

The Journal
of
Theological Studies

JULY, 1925

NOTES AND STUDIES

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXE-
GETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(continued).

VI. *The use of numbers in St Mark's Gospel.*

It is my firm conviction that the Mark which lay before the later Synoptists, St Matthew and St Luke, was no other than the Mark which we possess. Abstraction has indeed to be made of *various readings* which in the natural course of transmission by scribes may have crept into the text of Mark between its original publication and the particular copies which, ten or twenty years later, lay before the other two evangelists: or again it is conceivable (though not very probable) that the true reading of Mark might in individual cases survive only in Matthew, or in Luke, or in Matthew and Luke, and have been lost in all the direct tradition of manuscripts and versions. But various readings are one thing, recensions are another. And the evidence for an *Ur-Marcus*—that is to say, for an original Mark of which the Gospel we have is a *recension* or new edition—crumbles on examination into nothing.

In the book which is the starting-point of all detailed criticism of the Synoptic problem, Sir John Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae* (ed. 2 p. 152) this conclusion is nearly but not quite reached. 'The Petrine source used by the two later Synoptists was not an *Ur-Marcus*, but St Mark's Gospel almost as we have it now. Almost; but not quite. For instance, a later editor's hand is very probably to be seen in . . .' and Sir John proceeds to enumerate nine passages. Now of these nine, three are cases of large numbers, 2,000 (v 13), 200 (vi 37), 300 (xiv 5), all three omitted by both Matthew and Luke, two of them found in St John:

and it seems to be suggested that these two may owe their place in our present Mark to the influence of the 'Johannine tradition'.¹

Therefore it may be useful, so far as these three passages are concerned, to lay the ghost once for all, and to shew that it is Marcan usage to note numbers, and Matthaean and Lucan usage to tend to omit them. As we should expect, there is no universal rule to be laid down: sometimes both the two later evangelists retain the detail, but sometimes one omits, sometimes the other, and sometimes both. It is entirely in line with what happens in similar cases that there should be a proportion of instances in which their observed habit of omission of numbers should lead both to omit on the same occasion.

That Mark is fond of numerals is then a matter of fact which this instalment of my Notes is intended to prove: and if it is proved, the presumption is that the three doubtful or disputed numbers are genuine also.² But that is only one side of the argument. The other side is that the natural tendency of an educated writer of ancient times would be to omit numbers. For that assertion I am glad to be able to base myself on the testimony of Père Hippolyte Delehaye, written down without any reference to the Gospels but therefore the more impartial (I have quoted it once in print, but it will bear quoting again): 'Les procédés de la rhétorique des anciens les amenaient à ne point multiplier les noms de personnes et de lieux, à éviter de donner des chiffres exacts'.³ Persons, places, numbers: Mark is no rhetorician and is full of all three, Matthew and Luke are in nearer touch with the literary habits and presuppositions of their time, and tend, irregularly no doubt and so in a sense capriciously, to improve on their exemplar by omitting them.

There are certain numbers which refer to significant periods or events of our Lord's life, and these naturally recur in the other Synoptic Gospels:

1. Mark i 13 the 'forty days' of the Temptation: Luke iv 1, 2, Matt.

¹ I should reverse the argument, and see here proof of the dependence of the Fourth Gospel upon the Second: the numbers are not the only points of contact, and on Sir John's argument ἀγοράσωμεν and φαγεῖν (vi 37 = Jo. vi 5), ἀνέστησαν and ἄνδρες (vi 40, 44 = Jo. vi 10) ought all to have come into Mark from the 'Johannine tradition'. It must always be borne in mind that for fifty years after its composition St Mark's Gospel was the standard source of the evangelic history. Not only Matthew and Luke, but John and Pseudo-Peter as well, depend on him.

² I venture here to cite the final sentence of a letter from Sir John Hawkins to myself (under date June 1, 1920): 'What you say about Mark's constant fondness for numerals is a weighty argument for the genuineness of the 200 and 300 and 2,000 about which I was doubtful'.

³ *Saint Martin et Sulpice Sévère* p. 82 (*Analecta Bollandiana* vol. xxxviii, 1920).

iv 2 (Matthew, however, makes it 'forty days and forty nights' of fasting).

