

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.'¹

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.² 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:—

οὐδείς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ	οὐδείς γινώσκει τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ
ὁ πατήρ,	ὁ πατήρ,
οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τίς ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ	καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ
ὁ υἱός,	υἱός,

¹ *Essays on 'Supernatural Religion'*, 1889, pp. 15-16.

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.

καὶ ᾧ ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀπο- καλύψαι. καὶ ᾧ ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀπο- καλύψαι.
 (ἐπιγινώσκει C F W H Δ *al*²⁶ *ferē*.)
 (τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ . . . τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός, U and one cursive.)

Harnack's points are these : (1) that the earliest quotations of Luke have *ἔγνω* and not *γινώσκει* ; (2) that they give the two *τίς ἐστὶν* clauses in the reverse order as in U ; (3) that this cannot be the original text, but that the clause *τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ* 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 *ἔγνω* 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 ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ* only suits the clause *οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός*, 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 *υἱός* into *αὐτός*, 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 τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ* 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 *ἔγνω* and the reversed order in Luke. I think it is easy to shew that the evidence is unquestionably against Harnack on both points.

1. *The textual evidence.*

We have seen that Harnack 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 praevalēbit*'. *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 υἱόν, τὸν πατέρα*, for the Lucan clauses *τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱός, τίς ἐστιν 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)¹ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
2. Mt. A 2 131 (220) οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
3. Mt. O B 137 (229) οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.
4. Lk. A 2 148-9 (249) οὐδεὶς γάρ, φησί, γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
5. Mt. I 222 (376) οὐδεὶς γὰρ οἶδε τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.
6. Mt. Lk. O A 365 (620) in a series of extracts from Scripture : οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει τίς ἐστιν εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.

Only two quotations out of six give both members. B only appears once. Mixture appears in 6, for *ἐπιγινώσκει* and the repetition of the verb are Mt., the rest is Lk. οἶδε 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, φησὶν, οἶδε τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.
2. Mt. O οὐδεὶς γάρ, φησί, γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός.
3. Mt. O B οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.
4. Mt. O B οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐκ ἐπήγαγε· καὶ ᾧ ἂν βούληται ὁ πατήρ ἀποκαλύψαι· εἰρηκώς δὲ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός· εὐθὺς προσέθηκε· καὶ ᾧ ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.
5. Mt. O οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις γινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός.

But if we turn to St Cyril's *Comit. on Luke*, we shall find R in a very free citation : καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς φύσιν ἀδιδάκτως, φησὶν, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός· οὐδὲ τὸν ὁμοούσιον αὐτῷ υἱὸν εἶδεν τις εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ (p. 251, *P. G.* lxxii 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 ἀποκαλύψαι* 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 I, 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 καὶ ὡς περ τὸν πατέρα οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ. Just as here οἶδεν is Cyril's own, so is ἔγνω where it occurs οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν 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 ἔγνω? 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:—

1. Lk. R vol. i p. 107. *In illud 'omnia mihi tradita sunt' οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.*
2. Mt. O A p. 218. *De decretis Nic. syn.* 12 οὐδεὶς οἶδε τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τίς ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
3. Mt. 2 p. 286. *Ad Ep̄p. Ag. et Lib.* 16 οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός.
4. Mt. 2 A p. 416. *Oratio I c. Arianos* 12 οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
5. Mt. 2 A p. 443. *Ibid.* 39 οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
6. Mt. 2 p. 593. *Oratio III c. Arianos* 44 οὐδεὶς γὰρ, φησί, γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός.
7. Mt. 2 A p. 634-5. *Oratio IV c. Arianos* 23 οὐδεὶς γὰρ γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός . . . καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
8. Mt. RA vol. v 14. *Sermo maior de fide* οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.

Here 1 is Lk. R and 8 is Mt. R, whereas 2 is Mt. O. The rest are all Mt. 2, with the ἐπι- left out in 4, 6, 7. We find οἶδε 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 οἶδε is much commoner in Cyril. It is not only found in Mt. citations (as above thrice) and *fragm. in Matt.* xi 27 (lxxii p. 404), but also in a Lk. passage, *De Ador. in Spir.* v, vol. i, 155 (381) οὐδεὶς γὰρ οἶδε τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, and in a mixed passage *Comm. in Ioh.* x 14, Book vi, lxxiii, 652 (1044) οὐδεὶς γὰρ οἶδε τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδ' αὐτὸν πατέρα τίς οἶδε τίς ἐστιν 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 Marcosians, *apud Iren.*) 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 γινώσκω does not mean 'I know' but 'I come to know', and ἔγνων 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. ἐπιγινώσκειν 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.

