

THE MISSION OF THE DISCIPLES

Mt. 9:35—11:1 and Parallels

FREDERICK C. GRANT, Evanston, Ill.

The following discussion rests upon and seeks to substantiate the theory, which has now several advocates, that Mark knew and made use of Q. For the sake of clearness, the passage in Matthew with its parallels and doublets may be tabulated as follows:

MT.	MK.	LK. 9	LK. 10	MT.	MK.	LK.
9:35	6:6			4:23		
36	34					
37f			10:3			
10:1	7ac	9:1	1			
	7b				3:14-19	6:13-16
2-4						
5f						
7		2				
8						
9-10a	8f	3	4			
10b			7b			
11	10	4				
13f			5f			
			7ac8f			
14	11	5	10f			
15			12			
16			3			
17f	18:9			24:9a		21:12f
19f	11	12:11f				14f
21	12					16
22	13			12b13		17.19
23						
24f		6:40				
26		12:2			4:22	8:17
27-32		3-8				21:18
33		9			8:38	9:26
34-36		51.53				
37		14:26				
38		27		16:24	34	23
39		17:33		25	35	24
40				18:5 (f)	9:37 (f)	48(f)
41						10:16(f)
42					41 (f)	
11:1						

These may be examined easily in Huck's *Synopsis*.

Mt. 9:35 represents Mk. 6:6b plus Mt. 4:23. That Mt. had Mk. 6 before him is at first glance quite probable; the transitive use of *περιῆγεν* (contrast 4:23) is parallel to Mk. (B. Weiss in Meyer I, 1, ed. 9 and 10, p. 193), though the verse as a whole, like 4:23, forms the heading to a new section in the gospel. Weiss also refers the omission of *ἐν . . . τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ* to Mk.; Jesus is accordingly represented as not limiting his preaching-tour to Galilee. But this can hardly be significant, in view of 19:1; Jesus does not carry his public ministry outside the limits of Galilee until considerably later. Moreover, *ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλ.* in 4:23 is parallel to Mk. 1:39 *εἰς ὅλην τ. Γαλ.*; where it is also to be noted that Mt. prefers *περιῆγεν* to Mk.'s *ἦλθεν*. In view of this phenomenon, Mk.'s use of the rare¹ *περιῆγεν* in 6:6 is striking; (and note Mt.'s omission of *κύκλω* (strongly LXX), which is unnecessary if the force of *περι* in *περιῆγ.* is retained). At the very least, we cannot close our minds at once against the possibility that Mt. has particular, perhaps documentary, reason for preferring the uncommon *περιῆγεν* in 4:23; and that Mk., although avoiding it in 1:39, comes to it in 6:6 (here only in his gospel; that he did not thoroughly understand it is implied in his addition of *κύκλω*). The same phenomenon is to be noted in the case of *διδάσκων*. That the verse in Mt. is a repetition of 4:23 for the purpose of introducing a new section of the gospel is most likely; but is its form derived from Mk., with the addition of a summary of Jesus' activity from Mt.'s own hand?—or do both 9:35 and 4:23 go back to a formula upon which Mk. also is dependent, and which he abbreviates in his customary manner? The latter seems at least a possibility to the present writer.

9:36 represents Mk. 6:34, although *ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους* is in Mt.'s style (cf. 5:1), and *ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐριμμένοι* may be due to his didactic ("homiletic"? cf. 12:40) purpose (the difference in number, *τ. ὄχλους* instead of *πολὸν ὄχλον*, simply represents a difference in style; Mt. ordinarily prefers the plural, Mk. the singular, of *ὄχλος*). But the Marcan parallel occurs considerably later, and has a different motive: it introduces Jesus' "teaching them many things" just before the feeding of the 5,000. Does Mt. use it by anticipation? Hardly so, for Mt.

¹ I. e., in the intransitive N. T. sense. The word occurs in the N. T. only in Mt. (thrice), Mk. (once; here) and in Ae. (once).

follows Mk. when he reaches 6:34 in his narrative (14:14,—which is certainly due to Mk.; Lk.'s parallel goes off on a decided tangent—*ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*—although Mt. and Lk. agree against Mk. in representing our Lord as *healing* on this occasion, thus perhaps indicating a Q-substratum introductory to the feeding of the 5,000). The parallel is possibly due to oral tradition, or else, more likely, to Mt.'s familiarity with Mk.; he must have been tolerably familiar with a writing upon which he relies so thoroughly as he relies upon Mk. The sharp contrast in figure with 37f renders it probable that Mt. has inserted v. 36, out of its context, in order to emphasize Jesus' motive in sending out the Twelve. Despite his skill in conjoining 36 and 37f, (cf. *τότε*), this change of figure is too abrupt, although the sense is continuous: it was a vision of the great need which prompted the call to prayer for help and for helpers. Vv. 37f are without doubt from Q.; they are closely paralleled in Lk. (10:2), and B. Weiss points out (*Quellen d. syn. Ueb.*, p. 25) the use of *θερισμός*, *ἐργάται*, and *ἐκβάλη* elsewhere in Q.

10:1. As Weiss remarks (*op. cit.*, p. 25), the *προσκαλεσόμενος* throws us off the track; it is a Marcan word, occurring nine times in that gospel. But Mt. and Lk. agree against Mk. in supporting a participial construction (Lk. in c. 9, where he is following *Mk.*); in a more logical order than Mk.'s (1. Call. 2. Giving authority over unclean spirits—Lk. adds *δύναμιν*, which he emphasizes (cf. 5:17, etc.), 3. Sending out (Mt. 10:5, Lk. 9:2). Mk.'s order is 1, 3, 2); and in the addition of healing (*καὶ νόσους θεραπ.*; Mt. has formulated this after his previous model, 9:35; 4:23; cf. Lk. 9:2—*καὶ ἰᾶσθαι*). This observation suggests as a solution the possibility, once more, of Q. underlying the whole passage, which (Q.) Mk. used and abbreviated. *ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτά*, like *μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ*, is an explanatory addition by Mt. Reference will be made later to the "Hebraisms" of the passage. Mk.'s *δύο δύο* (which is not necessarily a Hebraism; cf. J. H. Moulton, *Gram. of N. T. Greek, Proleg.*,³ p. 21 note 3, p. 97), paralleled by Lk.'s *ἀνὰ δύο* (10:1; ?*ἀνὰ δύο δύο* BKII *min syrsin*?—either the unnecessary second *δύο* is a copyist's error, or else the reading is a conflate, due to the influence of Mk.), presents a difficulty whether ascribed to Mk., Q., or oral tradition. If Mk., why did Mt. and Lk. (c. 9) omit it? If Q., why

did Mt. omit it,—especially since he arranges the list of the XII in pairs? If oral tradition, how came Lk. to add it in c. 10 after omitting it in c. 9? The expression is not foreign to Mk.'s style; cf. v. 39 f. (where note also Lk.'s // 9:14—though the command is phrased in Hebraic style, Lk. has simply ἀνά πενήκοντα); but Lk.'s parallel seems to be undesigned—it occurs, as we have already noted, not when he is copying Mk., but when inserting the “special” (oral?) matter regarding the Mission of the Seventy (in which section, as shall be seen, he uses Q. very largely). *Quid explicatio?*

