NOTES AND STUDIES

DR HARNACK ON LUKE x 22: NO MAN KNOWETH THE SON.

In 1874 Lightfoot wrote of the author of Supernatural Religion: ‘Why, when he contrasts the Christology of the Synoptic Gospels with the Christology of St John, does he not mention that “apologists” quote in reply our Lord’s words in Matt. xi 27 sq., “All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him”? . . . This one passage, they assert, covers the characteristic teaching of the fourth Gospel, and hitherto they have not been answered.’

Since then the obvious reply has become a commonplace, though it involves a petitio principii,—that the passage does not belong to the earlier strata of the Gospels. But as it is found in almost identical language in Luke x 21-2, it is not easy to deny that it goes back to the common source known as ‘Q’, which is nowadays usually assumed as the explanation of the resemblances of Mt. and Lk. where they are not both using St Mark.

The nature of Q has recently been carefully investigated by Harnack. He considers it to be of very early date, earlier even than Mk. But the passage in question is awkward. The MS evidence is almost unanimous in both Gospels. Yet how can a ‘Johannine’ passage of this kind belong to Q? Harnack has invented an ingenious answer to the difficulty. He supplements the MSS by the evidence of early citations, and concludes that the form in Luke was originally different, and represented the primitive Q exactly; and he believes that in this conjectural form the Johannine element is so far attenuated that there can be no objection to attribute it to a very early date.

The crucial verses run thus:—

ουδὲς ἐπιγνώσκει τὸν ζιών εἰ μή οὔδὲς γινώσκει τὸς ἔστιν ὁ νιώς εἰ μή ὁ πατὴρ,

ουδὲ τὸν πατέρα τὶς ἐπιγνώσκει εἰ μή καὶ τὸς ἔστιν ὁ πατὴρ εἰ μή ὁ νιώς,


2 Sprüche und Reden Jesu (Leipzig, 1907). I quote from the English translation (The Sayings of Jesus, Williams & Norgate, 1908), but I correct it from the German and give the German pages in brackets.
Hamack's points are these: (1) that the earliest quotations of Luke have ἐγνω and not γνωσκει; (2) that they give the two τὶς ἐστὶν clauses in the reverse order as in U; (3) that this cannot be the original text, but that the clause τὶς ἐστὶν δὲ υἱὸς εἶ μὴ δὲ πατὴρ must be an interpolation of very early date into Lk. from Mt. It will be best to give this third point in his own words:—

1. One does not by any means expect to find the clause about 'knowing the Son' in this connexion, even though it is not positively unbearable; for this ascription of praise is concerned both in its beginning and its close with the knowledge of God.

2. The historic aorist ἐγνω suits the Son's knowledge of the Father extremely well, but it does not so well suit the Father's knowledge of the Son. This has been noticed by thoughtful copyists, who have tried to overcome the difficulty in various ways.

3. The clause καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύφθη only suits the clause αὐθεὶς ἐγνω τὶς ἐστὶν δὲ πατὴρ εἰ μὴ δὲ υἱὸς, and not the other clause with which it is connected above in Luke (the Son is God's interpreter and not His own). This has also been correctly seen by the copyists who have accordingly overcome the difficulty by transposition, or even by changing υἱὸς into αὐθεὶς, which then refers to the Father.

4. In Cod. Vercell. of Luke we even now read the saying without the clause concerning 'knowing the Son'.

In my opinion we are almost forced to the conclusion that in Luke the words καὶ τὶς ἐστὶν δὲ υἱὸς εἶ μὴ δὲ πατὴρ were originally wanting.

If they were wanting in Luke they were also wanting in Q.

We may pass over these assertions for the moment, for they have no basis until the textual question has been decided beyond all doubt in favour of ἐγνω and the reversed order in Luke. I think it is easy to shew that the evidence is unquestionably against Hamack on both points.

1. The textual evidence.

We have seen that Hamack appeals over the head of all existing MSS to the witness of early writers. Now it is in any case very precarious to go against all the MSS in order to follow patristic quotations, since these are usually very free. But in the case of a much quoted text it is a particularly hazardous proceeding, for every one is aware how often the popular form in which quotations are made is incorrect. Vergil did not write 'Uno avulso non deficit alter'; Mrs Malaprop never said 'Caparisons are odorous', nor did the people cry out in 3 Esdras 'Magna est veritas et praevalebit'. Lex orandi is a mistake for lex supplicandi. The reader will probably call to mind many examples.
To shew how much this warning is needed, I will begin by two later Fathers, to whom Harnack has not appealed. From these we may learn how to treat the more important evidence of the earlier centuries.

The form of the saying in Mt. is distinguished by the repetition of the verb, by the prefix ἐπι- before γινώσκει, and (far more noticeably) by the simple accusatives τὸν υἱὸν, τὸν πατέρα, for the Lucan clauses τὸς ἐστίν ὁ υἱὸς, τὸς ἐστίν ὁ πατήρ. It will be easy to see which evangelist is quoted in each case, and to recognize a mixed citation.

We will begin by the citations in a single book, St Cyril of Alexandria's *Thesaurus*:

1. Mt. A 2 p. 20 (37) οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ θὰ ἐν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
2. Mt. A 2 131 (220) οὐδεὶς ἐπιγνώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ θὰ ἐν υἱῷ ἀποκαλύψῃ.
3. Mt. O B 137 (229) οὐδεὶς ἐπιγνώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγνώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ θὰ ἐν υἱῷ ἀποκαλύψῃ.
4. Lk. A 2 148–9 (249) οὐδεὶς γὰρ, φησὶ, γινώσκει τὸ ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ θὰ ἐν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
5. Mt. I 222 (370) οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὔτε τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.

