

ARTICLE V.

THE NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATION OF A TWICE-REPEATED PROPHECY.

BY HENRY A. SANDERS, ANN ARBOR, MICH.

THE prophecy contained in Isaiah xl. 3-8 and Malachi iii. 1 is quoted with varying degrees of completeness by all four of the Evangelists, though the characteristic part of the prophecy does not appear in the other New Testament writers.¹ It has been generally assumed that all drew independently from the Old Testament, or that Mark influenced the others, in which case it is necessary to assume that Luke again had recourse to Isaiah to complete the quotation. There are, however, certain difficulties with accepting either of these views. Thus all the quotations agree in a noteworthy variation from Isaiah, which surely could not have happened if all had drawn independently. Neither can Mark have been the source of the other three; for, in addition to the extra verses quoted by Luke, it may be noted that Mark alone joins the two prophecies, while assigning both to Isaiah (cf. * B D L Δ 33, etc. OL Vg Syrr Cop Arm^{edd} Pers Goth Iren Orig Porphyr etc.). The prophecy of Malachi is quoted, to be sure, by Matthew and Luke, but in unconnected passages. It certainly does not seem likely that all three would have excluded the Malachi verse from the immediate context, if they drew the Isaiah verses from Mark.

Not only do these reasons give a decided intimation that

¹ 1 Peter i. 24 quotes Isaiah xl. 7-8, but only to illustrate the enduring character of the word of God.

the Evangelists drew these Old Testament citations from an intermediate source, but the passages are long enough and show sufficient variations both originally and in MS. transmission to enable one to reach definite conclusions on the question, if a careful comparison of all the passages be made. My attention was first drawn to this subject by the discovery of a long addition to the citation at Mark i. 3 in the fourth-century Greek MS. W and the necessity of explaining the source of the corruption previously known only in the twelfth-century Old Latin MS. c.

The question can be handled most clearly by giving in parallel columns all the instances of New Testament quotation of these Old Testament passages.

As regards the Malachi passage it is evident that the Evangelists have reproduced the idea merely, yet the agreements, set in small type, are sufficient to prove Malachi the ultimate source. Furthermore the agreements of the three against Malachi, set with hair-spacings, prove conclusively that there was an intermediate source, which prepared the passage of Malachi for the use of the Evangelists. Mark cannot have been the source of the other two, because of the failure of the introductory sentence as well as of the phrase *εμπροσθεν σου*. Also the best MS. and Version authorities make Mark assign the passage to Isaiah along with the following prophecy. Neither of the others are influenced by the error, but as they omit to mention Malachi, it seems probable that the common source omitted; hence arose the error of Mark. Matthew may have been the source of Luke, but not Luke of Matthew, for *εγω* was surely missing in the original Luke.

The indebtedness of the New Testament writers to Isaiah is even clearer. There can be no question that the Septuagint version of Isaiah was the original source. The perfect

NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS OF MALACHI 3, 1

Matthew 11, 10	Luke 7, 27	Mark 1, 2	Malachi 3, 1
<p>οὗτος [γάρ]¹ ἐστὶν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω² τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς³ κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.</p>	<p>οὗτος¹ ἐστὶν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ [ἐγὼ]² ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου³ σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.⁴</p>	<p>καθὼς¹ γέγραπται [ἐν τῷ Ἑσαία τῷ προφήτῃ]² ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ³ ἀποστέλλω⁴ τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου [ἔμπροσθέν σου].⁵</p>	<p>ἰδοὺ[ἐγὼ]¹ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ² ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου,</p>
<p>¹ — γαρ, N B D Z b d gik Syra^a Eth Or Ambr Op Quacst. ² ἀποστελω, X al pc. ³ και, P a b c k Cop Syr^b Chr Ambr Hier.</p>	<p>¹ + γαρ, U 1, fam 13, 33, al b e Cop Arm. ² — εγω, N B D L W Ξ fam 1, 243, 346, OL Vulg Cop Arm Epiph Tert. ³ Dn 57 omit πρὸ προσώπου; Ξ omits σου also. ⁴ — ἐμπροσθεν σου, D 122^b, a 1 Tert.</p>	<p>¹ καθως, N B K L Δ Π fam 1, 33, 255, 471, 474, Or Tit Bas Serap Severian; others have ωs. ² = N B D L Δ 33, al²⁵ OL Vulg Cop Syra^b(^{ae}) Arme^{ad} Pers Goth Ir Or Porphyrtit Bas Serap Epiph Severian Eus Victorin Hier Aug. ³ — εγω B D 28, OL Vulg (10 MSS) Severian Ir Hier. ⁴ ἀποστελω, N al pauc Cop. ⁵ om. N B D K L P W Π⁶ φ 36, 102, 507, 700, a b c d l q Vulg (7 MSS) Cop Syra^b Eth Pers Or Ir Hier.</p>	<p>¹ — εγω N² A Q Γ. ² — και N⁶.</p>

NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS OF ISAIAH 40, 3

Matthew 3, 3	Luke 3, 4	Mark 1, 3	Isaiah 40, 3	John 1, 23	
<p>οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ρηθεὶς διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγον- τος· φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.¹ OL (a b^c g₂ gat Ir Arn) add: <i>omnis vallis implebitur et omnis mons et col- lis humiliabitur et erunt² (prava in directa)⁴ et aspera in vias planas,⁵ et videbit omnis caro salutare⁶ dei.⁷</i></p>	<p>ὡς¹ γέγραπται ἐν βί- βλῳ λόγων Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου² φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυ- ρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ³ 5) πᾶσα φάραγξ πληρωθήσεται, καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνος ταπεινωθήσεται, καὶ ἴσ- ται τὰ σκολιά εἰς εὐθει- αν⁴ καὶ αἱ τραχεῖαι εἰς ὁδοὺς λείας, 6) καὶ ὄψε- ται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτή- ριον τοῦ θεοῦ.⁵</p>	<p>φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.¹ OL c adds: <i>omnis vallis replebitur, et omnis mons et collis humiliabitur, et om- nia prava erunt recta et aspera in plani- tiem; et videbitur gloria domini, et vide- bit omnis caro salu- tare dei nostri quon- ianiam deus locutus est. Vox dicentis: clama. Et dixit: quid clamabo? omnis caro fenum et omnis gloria</i></p>	<p>MS W adds: πᾶσα φάραγξ πληρωθήσεται, καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνος ταπεινωθήσεται, καὶ ἴσται πάντα τὰ σκολία εἰς εὐθείαν, καὶ ἡ τραχεῖα εἰς πεδῖον καὶ² ὄψθη- σεται ἡ δοξα κυρίου, καὶ ὄψε- ται πᾶσα σὰρξ τοσωτηριον του θεου, οτι κεν ἐλαλησεν φωνὴ λεγοντος, βοησον καὶ εἶπα τι βοησω οτι πᾶσα σὰρξ χορτος, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ δοξα αὐτης ως ανθος χορτου ἐξηρανθη ο</p>	<p>φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποι- εῖτε¹ τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. 4) πᾶσα φά- ραγξ πληρωθήσεται, καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνος τα- πεινωθήσεται· καὶ ἴσται πάντα² τὰ σκολία εἰς εὐθείαν, καὶ ἡ τραχεῖα εἰς πεδῖα.³ 5) καὶ ὄψθη- σεται ἡ δοξα κυρίου, καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ το σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησεν. 6) φωνὴ λέγοντος βοησον καὶ εἶπα τί βοησω; Πᾶσα σὰρξ χορτος καὶ</p>	<p>ἔφη· ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαίας ὁ προ- φῆτης. MSS W e add after κυρίου: εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτου.¹ ¹ ο δε εφη, sam 13, c ff₂ e (Syr¹) (b a). ² dei nostri, e. I Peter 1, 24 διότι πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς χορτος, καὶ πᾶσα² δοξα</p>

		<i>e ius sicut flos feni; aruit fenum et flos cecidit; verbum autem domini manet in aeternum.</i> ³	χόρτος και το άνθος εφε- πεσεν το δε ρημα κυ- μανει εις τον αιωνα. ³	πασα δοξα ανθρωπου ως άνθος χόρτου γ) εξηράν- θη ό χόρτος και το άνθος εξεπεσεν, ⁴ 8) το δε ρημα του θεου ημων ⁵ μανει εις τον αιωνα.	αυτης ¹ ως άνθος χόρ- του εξηράνθη ό χόρτος, και το άνθος ⁴ εξεπεσεν ⁴ 25) το δε ρημα κυριου μανει εις τον αιωνα.
¹ δια, N B C D W 1, 13, 33, 124, 157, 209, 700, al OL Vulg Cop, others have uro.	¹ καθως, c Eus.	¹ του θεου υμων, D 34 ^{ms} ; <i>dei nostri</i> , a b c f ff ₂ Gs MT Goth Syr p ^{ms} ; <i>ante deum</i> , Iren.	¹ + δια της αβητου, Q ^{ms}	¹ - ως, N ^o A 4, 13, 15, 29, 36, 59, 69, 137, al cat am ^o harl Syr ^o Arm ^o Thphyl.	
² <i>dei nostri</i> , b Syr ^{ms} Cyr Ir.	² + λεγοντος, A C X Γ Δ Η unc ^o al f q Goth Syr ^{ms} Eth Chron.	² κα, κων 1.	² - παντα, A (sab 7 Q).	² + η, N ^o .	
³ + <i>omnia</i> , a.	³ υμων, D ^o ; <i>deo nos- tro</i> , Syr ^{ms} Pers (Ir).	³ It is possible to restore the ancestor of W and c perfectly; c has substituted <i>recta</i> for εις ευθειαν, <i>aspera</i> for η τραχεια (see below), <i>dei nostri</i> for του θεου, <i>dixit</i> for ειπα, and has omitted οτι after <i>clama- bo</i> ; W has η δοξα for δοξα as its only change.	³ πεδιαν, N ^o ; οδους λιας, N ^o b A Q ^o ; α σ εις πεδιον, θ am. τοις ό, Q ^{ms} .	³ αυτης, N ^o A B C h 5, 7, 9, 15, 69, 73, 137, al ^{ms} cat Vulg Syr Cop Eth Did Or; αυτου, N ^o ; others have ανθρωπου.	
⁴ <i>tortuosa in direc- tione</i> , Iren.	⁴ ευθειας, B DF 73, 253 ^o , l 3a, a b c ff ₂ G l Vulg Arm Or.		⁴ Q ^{ms} gives long addi- tion from Symmachus and Theodotion.	⁴ + αυτου, C K L P al cat (Vulg) Cop Eth Eus Hipp.	
⁵ <i>viam planam</i> , c.	⁵ (του θεου), κυριου, D Eth; Syr ^{ms} substitutes Isaiah 40, 5 for this verse.		⁵ - ημων, Q.		
⁶ <i>salutarem</i> , a.					
⁷ - <i>et videbit dei</i> , gat.					