Vv. 2-4 were doubtless inserted here by Mt. He has just used τοὺς δώδεκα, adding μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ inasmuch as up to this point he has recorded the call of only five of the XII (and accordingly has not, heretofore, used the expression, “the Twelve”); now he proceeds to append a list of their names. It is hardly to be supposed that he thought of the XII as being set apart on this particular occasion, although he omits Mk.'s account (3:13 ff.). According to Mk.'s account, the mission of the disciples took place much later in Jesus' ministry, shortly before his retirement from public activity, when the full number of the XII was complete. Mt.'s stopping here to give a list of the XII is a tacit approval of the view that the mission took place considerably later. If we examine the three lists (Mt. 10:2-4; Mk. 3:16-19; Lk. 6:14-16) we note the following phenomena: Mk. lists them 1. Peter, 2. James, 3. John his brother, 4. Andrew, 5. Philip, 6. Bartholomew, 7. Matthew, 8. Thomas, 9. James son of Alphaeus, 10. Thaddeus, 11. Simon the Canaanite, 12. Judas Iscariot. Mt.'s order is 1, 4, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 7, 9-12; Lk.'s is 1, 4, 2, 3, 5-9, 11 (10; Judas the son of James same as Thaddeus?), 12. Mt.'s order 1, 4, 2, 3, is the order in which he records their call to discipleship (4:18-22); the inversion of 7 and 8 is on stylistic grounds (cf. E. Klostermann *ad loc.* in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum N. T.*); but how comes it that Lk.'s order 1, 4, 2, 3, 5 ff., agrees with Mt. against Mk.? The explanation of Mt.'s order does not apply to Lk., for he omits the call of Andrew altogether. It may be offered in explanation that the name of Andrew (4) is placed after that of Peter on account of his relationship (“ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ”); but this only completes our statement of the case—for both Mt. and Lk. have this addition, while Mk. omits it. Furthermore, both Mt. and Lk. omit Mk.'s

addition of the clause mentioning the name given to the sons of Zebedee. It would seem that some better account of these discrepancies and agreements must be given than the hypothesis that Mt. and Lk. were wholly dependent upon Mk., revising Mk. each in his own way and in the light of wider knowledge. Mk.'s disagreements with Mt. and Lk., in order, and in matter (v. 17), seem much more like explanatory additions to, or arbitrary rearrangement of, "Q." (or other document containing a list of the apostles) than like concerted omissions on the part of Mt. and Lk. Mt.-Lk.'s combined rearrangement and "omissions" are strongly suggestive of a common source,—which Mk. also used, rearranged, and lengthened.

Vv. 5-8. V. 5 τοὺς ἰβ' ἀπέστειλεν and παραγγειλας αὐτοῖς can naturally be explained as taken over from Mk. (vv. 7 and 8; though Lk. has ἀπέστειλεν, exactly equivalent). But how does Mt. come to insert 5b-8, wedging in this long paragraph of directions between the direct and indirect objects of Mk.'s παρήγγειλεν? How, also, does it come that Lk. has a parallel (9:2) to this section which is not found in Mk., though in c. 9, 1 ff. Lk. is most certainly following Mk.? The simplest explanation is that Mt. is not *inserting* vv. 5b-8, but that Mk. has omitted them in copying Q. (Mt. vv. 5-10). What motive is to be ascribed to Mk. as explaining this omission? We do not know. Mk.'s brevity in this section seems unaccountable, especially in view of his extended account of John the Baptist's death later in the chapter. We should certainly expect him to give some reason, in our Lord's own words, if possible, for the sending out of the XII; and yet, none is given, except that it is said they went out preaching repentance, exorcising many demons, and anointing with oil many that were sick and healed . . . (v. 12 f.). According to Mk.'s representation, the disciples are told *how* to go, but not *why*; they are given no message to deliver, no commission to carry out. How should this occur, unless Mk. presupposed an acquaintance on his readers' part with the tradition regarding this event—which he only mentions and hastily passes over? Or else, unless the difficulties involved in the command to confine the mission to the Jewish towns and villages of Palestine—"the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. v. 6)—seemed unsurmountable and inexplicable? And yet, this was the only time at which our Lord could so have directed

the XII; and the limitations which he placed upon them in their mission were just those which he had recognized in his own work all along (cf. Mt. 15:24; 4:23; 9:35). It is evident that the paragraph is very old and authentic (i. e., not due to Mt.); note the "Hebraisms" in vv. 5 f.: the anarthrous ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν, πόλιν Σαμαριτῶν, οἶκον Ἰσραήλ.² Why Lk. omitted the equivalent of 5b and 6, if it stood in Q., we can only surmise. Perhaps it was "not suited to his purpose"; or it would only give rise to misunderstanding in the minds of his readers; or it did not suit his conception of the mission. We do not know why. He gives the equivalent of vv. 7 f. in 9:2 and 10:9. There is no reason why δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε, v. 8, should not properly belong in this connection. The difficulty arises when it is understood to refer to *teaching*: "you have learned without cost; therefore, do not expect to receive compensation for your labor of teaching others" (cf. Irenaeus I, 4, 3; and even Schürer, *GJV*⁴ II. 379; etc.). This is hardly a necessary or even a possible construction. Originally it could only have meant, pressed to exact and explicit definition, δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε τὴν ἐξουσίαν, δωρεὰν δότε· θεραπεύετε, κηρύσσετε (vv. 7 and 8).

Vv. 9 and 10 are parallel to Mk. vv. 8 f. Here Mk.'s order is

1. μὴ δὲν αἴρωσιν . . . εἰ μὴ ράβδον μόνον,
2. μὴ ἄρτον,
3. μὴ πήραν,
4. μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν,
5. ἀλλὰ ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια,
6. καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσθητε δύο χιτῶνας.