2. Mark viii 31, ix 31, x 34, the prophecies of the Resurrection 'after three days': Matthew and Luke, however (with the Creed-form of St Paul I Cor. xv 4), prefer the phrase 'on the third day', Matt. xvi 21, xvii 23, xx 19, Luke ix 22 (in ix 44, parallel to Mark ix 31, he omits all details), xviii 33; just as the printed texts make them, save in Luke xviii 33, prefer *ἐγερθῆναι* (*ἐγερθήσεται*) to Mark's *ἀναστῆναι* (*ἀναστήσεται*).¹

3. Mark ix 5, the 'three tabernacles' of the Transfiguration, is repeated in Matt. xvii 4, Luke ix 33.

There are also certain numbers which enhance the wonder of the miracles wrought by Christ, and, probably for that reason, are retained by Matthew and Luke:

4. Mark v 25 the woman who had had 'an issue of blood twelve years': repeated in Matt. ix 20, Luke viii 43.

5. Mark vi 38, 41, 43, 44: viii 2, 5, 6, 8, 9: viii 19, 20. The two accounts of the feeding of the multitude, and the summary reference to them by Christ, are incorporated by Matthew without the omission of any of the numbers which point either to the size of the multitudes (five thousand; four thousand), their long fast on the second occasion (three days), the small amount of provision (five loaves and two fishes; seven loaves and a few tiny fishes) and the large amount that remained over (twelve *κόφιναι*; seven *σφυρίδες*): indeed he adds on each occasion that the numbers of the multitude exclude 'women and children'.² Luke of course has only the first account of feeding: but there he, like Matthew, repeats the five loaves and two fishes, the twelve basketsful, and the five thousand 'men'.

6. The references to 'the Twelve', common in St Mark (iii 14, [15], iv 10, vi 7, ix 35, x 32, xi 11, xiv 10, 17, 20, 43), are rarer in Matthew and Luke, and form a transitional use to their treatment of other numbers given in St Mark. As I discussed this point fully in the last instalment of Notes on Marcan usage (*J. T. S.* April 1925, xiv 232, 233), no more need be said here than that Matthew never says *οἱ δώδεκα* but only *εἰς τῶν δώδεκα* (twice), *οὗτοι οἱ δώδεκα* (once), *οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί* (four times), *οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι* (once), while Luke has *οἱ δώδεκα* five times, *οἱ ἀπόστολοι* four times—in Luke ix 1 it is not certain whether we should read 'the Twelve' or 'the twelve apostles'. In any case 'the Twelve' is characteristically Marcan.

¹ B in Matthew $\frac{2}{3}$ gives *ἀναστήσεται*. And D latt. in Matt. $\frac{2}{3}$ give or represent *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας*.

² Presumably because Mark vi 44 (cf. Jo. vi 10) speaks of *πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες*. In Matt. xvi 9, 10 the precise numbers of the *κόφιναι* and *σφυρίδες* are omitted.

From this point onwards I record Mark's mention of figures in the order in which they are found in his Gospel, including two instances (8, 28 : iv 4-8, xiii 35) which illustrate his passion for precision though no actual figures are given.

7. ii 3 *παρालυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων*. Omitted by both Matthew and Luke, who doubtless considered that it was sufficient to say that the paralytic was brought 'on a bed'.

8. iv 4-8 *ὁ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν . . . καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες . . . καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας . . . καὶ ἄλλα ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλλὴν . . . καὶ ἔφερον εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ εἰς ἐξήκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑκατόν*. Mark, that is, is careful to make a parallelism between three classes of seed that did not germinate at all, and three that did—that is the meaning of the change from singular to plural—producing respectively thirtyfold, sixtyfold, and a hundredfold. Both Matthew and Luke miss the parallelism, and the one gives the plural all through, the other the singular, so that in both the implication is that only one class out of four came to any good, an implication that is definitely absent from St Mark's account.

9. iv 8, 20 *εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ εἰς ἐξήκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑκατόν . . . ἐν τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν*.¹ Matt. xiii 8, 23, retains the numbers on both occasions, though on both he inverts their order, 'a hundred', 'sixty', 'thirty': Luke drops all distinction between the three numbers, giving in the parable only 'a hundredfold' and no number at all in the interpretation, viii 8, 15.

