

St. Mark xiv. 41, 42.

BY REV. J. H. BERNARD, B.D., FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN, AND
ARCHBISHOP KING'S LECTURER IN DIVINITY.

“καθεύετε [τὸ] λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει· ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα· ἰδοὺ παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν. ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν· ἰδοὺ ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικεν.”

“Sleep on now, and take your rest : it is enough ; the hour is come ; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going : behold, he that betrayeth me is at hand” (R. V.).

THE difficulty of reconciling the latter of these verses with the former has been recognised by many commentators ; and, indeed, it is apparent to the most casual reader that our Lord's direction to His disciples to “sleep on” at such a moment is not only hard to explain when the general context is taken into account, but is actually contradicted by His recorded command immediately following it : “Arise, let us be going.” It is proposed in the following paper to bring together some of the principal methods of interpretation by which it has been attempted to render the whole passage consistent with itself, and to indicate the difficulties which beset the renderings of our English versions (A. V. and R. V.).

1. It has been supposed that the opening words were said *ironice*. As Dr. Maclear puts it : “Sleep on now, for ever if ye will. The words were spoken in a kind of gentle irony and sorrowful expostulation. The golden hour for watching and prayer was over. Their wakefulness was no longer needed” : *i.e.* “Sleep on meanwhile ; there has been enough of watching.” Or as Lengel, following Chrysostom, interprets : “Sleep on now, if ye can. Those are soon coming who will rouse you. *Si me excitantem non auditis, brevi aderunt alii qui vos excitent. Interea dormite, si vacat.*” That is, having slept when you should have kept watch, you may as well sleep now during the remainder of the time that is left you, before you are forcibly disturbed from your slumber. It is in some such way as this that the New Testament revision company seem to have taken the passage, for they translate : “Sleep on now, and take your rest : it is enough ; the hour is come ; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going ; behold, he that betrayeth me is at hand.” And this gives excellent sense, provided that we suppose, as St. Augustine suggests,¹ that our Lord allowed the

disciples to sleep until Judas came, and that there was a definite interval of time between the meditative words, “Sleep on now, and take your rest,” and the command to wake, “It is enough ; the hour is come. . . . Arise, let us be going.” M. Henri Lasserre, in his interesting *Traduction Nouvelle* of the Gospels, arranges the text with this idea :—

“A son troisième retours vers eux, il leur dit :— C'est assez ! Dormez à présent et reposez vous. . . . Et maintenant, l'heure est venue ! Le Fils de l'Homme va être livré entre les mains des persers. . . . Levez vous et avançons ! Déjà s'approche celui qui me trahit.”

The abrupt, disjointed sentences in St. Mark favour this interpretation to a certain extent, and are admirably rendered by M. Lasserre in his vivid French. The only difference between this explanation and that hinted at by Augustine is in reference to the words “it is enough,”—these referring, according to the one interpretation, to the time for sleep being past ; according to the other, they indicate that there is no more need of watching.

It is, however, a difficulty that we are thus obliged to break up an (apparently) continuous utterance into two distinct utterances, spoken at different times and (if we may venture to say so) in different moods. This may be a legitimate artifice, but it *is* an artifice, and ought not to be

est, Dormite jam et requiescite, tanquam ab exprobante, non a permittente sit dictum. Quod recte fieret, si esset necesse ; cum vero Marcus ita hoc commemoraverit, ut cum dixisset, Dormite jam et requiescite, adjungeret, sufficit ; et deinde inferret, Venit hora ; ecce tradetur Filius Hominis : utique intelligitur post illud quod eis dictum est, Dormite jam et requiescite, siluisse Dominum aliquantum ut hoc fieret quod permiserat ; et tunc intulisse, ecce appropinquavit hora. Ideo post illa verba secundum Marcum positum est, sufficit, id est, quod requievistis jam sufficit. Sed quia commemorata non est ipsa interpositio silentii Domini, propterea coarctat intellectum, ut in illis verbis alia pronuntiatio requiratur.”