Compared with this, Mt.'s order is

4. μὴ (κτῆσησθε χρυσὸν μὴδὲ ἄργυρον μὴδὲ) χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν,
3. (+ εἰς ὁδόν),

² Cf. Blass, *Gramm.* § 46, 9; but also Moulton, *Proleg.*³ p. 81 f.; 236; Radermacher, *Gramm.*, p. 94. It is possible that these expressions had acquired, among Greek-speaking Jews (i. e., bilingualists), a grammatical character approximating to that of proper names, fixed "ιδιώματα." To these may be added the expressions found in vv. 15, 23 (BD om. του 1°), 41 (μισθὸν twice. Ct. v. 42; this may have some bearing on the literary analysis of the two verses), and even in v. 1 (where there are three), where Mt. is commonly supposed to be using Mk. Edersheim long ago pointed out the essentially Jewish forms of thought and modes of expression in this chapter (cf. *Life and Times*,⁴ i, 641, 644 f.).

6. (μηδὲ δύο χιτῶνας),
5. (μηδὲ ὑποδήματα; cf. Lk. 10:4),
1. μηδὲ ῥάβδον!

Lk.'s order (c. 9) is

1. (but equivalent to Mt.; the ῥάβδος is forbidden).
- 3, 2, 4. (μήτε ἀργύριον; cf. Mt.),
6. (μήτε ἀνὰ δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν).

In c. 10, Lk.'s order is

4. (μὴ βαστάζετε βαλλάντιον),
- 3, 5. (μὴ ὑποδήματα; cf. Mt.), and
7. μηδένα κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀσπάσθησε.

Perhaps the first peculiarity observable in going over these lists is that Mt.'s order is more closely parallel to that of Lk. 10 than to that of Mk. 6, and that Mk. is paralleled by Lk. 9 more closely than by either Mt. or Lk. 10. The similarities and identities of language are next to be noted, especially those in which Mt. and Lk. agree against Mk.: Mt.'s ἄργυρον (silver) and Lk.'s ἀργύριον (money); the prohibition of the staff, and (Lk. 10) shoes (ὑποδήματα). Noticeable also is Mk.'s ἀλλά, which is almost meaningless, since there is no transition in thought, and is followed by καὶ μὴ ἐνδ. δύο χιτ., continuing and completing the list of proscribed articles. Mk.'s ἀλλά presupposes the μὴ ὑποδήματα which Mt. and Lk. (c. 10) give, answering as it does the question naturally raised by that prohibition, 'if not shoes, then—ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια'. Mk. does not write all that is in his mind; and the transition is not clear to us, as it was to him. If, as I suspect, Q. lay before him, ὑποδεδεμένους would be very easily suggested by ὑποδήματα, which he omits. The following hypothesis suggests itself as the simplest explanation of the parallels: Mk. uses (and revises) Q.; Mt. combines Mk. and Q.; Lk. 9 follows Mk., with slight additions from Q. (μήτε ῥάβδον, μήτε ἀργύριον); Lk. 10 follows Q., omitting what he has already given in 9:3. (and changing "girdles" to "purse"?). It is to be noted that Mt. (while perhaps expanding the first part of the passage (v. 9) so as to include both Mk. and Q.?) offers a natural climax: "take neither money nor a wallet, nor two tunics, nor shoes, nor even a staff" (cf. Mt.'s order in 4:3-10, which is a natural climax, ignored by Lk.). This order, if it is that of Q., is misunderstood or ignored by Mk.,—who places the staff first; Lk.

follows Mk.'s order, though retaining the original form of the command in regard to the staff (i. e., prohibition). This seems to afford an explanation of Mt.'s and Lk.'s agreement against Mk. in forbidding the staff preferable to that of B. Weiss (Meyer I, 2^o, p. 419)—i. e., that Mt. and Lk. concurrently testify to the later misunderstanding of Mk.'s wording—as if Mk.'s *εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον* could have presented any difficulty!³ Lk.'s distributive (9:3) is hardly to be matched against Mt. and Mk.; he simply does not understand (or his readers will not understand) the custom of wearing one garment over another on long journeys⁴ referred to in Mk.; as in 3:11, he supposes the possession of two *χιτῶνες* to be a mark of affluence. It may be asked, in objection to the analysis of the passage just given, Why does Lk. fail to recognize (as Mt. has recognized) the dependence of Mk. on Q.? Doubtless this is the difficulty which the analysis of the whole section leaves with us; it is more defined at this point because the parallelism is here more close than in any earlier passage. We cannot go sufficiently far back of the earliest documents and traditions to find a sure answer. And the difficulty is only increased by reference to Mk.'s *δύο δύο* (v. 7), paralleled in Lk. 10. If we may hazard a guess, it is that Lk. had the definite narrative of Mk. before him, and also the sayings (with no context of narrative) in Q. Mk.'s version of the Q.-sayings (i. e., in v. 8 f.) represented such a complete revision that the identity was not at once recognizable (especially if they occurred, where Mt. places them, much earlier in Q. than in Mk.); his own tradition (oral?) of the Mission of the Seventy supplied the key—there were two missions, one of the XII, another of the LXX—and although he wavered in c. 9, correcting Mk. by reference to Q., he soon decided upon the solution of the difficulty by placing the balance of Q. in his account of the later mission (c. 10). It is possible that the "confused and unintelligible tradition" (Bousset) dates from Mk.'s revision of Q., and was almost as confusing to Lk. as to us. V. 10b (= Lk. 10:7c) is not in Mk., and is therefore, according to the ordinary canon, from Q. Since it fits either context, it is practically impossible to decide in which it belongs—though in Mt.

³ Contrast J. Weiss' explanation in *Die Schriften*,² i, 126.

⁴ Cf. *Jos., Antiq.*, 17:5:7; E. Klostermann *ad loc.*

it apparently breaks the close connection of vv. 10 and 11 implied in *δέ* (v. 11).

