

# *The Journal* *of* *Theological Studies*

APRIL, 1925

## NOTES AND STUDIES

### MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

*(continued).*

#### *V. The movements of Jesus and his disciples and the crowd.*

THE present instalment of these Notes on Marcan Usage deals with what seems to me a singularly interesting feature of the Second Gospel in comparison and contrast with the other two Synoptic Gospels, namely the position and relative prominence which in the structure of the narrative attaches to the disciples or the Twelve. This prominence is not to all appearance the result of a conscious attempt on the evangelist's part to emphasize it or in any way to advertise it: you might read the Gospel superficially without noticing it: but when once attention is drawn to it, it is seen to be there, and the natural and obvious explanation is that we have before us the experience of a disciple and apostle who tells the story from the point of view of an eyewitness and companion, who puts himself in the same group as the Master, who distinguishes the group of companions from the crowd at large. Matthew and Luke are Christian historians who stand away from the events, and concentrate their narrative on the central figure: in contrast with it other contrasts lose something of their importance, and on occasion the disciples and the crowd almost melt—as they never do in Mark—into one.

The first and perhaps of all the most significant distinction between the three Synoptists in this sphere is the distinction between the use of the plural and of the singular in the narrative of the movements of Jesus and his disciples. Twenty-one instances are enumerated in § 1 of these notes, in which the plural is used by Mark, denoting the coming and going of Jesus and his disciples—in fifteen of them the word is ἐρχεσθαι or one of its compounds—followed at once by the singular in reference to Jesus alone. Obviously it was simpler and saved space to construct

the whole sentence in the singular, and this is what the other Synoptists, concentrating attention on the Master, tend to do: on five occasions both substitute the singular for the plural, and on three more occasions Luke does so, while Luke five times and Matthew three times omit the whole clause containing the plural verb. The net result is that the retention of Mark's plural is rare in Matthew, rarer still in Luke. And the scribes of Mark, whether affected by the presence of the singular in the Synoptic parallels, or influenced independently by the same motives as influenced Matthew and Luke, tend themselves too to get rid of the plural: and in one or two cases it is not unreasonable to allow 'Marcan usage' a decisive voice and to accept the plural on what is apparently the weaker body of witness.

Why then did our earliest Evangelist tell his story in the plural, not being himself one of the company who went about with Jesus, save because he is repeating the story of one to whom the plural came natural as being himself an actor in the events he relates? 'We went across, and as he left the boat there met him . . .' 'Next morning after we had left Bethany he was hungry . . .' 'We come again to Jerusalem: and as he was walking up and down in the Temple . . .' The mixture of nominatives is less glaring between the first person and the third—'we' and 'he', instead of 'they' and 'he': and that may perhaps be the reason why St Mark so rarely writes 'Jesus'. Peter would be content with 'He': there could be no question who was meant.<sup>1</sup>

In one passage in particular, i 29, 'they left the synagogue and came into the house of Simon and Andrew with James and John', the hypothesis that the third person plural of Mark represents a first person plural of Peter makes what as it stands is a curiously awkward phrase into a phrase which is quite easy and coherent. 'We left the synagogue and came into our house with our fellow-disciples James and John. My mother-in-law was in bed with fever, and he is told about her . . .'<sup>2</sup> So too, i 16, 'He saw me and Andrew my brother'.

The usages of which details are given in the other sections of this paper are all intended to re-inforce the conclusion that Mark's story is told as from a disciple and companion, while Matthew and Luke are less directly interested in that particular point of view.

<sup>1</sup> Mark very rarely writes  $\delta$  'Ἰησοῦς in narrative, not infrequently in the give and take of question and answer: though scribes have tried to insert it, e. g. xii 41. Matthew adds  $\delta$  'Ἰησοῦς not less than some forty times, especially at the beginning of a paragraph. Luke is even more sparing than Mark with  $\delta$  'Ἰησοῦς, and like Mark, but oftener, makes use of *αὐτός*, 'He himself', 'The Master', or better still a stressed 'He': it is almost equivalent to our use of the capital H.

<sup>2</sup> My colleague Mr Brightman points out to me that this suggestion was anticipated by Godet: see his *Biblical Studies: New Testament* ch. i § 2, p. 24.

In § ii nine passages are enumerated where the sentence begins with a singular verb in reference to our Lord and goes on to mention the disciples: and more often than not this mention of the disciples falls out in one or both of the derivative accounts.