10. v 11, 13 *ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη . . . ὡς δισχίλιοι*, 'a great herd of swine . . . about two thousand'. The number disappears from both the other accounts, Matthew being content with *ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν*, Luke similarly with *ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν*. Probably both of them—Luke at any rate—felt that the figure might be thought exaggerated. In fact all Mark's larger cyphers are dropped (apart from those of the miracles of Feeding, see 5 above), such as the 200 *δηνάρια* of 14, vi 37, or the 300 of 30, xiv 5, and it is only the smaller ones that have a chance of surviving.

11. v 42 *ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα*, of the daughter of Jaiurus. Luke retains the note, but transfers it to the beginning of the story (viii 42), adding that she was an only daughter, *θυγάτηρ μονογενής*. Matthew, who reduces the whole episode, like the preceding episode of the demoniac, to the smallest possible compass, omits.

12. vi 7 *ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο*. Both Matthew and Luke omit the 'two and two': Luke, however, has an equivalent statement in his record of the Mission of the Seventy (or Seventy-two) x i *ἀπέστειλεν*

¹ On the reading and interpretation of *εἰς*, *ἐν* in these verses, see *J. T. S. Oct.* 1924, xxvi 16.

αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο, and it might be thought that he has simply transferred it from the one place to the other. But it would seem that it was our Lord's constant habit to send his disciples in pairs: see 22 (xi 1) and 31 (xiv 13) below, and compare the lists of the Twelve in Matt. x 2, Acts i 13. The balance of probability suggests therefore that Luke derived his ἀνὰ δύο of the Seventy from his special source at that place: there are other instances where he suppresses in what he borrows from Mark features which he retains in non-Markan portions of his Gospel. If Dr Streeter is right in his thesis that Luke came across Mark's Gospel when he had already composed the first draft of his own, it is not really surprising that in order to provide room for the new material he had to make excisions on a rather drastic scale. One may go further and conjecture that, just because Mark's non-literary Greek offered so many stumbling-blocks to his sense of style, he treated it throughout in a more ruthless temper and altered things that in a source presenting fewer solecisms he might have let pass.

13. vi 9 μὴ ἐνδύσῃσθε δύο χιτῶνας. The detail goes to heighten the ascetic character impressed by our Lord on the preparations for the Missionary journey of the Twelve: and Matthew and Luke, who emphasize this aspect to a still further point than Mark—they agree, according to the critical texts, in refusing the staff which Mark allows¹—naturally repeat it.

14. vi 37 ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν δηναρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους; 'Are we to go and spend ten pounds on bread for them?' The naïve question of the disciples seemed a reflexion on their faith, and the whole clause disappears in both Matthew and Luke. But the Fourth Evangelist (Jo. vi 7) took it over from Mark, turning it into a statement of fact 'Ten pounds' worth of loaves would not be enough', and putting it into the mouth of Philip. Compare the case of the three hundred δηνάρια, 30 below.

15. vi 40 κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πενήκοντα. Matthew omits entirely: Luke characteristically omits the higher number and contents himself (ix 14) with ἀνὰ πενήκοντα. It is curious that in the story of Obadiah's hiding the prophets 'by fifties' in the cave, 3 Reg. xviii 4, 13, verse 4 gives the κατὰ πενήκοντα of Mark, verse 13 the ἀνὰ πενήκοντα of Luke.

16. vi 48 περὶ τετάρτην φυλακὴν τῆς νυκτός. Matthew keeps the phrase: Lucan parallels fail us till chapter ix of Mark, but see below on no. 28.

17. viii 14 εἰ μὴ ἓνα ἄρτον. 'They had forgotten to bring loaves, and had not more than one loaf with them in the boat.' As so often in the

¹ There is some authority in both Matt. x 10 and Luke ix 3 for βάρδους in place of βάρδων. In Luke it is quite inadequate: but in Matthew it includes C L W Δ a k and may possibly be right.

case of Mark's dittographies, Matthew is content with one half of the double phrase, and omits the 'one loaf'.

18. ix 2 *μετὰ ἡμέρας ἕξ*, 'five days after' [i. e. after the Great Confession of viii 29] 'Jesus takes with him Peter and James and John'. Matthew retains the precise date: Luke ix 28 turns it into a round number, 'about a week', *ὥσει ἡμέραι ὀκτώ*.