Vv. 11-13, which B. Weiss, Harnack and Wellhausen unani-
mously ascribe to Q., contains the practical rule which the dis-
ciples are to observe upon entering a new town or village. It
may be remarked at once that there is nothing in Mk. (v. 10)
which cannot be explained as abbreviation of Q., and indeed,
although *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* and *ὅπου ἔάν* are common Marcan
phrases, the verse as a whole is best so explained. Mk.'s *ὅπου ἔάν*
is equivalent to the Matthean-Lucan phrase *εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν* (Mt. v. 11,
Lk. 9:4; 10:5). But did Q. read *πόλιν ἢ κώμην* (Mt.) or *οικίαν*
(Mk., Lk. 9 and 10)? B. Weiss prefers *οικίαν*. He views Mt.
10:11 as an interpolation of the author into Q., in consequence
of which he wrote *εἰσερχόμενοι* instead of *εἰσέλθῃτε* in v. 12
(*Quellen d. s. Ueb.*, p. 26). It may further be said for this view
that *οικίαν* is testified to not only by Lk. 10:5 and 9:4 (= Mk.
6:10), but also by the addition of *ἢ τῆς πόλεως* in v. 14 *after*
ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς οικίας, in a passage which undoubtedly refers
primarily to rejection by an entire town, not by a single house-
hold (as Mt. himself indicates in the next verse (15) *τῇ πόλει*
ἐκείνῃ, which verse is from Q.). But, the sword is two-edged!
The *whole* passage refers to acceptance or rejection by an entire
town or village. The disciples' message is to whole communi-
ties; it is not a house-mission, nor 'individual work': "greet
no man by the way" (Lk. 10:4). Mk. has abbreviated the
passage by selecting the outstanding principle of these direc-
tions—"into whatsoever *house* you enter, there remain till you
depart (from the town," obviously, although the sentence is
not clear as it stands alone in Mk.). Lk. has followed Mk.'s
abbreviated form in c. 9, with the change (back to Q.) of *ὅπου*
ἔάν into *καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν*. In c. 10, however, the passage (vv. 5-12)
presents this peculiarity: in v. 7, the disciples are bidden to
accept the hospitality of the *house* receiving them; in v. 8. in
similar terms, they are bidden to accept the hospitality of the
receptive *city*. The most natural explanation of this phenome-
non would seem to be as follows: Q. read something like the pres-
ent Matthean form of the passage, *εἰς ἣν [δ'] ἂν πόλιν (ἢ κώμην?*
may be due to 9:35) *εἰσέλθῃτε, ἐξετάσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἁγίος ἐστίν* (where
did Mt. get this, if not from his documents? It was hardly the
method of the later Palestinian Christian missionaries). Lk.

omits this—perhaps for the same reason for which he omitted the equivalent of Mt. vv. 5b, 6; perhaps the direction, simple enough in itself, in view of the common Jewish custom, was unintelligible to his Gentile mind, perhaps it was “unsuited to his readers” (although he records the claims which Jesus himself made for hospitality later in the gospel; cf. 19:5; 30 ff.; 22:10 ff.). It may be supposed that Mt. v. 13 (i. e. its equivalent in Q.) was not easily understood, and so Lk. explains the ἀσπάσασθε αὐτήν in v. 12 by giving the explicit πρῶτον λέγετε εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ (which Mt. v. 13 certainly presupposes). Thus also he avoids the use of ἀσπάσασθε,—which, following v. 4 (μηδένα . . . ἀσπάσησθε), might give rise to an apparent contradiction which would have to be explained; at least, for the sake of literary style, it was better to paraphrase the word. Klostermann (*Handbuch z. N. T., Mt.*, p. 225) prefers Lk.’s form to that of Mt.: “ἀσπ. αὐτ. . . . erscheint stärker gräzisiert als die dem Semitischen . . . besser entsprechende und zu der Fortsetzung bei Mt. selbst allein passende Form Lc. 10:5” (and cf. B. Weiss, *Q. d. s. U.*, p. 26 f.). Moulton and others have pointed out Mt.’s improvement of the Greek of his sources (cf. Moulton’s *Gram. of N. T. Gk.* i³, Index III, s. v. “Matthew”). This preference in no way invalidates our argument, viz., that Q. contained an equivalent to Mt. v. 11a. V. 6 in Lk. is practically equivalent to Mt. v. 13, the formulation of the conditions in each case being determined by the preceding verses (ἐὰν . . . ἀξία, or ἐὰν . . . εἰρήνης). Lk. then (v. 7) gives the equivalent of Mt. v. 11c, which is doubtless in its logical place here. This is followed (v. 7b) by the direction to eat and drink such things as are offered (τὰ παρ’ αὐτῶν). This cannot refer, as has often been supposed, to the waiving of the recognized distinctions between Jewish and Gentile dishes—food which is “clean” and that which has been offered to idols—for Lk. definitely bases it upon the maxim: ἀξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ (// Mt. v. 11b); it refers to the *right* of the disciples to such food as is offered them—what was really presupposed in the command not to take provisions on the journey (v. 4 // s). This renders unlikely the supposition that the words are due to Lk. himself (“under Pauline influence”). Although the words mean the same in Mt. as here, the connection of thought in Lk. is too close not to be original; probably Lk.’s location is to be

preferred (and cf. what was said above on Mt. v. 10b). To this is now added the direction, *μὴ μεταβαίνετε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν*. The words have no parallel in Mt., and indeed, seem unnecessary after the first part of the verse, in which the direction is implied. It is possible that Lk. has in mind here a later abuse—cf. *Διδιχί*, cc. 11-13—perhaps the situation when men arose who endeavored to make of the Gospel a way of gain. However, there is no reason why our Lord should not have forewarned the disciples against a kind of tactlessness incompatible with the dignity and seriousness of their mission. Then, either because of the interruption occasioned by the insertion of the two sentences, “the laborer is worthy . . . go not from house to house,” or, more likely, because he prepares to include the directions to heal and to preach the coming of the Kingdom (which he omitted above; parallel to Mt. vv. 7, 8—the command doubtless belongs in the Matthean location. It was natural for the disciples to be told *why* they were to go before being told *how* to go), he goes back to the beginning of the passage in Q.: *εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν εἰσελθῆτε*. The *καὶ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς* is presupposed in vv. 5-7 (that the expression is in Lk.’s own style, cf. the following verse and 9:5, where he prefers it to Mk.’s *δέξηται*); *ἔσθιετε τὰ πυρπιθέμενα* is from Q. (v. 7; repeated here as giving a summary of the situation); and v. 9 embraces the omitted Q.-verses (Mt. vv. 7 f.). Q. accordingly read *εἰς ἣν [δ'] ἂν πόλιν [ἢ κώμην?]* Lk. would have no reason for omitting it; cf. 13:22] *εἰσελθῆτε, ἐξετάσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀξίος ἐστίν· εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ἀσπάσασθε αὐτήν. [or, πρῶτον λέγετε· εἰρήνην τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦτω.] καὶ εἰ μὲν ἦ ἡ οἰκία ἀξία, ἐλθάτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτήν· εἰ μὲν δὲ μὴ ἦ ἀξία, ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω. (or, Lk. 10, 6). ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε, ἔσθοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ’ αὐτῶν· ἀξίος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ [τροφῆς? may be an accommodation to the facts of the present case (!) of what was originally a proverb] αὐτοῦ. [μὴ μεταβαίνετε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν?]*