Only two quotations out of six give both members. B only appears once. Mixture appears in 6, for ἐπιγνώσκει and the repetition of the verb are Mt., the rest is Lk. οὐδεὶς in 5 is a free citation. We have O for Mt. and in a mixed form (3, 6).

The following quotations are all from a single chapter (*Liber De Trinitate* xi, Mai *Bibl. nova Patrum* ii 688, *P. G.* lxxv, 1161): —

1. Mt. O B οὐδεὶς, φησὶ, οὔτε τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγνώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ θὰ ἐν υἱῷ ἀποκαλύψῃ.
2. Mt. O οὐδεὶς γὰρ, φησὶ, γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγνώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς.
3. Mt. O οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγνώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ θὰ ἐν υἱῷ ἀποκαλύψῃ.
4. Mt. O B οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγνώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ θὰ ἐν υἱῷ ἀποκαλύψῃ.
5. Mt. οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις γινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς.

But if we turn to St Cyril's *Comm. on Luke*, we shall find R in a very free citation: καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς φύσιν ἀδιάδικος, φησίν, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς· οὐδὲ τὸν ὄμοιον ἀυτῷ υἱὸν εἶδε τις εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ (p. 251, *P. G.* lxii 672). How does he come to change the order? Hardly

1 The pages are those of Aubert's edition (vol. V) with those of Migne (P. G. lxxv) in brackets. The full conclusion βούληται ἀποκαλύψῃ is marked B; the shortened form ἀποκαλύψῃ is called A. A quotation of knowing the Son without the parallel clause about knowing the Father is named 1, the citation of the latter clause without the former is named 2. It will be seen that these half quotations are particularly frequent. R will mean reversed order; the ordinary order is O.
because his MS was so written. Is it not simply because ‘the Nature of the Father’ is prior to ‘the consubstantial Son’, and he naturally mentions it first? For we find R equally in a free quotation from Mt., Lib. de Trin. 23, P. G. lxxv 1180 and οὕτως τὸν πατέρα οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱόν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ. Just as here οἶδεν is Cyril’s own, so is έγνω where it occurs οὐδεὶς έγνω τὸν υἱόν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.¹ There seems to be no real evidence in Cyril for any but the reading of the MSS. Why does he use οὐδεὶς? Surely because this ‘gnomic’ aorist is both more idiomatic and more forcible. It says not merely ‘no one recognizes’, but no one has ever recognized or can recognize.²

Let us take an earlier Alexandrine, St Athanasius:—


5. Mt. 2 A p. 443. Ibid. 39 οὐδεὶς ἐγνώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ζ ἃν ὁ υἱός ἀποκαλύφη.


Here 1 is Lk. R and 8 is Mt. R, whereas 2 is Mt. O. The rest are all Mt. 2, with the ἐτι left out in 4, 6, 7. We find οὐδεὶς once. It is not likely, after what we saw in Cyril, that Athanasius had B in his text. It is a quite natural abbreviation, and there is no reason to doubt that he knew the longer form as Cyril did. Again, the fact that he uses R in

¹ De Incarn. Unig. vol. 8, 680 (lxxv 1193), and also De recta fide ad Theod. Imp. 5, vol. 5 (lxxvi 1141). The form οὐδεὶς is much commoner in Cyril. It is not only found in Mt. citations (as above thrice) and fragm. in Math. xi 27 (lxxii p. 404), but also in a Lk. passage, De Ador. in Spir. v. vol. i, 155 (381) οὐδεὶς γὰρ οἶδε τις έστιν ὁ υἱός εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, and in a mixed passage Comm. in Joh. x 14, Book vi, lxxiii, 652 (1044) οὐδεὶς γὰρ οἶδε τὸν υἱόν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ αὐτὸν πατέρα τις οἶδε τις έστιν εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός.

² On gnomic and ‘timeless’ aorists, see J. H. Moulton’s Prolegomena (1906) p. 134. Though the Fathers usually quote ἔγνω in this passage in a gnomic sense, we shall see some places (notably in Justin and the Marcionians, apud Irms.) where it is taken in a historic sense. But doubtless some thought it in the very frequent present sense of ‘knoweth’ (i. e. ‘hath recognized’): for γνώσκω does not mean ‘I know’ but ‘I come to know’, and ἔγνω and ἔγνωκα often mean ‘I know’, like οἶδα, a simple fact which Harnack has not noticed. But it is not likely that the Fathers in quoting the text were always aware whether they meant the present sense or the gnomic sense. In the N. T. ἐπιγνώσκειν means to recognize a person.
both Lk. and Mt. will indispose us to believe that he found it in either case in his MSS; for he can hardly have found it in both evangelists.\(^1\)

We can now turn to the evidence adduced by Harnack. We have learned already that the text is likely to be quoted carelessly, and that a correct quotation outweighs the witness of many incorrect ones. We have also seen that it is not difficult to distinguish between Mt. and Lk.

It will be best to work backwards from the fourth century. Before taking more Alexandrines, Clement and Origen, we have to deal with the Origenist Eusebius. It should be premised that Eusebius generally employs a ‘Western’ text. So does Clement, and so also Origen very often.


3. Mt. G R *Hist. Eccl.* i 2, 2 τὴν γενεάν αὐτοῦ, φθονὶ, τις διηγήσεται; ὅτι δὲ οὗτος τὸν πατέρα τις ἔγραψεν εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὕτω καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τις ἔγραψεν εἰ μὴ δι' ὑπό της φθορᾶς τοῦ πατήρ.’

4. Mt. R *Ecl. Theol.* i 12 (Klost. p. 72, 4) διοῦ μεθεις ἔγραψεν τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, μηδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις ἔγραψεν εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν πατήρ.

