Aramaic employed by the Pharisees. The interpretation being editorial would best be put within brackets: cf. nos. 5 (ii 26 b), 9 (vii 3, 4), 11 (vii 26 a), 16 (xiii 14) and probably 17 (xiv 36).

From 8 to 12 inclusive there are no parallels in Luke.

9. vii 3, 4 οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι . . . ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων [καὶ κλιῶν].

The editors rightly print these verses within dashes: the Evangelist remembers that his readers would hardly understand the religious value set by the Pharisees on such an observance as washing the hands before meals, unless he correlated it with their general attitude to other similar purifications. Matthew discards the explanation: what was necessary for Gentile readers in Rome was unnecessary in Palestinian circles.

10. vii 18, 19 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε; οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἕξωθεν . . . ἐκπορεύεται; καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα.

A very interesting example, for it shews how the Greek fathers may be better guides to the intelligent reading of the Gospels than the best equipped modern critics. Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Chrysostom saw that καθαρίζων (the reading is quite certain, though later scribes attempted to make it more grammatical, as they thought, by changing it to the neuter) goes back to the beginning of the sentence, and means that Christ when he said this 'cleansed all meats': and we owe to Dr Field *Otium Norvicense* iii (= *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* p. 31) and to Dean Burgon (*Last Twelve Verses of St Mark* p. 179 note u) the recovery of the true exegesis from the patristic comments. Wellhausen *ad loc.* still takes καθαρίζων with τὸν ἀφεδρώνα! Loisy (*Les Évangiles Synoptiques* p. 965) is acquainted with the recovered interpretation, but thinks that if it is correct it can only be treated as a gloss, seeing that it 'interrupts the thread of the argument too unskilfully to be original'. But I do not think that any one who studies the series here enumerated of parentheses in the Second Gospel will accept the suggestion that unskilful interruption of the context is decisive against genuineness. If the parentheses were wholly normal and intelligible, the other Synoptists would not have got rid of them so consistently.

II. vii 25, 26 *ἀκούσασα γυνή περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἧς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, ἐλθοῦσα προσέπεισεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς, Συροφονικίσσα τῷ γένει) καὶ ἤρώτα αὐτὸν . . .*

Mark reflects as he writes that the sequel of the story will be unintelligible if he does not explain that the woman was not a Jewess either by race or religion, but on the contrary a Syrophenician in the one respect, a heathen in the other.<sup>1</sup> Matthew reduces the statement to the single word 'a Canaanite'—which by itself implied both things to those for whom he wrote—and put it at its logical place in the forefront of the story.

12. viii 14-17 *καὶ ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἓνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. (καὶ διστελλετο αὐτοῖς λέγων Ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρώδου). καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν. καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὐπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε;*

If the bracketed words are omitted from the sequence of the argument, everything seems plain sailing: and whatever explanation we give of the words in question, it can hardly be doubtful that our Lord's meaning, as reported in this Gospel, is that his disciples shewed grievous want of perception in not recognizing, after the miracles of the multiplication of the loaves, that their Master had at command a power from God to provide, if need were, their necessary food. This straightforward sequence of thought is broken by one intrusive verse. It is not an interpolation: the substance of it is present in the Matthaean parallel, and *διαστέλλομαι* is a characteristically Marcan word, never found in the other Gospels apart from a single passage, and that a doubtful one, in Matthew (xvi 20); Marcan, too, is the combination 'Pharisees and Herod'. The parallels give us no help: Matthew follows Mark closely. Luke omits the whole passage. But Luke, though he omits the passage, does give in quite another context (xii 1) the single verse 'Beware for yourselves of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy'. He may of course have borrowed it from this passage: it is more likely that it was in Q. Anyhow it seems that the context of 'bread' must have reminded St Mark of the saying about the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod, and he inserted it here, though strictly speaking it was foreign to the context. In other words, it must be regarded as a parenthesis, an extreme example of Mark's naïve and non-logical construction of his narrative. A modern writer would have put it in a note at the foot of