V. 14 (the presence of which in Q. Harnack questions; Weiss prefers Lk.’s form) follows Mk., with the explanatory addition of *τοὺς λόγους* (cf. additions in 9:36 and 10:1). Mk.’s *ἐκπορευόμενοι* is strongly Marean (cf. statistics in Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*,² p. 12); and although Lk.’s (9:5) *ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπό* is strongly in his own style (cf. Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 18), still the parallel *ἐξερχόμενοι* in Mt. cannot be ignored, since the possibility has been

considered that Lk. was following (or that he remembered) Q. as well as Mk. in c. 9. Mt. abruptly omits Mk.'s τόπος, and in its place has later τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης. Why? Because from the very beginning of the passage (v. 11) οἰκία has been in his mind—the treatment which the XII were to receive from and to accord the households approached (so also the Q.-verse which he omits, Lk. 10:7). He returns to the conception of the whole city accepting or rejecting the message, and adds ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης (which is Q.; cf. Lk. 9:5, where the exact phrase occurs, and 10:10 πόλιν). For the same reason—because it is in Q.—he prefers κοινορτόν (paralleled in Lk. 9:5; 10:11) to Mk.'s peculiar χοῦν. Lk. 10:10 f. is built out of Q., but in contrastive parallelism to his own vv. 8 f. B. Weiss (*op. cit.*, p. 28) pronounces impossible any change of the metaphorical words (Lk. 10) into the symbolic action (Mk. and parallels), but nevertheless prefers the Lk. 10 form in his reconstruction of Q. It does not seem impossible (nor unlikely) that a change in the opposite direction has taken place. According to these observations, Q. probably read: εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν εἰσέλθῃτε καὶ μὴ [δέξῃται?] ὑμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι . . . τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης καὶ τὸν κοινορτόν . . . τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάσσετε (Lk. would not insert ἀπό three times into Mk. 6:11 unless he had good reason for so doing). Lk. 10:11b is a completion of the parallelism to v. 9.

V. 15 is Q., though to be preferred in its Lucan form. To the reasons which B. Weiss gives (*l. cit.*) for so doing, in disagreement with Harnack, it may be added that Mt. avoids the presence of the demonstrative ἐκείνη twice in the same sentence, referring each time to a different dative noun.

V. 16. Both Harnack and B. Weiss prefer Lk.'s location (10:3); apparently, it has been placed here as an introduction to vv. 17 ff. But both the motive and the figure of Lk. 10:3 conflict with the preceding verse. Moreover, it would seem more natural for the verse to have formed the conclusion to the preceding directions and a transition to the following warnings (some of which must, so we shall endeavor to show, have stood in this connection in Q.), than as an introduction to the whole discourse on the mission of the XII. However, it is not to be denied that the verse as a whole may represent a considerably later point of view, when the mission was met (or could be expected to meet) with positive and powerful opposition. The

chief objection to Weiss' connection of Lk. 10:3 and Mt. 10:6 ("but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Behold, I send you forth as rams—leaders of the flock—in the midst of wolves"; cf. *Quellen d. s. Ueb.*, p. 26 note 3; also in Meyer, I, 2^o, p. 442, which is ratified in I, 1¹⁰, p. 200 note) is that ἀρνός [ἀρήν] (here only in N. T.) does not bear the interpretation placed upon it. In classical Greek, it invariably means 'lamb' or 'sheep,' and although related to Latin *aries* is nevertheless the equivalent of Latin *agnus*. In the LXX, it is used as equivalent to מְרִיא ('fatling'; I Kgs. 1:9), כֶּשֶׁב ('lamb'; Gn. 30:32), גֵּרִי ('kid'; Ex. 23:19), etc.—while the LXX consistently uses the thoroughly classical κριός as the equivalent to Heb. אֵיל. More than this, is it likely that both Mt. and Lk. would have ignored and destroyed this sequence of thought if the passage had so stood in Q.—the one by widely sundering its two sections, the other by omitting half the saying? Lk. has corrected the loose and vulgar πρόβατα, which was an indefinite term for small cattle, including goats, and as referring to sheep was used of indolent persons, by substituting the finer expression, ἄρνες.

The remainder of the chapter (with the exception of vv. 24 f.) occurs later in Lk.—mainly in c. 12—i. e., not only later than Mt. places it, but later even than the (Lucan) parallel to Mt. 10:1-16. It is most likely, therefore, that these paragraphs came later in Q., since it is generally conceded that Lk. preserves Q.'s order better than Mt. But they did not occur so much later in Q. that Mt. was entirely without justification in inserting them here.

Vv. 17-22 are almost word-for-word parallel to Mk. 13:9-13. For this reason, when he comes to Mk. 13, Mt. contents himself with the bare summary, (παρὰδύσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς) θλίψιν, and the conclusion of the discourse, 24:9; 13. In the present location, the tone hardly passes with 9:36 ff. Is Mt. inserting the discourse here in contravention of Mk.'s exact dating (13:1; 3)? Or is he locating here a section (undated) from Q. which Mk. has located in the discourse on the Mount of Olives—and whose Marcan equivalent Mt. recognizes as a section taken from Q.? In view of Mt.'s treatment of Mk. and Q. above, we are inclined to the latter view. It is to be noted that Harnack, though very

doubtful, labels the section Q. V. 18, καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (cf. 24:9-14) perhaps meant (as in Mk. 13:10, its parallel) the heathen world at large; but Mt., in view of vv. 5 f., 23b, thinks only of the heathen military residents in Palestine. The context of Lk.'s parallel (12, 11 f.) is later—if we may call it 'context'; for the "great insertion," in which it occurs, seems to be composed of many separate sayings and events placed in an order which does not commend itself as the probable historical order,—but sayings and events which, with only a few exceptions, must be placed late in Jesus' public life. The whole cast of the section is (with few exceptions) futuristic (especially c. 12, which contains sections placed by Mt. in connection with the Synoptic Apocalypse, 24:42—25:13). And the language here decidedly betokens working-over: ἀρχάς, ἐξουσίας, ἀπολογίασηθε, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα (as a proper name), and the deterministic ἂν δεῖ εἰπεῖν (which is, however, no real enlargement upon the parallels). Still, the curious πῶς ἢ τί, found in Mt. (v. 19) but not in Mk. (13:11), cannot be ignored. Doubtless Lk. has here a detached Q.-saying (or "logion") which Mk. places in a better—probably the correct—context; and he has dealt with this saying in the same fashion in which he deals with Mk. in 21:12-19.

