

## ON IMMEDIATELY IN MATT. XXIV 29.

It has frequently been maintained that Matt. xxiv 29 is more original in expression than the parallel passage Mk. xiii 24; and now Dr Sanday in the new Oxford *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 10, has lent the weight of his authority to what I cannot but consider to be the erroneous view. This seems, therefore, a not inappropriate time for entering a respectful protest. Dr Sanday says: 'In Matt. xxiv 29, "*Immediately* after the tribulation of those days", the word "*immediately*" is not found in the parallel text Mk. xiii 24; and yet we may be pretty sure that it is original, because it would seem to be contradicted by the event.'

But does the passage in St Matthew really say more definitely than that in St Mark that the Parusia will come 'immediately'? I do not think so. Had we found in some Gospel such a statement as 'When ye see Jerusalem encompassed by armies, know that its desolation is nigh. But immediately after the city is taken, the sun shall be darkened and the sign of the Son of Man will appear'—then, indeed, we might say that this is a definite *vaticinium* which would seem to be contradicted by the event, and we might consequently regard it as more 'original' than the vaguer language of Mk. xiii 24. But this imaginary saying is not what we find in Matt. xxiv. 29. The *θλίψις* of this verse and of Mk. xiii 24 is a much vaguer state and period. Matthew does not say the Parusia is coming immediately: he only says that the Parusia is coming *immediately after* a certain period of tribulation, a period itself in the future. No doubt it is all to come to pass in 'this generation' (Matt. xxiv 34, Mk. xiii 30, Lk. xxi 32): that is common to all the Synoptic Gospels. What I am here trying to point out is that Matthew's *εὐθέως* introduces no new element into the anticipated chronology.

In Mk. xiii 21 ff the disciples are told not to believe when folk say the Messiah has come here or there: *μὴ πιστεύετε*, our Lord says to them, but (*ἀλλά*) when the tribulation is past then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds (*vv.* 24–26). *ἀλλά* always looks back to a preceding negative expressed or understood. If in *v.* 24 it does not actually look back to 'do not believe' in *v.* 21, then we must understand it to mean 'These impostors are not the Messiah, but . . .'.

The parallel passage Matt. xxiv 23–30 follows Mark very closely, except that Matthew inserts *vv.* 26–28 from Q (= Lk. xvii 23, 24, 37<sup>h</sup>). By this insertion, especially by *v.* 28, 'after the tribulation' has been broken off from 'do not believe', and so Matthew introduces it by *εὐθέως δέ*. The meaning is not different from the meaning of Mark; but whereas Mark speaks of the future tribulation and the future Parusia as being all in *one* period (*ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις*), Matthew

distinguishes *two* periods, the 'tribulation of those days' and the Parusia immediately (*εὐθέως*) afterwards. The difference between the two Gospels is here merely one of wording; so far as the time indicated for the Parusia is concerned I cannot see that either is more original than the other.

With regard to the second passage brought forward by Dr Sanday as an instance of the occasional inferiority of Mark, viz. the Saying 'I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel', which in Matthew introduces the conversation between our Lord and the Syro-phoenician woman,<sup>1</sup> it may be remarked that the phrase τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ has already been used in Matt. x 6. One of the most marked features of Matthew's style is his frequent repetition of his own peculiar or characteristic formulas.<sup>2</sup> We may very well believe that he found traditional authority for telling us that our Lord had quoted 'I desire mercy and not sacrifice' from Hosea; but at the same time we may regard the insertion of this in the context of Matt. ix 13 as being simply and solely an editorial addition, whatever may be the case with regard to Matt. xii 7. Similarly it is not unreasonable to regard Matt. xv 24 as designed by the Evangelist to introduce and explain the curt refusal of Mk. vii 27. In any case it seems to me to be similar in genesis to such peculiarities of the First Gospel as Matt. ix 13 (referred to above), xiii 10, xiv 16<sup>a</sup>, 18, xvi 11, xvii 7.

For these reasons I cannot accept Dr Sanday's illustrations as self-evident 'examples in which the text of St Mark as we have it does not appear to be prior to that of one or both of the two companion Gospels' (*Studies*, p. 9).

F. C. BURKITT.

#### ON EATTON EKENΩSEN, PHIL. ii 7.

THE Note by Mr John Ross in *J. T. S.* July 1909 p. 573 seems to remove the difficulty (felt by Lightfoot, Gifford, and other commentators) of giving ἀρπαγμός its proper active signification. It also seems to remove all ambiguity from the phrase εαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν. This may now be interpreted as the exact antithesis of ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο—'He considered His equality with God not as an opportunity of self-aggrandizement, but effaced all thought of self and poured out His fullness to enrich others'.

<sup>1</sup> Matthew calls her a Canaanite: what an artificial Old Testament word! It is just like calling Wady Ghurundel 'Elim'.

<sup>2</sup> I need only refer to Sir John Hawkins's lists in *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 168 ff, and the phrases printed in clarendon type, pp. 82-98.