<sup>1</sup> I feel sure that St Mark means by Ἑλληνίς not 'Greek-speaking' (as Swete) but 'heathen', and I think that Matthew so understood him when he substituted for Ἑλληνίς Συροφονικίσσα τῷ γένει the single word *Xαναία*. If Mark had meant 'Greek by language, Phoenician by race', he must have added something like τῇ γλώσσῃ. The normal meaning of Ἑλλην in N.T. is 'pagan', and that is precisely the sense needed to lead up to the contrast between 'children' and 'dogs'.

the page, and introduced it with the phrase 'compare . . .' The ancients, lacking such devices, were shut up within the alternatives of intercalation into the body of the text and omission. The modern editor of an ancient text, in which such intercalations occur, can only guide his readers by the typographical expedients of the dash and the bracket.

13. ix 36-42 (38-41) *καὶ λαβὼν παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὸ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ὅς ἂν ἐν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δέχηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέχεται, οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. (\*Ἐφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης Διδάσκαλε, εἶδαμέν τινα . . . ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστίν. ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.) καὶ ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων, καλὸν ἐστὶν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περικέεται μύλος ὀνίκος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίσῃ σε ἡ χεὶρ σου . . .*

In the ninth chapter of his Gospel St Mark devotes a larger proportion than hitherto to the Sayings of Christ. There are indeed in the earlier chapters episodes introduced which lead up to Sayings, and without the Sayings the episode would have no special point. Such would be, for instance, the plucking of the ears of corn, ii 23-28. But in the second half of the Gospel the training of the disciples gives more occasion to direct and systematic teaching, either not dependent upon special episodes at all, or at any rate more loosely connected with them than before. And the verses cited at the head of the paragraph exemplify this new feature of his story. It is hardly possible to suppose either that verses 35-50 are all continuous and belong to a single occasion, or that verses 35-37 record one conversation introduced by the episode of the child placed in the midst, 38-50 another conversation introduced by the remark of John. What we have is something more complex than that, and less easy to disentangle.

As in the last passage treated, no. 12, it seems likely that the Evangelist has interwoven with one another Sayings originally independent, though very probably belonging to the same cycle of teaching. And the method of combination seems to be on the same lines as before: a word or phrase brings to the writer's mind another Saying on a similar topic and he sets it down, returning later on to the original topic. The intervening words may once more be treated as an example of Mark's fondness for parenthesis.

If we read verses 37 and 42 consecutively, it is difficult not to think that they are connected with one another. 'Whosoever shall receive one of such children as this, receiveth me . . . and whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe, it were better for him . . .' St Mark will have inserted the episode of John's remark and the Lord's

answer, because it seemed to him to illustrate the same general idea ; but having so inserted it, he returns to the topic from which he started and completes the saying which the parenthesis had interrupted.

Wellhausen, too, points out the connexion of verses 37 and 42. But he brings an arbitrary element into his exegesis of the passage by making a contrast between verses 43 and following, which he regards as genuine words of Christ, and verses 42 and preceding which appear to him to imply the period of the Apostolic age and not the period of the Ministry. He follows D in verse 40, reading *ὅμων* for *ἡμών*, 'Whosoever is not against you is with you', and supposes that the Evangelist or his authority has in his mind attempts in the primitive community to dispense with the leadership of the Twelve. Even if he is right in the reading he adopts, there is an obvious objection to his interpretation which he has not attempted to meet. The Gospel according to Mark puts in the foreground the selection of the Twelve and their subsequent training, and not less the prominence of Peter as spokesman of the inner company of the disciples. If there was in the early Church any tendency to minimize the one or the other, it certainly could not be proved from our Second Gospel. Except on the postulate that Jesus cannot have contemplated the continued existence of preaching in his name after his death, it is surely far simpler and more reasonable to suppose that the Saying or Sayings which inculcate the principle laid down in these verses came from no other lips than his.