After this insertion, v. 23 continues the original Q. passage (note the ὅταν (cf. v. 19 // Mk. 13:11), πόλαι, etc.) directing the XII what to do in case the message met with hostility (vv. 14 ff.). V. 23b, if authentic, could have been spoken only at this time (and cf. v. 6). The mission of the XII represents Jesus' final effort to win over the nation as a whole—"the lost sheep of the house of Israel"—and took place just before his retirement with the disciples and their restless wanderings in N. Galilee and on the E. side of the Lake (cf. even Edersheim⁸ i, 643; this much we can allow the Schweitzerian thesis). Later, as the shadow of the Cross darkened more heavily his path, and the complete rejection of his message by his own people became more certain, he began to look to the world at large as the proper objective of his disciples' efforts (Mk. 12:9 // s; 13:10 / Mt. 24:14; Mt. 22:9 //; Mk. 14:9 //). The date of the Parusia became more indefinite—though still confined within the lifetime of the then-living generation. And although Mt., in harmony with his general conception of the present discourse (cf. Weiss, *Quellen*, p. 25; etc.), may possibly think that it

refers to the early Palestinian Christian mission after the death of Jesus (i. e., in his own day), nevertheless, if v. 23b were placed very much later in his gospel, we should certainly at once doubt its authenticity.—But it is one thing to posit the existence of a saying in Q., and another to accept it as authentic; one does not follow from the other. To Lehrs' dictum, 'Thou shalt not worship an ancient manuscript' (Nestle, *Einführung*,³ pp. 180, 244), might need to be added to-day, 'Neither shalt thou worship an hypothetical document.' We may perhaps see in v. 23 an indication of the date of Q.—the time when the "great persecution" arose in Jerusalem, and the Church was scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, following the death of Stephen (Ac. 8:1-4), when Saul "laid waste the church." In this hour, as the disciples were hounded from city and village, the saying in v. 23b became current (perhaps based upon some such foundation as the (later) 'fly-sheet' in Mk. 13). In answer to the cry, **אָרְיִן אָרְיִן**, were found the words, "οὐ μὴ τελίσητε τὰς πόλεις Ἰσραὴλ ἕως ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου." The saying must have been before Mt. in Q.; the fact that he gives it, despite his open recognition throughout (and culminating in 28:19) of the Gentile mission, proves it to have had somewhat greater authority than that of oral tradition, great as such authority no doubt was. An objection can be raised against its having stood in this connection in Q. on the ground that while v. 14 f. presuppose a situation where the XII can enter and leave a city in peace, and shake off the dust from their feet against it, v. 23 presupposes active persecution. But v. 23 has certainly as much right to the present location in Q. as has v. 16 (which is undeniably Q., and in its present context in Q.); and v. 16, in Q., introduced v. 23, and formed the transition to it from 14 f.

Vv. 24 f. base this expectation of persecution upon Jesus' own experience in the past. Lk.'s parallel places the saying in a wholly different context and gives it an entirely different form and meaning (cf. Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden Jesu*, ii., 44 f.).

Vv. 26-33 may perhaps belong elsewhere (as in Lk.); and possibly much later than the place given them in Lk. Mk. parallels v. 26b in 4:22 (followed by Lk. 8:17), a not impossible context (explanation of parables). (V. 26a *αὐτοῖς* refers back to v. 17 *οἱ ἄνθρωποι*, and is probably added by Mt.). Mk.

also has a parallel to v. 33 (8:38; followed by Lk. 9:26). The natural inference from these two facts, taken together with the fact of Mt.'s and Lk.'s complete parallelism in the whole present section (vv. 26-33 //), is that a section such as this stood entire in Q.—a series of sayings, or a discourse, on the subject of courageous confession of the Christian name and fearless preaching of the Gospel message. And if we consider the saying in v. 16 (or even that in v. 14) to belong in its present connection, there is no reason why this section should not have been related originally to the discourse at the mission of the XII. It is easy to minimize the danger which attended this mission of the XII to the cities and villages of Galilee during our Lord's lifetime, by thinking mainly of the circumstances accompanying the efforts of the Apostles after Pentecost. But that there was real danger involved in this mission is clear from such passages as Lk. 11:53 f.; Mk. 9:30 f.; Lk. 13:31; Mk. 3:6; Lk. 4:29; clearer still, from the fate which so soon overtook Jesus himself. As for the *ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί* (v. 32), it is surely no stretch of the imagination to suppose that the XII were to go forth on their journey as emissaries of Jesus; the whole thing was meaningless otherwise;—they were to cover territory which Jesus could not himself reach. The main reason for placing the section later is found in vv. 26b-27, which apparently are intended to convey the impression that the time for reticence and restraint in announcing the message is past; the hour for avoiding agitation among the masses at the cost of silence is now by: "what ye have heard (whispered) in the ear, shout forth from the house-tops." This may or may not suit a later date than the present. (Cf. Jülicher, *op. cit.*, ii. 96 f.)