1. Mt. GR *Dem. Ev.* iv 3, 13 (149 b) 'τὴν γενεὰν γὰρ αὐτοῦ' φησί 'τίς διηγήσεται;' καὶ 'ὥσπερ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὕτω καὶ τὸν υἱὸν οὐδεὶς ἔγνω εἰ μὴ ὁ μόνος ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν πατήρ.'
2. Mt. G (R) *Dem. Ev.* v 1, 25-6 (216 d) πολλαῖς ἤδη ἐπειπόντες 'τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται;' ... 'οὐδεὶς ἔγνω', φησί, 'τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός'. ᾧ καὶ ἐπιλέγει 'καὶ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.'
3. Mt. G R *Hist. Eccl.* i 2, 2 τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ, φησὶν, τίς διηγήσεται; ὅτι δὴ οὐτε τὸν πατέρα τίς ἔγνω εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐτ' αὖ τὸν υἱὸν τίς ἔγνω ποτὲ κατ' ἄξίαν εἰ μὴ ὁ μόνος ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν πατήρ.
4. Mt. R *Eccl. Theol.* i 12 (Klost. p. 72, 4) ὅτι μηδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, μηδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τίς ἔγνω εἰ μὴ ὁ μόνος ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν πατήρ.
5. Mt. 2 G A *Eccl. Theol.* i 16 (p. 76, 5) παρατίθεται μὲν (ὁ Μάρκελλος) τὰς τοῦ Σωτῆρος φωνάς, δι' ἃν ἔφη 'οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ,' ὥσπερ δὲ ἐπαυροῦσθαι αὐτὰς ἀντὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ Λόγον αἰθῆς ὀνομάζει ὡδε λέγων·
Mt. 2 'οὐδεὶς γὰρ ὀιδεν,' φησὶν, 'τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, τουτέστιν ὁ Λόγος.'
6. Mt. I *Eccl. Theol.* i 20 (85, 32) διὸ προφήσας 'πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου' ἐπήγαγεν 'καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ'. σεσιγήσθω τοῖσιν πᾶσι ἀπόρητος περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, καὶ μόνῳ τῷ πατρὶ παραδεδοσθῶ ἡ τῆς ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενέσεως αὐτοῦ γνῶσις.
7. Mt. G 2 *Eclog. proph.* i 12 (Migne, iv 1065 A) ἐπεὶ μηδ' εἰς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός.
8. Lk. B *Comm. in Psalm.* cx (ap. S. Athan. *ophr.* ed. Bened. IV 704) ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ . . . καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.
9. Mt. G R *Ep. ad Constantianam* (*Conc. Nic.* ii, Sess. vi, Mansi, xiii 313) ὅτι οὐτε τὸν πατέρα τίς ἔγνω εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός' οὐδ' αὐτὸν [τὸν] υἱὸν γνοίη ποτὲ τίς ἐπαξίως εἰ μὴ ὁ μόνος ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν πατήρ.

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 ἔγνω 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 from the letter to Alexander of Constantinople (*Theodoret H. E.* i 3): Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔγνω τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός, λέγων, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τὸν πατέρα οὐδεὶς ἔγνω εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός. Here we have G O, partly Lk. (τίς ἐστὶν), partly Mt. (τὸν πατέρα and the repetition of the verb). Again: Οὐδεὶς οἶδε τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ οὐδεὶς οἶδε τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ. Here we have Lk. R, with οἶδε twice. There is evidently no sufficient reason for doubting that Alexander's MSS were like ours, but he is quoting freely.

ὁ γεννήσας. One guesses that Eusebius has some passage of Origen in his mind. (On the next page will be found Origen *c. Cel.* vi 17, which has suggested κατ' 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 τὸν πατέρα shews that Mt., not Lk., is in question. But 6 shews that Eusebius really read ἐπιγινώσκει in Mt., while 8 (not given by Harnack) is Lk. exactly. He attributes οἶδεν in 5 to Marcellus of Ancyra.