agreements of all the later writers, including W and c of Mark, with Isaiah (set in small type) show the extent of the literal copying. Yet here again we can prove an intermediate source, for all the New Testament citations agree against Isaiah in the following words (hair-spaced): *αυτου* against *του θεου ημων*; *πεδιον* (*planitiem*) against *πεδια οι οδους λιας*; *αυτης* against *ανθρωπου*; and *κυριου* against *του θεου ημων*. In the first case Matthew, Mark, Luke, and MSS. W and e of John agree against the Septuagint Isaiah, and in the last two cases 1 Peter supports the addition to Mark. Thus in only one case (*πεδιον*, *planitiem*) do we have to rely on the evidence of W and c alone. Yet even here it is certain that the change was made by the intermediate source, for the margin of MS. Q of Isaiah quotes this reading from Aquila and Symmachus and states that Theodotion supported the Septuagint form *πεδια*.

It is equally clear that MSS. W and c of Mark are in no way indebted to Luke, for not only do they give verses 6, 7, and 8 not found there, but they also retain *παντα* of Isaiah, verse 4, and in verse 5 the phrases *και οφθησεται η δοξα κυριου* and *οτι κυριος ελαλησεν* which are omitted by Luke.

The Old Latin addition to Matthew in this quotation is of no assistance, as it is drawn directly from Luke. The addition to the John quotation, found in MSS. W and e, is also harmonistic, though one can not be certain which Gospel was the source. It may further be noted that in all the Gospels the Version Tradition (D Old Latin Syrcu) shows a tendency to harmonize with Isaiah. The one case (*aspera* against *η τραχεια*) in which Old Latin c agrees with Luke against W is probably due to Latin idiom. The neuter plural of the adjective is much more freely used as a substantive in Latin than the neuter singular.

On the other hand the Luke passage might easily be derived from Mark, if the whole addition found in MSS. W and c could be referred to the original text of that Gospel. This is, however, an impossibility. The MS. evidence is far too weak for such an assumption. The only alternative is to suppose that the ancestor of W and c drew from the source of Luke, which must then have been the same intermediate source which all the New Testament writers used for their Isaiah and Malachi quotations. This lost source used the Septuagint but recast the quotations slightly and in one case was under the influence of Symmachus or Aquila. That the ancestor of W and c should thus go back to a source of Mark to fill out the incomplete quotation is not surprising. Resch has shown¹ quite conclusively that MS. D contains many changes in Luke and Acts, which he referred back to one of the original sources of those books. He holds that a Jewish-Christian reviser worked over the ancestor of D before 140 A.D. and probably drew on the L source of Luke for some of the additions to that Gospel. Whether this be capable of proof or not, it must be accepted that in the earlier period a certain amount of material from good sources made its way into some MSS. of the Gospels. Probably the best examples of this are the story of the woman taken in adultery (John vii. 53-viii. 11) and the last twelve verses of Mark. In view of the passage just discussed, it seems likely that one at least of the source books of our present Gospels lived on long enough to materially influence the text development of those Gospels. That there was a real desire on the part of some reviser or revisers to go back to the original source in correcting the text before them is illustrated also by the addition

¹ *Agrapha*, pp. 349 ff.

to Mark xvi. 14 in MS. W.¹ This additional saying of Christ may well have stood in Aristion, or whoever was the writer from whom the last twelve verses of Mark were borrowed; but, even if that be accepted, it should not materially add to our appreciation of the passage. The addition as completed in *W* may and probably does trace its origin back to the end of the first century, but it does not make the impression of originality characteristic of the Synoptic Gospels.

¹ Cf. *Biblical World*, 1908, p. 141; *Amer. Jour. of Arch.*, vol. xii. p. 53; Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 30.