5. Mt. 2 G A *Ecl. Theol.* i 16 (p. 76, 5) παρατίθεται μὲν (δ' Μάρκελλος) τὰς τοῦ Χαντρός φωνὰς, δ' ὡς εἶπε τοῖς οὐδείς ἔγραψεν τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός καὶ δι' ὁ υἱός ἀποκαλύφθη, ὡςπερ δὲ ἐπαναλημμένοις αὐτὰς ἀντὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ Λόγου ἄλλοις ὀνομάζεις δὲ δὲ λέγουν.

Mt. 2 ‘οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὗτος,’ φθονὶ, τοῦ πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, τούτους τοὺς Λόγος.’


7. Mt. G 2 *Eclog. proph.* i 12 (Migne, iv 1065 A) ἐπιεὶ μὴ εἰς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός.


The first four quotations and the last are not independent, as is shewn by the recurrence of the passage from Isaiah liii, and the

\(^1\) Though ἔγραψε does not seem to occur in Athanasius, it is found once in Didymus. As Alexander of Alexandria is ante-Nicene, it may be of interest to add his two versions to the letter to Alexander of Constantinople (Theodoret *H. E.* i 3): οἴδας γὰρ ἔγραψε τὶς ἑστὶν ὁ υἱός, λέγων, εἰ μὴ δι' ἡμέρας, καὶ τὸν πατέρα οὐδεὶς ἔγραψεν εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός. Here we have GO, partly Lk. (τὶς ἑστὶν), partly Mt. (τὴν πατρίαν and the repetition of the verb). Again: οἴδας αὐτῶν τὶς ἑστὶν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ οὐδεὶς οἴδας τὶς ἑστὶν ὁ υἱός εἰ μὴ δι' ἡμέρας. Here we have Lk. R, with oide twice. There is evidently no sufficient reason for doubting that Alexander’s MSS were like ours, but he is quoting freely.
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One guesses that Eusebius has some passage of Origen in his mind. (On the next page will be found Origen c. Cels. vi 17, which has suggested καὶ ἀξίαν in 3, 9, and ὁ γενν. in 1, 3, 4, 9.) Again, 5 is so near 4 in the same book that it is hardly independent.

In all these 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, and also in 7, we find ἔγνω (G), and in all cases the form τῶν πατέρων shews that Mt., not Lk., is in question. But 6 shews that Eusebius really read ἐπηγνώσκει in Mt., while 8 (not given by Harnack) is Lk. exactly. He attributes ὄλευθ in 5 to Marcellus of Anycra.

He gives R three times in Mt., but just when he is using Origen's form. Thus Harnack's conclusion is wrong that Eusebius found ἔγνω and the reversed order in Luke. He had Lk. exactly right; but borrowed Mt. GRA from Origen, though he probably read Mt. right in his Bible.

We now come to Origen himself:—

1. Mt. 3 G contra Celsum ii 71 (Koetschau i p. 193, 14) τῷ οὖν ἔγνω τῶν πατέρων ὁ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς.
2. Mt. O G A contra Celsum vi 17 (p. 88, 19) οὔτε ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν ὁ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, οὔτε τῶν πατέρων ὁ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ὃς ἔδωκεν τὰς ἀποκάλυψις. οὔτε γὰρ τὸν ἀγέννητον καὶ πάτηρ γεννησίς φώσας πρωτότοκον καὶ ἔδωκεν εἰδέναι τις δούναι ὅσα ὁ γεννησίς αὐτὸν πατήρ, οὔτε τὸν πατέρα, κτλ.
3. A contra Celsum vi 64 (p. 135, 23) τῷ δὲ αὐτὸς ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ πατέρα.
5. Mt. 2 Comm. in Ioh. i 16 (Preuschen p. 20, 17) οὐκ ἔδωκεν τὸν πατέρα, ἐγὼ ἐπιμελώς τις ἐξετάζω, πότε γνώσονται, οἷς ἀποκάλυπτε ἐγὼ καὶ πατέρων τὸν πατέρα υἱός, τὸν πατέρα...
6. Mt. 3 A Comm. in Ioh. i 38 (p. 49, 8) ἀποκάλυπτε τῷ ἔγνω πατέρα. 'οὔτε γὰρ ἔγνω τῶν πατέρων ὁ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ὃς ἔδωκεν τὰς ἀποκάλυψις.
7. Mt. 2 G Comm. in Ioh. xiii 24 (p. 248, 19) οὔτε γὰρ ἔγνω τῶν πατέρων ὁ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς.
8. Mt. 2 G Comm. in Ioh. xix 3 (p. 301, 26) = 5 (om. γὰρ).
9. Mt. 2 G Comm. in Ioh. xx 7 (p. 334, 19) = 8.
10. Mt. 1 G Comm. in Ioh. xxxii 29 (p. 474, 16) γέγραπται: oὔτε ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν ὁ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ.
11. Mt. 2 A Comm. in Ioh. xxxii 39 (p. 474, 33) οὔτε ἔγνω τῶν πατέρων ὁ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ὃς ἔδωκεν τὰς ἀποκάλυψις.
12. Mt. 1 G Selecta in Psalmos (De la Rue vol. ii p. 537) οὔτε γὰρ ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν ὁ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ (= 10).
13. Mt. R De Princ. i 1, 8 (De la Rue, i p. 53) 'Denique ipsis se euangelio non dixit quia nemo uidit patrem nisi filius, neque filium nisi pater, sed ait:
Mt. (G) O "Nemo nouit filium nisi pater, neque patrem quis nouit nisi filius"'.
14. Mt. (G) B De Princ. i 3, 4 (i p. 61) 'Sicut enim de filio dicitur, quia nemo nouit patrem nisi filius, et cui ovoluerit filius reuelare'.
15. Mt. O De Princ. ii 4, 3 (i p. 86) 'Nemo nouit filium nisi pater, neque patrem quis nouit nisi filius, et cui ovoluerit filius reuelare. Manifestum ergo est quia non dixit, Nemo uidit patrem nisi filius, sed Nemo nouit patrem nisi filius'.
16. Mt. (G) R De Princ. ii 6, 1 (i p. 89) 'Nemo nouit patrem nisi filius, neque quis nouit filium nisi pater'.
Among the Greek quotations there is not one instance of Lk. Except for 5 ἐγνωκεν, every case gives ἐγνώ. A occurs five times, B never. But then only one Greek example is a full quotation, so that the use of the shortened form A is not very significant. Thus Origen may possibly have had A and G in Mt., but not R.