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. 2 G *contra Celsum* ii 71 (Koetschau i p. 193, 14) τῷ 'οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός.'
2. Mt. O G A *contra Celsum* vi 17 (p. 88, 19) οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ. οὔτε γὰρ τὸν ἀγέννητον καὶ πάσης γενετῆς φύσεως πρωτότοκον κατ' ἀξίαν εἰδέναί τις δύναται ὡς ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν πατήρ, οὔτε τὸν πατέρα, κτέ.
3. A *contra Celsum* vi 64 (p. 135, 23) ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ τὸν πατέρα.
4. Mt. G A *contra Celsum* vii 44 (p. 194, 30) οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
5. Mt. 2 *Comm. in Ioh.* i 16 (Preuschen p. 20, 17) ὡς νῦν μόνος ὁ υἱὸς ἔγνωκε τὸν πατέρα· εἰ γὰρ ἐπιμελῶς τις ἐξετάξοι, τότε γνώσονται, οἷς ἀποκαλύπτει ὁ ἔγνωκὼς τὸν πατέρα υἱός, τὸν πατέρα . . .
6. Mt. 2 G A *Comm. in Ioh.* i 38 (p. 49, 8) ἀποκαλύπτει δὲ ἔγνω πατέρα. 'οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.'
7. Mt. 2 G *Comm. in Ioh.* xiii 24 (p. 248, 19) οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός.
8. Mt. 2 G *Comm. in Ioh.* xix 3 (p. 301, 26) = 7 (*om. γάρ*):
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· οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.
11. Mt. 2 G A *Comm. in Ioh.* xxxii 29 (p. 474, 33) οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
12. Mt. 1 G *Selecta in Psalmos* (De la Rue vol. ii p. 537) οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ (= 10).¹

¹ The Latin translations supply the following passages :—

13. Mt. R *De Princ.* i 1, 8 (De la Rue, i p. 53) 'Denique ipse in 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 uoluerit 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 uoluerit 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 *ἐγνω*. 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 *ἐγνω*; 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 *uidit* implies the aorist *ἐγνω*. 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 *Protrephticus* i 10, 3 (Potter p. 10; Stählin p. 10, 15) *Θεὸν οὐδείς ἐγνώ
ει μή δ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν δ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.*

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'.
18. Mt. 2 (G) B *In Num. Hom.* xviii (ii p. 340) 'Nemo nouit patrem nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare' (= 14).
19. Mt. (G) O B *In Cantica*, Prologus (iii p. 31) 'Filius nemo nouit nisi pater, neque patrem quis nouit nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare' (sic MSS, libri editi 'Scit 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';
21. L O B *In Luca* autem ita ait 'Nemo scit quid sit filius nisi pater, et nemo scit quid sit pater nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare. Secundum Ioannem uero ita scriptum est: Sicut agnoscit me pater, et ego agnosco patrem (Io x 15). In quadragesimo uero quinto Psalmo dicit: Vacate et cognoscite, quoniam ego sum Deus'.
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) 'Filius 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) *Fragm. in Ioh.* cviii (Preuschen p. 562, 23) 'Reuelat patrem, quem nemo cognouit, 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 1 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 G A *Paedagogus* i 5, 20, 2 (P. p. 10 ; S. p. 101, 32) : as 1.
3. Mt. 2 G *Paedagogus* i 8, 74, 1 (P. 142 ; S. 133, 7) και τοῦτο ἦν τὸ 'οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα'.
4. Mt. O G *Paedagogus* i 9, 88, 2 (P. 150 ; S. 142, 1) 'οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ,' λέγων, 'οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός'.
5. Mt. O G A *Stromata* I xxviii 178, 2 (P. 425 ; S. 109, 27) οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔγνω τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, και ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
6. Mt. 2 G A *Stromata* V xiii 84, 3 (P. 697 ; S. 382, 14) ἐπεὶ 'μῆδεὶς', φησὶν ὁ κύριος, 'τὸν πατέρα ἔγνω εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, και ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ'.
7. Mt. 2 G A *Stromata* VII x 58 (P. 866) Θεὸς και πατήρ εἰς και μόνος ὁ παντακράτωρ, ἃν οὐδεὶς ἔγνω εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, και ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
8. Mt. 2 A *Stromata* VII xviii 109 (P. 901) οὐδεὶς γάρ, φησὶ, γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, και ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.
9. Mt. 2 A *Quis dñes* 7-8, (P. 939, Barnard p. 6) ἡ δὲ ἐπίγνωσις αὐτοῦ και οἰκειώσις και ἡ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀγάπη και ἔξομοίωσις μόνῃ ζαή. 8. τοῦτον οὖν πρῶτον ἐπιγνώσει τῷ ζῆσμένῳ τὴν ὄντως ζωνη παρακελεύεται, ἃν οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, και ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.