19. ix 43, 45 *τὰς δύο χεῖρας . . . τοὺς δύο πόδας*. There is no parallel in Luke: in Matthew's abbreviated account (xviii 8) the numerals remain, the articles disappear; Mark's phrase, however, is good Greek for 'your two hands', 'your two feet'.

20. x 30 *ἐκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ*. To the other two Synoptists the phrase had a touch of exaggeration about it, and Matthew (xix 29) reduces it to *πολλαπλασίονα*, Luke (xviii 30) to *ἑπταπλασίονα*.¹

21. x 35, 41 *οἱ δύο . . . οἱ δέκα*. The reading *οἱ δύο* is only given by B C 579 and the Egyptian versions: but it is in accordance with 'Marcan usage', and *οἱ δύο . . . οἱ δέκα*, 'the two . . . the ten', mutually support one another. There is no Lucan parallel: Matthew has 'the ten', but has only 'the sons of Zebedee' without 'two'.

22. xi 1 *ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ*. So Matthew and Luke: but contrast Matthew in no. 31. As I have suggested on no. 12 above, it seems to have been our Lord's regular custom to send out his disciples in pairs.

23. xii 20, 21 *ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα . . . καὶ ὁ δεῦτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν . . . καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὡσαύτως· καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα*. The numerals are an integral element of the point of the problem put to our Lord, and so both the other accounts retain them all.

[24]. xii 42 *μία χήρα πτωχὴ ἔβαλεν . . .* Matthew omits the episode: Luke substitutes *τινὰ χήραν πενιχράν*. I have put this instance in brackets, because Luke clearly regarded *μία* not as the numeral but as in effect the indefinite article: and in this I believe he interpreted Mark correctly. Mark's style is so naïve that it is not probable that he meant to emphasize any contrast between *πολλοὶ πλούσιοι* and *μία πτωχή*, any more than between *μία χήρα* and *λεπτὰ δύο*. There were 'plenty of rich people', and then there was 'a poor widow'. Mark is fond of *εἰς* (generally with a following genitive²), and Luke almost invariably

¹ I follow Burkitt (*Gospel History and its Transmission* p. 50) in reading 'seven-fold' in Luke with D Old Latins (including St Cyprian and Jovinian) and perhaps the Diatessaron. St Jerome *adv. Jovin.* ii 19, 26 asserted that Jovinian, for reading *septies*, 'aut falsarii aut imperitiae reum teneri': the question now is whether the tables should not be turned.

² In two or three cases Mark has *εἰς ἓκ*, ix 17 *εἰς ἓκ τοῦ ὄχλου*, xiv 18 *εἰς ἔξ ἡμῶν*, and according to some authorities in xiv 20 *εἰς [ἓκ] τῶν δώδεκα*. I think this

changes it to *τις*. Just as in late Latin and in the Romance languages, so in Greek also (in the *κοινή* and in modern Greek), the place of an indefinite article came gradually to be supplied by the numeral 'one'.

25. xii 42 ἔβαλεν λεπτά δύο, ὃ ἐστὶν κοδράντης. Luke xxi 2 keeps the 'two mites' (omitting Mark's parenthetical explanation for his Roman readers, 'which are a farthing'), because the story turns on it.

[26]. xiii 2 καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν. A 'Western' reading of D W and O. L., depending on xiv 58 xv 29: hardly genuine, or why should both Matthew and Luke have omitted it?

27. xiii 27 ἐπισυνάξει . . . ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων. The 'four winds' are simply a variation of the proverbial 'four quarters' of the earth, north, south, east and west. The phrase is taken from Zach. ii 6 (10) and is copied by Matthew xxiv 31: Luke omits the whole verse.

28. xiii 35 ἢ ὄψε ἢ μεσονύκτιον ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας ἢ πρωί. A popular way of representing the four watches (cf. 'the fourth watch', no. 16 above), into which Roman usage divided the twelve hours of the night, so as to secure that no guard should be on watch for more than three hours: Vegetius *de re militari* p. 83, quoted by Blass (I owe the ref. to Swete *ad loc.*) on Acts xii 4. Matthew omits the details: when Luke writes (xii 38) 'whether in the second or in the third watch', he may be meaning to suggest the two central watches, i. e. the darkest hours, or he may be reproducing the Jewish terminology of three watches, the second being φυλακὴ μέση (Judges vii 19), the third φυλακὴ πρωία (Ps. cxxix [cxxx] 6).

