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 \(\Delta\) 33, etc. OL Vg Syrr Cop Arm\(\text{odd}\) Pers Goth Iren Orig Porphyry 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 εγὼ 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 11, 10</th>
<th>Luke 7, 27</th>
<th>Mark 1, 2</th>
<th>Malachi 3, 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὁβόδ [γῆρ] ἐστὶν περὶ ὧν γέγραψαν' ἴδοι ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸς προσώπῳ σου, δὲ κατασκευάζει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου.</td>
<td>ὁβόδ [γῆρ] ἐστὶν περὶ ὧν γέγραψαν' ἴδοι [ἐγὼ]. ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸς προσώπῳ σου, δὲ κατασκευάζει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου.</td>
<td>καθὼς ἐγέραται [ἐν τῷ Ἑσαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ]. ἴδοι ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸς προσώπῳ σου, δὲ κατασκευάζει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου.</td>
<td>ἴδοι [ἐγὼ] ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸς προσώπῳ μου,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 — γῆρ, Ν B D Z b d g k Syrς Eth Or Ambr Or Quaest.  
2 ἀποστέλλω, X al pc.  
3 καὶ, P a b c k Cop Syrς Chr Ambr Hier.  

1 ἐγέραται, U ſ, fam 13, 33, al b e Cop Arm.  
2 — ἐγέραται, Ν B D L W ſ fam 1, 243, 346, OL Vulg Cop Arm Epiph Tert.  
3 ἐγέραται, Ν B D L W ſ fam 1, 243, 346, OL Vulg Cop Arm Epiph Tert.  
4 ἐγέραται, Ν B D L W ſ fam 1, 243, 346, OL Vulg Cop Arm Epiph Tert.  
5 — γῆρ, U ſ, fam 13, 33, al b e Cop Arm.  

1 καθὼς, Ν B K L Δ II fam 1, 33, 255, 471, 474, Or Tit Bas Serap Severian; others have ἰς.  
2 — καθὼς, Ν B D L Δ 33, al 196 OL Vulg Cop Syrς Cyriac. Armadae Pers Goth Ir Or Porphyry Tit Bas Serap Epiph Severian Eus Victorinus Hier Aug.  
3 — γῆρ, B D L 38, OL Vulg (10 MSS) Severian Ir Hier.  
4 ἀποστέλλω, Ν al pc ms Cop.  
5 om. Ν B D K L P W ſ φ 36, 202, 507* 700, a b c d l q Vulg (7 MSS) Cop Syrς Eth Pers Or Ir Hier.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 3, 3</th>
<th>Luke 3, 4</th>
<th>Mark 1, 3</th>
<th>Isaiah 40, 3</th>
<th>John 1, 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oβτος γάρ ἐστίν ὁ Ἵσαλων τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος: φωνὴ βοῶτος ἐν τῇ ἀρμῇ ἐστιν ἡ ἐν τῇ ἀρμῇ τοῦ δοῦν κυρίου, εὐθείᾳ ποιεῖ τὰς τριβῶν αὐτῶν. 3</td>
<td>ὅσιος γεγραμμένος εἰς βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἵσαλων τοῦ προφήτου: λέγεται φωνή βοῶτος ἐν τῇ ἀρμῇ τοῦ δοῦν κυρίου, εὐθείᾳ ποιεῖ τὰς τριβῶν αὐτῶν. 5</td>
<td>φωνὴ βοῶτος ἐν τῇ ἀρμῇ ἐστιν ἡ ἐν τῇ ἀρμῇ τοῦ δοῦν κυρίου, εὐθείᾳ ποιεῖ τὰς τριβῶν αὐτῶν. 4</td>
<td>ἔφη ἔγωγεν βοῶτος ἐν τῇ ἀρμῇ, εὐθείᾳ ποιεῖ τὰς τριβῶν αὐτῶν. 1</td>
<td>Εἶπεν ἔγωγεν βοῶτος ἐν τῇ ἀρμῇ εὐθείᾳ ποιεῖ τὰς τριβῶν αὐτῶν. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL (a b c g, g, gat, Ir Am) add: omnis vallis replebitur et omnis mons et collis humilis et erunt (prava in directa) et aspera in vias planas, et videbit omnis caro salutare dei. 4</td>
<td>OL c adds: omnis vallis replebitur, et omnis mons et collis humilis, et omnia prava recta et aspera in planitiem; et videbit gloriam dominii. 4</td>
<td>MS W adds: prasa faramex pelamidhsetai, kai par oros kai bovos takewnidhsetai, kai esta tasta ta skolia kai evtheia, kai h trachia kai ormos ormos ormos ormos ormos ormos. 4</td>
<td>MSS W e add after kuryou: euvtheia poieita tais trobov auton 3</td>
<td>I Peter 1, 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 o de oph, fam 13, e H e (Syril) (b 8).
2 dei nostri, o.
3 διδίδη κακα σφη υψη εύχος καὶ πάνα σάρκι χριστού καὶ πάνα δέξα
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>1 sahov, c Eus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+ λεγοτος, A C X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Γ Π unce al f q Goth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Syr Eth Chron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>vum, D F; dei nostri, Syr Pam Eten (1r).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>evheo, B D E F Η 73, 351, 1 38, a b c f g h, l Vulg Arma Or.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(rou θεου), κυριου, D Eth; Syr substitutes Isaiah 40, 5 for this verse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>του θεου vum, D 34, mel; dei nostri, al b c f g, g MT Goth Syr 69; ante durnum, Iren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>κα, man 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 It is possible to restore the ancestor of W and c perfectly; c has substituted recta for εις ευθεας, asphara for η πραξεις (see below), dei nostri for του θεου, διδιτ for εις, and has omitted ort after κλαμάντο; W has η δοξα for δοξα as its only change. 

κάσα δόξα ἀνθρώπων ᾧ ἄνθρωπος ὁ κύριος, 
καὶ το ἀνθρώπις εἰς τὸ ἄνθρωπος. 
το το άνθρωπος εἰς το ἄνθρωπος. 
το το άνθρωποι κυρίων 
το το άνθρωποι μνει εἰς 
τον αἰώνα.

1 + δια τῆς θεσανον, Qer. 
3 — παντε, A (sub Q). 
3 — τολμα, Νθ; elsewhere 
3 — τολμα, Νθ; elsewhere 
4 Qer gives long addition from Symmachus and Theodotion.
5 — ημω, Q.
7 — et.
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): \( \text{avtov against tou theou \eta\mu\nu} \); \( \text{pedion (planitiem) against pedia or odo\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\n
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 shown 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. 52–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.
Two New Testament Quotations. [April, 14
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to Mark xvi. 14 in MS. W. 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.