14. xii 12 α και ἐξήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι (και ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον), ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν.

Obviously the recognition on the part of the Jewish authorities that the Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen had been directed against them, was the reason not for their fear of the multitude but for their desire to arrest Jesus. The words 'and they feared the multitude' interrupt the connexion, and it is from that point of view necessary to bracket them. The Evangelist ought logically to have put first the reason for the desire before mentioning the obstacle which interfered with its fulfilment.

The sense is clear enough, and Luke (xx 19) left Mark's order of the clauses unaltered. Matthew (xxi 46) felt a difficulty in the sentence as it stood, and substitutes a reason for their fearing the people in place of Mark's reason for their desire to arrest Jesus: 'they feared the multitudes because they [the multitudes] held him for a prophet.'

15. xiii 9-11 παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια και εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε, και ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων και βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε, ἕνεκεν ἑμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς—και εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον—και ὅταν ἄγνωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μη προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε . . .

The connexion of verses 9 and 11 is obvious: it is broken by verse

10 which Luke in his parallel passage (xxi 13, 14) and Matthew in an earlier parallel (x 18, 19) entirely omit, while Matthew at this point (xxiv 9) transfers the verse to the end of the section (after Mark xiii 13) *καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τότε ἔξει τὸ τέλος*. This Matthaean phrase does probably supply the answer to the two questions which suggest themselves about the Marcan parenthesis. In the first place it is the words *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς* which give the cue for the parenthetic reference to the preaching of the Gospel to all nations: in the second place *πρῶτον* is correctly interpreted by Matthew to mean 'before the end come'.

16. xiii 14 *ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ (ὁ ἀναγνώσκων νοεῖτω), τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ . . .*

An obvious and acknowledged parenthesis, copied by Matthew, omitted by Luke. Whether Matthew retained it because he understood what it meant, whether Luke omitted it because he saw that it was no longer necessary, I am not sure: but I am quite sure what Mark meant by it.

In the first place *ὁ ἀναγνώσκων* has nothing to do with the Reader, or with any reading of the Gospel in the Christian congregation. It would be an anachronism to suppose that the Evangelist contemplated the use of his Gospel in public worship: and it is a pure misunderstanding of the meaning of *ἀναγνώσκω* to suppose that it excludes private reading. It was the custom of the ancients to read aloud to themselves: St Augustine relates it of St Ambrose as something unusual that he read to himself, as we do, without using his voice.<sup>1</sup> Mark simply means 'my readers'.

In the second place *νοεῖν*, as in Apoc. xiii 18 *ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω*, means 'to read between the lines', 'to penetrate below the surface'. Evangelist and Apocalypticist alike mean something that neither can afford to put down in black and white. In both cases there is veiled

<sup>1</sup> Aug. *Confess.* vi 3 (ed. Ben. i 121) 'Sed cum legebat, oculi ducebantur per paginas, et cor intellectum uetabatur, uox autem et lingua quiescebant. saepe cum adessemus (non enim uetabatur quisquam ingredi aut ei uenientem nuntiare mos erat), sic eum legentem vidimus tacite, et aliter numquam; sedentesque in diuturno silentio—quis enim tam intento esse oneri auderet?—discedebamus, et coniectabamus eum, paruo ipso tempore quod reparandae menti suae nanciscebatur, feriatum ab strepitu causarum alienarum nolle in aliud auocari et cauere fortasse ne, auditore suspenso et intento, si qua obscurius posuisset ille quem legeret etiam exponere necesse esset aut de aliquibus difficillioribus disceptare quaestionibus, atque huic operi temporibus impensis minus quam uellet uoluminum euolueret: quamquam et causa seruandae uocis, quae illi facillime obtundebatur, poterat esse iustior tacite legendi. quolibet tamen animo id ageret, bono utique ille uir agebat.' I owe this reference to my colleague, Prof. J. A. Smith.