In the Latin translations we find R once (16), but O many times (13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 23). In 26 cognouit clearly stands for ἐγνώ; but the nouit of all the other places is the ordinary O. L. and Vulg. word in Mt.; in 13 and 15, however, the parallel with uidi implies the aorist ἐγνώ. In 24 scit represents γινώσκει. In 20–1 Origen for a wonder cited Lk.; and this makes assurance doubly sure that all his other quotations are Mt. We cannot trust the translators in details, and they are given to interpolating.

We next take Clement (see Barnard Texts and Studies v 5 p. 16):

1. Mt. 2 G A Protrepticus i 10, 3 (Potter p. 10; Stählin p. 10, 15) Θεὸν οδεῖσ ἐγνώ εἰ μὴ δ ὅποθ, καὶ φᾶν δ ὅποθ ἀναφάγης.

17. Mt. 2 (G) B In Leuit. Hom. vii (ii p. 223) 'Quomodo comedit? Nemo, inquit, nouit patrem nisi filius. Secundo in loco manducant filii eius, nemo enim nouit patrem nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare'.


19. Mt. (G) O B In Cantica, Prologus (iii p. 31) 'Filium nemo nouit nisi pater, neque patrem quis nouit nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare' (sic MSS, libri editi 'Sicit enim nemo patrem nisi filius', De la Rue).

20. Mt. (G) O B In Cantica ii (p. 58 C) 'Cuius scientiae opus illud principale est, quod in eu. sec. Matt. quidem ita dicit: Nemo nouit filium nisi pater, neque patrem quis nouit nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare';


22. Mt. 2 (G) B In Matt. (Old Latin transl. iii p. 874 C) 'Qui confidit se cognoscere patrem, dicens: Nemo nouit patrem nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare' (= 14).

23. Mt. (G) O B In Rom. Bk. i 16 (iv p. 472) 'Filium nemo nouit nisi pater, neque patrem quis nouit nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare'.

24. Mt. 2 B In Rom. Bk. iii (iv p. 515) 'Nemo enim scit patrem nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare'.

25. Mt. 2 (G) In Rom. Bk. viii (iv p. 642) 'Solus est enim filius qui nouerit patrem'.

26. Mt. 2 (G) Fraggm. in Joh. cviii (Preuschen p. 563, 23) 'Reuelat patrem, quem nemo cognotit, nisi ipse solus'.

In 20 Mt. is given acc. to Vulg. and O. L. In 21 quid for quis is not in any MSS given by Wordsworth, and is perhaps a slip of the scribe. The repetition of scit is not supported by MSS, as b l q, which repeat the verb, have nouit (b q) and cognoscit (l). In the passage from John x 15 the Vulg. and some O. L. have nouit, though all have agnosco; only b e have agnoscit.
2. Mt. 2 GA Paedagogus i 5, 20, 2 (P. 10; S. 101, 32) : as l.
3. Mt. 2 GA Paedagogus i 8, 74, 1 (P. 142; S. 133, 7) καὶ τότε ἦν τὸ 'οδεῖς ἐγγὺς τὸν πατέρα'.
4. Mt. O G Paedagogus i 9, 88, 2 (P. 150; S. 142, 1) 'οδεῖς ἐγγὺς τὸν ὦδον εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, ἔγινεν, 'οδεῖ τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ ὦδος'.
5. Mt. O G Stromaţa V xiii 84, 3 (P. 150; S. 142, 1) ἡμείς, διδοῦ ἐγγὺς τὸν ὦδον εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, ὁδεῖ τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ ὦδος, καὶ νῦν ὁ ὦδος ἀποκαλύφθη.
6. Mt. O G Stromaţa VII x 58 (P. 866) ὁμοίων ἐγγὺς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ἡ ὦδος, καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ ὦδος ἀποκαλύφθη.
7. Mt. 2 GA Quis dēus 7-8, (P. 939, Barnard p. 6) ἡμείς καὶ ἑαυτὸς ἐν παντακράτειρ, διὸ ὁδεῖς ἐγγὺς εἰ μὴ ὁ ὦδος, καὶ νῦν ὁ ὦδος ἀποκαλύφθη.
8. Mt. 2 A Stromaţa VII xviii 109 (P. 901) ὁδεῖς γὰρ, ἡμείς, γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ ὦδος, καὶ νῦν ὁ ὦδος ἀποκαλύφθη.
9. Mt. 2 A Quis dēus 7-8, (P. 939, Barnard p. 6) ἡμείς καὶ ἑαυτὸς ἐν παντακράτειρ, διὸ ὁδεῖς ἐγγὺς εἰ μὴ ὁ ὦδος, καὶ νῦν ὁ ὦδος ἀποκαλύφθη.

All but two are half quotations. Neither of these two gives R. A comes seven times. As in Origen there is no Lk. at all. Did Clement only in later life use a codex which read ἐπιγνῶσκει;? Or did he in later life discover that he had always been quoting by heart and incorrectly?