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 ἐπιγινώσκει? Or did he in later life discover that he had always been quoting by heart and incorrectly? ¹

We may next take St Irenaeus :—

1. Mt. R A *Haer.* ii 6, 1 'Nemo cognoscit Patrem nisi Filius, neque Filium nisi Pater, et quibus Filius reuelauerit'.
2. Mt. 2 G *Haer.* ii 14, 7 'Saluator ergo secundum eos (Valentinianos) erit mentitus, dicens: "Nemo cognouit Patrem nisi Filius". Si enim cognitus est a matre uel a semine eius, solutum est illud, quod "Nemo cognouit Patrem nisi Filius" '.

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 on purpose, and kept to it. Whether it is for the sake of euphony that he varies the verb from ἔγνω to οἶδεν, 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 οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, και οἷς ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.
2. *Hom.* xviii 4 οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, και οἷς ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.
3. *Hom.* xviii 7 και οἷς ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύπτει.
4. *Hom.* xviii 11 οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα.
5. *Hom.* xviii 13 οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, και οἷς ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.
6. *Hom.* xviii 13 οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα . . . οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις οἶδεν.
7. *Hom.* xviii 20 οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.

3. Mt. O B *Haer.* iv 6, 1 'Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi Pater, neque Patrem quis cognoscit nisi Filius, et cui uoluerit Filius reuelare'.
4. Mt. RA *Haer.* iv 6, 3 'Nemo cognoscit Patrem nisi Filius, neque Filium nisi Pater, et quibuscumque Filius reuelauerit'.
5. Mt. OA *Haer.* iv 7, 1 '[Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi Pater, neque Patrem nisi Filius], et quibuscumque Filius reuelauerit. "Reuelauerit" enim non solum in futurum dictum est, quasi tunc inceperit Verbum manifestare Patrem, cum de Maria natus; sed communiter per totum tempus positum est'.¹

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 $\xi\gamma\nu\omega$ seems to be attributed to the Valentinians.

In two other passages we find $\xi\gamma\nu\omega$ (*cognouit*). In the former (below), i 20, 3, the Marcossians 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, $\xi\gamma\nu\omega$, $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota$, and $\omicron\iota\delta\epsilon\nu$; 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 Filius, 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. Marcossians ap. Iren. *Haer.* i 20, 3 *οἰονεὶ κορωνίδα τῆς ὑποθέσεως αὐτῶν φέρουσι ταῦτα* 'Ἐφομολογήσομαί σοι . . . καὶ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.

Mt. G R B. Heretics ap. Iren. *Haer.* iv 6, 1 'Nemo cognouit Patrem nisi Filius nec Filium nisi Pater, et cui uoluerit Filius reuelare'.

Mt. (G) R. Adamantius, *Dialogue* i 23 (Bakhuysen p. 44, 1): Megethius, the Marcionist, says: *ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν δείξω ὅτι ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πατήρ καὶ ἄλλος ὁ δημιουργός . . . ὁ Χριστός . . . εἰπών* 'οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα

M I *εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις γινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ*. Same page, line 14, in the reply of Adamantius: *οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ*, and line 29, the arbiter Eutropius quotes: *οὐδεὶς οἶδε τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ*.

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 cuiusque filius reuelauerit'. (Rönsch's reading is wrong: *patrem . . . et filium*, Mt.)

With the last passage we must compare Tertullian's own citations (Rönsch *N. T. Tertullianus* p. 103):—

Mt. 2 G. c. *Marc.* ii 27 'Ceterum patrem nemini visum etiam commune testabitur evangelium, dicente Christo: "Nemo cognovit patrem nisi filius"'

Mt. 2. c. *Prax.* 8 'Solut filius patrem novit'. 19, 'Solut sciens sensum patris'. 26. 'Hic quoque patrem nemini notum nisi filio adfirmat'.