reference to the Roman power, and just as St Paul conceals allusion to empire and emperor by employing both masculine and neuter, ὁ κατέχων and τὸ κατέχον, in 2 Thess. ii 6, 7, so St Mark with a bold disregard of grammar writes τὸ βδέλυγμα ἐσθηκότα because he wants to indicate that Daniel's 'abomination of desolation' has a human reference. Matthew, seeing in the capture of the Temple the fulfilment of the prediction, paraphrases 'standing in the holy place': Mark, writing with the prediction still unfulfilled—though it is possible that the Jewish war had already broken out—reproduces, we may well believe, the very phrase employed by Jesus, and adds to it parenthetically his own comment.

Wellhausen *ad loc.* goes preposterously wrong. 'The warning to the reader to take note', he says, 'fits only with the context of Matthew, where express reference is made to Daniel—the reader of Daniel, that is, is to note how his prophecy is fulfilled—and has therefore been inserted in Mark out of Matthew'. If critics would take a little more trouble to master the meaning of the words before them, counsel would less often be darkened, and textual problem and Synoptic problem would arrive more speedily and surely at solution. Wellhausen's work is full of acute exegesis: but this comment is perverse.

17. xiv 36 Ἀββὰ (ὁ πατήρ).

So St Paul in Gal. iv 6, Rom. viii 15. The early Church as we know it was, as were all the Jews of the Dispersion from Alexandria round to Rome, Greek-speaking. But just as Greek survived in the Roman church and other Western churches for purposes of worship after it had ceased to be the language of ordinary speech—witness the *Agios agios agios* of Sатурus's vision in the Acts of Perpetua—just as Latin has remained the liturgical language of south-western Europe, or Old Slavonic of Slav Churches, or Coptic of the Monophysite church of Egypt, so Aramaic phrases survived in the Greek-speaking churches founded by St Paul. The Ἀββὰ of the Christians of Galatia and Rome, the μαρὸν ἀθά of the Christians of Corinth, are like the *Kyrie eleison* in the Latin liturgy of to-day.<sup>1</sup>

What then of ὁ πατήρ? It is the Greek equivalent inserted to explain the Ἀββὰ for those of the congregation who were ignorant of Aramaic. I cannot think (with Sanday and Headlam on Rom. viii 15) that we are to suppose that our Lord used both words in his prayer—any more than he used Greek as well as Aramaic on the other occasions on which St Mark records the actual Aramaic (or Hebrew<sup>2</sup>) words employed by

<sup>1</sup> I do not mean to assert that the *Kyrie* in the Mass goes back to the second or third century, though I am not convinced to the contrary. But there is at any rate some probability that the *Agios agios agios* of Mozarabic and Gallican books is a survival rather than a later introduction.

<sup>2</sup> In Mark xv 34 I believe the true text to be that of D<sup>k</sup> (with some support from other Old Latins and B) ἤλει ἤλει λαμὰ ζαφθάνει (יְהוָה יְהוָה), that is to say, that the

him. 'Ο πατήρ, then, is one more of St Mark's parentheses. But it differs from his other parentheses in being provided for him, so to say, ready made. It was in familiar use—possibly in connexion with the Lord's Prayer—in the church of the Apostolic age. But St Mark's testimony is the last that we have for it. After the destruction of Jerusalem the Aramaic element in Greek-speaking Christianity disappeared. Matthew and Luke agree in substituting Πάτερ for the earlier Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ.

18. xvi 3, 4 καὶ ἔλεγεν πρὸς ἑαυτὰς Τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; (καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀνακεκίλισται ὁ λίθος) ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.

I cannot doubt that St Mark's motive in the words 'for it was very great' was to account for the anxiety of the women to find help in the rolling away of the stone. If it had been a small one, they could have rolled it away unaided: as it is, they doubt their own capacity to do so without assistance. The parenthesis explains that after all their anxiety was unnecessary: the stone had been, not indeed rolled away, but shifted, 'rolled a little' (κυλισθεὶς ἐπεχώρησε παρὰ μέρος, *Ev. Petri*), sufficiently to permit of their entrance. The structure of the sentence closely resembles that of xii 12, no. 14 *supra*.