We may next take St Irenaeus:—
1. Mt. R A Haer. ii 6, 1 'Nemo cognoscit Patrem nisi Filius, neque Filium nisi Pater, 
2. Mt. 2 G Haer. ii 14, 7 'Saluator ergo secundum eos (Valentinianos) erit mentitus, 
dicens: "Nemo cognouit Patrem nisi Filius 
3. Hom. xvii 4 oVll1l l-yvQJ TdV 1TrTaP, d µi) 0 vl6s, ws ovtiE TdV v/6v TIS olll•v 
4. Hom. xvii 3 oMEls l-fVOI TOV 'lraTEpa ••• ou3~ TOv vl6v TIS olaev.
5. Hom. xviii 20 oit8Els l-yv01 rov n.Tlpa El µi) 0 vlos, ws oit8E Tiv vl6v TIS olll& 
6. Hom. xviii 11 oVldls l-yv01 TOV 'lraTEpa •••
7. Hom. xviii 20 oVldls l-yv01 TOV 'lraTEpa •••

1 I give in a note the citations in the Clementine Homilies because Resch and Harnack have given them. But I attach no importance to them. The reading is practically invariable; but all the instances occur in a very short space between Hom. xvii 14 and xviii 20. The writer did not wish to quote, as he meant it to be supposed that the Gospels were not yet written. I am inclined to suppose that he actually invented this particular form for purpose, and kept to it. Whether it is for the sake of euphony that he varies the verb from 1-yvQJ to olti•v, or whether his strange form of Arianism (see Zeitschr. für N. T. Wiss., 1908, pp. 21-34, 147-59) finds some subtle distinction between the two verbs, I do not venture to guess:—
1. Hom. xvii 4 oVldls 1-yv01 vTov 'lraTEpa εἰ µή δ ὦδος, ὧς oVl τὸν ὦδον τίς oVl 1Vl ei µή δ πατῆρ, καὶ ὕστερα δ ὦδος ἀποκαλύφθαι.
2. Hom. xvii 4 oVldls l-yv01 vTov 'lraTEpa εἰ µή δ ὦδος, ὧς oVl τὸν ὦδον τίς oVl 1Vl ei µή δ πατῆρ, καὶ ὕστερα δ ὦδος ἀποκαλύφθαι.
3. Hom. XVIII 7 καὶ ὕστερα δ ὦδος ἀποκαλύφθαι.
4. Hom. XVIII 11 oVldls l-yv01 vTov 'lraTEpa.
5. Hom. XVIII 13 oVldls l-yv01 vTov 'lraTEpa εἰ µή δ ὦδος, ὧς oVl τὸν ὦδον τίς oVl 1Vl ei µή δ πατῆρ, καὶ ὕστερα δ ὦδος ἀποκαλύφθαι.
6. Hom. XVIII 13 oVldls l-yv01 vTov 'lraTEpa . . . oVl τὸν ὦδον τίς oVl.
7. Hom. XVIII 20 oVldls l-yv01 vTov 'lraTEpa εἰ µή δ ὦδος, ὧς oVl τὸν ὦδον τίς oVl 1Vl ei µή δ πατῆρ.


5. Mt. O A Haer. iv 7, 1: "Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi Pater, neque Patrem nisi Filium, et quibuscunque Filius reuelauerit. "Reuelauerit" enim non solum in futurum dictum est, quasi tune incepterit Verbum manifestare Patrem, cum de Maria natus; sed communiter per totum tempus positum est."

The text is uncertain, and we cannot tell how far it has been doctored by the translator. As the evidence stands, it would appear that Irenaeus used O or R, B or A, indifferently. If so, we may assume that R and A are free quotations. We find only Mt., never Lk. In 2 the εγνω seems to be attributed to the Valentinians.

In two other passages we find εγνω (cognouit). In the former (below), i 20, 3, the Marcosians are the culprits; and St Irenaeus in stating that this is their reading, seems to disapprove of it. He adds that they use it to shew that no one knew their invented 'Father of Truth' before the advent of the Son. In the second passage, iv 6, 1, he first quotes the text as above (3), and then gives it again as it is quoted 'by those who wish to be cleverer than the Apostles', adding that these interpret it as though the true God had been unknown until the advent of Christ. Now in the whole of this latter passage he is attacking the Marcionites, and Harnack argues that the persons 'who wish to be cleverer than the Apostles' are the Marcionites. This seems very improbable. The text is, in fact, the same, and the argument from it is the same as in i 20, 3, and Irenaeus seems to have repeated both as being in favour of the Marcionite contention, since here Marcus and Marcion were at one. But there is no sufficient reason to make us suppose that he is actually quoting a Marcionite document and giving us the reading of Marcion's Luke. In fact, the quotation is from Matthew; and though we might suppose that here (as in other cases) Marcion's text had been assimilated to Matthew, yet we have the explicit witness of Tertullian that Marcion had the Lucan form, as we should have anticipated.

I subjoin below the citation by the Marcionite interlocutor in the Adamantius Dialogue, because Harnack has followed the Dialogue and Irenaeus as two independent witnesses to Marcion's text, and prefers them to Tertullian. But the Dialogue on one and the same page gives three different words, εγνω, γνωσκει, and οидει; yet Eutropius, the speaker who gives the third form, shews no sign of wishing to correct the form cited by the Marcionite, and it seems clear that none of the three is

1 But the Syriac, fragm. xv, of this passage gives 'Nemo cognoscit Patrem nisi Filium, neque Filium', &c., and Harvey has a note on the Syriac (ii p. 443) in which he remarks that 'the Clem., Ar., and other MS' transpose the terms in the same way. But he may be referring only to iv 6, 3, where he had altered the reading from that of the MSS.
intended to be more than a free quotation. Further, the Dialogue very probably gets its quotation from Origen’s form, and it is Mt. not Lk.