The same considerations apply to vv. 34-39. The Lucan contexts appeal for preference over the Matthean not only because of Mt.'s inclination to group related sayings into discourses, but especially, as Jülicher says (*op. cit.*, ii., p. 208), because the Lucan parallels give no hint of time or place (except that they are addressed to the disciples in the presence of the multitudes). I. e., Lk. has taken them over just where they stood in Q., without attempting (as Mt. has done) to locate them more definitely. We may assume the truth of this in regard to vv. 34-36. With vv. 37-39 the case is somewhat different. As in vv. 26 and 33, so in v. 38 f. we have a Marcan parallel at a

different place (8:34 f.), here followed, not by Lk. alone, but by both Mt. (16:24 f.) and Lk. (9:23 f.). The same general conclusion is to be drawn: Mk. has used Q.—and has located the sayings in what is not at all unlikely the true context (sayings laying down the conditions of *discipleship*, not of participation in the Mission). The induction is strengthened by the fact that in Mk. 8, as here, the complete saying—in two sections: a. bearing the cross, b. saving one's life—is preserved (contrast Mk. 4:22 and 8:38, where parts of the sayings are lost), and *in the same order*. V. 37 obviously does not belong here (in Mt.). Were the relatives of the XII at hand endeavoring to dissuade them from entering upon Jesus' mission, as Jesus' own relatives had earlier done? The verse is inserted here because of its connection with vv. 35 f. But we cannot omit 37 alone; 37 and 38 stood connected in Q., as Lk. 14:26 f. indicates; and so did also 38 and 39, as Mk. 8:34 f. proves. What is the solution?—That all three verses stood in their Matthean order in Q.; that Lk. used the Q.-section in c. 14, Mk. using it in c. 8.—Mt. and Lk. following the latter in cc. 16 and 9 respectively. (Lk.'s use of part of the section (// to v. 39) in 17:33 is certainly "out of order"; the application given to it by the context—a description of the Day of the Son of Man—is curious if not disconcerting.)

Vv. 40 ff. apparently return to the original Mission-discourse—presupposing the situation of receptivity and hospitality (vv. 11 ff.), promising a reward to those who entertain the missionaries. The laborer is worthy of his keep (10b); but also, the one who keeps him shall not lack a rightful compensation—nay, he who gives to one of these little ones (the disciples; cf. Lk. 12:32 τὸ μικρὸν ποιῆμιον) only so much as a cup of cold water, 'in the name of a disciple,' shall by no means lose his reward. That some such conclusion stood at the end of the discourse is proven by the parallel Lk. 10:16. But in what sense could the XII be spoken of as *προφήται* and *δίκαιοι*? "In diesen Sprüchen liegen wohl Worte Jesu zugrunde, aber Matthaeus hat sie umgestaltet zu einer Anweisung an die späteren Missionare und Gemeinden" (J. Weiss, *Die Schriften d. N. T.*², i., 313). Vv. 40 and 42 are completely tangled-up with Mk. 9:37 and 41. What has really happened can only be conjectured. The efforts

to place the sayings in suitable contexts have been so thorough as almost completely to disguise their original form and significance. Probably Mk. has placed the saying in v. 40 (// Lk. 10:16) in 9:37, making the change which was required by the new context, but retaining the rest of the verse (latter part) in its original form; and has used the equivalent of v. 42 in 9:41—in a different (“later”?) form, though preserving the correct interpretation: ὑμᾶς equivalent to οἱ μικροί. The inference lies close to hand that vv. 40 and 42 stood in their Matthean-Marcian sequence in Q.; and that Mk., though omitting the ‘Mission discourse’ as a whole, yet preserves these sayings, placing them in contexts which to him appear suitable. Q. probably did not contain any extended ‘Mission discourse,’ as such, but followed the account of the mission more or less immediately with a series of sayings which have been used by Mt. in the present chapter, by Mk. partly in his parallel chapter and partly in cc. 8 and 9, by Lk. partly in cc. 9, 10, 12, and 14.

V. 1 of c. 11 is Mt.’s own addition.

We may accordingly summarize our conclusions in regard to Mt. 9:35-11:1 as follows:

9:35 = a Q. formula (cf. 4:23) which Mk. abbreviates.

36 = inserted from Mk., not by anticipation of 6:34, but to emphasize motive. (For cf. Mt. 14:14.)

37 f. = Q.; Mk. omits.

10:1 = Q., with additions by Mt.; Mk. abbreviates.

2-4 = Q., but out of Q.-location; Mk. revises (c. 3).

5-8 = Q.; Mk. omits.

9 f. = Q.; Mk. revises.

11-13 = Q.; Mk. abbreviates.

14 = Q. plus Mk.; Mk. revises.

15 f. = Q.; Mk. omits.

17-22 = Q. (belongs much later? Mk. places in c. 13).

23-25 = Q.

26-33 = Q., a series of detached sayings? (Paralleled in Mk. cc. 4 and 8.)

34-39 = Q.-sayings (out of place? Also paralleled in Mk. 8); vv. 37-39 stood in their Matthean order in Q.

40 = Q., hardly in its original form; (prefer Mk. 9:37, except first six words).

41 = Mt. (Q.-substratum?).

42 = Q., (placed by Mk. in 9:41, which preserves the original sense, but gives later form).

11:1 = Mt.

Mk.'s whole passage is brief and sketchy; he simply records the fact of the mission, gives briefly the directions as to personal equipment and acceptance of hospitality, what to do in case the message is rejected, and states the fact of their preaching and healing, omitting any further statement of their message. It is difficult to account for this brevity. Especially, if he uses Q., why does he omit so much? Lack of space does not dictate it, for, as above noted, he follows the passage with an extended account of the death of John the Baptist. It has been frequently observed that Mk. is more concerned in giving the narrative of Jesus' work than in recording his teaching. But this observation only presents a further problem for solution. It would seem that Mk. is interested in giving the narrative of Jesus' life ('Petrine tradition') in order to supplement (but not supplant) the discourse-document already in the possession of the Christian community. (If the discourses were not already in written form, but merely in oral tradition (J. Weiss, *Die Schriften*,² i., 125 f.), why should Mk. *write* the narrative and not also the discourses?) This seems a much more plausible explanation of Mk.'s brevity, and his omission of discourse-material, than the assumption that Mk. was limited, through Peter's reminiscences, to narratives, and did not *know* the discourses (would Peter have remembered the narratives, while forgetting the discourses?). It is true, he begins his gospel with the words, "The Evangel concerning Jesus Christ, Son of God"—which without doubt means, 'concerning Jesus Christ, a person who taught and healed and wrought miracles in Galilee, and then went up to Jerusalem and died, at the hands of the authorities, as the Savior'; and not, 'the Evangel of Jesus Christ, which he himself first preached, and then through his apostles gave to the world'; yet we can hardly imagine him so completely ignoring the *teaching* of Jesus unless he could assume that his readers were already familiar with it. The question must have arisen more than once, as he wrote his narrative and recorded the fact of Jesus' teaching the crowd, the disciples, etc. (1:21; 2:2; 13; etc.—only in 4:1 ff. does he give an account of the

matter taught), 'What did Jesus teach, in the synagogues, at the lake-side, in the house and on the highways, as the multitude came about him to hear "the word"?'