The detail is so unimportant that it can only have come from the artless narrative of one who was relating individual experience. Fortunately perhaps for us, the Evangelist was no more given to distinguishing the essential and the unessential features of a story than was his informant, and it re-appeared untrimmed in his record. Matthew, true to his methods of condensation, omits the whole episode of the two verses, though he has transferred to his account of the entombment, a few verses higher up, the detail that the stone was 'great': Luke simply states that the women found 'the stone' rolled away from the sepulchre, but he had said nothing of the closing of the tomb and no doubt simply means his readers to understand that the normal proceeding had been adopted, and the tomb closed with a slab which was now found 'rolled away'.

19. xvi 7 εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ ὅτι Προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν—ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε—καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν.

The natural exegesis of these words, if printed without punctuation

Evangelist reports our Lord's cry according to the Hebrew of the Psalm and not in Aramaic (ܐܘܪܝܘܢ): Matthew substituted the Aramaic, and the Matthean reading, as so often elsewhere, has ousted the original reading in St Mark. On our Lord's knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures see Dr Headlam's *Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ* p. 107f. That he should have used the Hebrew of a familiar Scripture in a dying ejaculation is just as natural as it would be for a Roman Catholic to use the Latin of the Vulgate.

or brackets, is that our Lord had told the disciples that they would see him in Galilee. But the Gospel contains no record of any such Saying. Matthew, therefore, by substituting the first person for the third, εἶπον for εἶπεν, changes the sense from a prediction of our Lord's to a statement by the angel, 'You will see him in Galilee: I tell you so categorically'.<sup>1</sup> Luke retains the third person; but as his Gospel records appearances of the Risen Christ in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood only, he has to connect Galilee not with the appearances but with the prediction, 'He spake yet being in Galilee'. But St Mark had recorded one prediction by Jesus, uttered as recently as the Last Supper (xiv 28), μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, in language of which the angel's words seem an obvious echo, xvi 6, 7, ἠγγέρθη . . . προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν . . . καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν. Apart from the three intrusive words, ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε, the correspondence is exact. Treat them as a parenthesis after the Marcan manner, place them between dashes, and all difficulty disappears.

C. H. TURNER.

### SOME TENDENCIES IN OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

FOR some time past there have been striking developments in Old Testament Criticism. Even fifteen years ago Dr Skinner could remark that 'O. T. scholars have a good many new eras dawning on them just now', although, as he immediately added, 'whether any of them will shine unto the perfect day, time will show'.<sup>2</sup> And, in fact, no new era has as yet appeared, although it can justly be said that tendencies to pass beyond or away from the current 'Wellhausen' position are considerably stronger and more significant than they were in 1910. Much could be said upon the nature and value of these tendencies, but it will be convenient for the present to confine our remarks to a couple of books which can be regarded as symptomatic of the conviction that some new stage in O. T. criticism is necessary. In one of them a German writer, Martin Kegel, Ph.D. (Eng. trans., *Away from Wellhausen*, Murray), offers what the sub-title describes as 'a contribution to the new orientation in O. T. study'. In the other (*The Code of Deuteronomy*, James Clarke) Prof. Adam C. Welch of Edinburgh publishes what the 'jacket' styles 'a singularly courageous book', and not

<sup>1</sup> Hort *ad loc.* proposes to restore εἶπεν in the text of Matthew. But I think Matthew was puzzled by Mark's statement as he understood it, and deliberately altered it: unless indeed he read εἶπον in his copy of Mark. In either case, ἰδοὺ appears to me to exclude εἶπεν. It introduces a new speaker.

<sup>2</sup> Commentary on *Genesis* (1910) p. xliii; cf. *J. T. S.* xii (1911) p. 467.