Mt. G R A. Marcosians ap. Iren. Haer. i 20, 3 ἐδειλεν καρωνία τής ἐνθοθέσεως αὐτῶν φέρουσα πάρα τ’ ἐξουσιασθεὶς σου... καὶ οὖδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δ υἱὸς, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ δ φατήρ, καὶ ὃ εἶναι δ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύφθη.


Mt. (G) R. Adamantius, Dialogue i 23 (Bakhuyzen p. 44, 1): Megethius, the Marcionist, says: ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν δείχω ὧν ἂλλος ἂγιν ὡς τοῦ Χριστοῦ πατὴρ καὶ ἂλλος ὁ δημιουργός... ὁ Χριστὸς... εἰπὼν ὀδηγεῖς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δ υἱός, ὀδηγεῖς τὸν υἱὸν τις γνώσκει εἰ μὴ δ υἱοῦ. Same page, line 14, in the reply of Adamantius: ὀδηγεῖς γνώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ δ υἱοῦ. Same page, line 29, the arbiter Eutropius quotes: ὀδηγεῖς ὀδηγεῖς τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ δ υἱοῦ. Lk. R A. Marcion apud Tert. c. Marc. iv 25 ‘Nemo enim scit qui sit pater nisi filius et qui sit filius nisi pater, et cuiunque filius reuelaverit’. (Rönisch’s reading is wrong: patrem... et filium, Mt.)

With the last passage we must compare Tertullian’s own citations (Rönisch N. T. Tertullianus p. 103):

Mt. 2. G. c. Marc. ii 27 ‘Ceterum patrem nemini visum etiam commune testabantur evangelium, dicente Christo: “Nemo cognovit patrem nisi filius”’.

Mt. 2. c. Prax. 8 ‘Solus filius patrem novit’. 19. ‘Solus sciens sensum patris’.

26. ‘Hic quoque patrem nemine notum nemilio affirmat’.

Mt. 2 A. Præscr. 21 ‘Quia nec alius patrem novit nisi filius et cui filius revelavit’.

All these are Mt. This shews that Tertullian in c. Marc. iv 25 was taking care to give Marcion’s Lucan form accurately, and not from memory. His cognouit may be a free form of the ordinary Latin reading nouit; but it is also just possible that it represents ἔγνω.

Anyhow the case is clear with regard to Marcion. He had γνώσκει and not ἔγνω. He had the Lucan form, but apparently the reversed order (R).

Tatian comes next:—

Lk. O B. Arabic Diatess. xv 38 (Hamblin Hill p. 104) ‘No one knoweth who the Son is save the Father, and who the Father is save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him’.

Mt. R. Ephrem, Comm. on Diatess. (Moesinger p. 117; H. Hill p. 348) ‘No man knoweth the Father but the Son, neither the Son but the Father’. 

Mt. R. Ibid. p. 216 ‘No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father’.

We cannot follow Harnack in citing Tatian for ἔγνω, as there is no authority for this; nor for R in Lk. Whether he read Mt. R or Lk. O is not clear. Ephrem is the better authority, and he is here against all the other Syriac witnesses, Sin Cur Pesh Hkl Aphraates, which all have O.1 But it is not certain that he is quoting carefully. On the other hand, if

1 See Burkitt Evangelion de Mepharrshe vol. i pp. 59, 315. Victor of Capua gives Mt. in Cod. Fulid. Diatess. c. 67.
Tatian really had Mt., one does not see why the Arabic should have substituted Lk.

In the last place we come to the earliest authority, St Justin Martyr:—

Mt. G R A. *Apol.* i 63, 5 οὔτεις ἐγνω τὸν πατέρα εἶ μὴ ὃ ὑλός, οὔτε τὸν ὕλον εἶ μὴ ὃ πατήρ καὶ οἴς ἂν ἀποκαλύφη ὃ ὑλός.

Mt. G R A. *Apol.* i 63, 19 οὔτεις ἐγνω τὸν πατέρα εἶ μὴ ὃ ὑλός, οὔτε τὸν ὕλον εἶ μὴ ὃ πατήρ καὶ οἴς ἂν ὧδε ἀποκαλύφη.

Mt. R A. *Dial.* 100, 5 οὔτεις γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἶ μὴ ὃ ὑλός, οὔτε τὸν ὕλον εἶ μὴ ὃ πατήρ καὶ οἴς ἂν ὧδε ἀποκαλύφη.

Each quotation varies, so that Justin is not quoting carefully from his book. Every time he gives oís for δ; and this (we find it in the *Clem. Hom.*) was presumably never in any MS. All three times he uses Mt. R, not Lk. We have twice ἐγνω against a single γινώσκει; but then the two ἐγνω are close together and count only as one witness. It is possible that Justin read ἐγνω; but it is not impossible at all that he had ἐπιγινώσκει in his MS! We have really no means of dogmatizing.¹

2. Summary of textual evidence.

A. We are now in a position to estimate Harnack's summing up of the evidence he gave:—

p. 288 (German ed. p. 200): 1. A section of the Marcionites, the Marcosians, Justin (in the *Apology* [Tatian], the Alexandrians (Clement, Origen [both practically always] and later writers also), and Eusebius (practically always) agree in reading ἐγνω. Accordingly ἐγνω is the reading which has in its favour the most ancient testimony.

We must omit the Marcionites and Marcion, Tatian and Eusebius. The remainder are all doubtful witnesses. Against ἐγνω we have Marcion explicitly for Lk. and Irenaeus explicitly for Mt. But Justin is on the whole a witness against ἐγνω in his *Dialogue*.

