

THE OUTSIDE AND THE INSIDE OF THE CUP.

NOTE ON ST. LUKE XI. 39-41.

A.V.—“And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter, but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. Ye fools, did not He that made that which is without make that which is within also? But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you.”

R.V., v. 41.—“Howbeit, give for alms those things which are within; and, behold, all things are clean unto you.”

THE above verses have long been a cause of perplexity to the careful reader of St. Luke's Gospel both in the original and in the English version. Our Lord is contrasting the care and attention which the Pharisees bestow on externals with their negligence in things inward and vital—“Ye fools, did not He that made that which is without make that which is within also? Cannot He see the foul *inside* as well as the outside defilement?”

The conclusion we should expect is: “Make clean the *inside* as well, and then *all* is clean; but instead we have “But rather give alms (!) of such things as ye have; and, behold,” etc.

The crux of the passage for translators and commentators appears to lie in the words τὰ ἐνὸντα in v. 41, which are explained variously. (See Dean Farrar's note *in loco* Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools for a brief summary of their various renderings. He remarks himself, Perhaps we may render “As for that which is within you, give alms.”) But no one seems to suspect the text of being corrupt or interpolated.

Before considering particular words let us see what is the *sentiment* which the passage, as rendered in A.V. and R.V., seems to attribute to our Lord. It is this: that wealth gained by “extortion and villiany,” ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας, may be purified, compounded for, as it were, by giving a *part* in alms. If we take the vague rendering of

the R.V., "Give for alms those things which are within," to mean "Give *all* your wickedly acquired earnings to the poor," the sentiment thus extracted is hardly improved. Our Lord is not addressing actual or would-be disciples, men who were "not far from the kingdom of heaven," but hypocrites, men "full of extortion and wickedness," and this rendering makes Him tell the extortioner that he can salve all his misdeeds by giving his ill-gotten gains to the poor. What *right* would the extortioner have so to do? His duty would be to make *restitution* fourfold to the wronged, and also to make himself amenable to the human laws which he had transgressed.

The whole sentiment seems in flat contradiction to the spirit of our Lord's teaching. Let us then, in order to reach a solution of the difficulty, compare this passage with the corresponding one in St. Matthew, ch. xxiii. v. 25 sqq. : οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταὶ, ὅτι καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐξ ἄρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας. Φαρισαῖε τυφλὲ, καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου ἵνα γίνηται καὶ τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ καθαρὸν (= St. Luke's πάντα καθάρᾳ).

All the commentators have noticed the resemblance between the two passages, but hardly sufficient attention has, it seems to me, been drawn to the *closeness* of that resemblance.

The passage as given by St. Matthew is almost verbally identical with that in St. Luke, beginning *Nῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* (v. 39) up to the words *πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα*, when the phrase, *δότε ἐλεημοσύνην*, so much out of keeping with the remainder of the verse, comes in.

How is this intrusive phrase to be explained or accounted for?

In every other point the passages match phrase by phrase, and almost word by word.

We have the verb "purify" twice in the passage from

St. Matthew, “καθαρίζετε” (v. 25), and “καθάρισον” (v. 26); but in St. Luke, instead of “καθαρίζετε” in the second place to match St. Matthew’s “καθάρισον,” we have the unaccountable “*δοτε ἐλεημοσύνην.*”

I can hardly believe that any ingenuity of interpretation could extract from the passage in St. Luke, as it stands in the received text, a sentiment which we could imagine our Lord as sanctioning with His authority.

The remedy I venture to suggest is simple. It is, strike out “*δοτε ἐλεημοσύνην*” in v. 41, and read “καθαρίζετε” instead. We shall then obtain a perfect and unexceptionable sense, and the almost verbally exact parallel with St. Matthew (interrupted by *δοτε ἐλεημοσύνην*) is preserved.

Νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας. ἄφρονες, οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν; πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα καθαρίζετε. καὶ ἰδοὺ πάντα καθαρὰ ὑμῖν ἐστιν.

Taking into account the prominence of the contrast between “the inward” and “the outward” in these parallel passages, I venture to assert that St. Luke’s τὰ ἐνόντα must correspond to St. Matthew’s τὸ ἐντός, and, this being the case, that “καθαρίζετε” or a similar verb is absolutely required to govern “τὰ ἐνόντα.”

It remains to account for the interpolation of *δοτε ἐλεημοσύνην*. It might be supposed that it arose from a marginal gloss “*δίδοτε ἐλεημοσύνην*” on “*ἀποδεκατοῦτε*” of v. 42; but the following is, I think, a much likelier explanation. I believe the error to have arisen from lipography on the part of a very early transcriber—lipography of a word, not a letter. The word “καθαρίζετε” occurs in St. Luke, v. 39. The transcriber, having written τὰ ἐνόντα, v. 41, should have repeated “καθαρίζετε” after it; but being vaguely conscious of having just written that word, he omits to repeat it, and proceeds καὶ ἰδοὺ, etc. The next

reviser or transcriber saw that something was lacking to the sense, and, probably having in his head a verse which occurs a little further on, St. Luke xii. 33, "παλήσατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν καὶ δότε ἐλεημοσύνην," he jumped to the conclusion that ἐνόντα = ὑπάρχοντα, and that δότε ἐλεημοσύνην was the missing phrase. The blunder may have been made by the original, or a very early transcriber, and, never having been corrected, would of course have tainted all the MSS.

As regards the metaphor by which the soul of man is spoken of as a "vessel" which, according as the interior is foul or clean, taints or preserves what is poured into it, our Lord was not the first to employ it. It was probably in vogue among the Stoic moralists.

Horace uses it twice. *Epp.* I., II. 54 :—

"Sincerum est nisi *vas*, quodcumque infundis, acescit";

and *Sermm.* I., III. 55, 56 :—

"Virtutes ipsas invertimus atque  
Sincerum cupimus *vas* incrustare."

A still closer parallel than either, though expressed with cynic coarseness, is to be found in Long's Translation of Epictetus, CLXXIX., from Aulus Gellius, XVII. 19 (I abridge largely): "Quum animadverterat hominem pudore amisso, importuna industria, corruptis moribus, audacem . . . studia quoque et disciplinas philosophiae contrectare, his eum verbis increpabat: "Ἀνθρῶπε, ποῦ βάλλεις; σκέψαι εἰ κεκάθαρται τὸ ἀγγεῖον. ἂν γὰρ εἰς τὴν οἴησιν βύλλῃς, ἀπώλετο. ἢν σαπῆ, ἢ οὖρον ἢ ὄξος γένοιτ' αὖν, ἢ τι τούτων χεῖρον.

With these passages from profane writers, as well as from St. Matthew, the sentiment of verses 39–41 of St. Luke xi., restored as I suggest, is in complete agreement; but if the δότε ἐλεημοσύνην of the received text be retained, it stands in glaring discrepancy with them all.

A. A. BURD.