¹ See *De Consens. Evang.* iii. 4 : “Qua velut repugnancia commoti qui legunt, conantur ita pronuntiare quod dictum

resorted to until every simpler method of exegesis has been ruled inadmissible. For it is quite foreign to the style of the Synoptists to combine in this way two different sayings of our Lord, without giving the slightest hint that they were spoken under different circumstances. All three Evangelists freely use introductory phrases when quoting Christ's words, and are accustomed to indicate with clearness the occurrences which called them forth. Whether we suppose the interval between the touching rebuke, "Sleep on henceforth: the time when you might have given me your sympathy is over," and the stern call to rise and go, as long or short—at least, it is necessary that the change in tone was called forth by a change in the situation. It has been conjectured that our Lord raised His eyes and saw Judas approaching, just after He had said "Sleep on;" and that then He perceived as it were the impossibility of further delay. The crisis has come; they must all act—the Master His part, the disciples theirs. But this is to read something into the narrative that is not there already; and, moreover, it assumes that the Evangelists (for almost the same words are found in St. Matthew xxvi. 45) have omitted to mention the cause and occasion of the change of tone in our Lord's words. Whatever view we take of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, it will be probably admitted that the account of this scene comes from an eye-witness. But what eye-witness would tell a story in such a way? To record as a single sentence utterances which (on the hypothesis under consideration) were spoken under different circumstances, in different tones, and were separated by some definite interval of time! It is possible, but is it probable?

2. Professor Palmer has made a suggestion (in the *Classical Review* for July 1888) which has the advantage of giving a very striking dramatic force to the words of our Lord in question. He proposes that we should understand them as the language of stern and weighty rebuke: "Take your rest, and sleep *in future*; but *now* rise, let us go. Enough of slumber. Behold, he that doth betray me is at hand." This makes the whole passage consistent with itself. The pathetic inquiry and admonition, "Why sleep ye? watch and pray lest ye enter into temptation," addressed to the disciples on the first two occasions on which they were found slumbering, is now on this third

occasion exchanged for the language of solemn reproof. "This is no time for sleep; take that hereafter. Do you not see that even now the traitor approaches? Rise, let us go."

If the Greek can bear out this interpretation it seems the best yet offered, and the most natural. But it rests on the hypothesis that τὸ λοιπὸν or λοιπὸν (as the reading is a little doubtful) may mean "*in the future*, as opposed to *now*" rather than "*for the future*;" and of this usage no certain example has yet been produced from Greek literature. The regular meaning of the word is, of course, "henceforth," "from that time on;" it denotes future duration, starting from the present moment, differing in this from τοῦ λοιποῦ, which rather indicates a definite point of time in the future (see Ellicott in Gal. vi. 17). For instance, it occurs in Acts xxvii. 20, "All hope was *from that time on* taken away;" in Heb. x. 13, "*henceforward* waiting until, etc.;" 2 Tim. iv. 8, "*from henceforth* is laid up for me the crown of righteousness;" 1 Cor. vii. 29, "the time is shortened, in order that *henceforth* both those that have wives may be as though they had none," etc. In the Epistles of Ignatius it is used in the same sense, e.g. *ad Eph.* 11, λοιπὸν αἰσχυρθώμεν, "*henceforth* let us have reverence;" and *ad Smyrn.* 9, εὐλογόν ἐστιν λοιπὸν ἀνανήψαι ἡμᾶς, "it is reasonable *henceforth* that we wake to soberness." I count it unnecessary to give parallels from classical authors of this, the ordinary usage of the word. Now, if no parallel can be cited (and the present writer has failed to find one) justifying the sense which would be needed if we were to adopt Professor Palmer's interpretation of the passage, it would seem that that interpretation cannot be pressed. Construing the opening sentence as an imperative, we must take it as the Revisers have done: "Sleep on," i.e. "Sleep on henceforth;" and this is open to the objections noticed above.