Thus the possible evidence is reduced to

1. Mt. (Justin) and the Marcosians;


Harnack continues:—

2. The reading ἐγνω stood in St Luke; [note: This is also the opinion of Blass, Keim, Meyer, and Schmiedel.] for this is suggested by the reading in Marcion's gospel, and the hypothesis is supported by the nouit of the very ancient Latin codices Vercellensis (a) and Veronensis (b) in St Luke, whereas the remaining O. L. codices, except q, read scit. The hypothesis finally receives very strong support from the other aorists: ἐκρωψα, ἀνεκαλυψα, ἐγάνετο, παρεδόθη.

We have seen on the contrary that Marcion had the Lucan form with scit = γινώσκει, and that every single instance of ἐγνω was in Mt. ¹ As for the nouit of two solitary Latin MSS in Luke, we can oppose to it the

¹ I refer the reader to the judicious remarks of Dr Zahn *Gesch. des N.-T. Kanons* i 557. He notes that 'in Bezug auf diesen Spruch die umstaltende Kraft des mündlichen Gebrauches schon vor Justin's Zeit geschäftig gewesen ist".
nouit of all the Latin MSS of Matt., both O. L. and Vulg., except three or four! Harnack’s last sentence seems to have got into this paragraph by mistake, for all the four aorists are in Matt. as well as in Luke, and therefore provide no support for the notion that ἐγνω was in the one rather than the other.

But does nouit really represent ἐγνω? Nouit is only a perfect in form, not in meaning, like oἶδα, and is exactly equivalent to cognoscit or scit. It is therefore odd that Harnack, who takes ἐγνω to be a ‘historic’ aorist, should think that it was translated by nouit! But, in fact, ἐγνω in the sense of ‘knoweth’ is just as much a present as nouit or oἶδα, and therefore it is possible that it underlies the nouit of the Latin versions of Matthew. If it did, that would be distinct evidence that it was really found in some Greek codices. Yet even so it would not be a very widespread ‘Western’ reading, for it is not in Irenaeus nor in any Syriac authority whatever, nor in such Greek MSS as D and the Ferrar group.

B. It would seem that Marcion had Lk. R, and that the Marcosians had Mt. R; so possibly had Justin. Certainly Clement never had R; Irenaeus, Origen, and later writers sometimes use Mt. R and more rarely Lk. R out of carelessness. As we find R now in at least two MSS of Luke, so it may conceivably have stood in the second century in a few MSS of Matt. But this remains uncertain.

C. As to βούλησαι δι'; καλύψαι against ἰδι'καγαλύψη, the shorter form is as natural as it is common, and it may quite well have crept into some MSS of Matt. and Lk. (the evidence is mainly for Matt.), but we cannot be sure. But at least we know that it ordinarily appears in careless or abridged quotations in writers who give the longer form when quoting fully.

1 The Latin versions have in fact:—

Vulg. Mt. ‘Nemo nouit filium nisi pater, neque patrem quis nouit nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare’.

Lk. ‘Nemo scit qui sit filius nisi pater, et qui sit pater nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare’.

nobit a nouit b cognoscit c d e repetiunt uerbum b l q nobit b cognoscit l nouit q.

2 It is not a fact that noui usually stands for ἐγνω. On the contrary, in the Gospels, noui stands about 11 times for oἶδα, 7 times for γνίσκω, 3 times for ἐγνω (no οὐ for ἐλθόντα once, and for ἀναπτύσσει, in Mk, iv 11 and the parallels in Mt. and Lk.). Consequently Harnack’s proof falls to the ground. On the other hand, ἐγνωκεῖν (never in John) is rendered by cognesci 14 out of 15 times in the Synoptists, 8 out of 12 in Acts, and all the twelve times that it occurs in St Paul. Hence it may be improbable that nouit in Matt. represents ἐγνωκεῖν. Consequently it may after all stand for ἐγνω or oἶδα. The γνόσκει of Lk. is naturally translated by scit, a frequent rendering (in a b by nouit, perhaps from Matthew).
Lastly, even if we were to give full value to all the citations as if they represented contemporary MSS, the evidence would be insufficient to make εγνω more than an interesting ‘Western’ variant in Matthew, or R and A more than occasional corruptions in Mt. and Lk.

3. The parallelism of the verses.

We now turn back to Harnack’s conclusions (numbered 1, 2, 3, 4), which were quoted at the beginning of this article (above, p. 553). The textual basis on which the assertions rested has been found insecure; but the assertions themselves need some examination.

Paragraph 2 says that ‘The historic aorist εγνω suits the Son’s knowledge of the Father extremely well’;—this is true, if we take it as historic. ‘But it does not so well suit the Father’s knowledge of the Son’,—true again, if we take it as historic. It is indeed used in the ‘historic’ sense by Justin and the Marcosians; but most of the Greek writers who use it intend the gnomic sense or the present sense, for they use it just as much when ‘knowing the Son’ comes first or stands alone.

Paragraph 4 scarcely needs comment. There is no significance in a’s nouit, and we need not see in its omission of a clause anything graver than the ordinary oscitatio scribae.

Paragraphs 1 and 3 may be discussed together. It is evidently true that the final ‘clause καὶ δὲν . . . only suits the clause οὐδεὶς εγνω τὶς ἔστιν ὁ πατὴρ, and not the other clause’, for ‘the Son is God’s interpreter and not His own’. But this cannot prove that the latter clause must be omitted; it only shews that the MS order, according to which the two clauses which suit one another come together, is the right one. The clause which rightly stands first οὐδεὶς εγνω τὶς ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ would need a converse addition καὶ δὲν βούληται ὁ πατὴρ ἀποκαλύψαι.