Mt. 2 A. *Praescr.* 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 *γινώσκει* 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 Mepharreshe* vol. i pp. 59, 315. Victor of Capua gives Mt. in *Cod. Fuld. 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 οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ
καὶ οἷς ἂν ἀποκαλύψῃ ὁ υἱός.

Mt. G R A. *Apol.* i 63, 19 οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ
καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.

Mt. R A. *Dial.* 100, 5 οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ
καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.

Each quotation varies, so that Justin is not quoting carefully from his book. Every time he gives οἷς for φῖ; 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 ἔγνω against a single γινώσκει; but then the two ἔγνω are close together and count only as one witness. It is possible that Justin read ἔγνω; 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 ἔγνω. Accordingly ἔγνω 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 ἔγνω we have Marcion explicitly for Lk. and Irenaeus explicitly for Mt. But Justin is on the whole a witness against ἔγνω in his *Dialogue*.

Thus the possible evidence is reduced to

1. Mt. (Justin) and the Marcosians;
2. Mt. Clement and Origen.

Harnack continues :—

2. *The reading ἔγνω 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: ἔκρυψας, ἀπεκάλυψας, ἐγένετο, παρεδόθη.

We have seen on the contrary that Marcion had the Lucan form with *scit* = γινώσκει, and that every single instance of ἔγνω was in Mt. ! 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!¹ 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 *ἔγνω* was in the one rather than the other.

But does *nouit* really represent *ἔγνω*? *Nouit* is only a perfect in form, not in meaning, like *οἶδεν*, and is exactly equivalent to *cognoscit* or *scit*. It is therefore odd that Harnack, who takes *ἔγνω* to be a 'historic' aorist, should think that it was translated by *nouit*! But, in fact, *ἔγνω* in the sense of 'knoweth' is just as much a present as *nouit* or *οἶδα*, 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.²

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 *βούληται ἀποκαλύψαι* against *ἀποκαλύψῃ*, 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:—

Vulgate. Mt. 'Nemo nouit filium nisi pater, neque patrem quis nouit nisi filius, et cui uoluerit filius reuelare'.

cognoscit *d ff* (cognouit Tert. ¹/₃), agnoscit *k*

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*

repetunt uerbum *b l q* nobit *b* cognoscit *l* nouit *q*.

² It is not a fact that *noui* usually stands for *ἔγνω*. On the contrary, in the Gospels, *noui* stands about 11 times for *οἶδα*, 7 times for *γινώσκω*, 3 times for *ἔγνω* (*nosse* for *εἰδέναι* once, and for *γινώσκει* thrice, in Mk. iv 11 and the parallels in Mt. and Lk.). Consequently Harnack's proof falls to the ground. On the other hand, *ἐπιγινώσκω* (never in John) is rendered by *cognosco* 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 *ἐπιγινώσκει*. Consequently it may after all stand for *ἔγνω* or *οἶδε*. The *γινώσκει* 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 $\xi\gamma\nu\omega$ 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 $\xi\gamma\nu\omega$ 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 $\kappa\alpha\iota \psi \acute{\alpha}\nu . . .$ only suits the clause $\sigma\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma \xi\gamma\nu\omega \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \delta \ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, 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 $\sigma\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma \xi\gamma\nu\omega \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \delta \ \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\iota \ \mu\acute{\eta} \delta \ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ would need a converse addition $\kappa\alpha\iota \psi \acute{\alpha}\nu \ \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\gamma\eta\alpha\iota \ \delta \ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho \ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\psi\alpha\iota$.

But a clause to this effect is actually to be found in the preceding verse: 'Ἐξομολογούμαί σοι, πάτερ . . . ὅτι . . . ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις. 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. α. 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 χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος . . . Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, and in

2. Galat. i 15 Ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν [ὁ θεὸς] ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εὐθὺς οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι . . .

Harnack considers that not only in St Matthew (this was obvious), but even in St Luke, the whole passage from Ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι onwards is not in its original context. He has therefore to discover what is meant by ταῦτα, 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 ναί takes up the ἐξομολογοῦμαι, and the clause ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἐμπροσθέν σου 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. And no one knoweth the Son but the Father: neither doth any one know the Father but the Son, and he to whom it shall please the Son to reveal Him'.

² With the earlier verse Ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, κτέ. Harnack has paralleled:—

I Cor. i 19, 21 Γέγραπται γάρ· ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν, καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν ἀθετήσω' . . . ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν, εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος σώσαι τοὺς 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 νήπιοι 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.¹ 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.