3. But is the opening sentence an imperative? The ordinary French and German versions do not regard it as such: in them it is construed as interrogative. "Vous dormez encore et vous vous reposez?"¹ "Ach, wollt ihr nun schlafen und ruhen?" This is the rendering adopted by Titmann in his *Synonyms of the New Testament*, who translates, "Num pergitis dormire? schlaft ihr

¹ The sentence is thus punctuated in the edition of Osterwald's version published at Oxford in 1872.

noch immer?" and is favoured by Krebs, who paraphrases: "Num jam (cum omnium minime opportunum dormiendi tempus est) dormitis et quiescitis?" More simply and with more regard to the etymology of *λοιπόν* we may paraphrase: "Are you sleeping and resting *for the time that yet remains?* Surely you have had enough of sleep. The hour is at hand. Do you not see the torches of the crowd in the distance?" To translate *λοιπόν* as equivalent to *quod superest* is quite legitimate, as will be admitted; indeed, Alford interprets it exactly thus in 1 Cor. vii. 29, though he does not seem to have hit the precise meaning of that passage. The only objection to doing so is that it makes *λοιπόν* rather more emphatic than it would seem to be from its place in the sentence; but that is not a very serious point. One argument has been brought forward in favour of giving the sentence an interrogative turn, which must be noticed here in order to point out its fallaciousness. It has been alleged (see Dowdall, *Classical*

Review, December 1888) that we thus harmonise St. Matt. xxvi. 45 and St. Mark xiv. 41 with St. Luke xxii. 46: *τί καθεύδετε; ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς πειρασμόν.* *Why sleep ye? rise and pray that ye enter not into temptation;* the opening clause of which is interrogative. But the real parallels to this passage from St. Luke are St. Matt. xxvi. 41 and St. Mark xiv. 38; the words recorded by St. Luke are those spoken by the Lord on the *second* occasion when He found His followers sleeping; the words addressed to them by Him on the *third* and last occasion are not preserved by this Evangelist at all. Hence the interrogative form of the sentence in St. Luke xxii. 46 does not help us in the interpretation of the passage before us.

But on the whole, though this argument be not valid, it seems to the present writer that fewer and less weighty objections lie against the last mentioned line of interpretation than against either of the other two.

The Study of Theology in British Baptist Colleges.¹

BY THE REV. D. WITTON JENKINS, GLASGOW.

I HAVE read with deep interest and sympathy Principal Davies's paper on this subject. And, because I agree with so much of it, I venture to point out what seems to me its defect. As a student of a Baptist college, I can endorse fully the criticism as a whole, and also the suggestions thrown out. The writer has put his finger on the weak points of the training given in our colleges. It is only when a man gets out into the work of the ministry that he realises the fact. The training in theology is not thorough enough. It is too narrow, too shallow, too fragmentary, and by no means covers the ground which ought to be covered. It is true that students *are* dissatisfied, and are crying out for reform. In comparison with what is done in some other colleges in this country, and especially in America and Germany, I do not hesitate to say that we are miserably behind. In most of our colleges an attempt is made to teach most, if not all, the branches named in the conspectus; but it is only an attempt.

¹ This paper was in hand before the issue of the June number, and is therefore independent of Notes by Dr. Culross and Prof. Marshall, with which it agrees.

I wish to emphasise what has been pointed out: viz., that the fault lies, not in the tutors, so much as in the *system*. It is a marvel that the tutors are able to accomplish so much, and produce results so creditable. According to our present system, we have no room for specialists. If they were placed in the position, they would be square men in round holes. The only man that suits is an all-round man, who can beg, preach, transact business, entertain, keep up interest in the particular college, as well as teach theology. Now it is impossible to do thorough work on these lines. Happily in Scotland our theological tutor is not required to attend to these extraneous matters. He devotes himself to teaching theology. It is true that some colleges are affiliated with universities where the students take their Arts course. But these are, in my opinion, worse off than the others, because each has only one tutor to teach all subjects not taken in the university. And this one man has to attend to all the extras already named, without the aid and counsel of a colleague. What can one man do among fifteen or twenty students?