But a clause to this effect is actually to be found in the preceding verse: Ἑξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πατέρ . . . ὅτι . . . ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νοῦς. What has the Father revealed? Undoubtedly the things concerning the Son.

Thus the sequence and the balance of the whole passage is quite simple, though Harnack has unfortunately failed to see it:

I. a. I thank Thee, Father, that Thou hast revealed these things [concerning the nature of the Son] not to the wise but to babes, for so it seemeth good to Thee.

I. β. All that I have is from the Father, so that He alone knows the Son, and consequently He alone could reveal Him;

II. β. Just in the same way, only the Son knows the Father,

II. a. And can reveal Him to whomsoever He thinks good to do so.

The parallelism is perfect. It is obvious that the order of the clauses
in the MSS is necessary, and that βούληται in the last clause is wanted to balance εὐδοκία ἐγένετο in the first.¹

It is very curious, after all this, to notice that Harnack's emendation has the result of retaining what is Johannine in the verses, and of rejecting what can be paralleled in much earlier authorities.²

The Johannine part is of course the statement that the Son alone knows and reveals the Father, e.g. John i 14, 18; xiv 6–9.³ This Harnack retains.

The converse of this, that only the Father can reveal the Son, is found almost word for word in

1. Matt. xvi 16, 17 Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζωντός . . . Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ, ὅτι σάρξ καὶ φύσις οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατὴρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, and in

2. Galat. i 15 ὄτε δὲ εὐδόκησαν [ὁ θεὸς] ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκάλυψα τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἔμοι ἵνα εὐαγγέλισαί αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἑθνεῖσι, εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμεν σαρκί καὶ αἵματι . . .

Harnack considers that not only in St Matthew (this was obvious), but even in St Luke, the whole passage from ἔξωμολογούμαι σοι onwards is not in its original context. He has therefore to discover what is meant by ταύτα, the things which God has revealed to babes:—

p. 207 (E.T. 297). We must here notice the aorists: not what God always does, but what He had done on the present occasion—in the success of the ministry of Jesus—was the object of the thanksgiving. Hence some instance of success of this kind, notorious to all, which has not however been transmitted in history, must have preceded the thanksgiving. The ναὶ takes up the εὔμολογομαί, and the clause ὅτι ὁ θεὸς εὐδόκησαν ἐγένετο εἰμπροσθὲν σοι takes up the thought of the preceding clause. The overpowering glory of the experience in the soul most naturally constrained the tongue to such repetition in the thanksgiving.

¹ For convenience I give the whole passage from Mt. xi 25 'At that time Jesus answered and said: I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to the little ones. 26. Yea, Father; for so it hath seemed good in Thy sight. 27. All things are delivered to me by my Father: neither doth any one know the Son but the Father but the Son, and he to whom it shall please the Son to reveal Him'.

² With the earlier verse ἔξωμολογομαί σοι, ἀντ. Harnack has paralleled:—

1 Cor. i 19, 21 Γεγραμμένα γὰρ ἀποκλώ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν, καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συννεφῶν ἀδελφῶν . . . ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἦγων ὁ κόσμος διὰ τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, εὐδόκησαν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆς μορφῆς τοῦ υἱοθετοῦσαν τὸς πιστεύοντας.

Harnack 'mit aller Reserve' (p. 210, E.T. 301) suggests that St Paul is here thinking of the passage of Q. It is indeed just possible. But the passage of Isaiah xxix 14 is obviously referred to by Q, so that the likeness to St Paul may be merely accidental. The passage from Galatians is far nearer. Yet I think St Paul was more likely thinking of Matt. xvi 16 (as Resch has already suggested), whether we are to suppose that passage to have belonged to Q, or to some other early writing or tradition.

³ In John x 15 both clauses are paralleled.
But this does not tell us the meaning of ταῦτα. The νῦνι are obviously either the Apostles or some very close disciples of Christ, such as the Seventy, with whose return the passage is connected in Luke. It is implied that they have been able to understand and realize the Lord's teaching in some marvellous way, which involved a revelation from the Father. Now what point would imply the need of a revelation from the Father? Clearly there is but one such point mentioned in these terms in Scripture, and that in two passages which have just been quoted: Peter's declaration 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God' is one, and St Paul gave us the other 'to reveal His Son in me'. The revelation of the Divine Sonship is therefore most naturally to be assumed as the object of our Lord's thanksgiving. This is just what was demanded by the parallelism above formulated. The Father has revealed the Son to the disciples (as He did to St Peter and to St Paul); it was His good pleasure, for without such a revelation none could know the Son, whom the Father alone knows; similarly, the Father is only known by the Son, and by those to whom it is His good pleasure to reveal Him.

Harnack's conclusion was: 'The original version of the saying (as it stood in Q) may be defended on good grounds; but the canonical version in both Gospels is "Johannine" in character and indefensible' p. 210 (302). But the question is not in the least whether it is defensible or not (that is for theologians not for critics), but whether or no it was an integral part of Q! Now I think we have seen that there is no good reason to doubt that the 'canonical' text of both Matthew and Luke is perfectly sound. It will therefore be somewhat arbitrary to decide on a priori grounds that the source could not have been Q. Certainly Harnack is not wont to have recourse to a priori methods. It is his habit to ridicule them.

In thus disagreeing with a single point in a very valuable book, I must not be understood to be ungrateful for the rest of the carefully sifted matter which it contains. On this one point, however, I am convinced that Lightfoot's contention remains true,—that the 'apologists' have not been answered.

Further, the evidence has been to me very instructive as to the limits within which one may use quotations by the Fathers in a textual question.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

1 If Harnack will accept the context in Luke as original, it will appear that the success of the Seventy has been a revelation to them of the Divine Sonship of their Sender.