29. xiv 1 ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας. Matthew retains the phrase: Luke paraphrases with ἡγγίξεν. If μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας means—see Field's admirable note on Matt. xvi 21—nothing else than τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, i. e. as we should say 'after two days', it follows that μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας must be equivalent to τῇ δευτέρᾳ ἡμέρᾳ (if that phrase were used), and mean 'next day'. The only exact parallel appears to be Hosea vi 2 ὑγάσει ἡμᾶς μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἐξαναστησόμεθα (quoted by Tertullian *adv. Marcionem* iv 43); for if, as Field assumes, the healing and the rising up refer to successive days, μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας must there again mean 'next day'. I do not feel entirely clear about this: but there is no real doubt as to the day of the week which Mark intends in this passage to identify. For in verse 12 the day before the Crucifixion, that is the Thursday, is called 'the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the Passover': by Roman reckoning the lambs were slain on the same day that they were eaten, and on that day the leavened bread would be cleared away and

is one of Mark's latinisms: and as *unus ex (de)* is the only possible rendering in Latin of εἰς with a following genitive, it is futile of editors to cite the Latins, where εἰς is doubtful in the Greek.

unleavened bread substituted, and it is Roman reckoning which Mark follows—by Jewish reckoning the lambs were slain on the afternoon of the 13th Nisan, and, a new day beginning at sunset, they were eaten on the evening of the 14th. But if the events of Thursday commence with xiv 12, then xiv 1-11 are the events of Wednesday at latest. But of Wednesday too at earliest, if tradition following the Fourth Gospel rightly places the Triumphal Entry on Palm Sunday: for xi 12 refers then to the morning of Monday, and xi 20 to the morning of Tuesday. The new day of xiv 1 can therefore only be Wednesday.

30. xiv 5 ἡδύνατο τοῦτο τὸ μύρον παραθῆναι ἐπάνω δηναρίων τριακοσίων. The figure was large, £12 or so, and no doubt seemed exaggerated: Matthew omits it, and there is nothing to correspond to it in Luke's account of an anointing (vii 36-50). But the Fourth Gospel (Jo. xii 5) —just as with the 200 δηνάρια at the Feeding of the multitude, no. 14 above—follows Mark and retains it.

31. xiv 13 ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. Mark once more notes (see nos. 12 and 22 above) that disciples were sent in pairs: Matthew, as in no. 12, omits, Luke xxii 8, presumably from independent knowledge, inserts the names, Peter and John.

[32]. xiv 20 ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐν τρυβλίον. So B C* ? ⊙ 565: the rest omit ἐν, and I think it may represent a marginal variant ἐν for εἰς (from Matthew xxvi 23 ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ). Therefore I have put it within brackets, for in that case it has no bearing on our problem, not being a numeral. But if ἐν is right, Matthew omits it: Luke has nothing strictly parallel.

33. xiv 30, 68, 72a, 72b (the two cock-crowings and three denials) σημερον ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήση . . . καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἕξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον [καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν] . . . καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν· καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα . . . ὅτι Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα δις φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήση. Admittedly all three Synoptists record a triple denial: admittedly Mark, and Mark only, speaks of a second cock-crowing. But so strong was the reciprocal influence exerted by the later accounts on the text of Mark that not many authorities in St Mark other than the Syrian recension (the *Textus Receptus*) give all four references to the second crowing, and one first class authority, **N** (with 579 and c) omits it on all four occasions. (1) Verse 30: *om* δις **N** C* D W 579 a c f f i k arm aeth. (2) verse 68: *om* καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν **N** B L W Ψ* 579 c syr-sin sah. (3) verse 72a: *om* ἐκ δευτέρου **N** L 579 c. (4) verse 72b: *om* δις **N** C* W Δ Σ 579 c aeth. Our best authorities (B D the chief Old Latins syr-sin sah) all give three out of the four references: but they differ as to the one they omit, for B syr-sin sah have the first, third, and fourth, D and the Old Latins give the second, third, and fourth. Thus the third and fourth references are