As we emerge from the tangled thicket of textual analysis and criticism, we are confronted with the historian's questions: What was the character and object of this mission? When did it occur? How long a period of time did it require? Was the mission repeated?

The synoptic evangelists agree in representing our Lord's public ministry as falling into two broadly distinguishable periods: one of popular activity, the other of comparative retirement. This retirement was due, in all likelihood, to the opposition of the popularly influential scribes and Pharisees (with the "Herodians"?); but at the same time, the opposition was accompanied by the apathy and unrepentance of the masses of the people—in the cities, especially Capernaum, where his "mighty works" had been done. On withdrawing from public activity, he devoted himself almost entirely to the 'training of the XII,' preparing them to meet the hour which was inevitably coming, when the rising storm should burst and the Son of Man be put to shameful death, and announcing his certain return to establish (or inaugurate) the Kingdom of God. As the day is apparently drawing to its close, and he can see the shadows gathering about him, believing that 'his hour' is soon to come, he sends out the disciples with a final appeal, the call to repentance before the coming of the Kingdom (Mk. 6:12; Mt. 10:7; Lk. 10:9).⁵ How successful was this mission, we cannot say. The disciples return (Mk. 6:30; Lk. 10:17) with joy, relating their success in casting out demons. But we hear of no great awakening to repentance among the people of the land. In the later period, perhaps because of the unrepentance which he, and then later the XII, had found, and the consequent unfitness of the nation to receive the Kingdom, Jesus' view of the future changed. Together with the assurance that the Kingdom would be taken away from the favored people and given

⁵ There is this much of truth in Schweitzer's theory of the Mission (cf. his *Messianität und Leidensgeheimnis*, p. 15 ff.; *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 357 f.); as a whole, his theory is not based upon a thorough documentary analysis of the sources, and hence is mechanical and subjective.

to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof (Mt. 21:43), perhaps coëval with the growth of this conviction, his sense of the Kingdom's *immediacy* (with which he had begun his preaching in Galilee) gave way more and more to the feeling that "the day and the hour knoweth no man"—though he persisted to the end in maintaining the coming of the Kingdom within a generation (Mk. 9:1; 13:30).

Now the location which we will choose for the material contained in Mt. 10 depends considerably upon our acceptance or rejection of this *Lebensbild*—which, however, seems plainly indicated in both the synoptics and John (cf. Jn. 6:66). If we accept it, there seems little reason for denying the place in the Discourse on the Last Things which Mk. (13:9-13) has given to Jesus' words on the destiny of the disciples, placed by Mt. in c. 10. Perhaps the substance of these words was given more than once (hardly in identical form); at least this is the impression given to us in all the gospels. Mk. reports three distinct occasions upon which Jesus announced to the XII his own impending fate (cf. *ἡρξασο*, 8:31). It was necessary to repeat it to them because they were slow to accept so hard a saying (8:32b; 9:32). Would it have been any the less necessary for him to repeat his prediction of the future awaiting the XII, their trials and duties—so out of harmony with *their* conceptions (cf. Mk. 8:32; 9:33-37; 10:35-45)? Would it not have been strange if, when predicting the fate of Jerusalem, and other signs which should accompany and precede the end, he had left wholly out of consideration his own disciples' part in these events, if he had not repeated the warnings and counsels already given them? The character of the sayings connected in Mt. (and Lk.; also in Q.?) with the mission of the disciples seems to fit the latter period far better than the former. Accordingly, our answer to the historical questions is: There was only one 'mission'; and this took place during Jesus' lifetime.⁵ How

⁵ Wellhausen's doubt that the mission ever occurred, on the score that it was not repeated, and that the XII were afterwards as passive and lacking in independence as before, has been well answered by J. Denney in his *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 194 f.: "We have no such knowledge of the circumstances as enables us to say that this experiment if successful must have been repeated. The fact that a thing is not done twice is not a proof that it was not done once. When the Twelve returned from their

long the disciples were gone on this mission, we have no means of knowing. But they were not sent out with the expectation that they were not to reappear until the Parusia (as is implied by Mt.'s discourse as it stands—the crux of Schweitzer's argument).

In lieu of any second mission, or general commission, of the disciples, to be fulfilled after Jesus' death, Mk. gives his words to the disciples regarding their future, in the (composite) Discourse on the Last Things, and other discourses on the Parusia of the Son of Man, sayings which were uttered, possibly, during our Lord's last days, possibly on the way up to Jerusalem (Mk. 10:32-45),—at any rate, towards the very end of his life.⁷

How were these sayings (in Mt. 10) drawn out of their original context (i. e., final discourses and sayings) and connected with the words at the mission of the XII during Jesus' ministry in Galilee? There are two considerations to be suggested: 1st, we have seen what Mt. has done in 10:17 ff.; 2d, we do not know what was the order of Q. Lk. gives us what we suppose to be an approximate order; and, as we have seen above, this order apparently located the sayings soon after the narrative of the mission.—But even Lk. was a redactor, and also, he followed the lead of Mk. (his *καθεξῆς*, 1:3, must be valued relatively to this fact)—and Mk. had already suggested the mission of the XII as a possible location for these sayings.—Certainly, we cannot get back of a hypothetical reconstruction of the order of Q.⁸

experimental mission, a crisis was at hand in the ministry of Jesus; and from that time He kept them closely by Him, and devoted Himself almost exclusively to preparing them for the dark future which was now impending.”

⁷ There are numerous traces of agreement of Mt./Lk. against Mk. even in the “Synoptic Apocalypse”; cf. Mt. 24, 2, *ταῦτα; καταλυθήσεται*; 3, *λέγοντες*; 4, *εἶπεν*; 5, *γάρ*; 6, *γάρ*; 7, *καὶ 2^ο*; 21, *ἔσται; μεγάλη*; 30, *καὶ δόξης πολλῆς*; 34, *ὡς ἂν πάντα*.

⁸ Cf. above on vv. 9 and 10 *fin.*, and 16 *fin.*

E. Schott has suggested that the mission could not have taken place before the disciples accepted the truth of Jesus' messiahship, and therefore Mt. is inconsistent in placing this mission before 16:13ff (*Die Auswanderungsrede*, in *ZNTW* for 1906, p. 150). Doubtless this is correct; yet it is by no means obvious that Jesus' messiahship was to form the subject of their message. Rather, this was the Kingdom of God (Lk. 9:2; the approach of the Kingdom, Mt. 10:7)—the subject of Jesus' own public preaching from the first.