above cavil: the first is implied by the fourth, and it is further an observed rule¹ that scribes are more prone to the influence of their prejudices—in this case to the influence of the parallel accounts—on a first occasion, but defer to the authority of their exemplar if the reading they have tampered with recurs once again or oftener: only about the second can there be any doubt. Here \aleph B omit, and Westcott and Hort do not even give *καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν* a place in the margin. Tischendorf, against \aleph B, puts the words in the text, and I am sure he is right. The evidence of \aleph L W 579 c—five witnesses for omission out of the nine—is nearly worthless, since they omit on one or more of the other occasions: the documents of the Sahidic version are divided, see Horner *ad loc.*: so that B Ψ^* syr-sin are the only unimpeachable authorities for omission. But it must not be forgotten that the influence of the parallel accounts, in the case of a complete statement like *καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν*, which could be simply dropped without apparent injury to the context, would be powerful for omission. And if ever internal evidence is allowed the decisive word, it guarantees (as I think) the genuineness of the phrase in dispute. I cannot believe that any other than the Evangelist put in the dramatic touch which is needed for the development of the story.

34. xiv 41 *καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον*. Mark does not mention that our Lord went away and prayed a third time, though of course he implies it; but because his story is told, here as elsewhere, from the point of view of the disciples' experience he does mention his third coming to the disciples. Matthew xxvi 44 fills up what Mark implies, and transfers 'the third time' to Christ's prayer. Luke omits the repeated coming and going, and concentrates the whole story into one withdrawal and one return.

35. xiv 58 *ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τούτου τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω*, and xv 29 *Οὐὰ ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν [ἐν] τρισὶν ἡμέραις* (cf. xiii 2, no. 26 above, if the reading were genuine). Matthew retains, both at the Trial and at the Crucifixion, doubtless because of the reference to the Resurrection: Luke omits the whole episode of the 'false witness'.

36. xv 1, 25, 33, 34 *πρὸ συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες . . . ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν . . . καὶ γενομένης ὥρας ἕκτης σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης. καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*. Only Mark enumerates the synchronisms of all the four watches of Good Friday: both Matthew and Luke omit the notice of the third hour.²

¹ See Wordsworth in the *Epilogus* to the Vulgate Gospels, p. 727 'saepe enim scribae quod primo loco pro mendo habebant, secundo pro uero agnoscunt'.

² The Fourth Gospel has *ἦν δὲ πρωὶ xviii 28, ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτη xix 14*, but I forbear to discuss the difficulty here.

Of these thirty cases (nos. 7 to 36) I put aside three, nos. 24 26 and 32: there remain twenty-seven. Three times only out of this total, 13, 22, 23, do both Matthew and Luke retain the numbers; but in order to be scrupulously fair I add on the same side the three occasions on which Matthew retains when there is no Lucan parallel, 16 19 27, and the one occasion where Luke retains when there is no Matthaean parallel, 25. Against these we have to set seven passages where both omit numbers, 7 (8) 10 12 14 33 36, and one where both bring the number down, 20, as well as three passages where Matthew omits but there is no parallel in Luke, 17 21 30. In the nine remaining instances one or other of the later Synoptists fails to reproduce the precision of Mark: in four, 11 15 28 31, Matthew omits while Luke retains, in four more, 9 29 34 35, Luke omits while Matthew retains, and in one, 18, Luke changes a precise number to a round one.

That is to say, it is more common for both of them to omit than for both of them to retain a number given in Mark: and it is vastly more common (about three times in four) for one or other of them to omit a number than for both of them to retain it.

This clear and decisive result (as I think it) tallies with a feature noticed in the last section of the Notes on Marcan Usage (*J.T.S.* April 1925, xxvi 237), namely the ascending scale of adjectives with which Mark is careful on different occasions to estimate the size of the crowd.

As the result of our enquiry, it is not too much to say that the suggestion that some of the numbers in Mark are not original because both Matthew and Luke omit them cannot maintain itself in face of the argument from Marcan usage. One more nail has been driven into the coffin of that old acquaintance of our youth, *Ur-Marcus*. He did enough harm in his time, but he is dead and gone: let no attempts be made to disinter his skeleton.

C. H. TURNER.