The passages collected in the following section (§ 3) differ only from these by the additional mention of the crowd. They witness to the more articulated conceptions of the Second Gospel: in later Gospels the lines become a little blurred and indistinct. Out of eleven passages there is practically none where something of the Marcan distinction of elements is not lost by both the other two evangelists.

This definite articulation, characteristic of Mark, is further brought out with regard to 'the crowd', ὄχλος, in § v. Alone among the three Synoptists he uses the word only in the singular—the one exception in x 1 refers to the gathering together of crowds from different quarters—because he or his informant visualizes as a single whole the body of people who came together to hear Jesus, and according to their numbers on each occasion describes them as 'a crowd' or 'a big crowd' or 'a considerable crowd' or 'a very big crowd'. Mark never uses the definite article in the nominative, ὁ ὄχλος, πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος (at any rate till the scene shifts to Jerusalem), except in relation to an indefinite 'crowd' mentioned just previously.<sup>1</sup> They are not a fixed quantity, so to say, not ὁ ὄχλος but ὄχλος, a necessary element in the picture but a variable and varying one. To the other evangelists, or at any rate to Matthew, they are a stereotyped but vague generality, 'the multitudes'.

A similar conclusion results from the study of the word ἀκολουθεῖν in § vi. In Mark this verb has ordinarily something still about it to suggest the literal sense: it is never used of the crowds—as it is in the other Synoptists—but only of the call to 'leave all and follow' Jesus. And more significant still are the changes which the two later Synoptists make by introducing ἀκολουθεῖν of the disciples 'following' Jesus, where Mark had spoken of Jesus and the disciples as a single group; see iv 36, ix 38.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, as to the terms used of the disciples themselves, St Mark's Gospel reveals its archaic and primitive character by its predominant

<sup>1</sup> ὁ ὄχλος in iii 20 (but note ὄχλος N\* C with W-H margin) would refer to the πλῆθος πολύ of iii 8: in ix 25 (but again ὄχλος N<sup>o</sup> B D Δ) to the ὄχλον πολύν of ix 14: πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος (ὄχλος D\*) ii 13 to the πολλοί of ii 2 and the διὰ τὸν ὄχλον of ii 4: πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος of iv 1 ὁ to ὄχλος πλείστος earlier in the same verse, and in ix 15 to ὄχλον πολύν of ix 14. In xv 8 D a k give, for 'the crowd', 'the whole crowd'. In oblique cases the article is of course essential, and implies nothing as between ὄχλος and ὁ ὄχλος: e.g. in ii 4 διὰ τὸν ὄχλον was the only possible phrase, just like 'because of the crowd' in English. You could not say δι' ὄχλον, 'because of a crowd'.

<sup>2</sup> Of the crowd Matt. iv 25, viii 1, xii 15, xiv 13, xix 2, xx 29; Lk. vii 9, ix 11: and of the disciples Matt. viii 23, Lk. ix 49, xxii 39.

use of the phrase 'his disciples' (§ iv below); whereas the other Gospels tend to introduce the absolute statement 'the disciples', a usage which doubtless goes back to a very early stage in the separate history of the Christian Society but does not go back to the time of the Ministry itself. And St Mark's Gospel is distinguished again from the other two by its fondness, especially in the later chapters, for the phrase *οἱ δώδεκα*, which comes to all appearance to be practically a synonym, during the last journey to Jerusalem and at Jerusalem, for 'the disciples'.<sup>1</sup>

i. *The impersonal plural, followed by the singular.*

1. *ι 21* καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασι διδάσκειν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν.

The plural is found in all authorities save *fam. ι* Origen and a very few others (*om. syr-sin*). Matthew omits the notice entirely: Luke gives the singular; but as the call of the first disciples comes at a later point in his story, he was naturally bound to do so.

2. *ι 29, 30* καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος . . . καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ . . .

ἐξελθόντες . . . ἦλθον **NA CL Δ** Vulg. with W-H text: B D W **Θ** *fam. ι*, *fam. ι3* and the Old Latins and Armenian ἐξελθὼν . . . ἦλθεν: *syr-sin* combines the two readings 'and he went forth . . . and they came', and so *l* 'et protinus egrediens de synagoga uenerunt': a and the Sahidic are defective. Matthew and Luke both have the singular. It is so much more probable that the singular would have been substituted for the plural by scribes of Mark than *vice versa*, that, in spite of the strong authority for ἐξελθὼν . . . ἦλθεν, I can feel little doubt that W-H are right in putting the plural in their text.<sup>2</sup>

3. *ν ι, 2* καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν . . . καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ . . .

ἦλθεν C L W **Δ** etc. *syr-sin*. Matthew omits the first clause altogether: Luke has the plural with Mark. External authority and intrinsic probability combined are decisive for ἦλθον.

4. *ν 38* καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον . . .

ἔρχονται **NA B C D ι 33**, the better half of Old Latin MSS (*b e i*) Vulg. and Sahidic: ἔρχεται L W **Θ** a c f f arm: *def. syr-sin*. Matthew and Luke both substitute the singular. There is no doubt about the

<sup>1</sup> I hope to recur in another number of the JOURNAL to this subject, and to examine the theory urged by Eduard Meyer in his important work *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, that *οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ)* and *οἱ δώδεκα* indicate two separate sources employed by St Mark. As far as I can see at present, this theory has no adequate basis at all.

<sup>2</sup> In Mk. ii 13 **N\*** gives ἐξῆλθον for ἐξῆλθεν: but though it may conceivably be right, the authority is too slight to justify the inclusion of the passage in this list.

reading in Mark : exactly the same instinct which actuated the other two Synoptists accounts for the reading of the minority.

5. vi 53, 54 καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ καὶ προσωρμίσθησαν. καὶ ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν . . .

Luke is now defective : Matthew retains the first plurals, διαπεράσαντες ἦλθον, but drops the other two as superfluous detail.<sup>1</sup>

6. viii 22 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν. καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ . . .

ἔρχονται **N**<sup>e</sup> B C D L W Δ ⊙ *fam.* 13 Latins Sahidic Armenian : ἔρχεται **N**\* A syr-sin etc. Again no doubt at all : but again we note the persistent inclination by some or other witnesses to substitute the singular. There are no Synoptic parallels.

7. ix 14, 15 καὶ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον ὄχλον πολὺν . . . καὶ εὐθὺς πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεθάμβησαν.

ἐλθόντες . . . εἶδον **N** B L W Δ k sah arm : ἐλθὼν . . . εἶδεν A C D ⊙ and all latins except k, etc. : syr-sin, as in no. 2, gives a conflate reading 'when he came to his disciples, they saw by them a great multitude'. Both Matthew and Luke keep the plural of Mark, though Matthew, as on some other occasions, omits all mention of the multitude. There are only eight witnesses (or nine, if we count syr-sin) for the plural in Mark, but their quality makes up for their quantity. Note that k is the only MS of the Westerns (in the literal sense) in the group : it preserves on not a few occasions a purer text than D.

8. ix 30 κάκειθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ.

This time there is no variation in our witnesses, and Matthew, too, retains the plural : Luke omits the whole clause, perhaps because he is going a few verses later to introduce his special story of the ascent to Jerusalem.

9. ix 33 καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ· καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς . . .

ἦλθον **N** B D W *fam.* 1 the best Old Latins (a b i k) with Vulgate and Sahidic : ἦλθεν A C L Δ ⊙ etc. Matthew and Luke both omit the details of the arrival at Capernaum and entry into the house. Once more there is no doubt about the reading.

10. x 32 ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτούς ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα . . .

The form of the sentence precluded any temptation to scribes of Mark to evade the plural : but Matthew changes ἀναβαίνοντες to ἀναβαίνων and goes straight on with παρέλαβεν τοὺς δώδεκα, while Luke omits

<sup>1</sup> From vii 24 to vii 37—the visit to Tyre, and return from Tyre to the sea of Galilee—the story is told throughout in the singular. May not our Lord have made this excursion alone and unaccompanied ?

everything which precedes παραλαβών. Thus in both of them the plural entirely disappears.

II. x 46 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱερειχώ. καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἱερειχώ . . .

ἔρχεται D with most of the Old Latins (but not ck) syr-sin and Origen. Matthew keeps the plural: Luke replaces the plural by the singular.

12. xi 1 καὶ ὅτε ἐγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα . . . ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

A very limited group, D and the Old Latins (with the exception of a), substitutes the singular, at the same time changing the present to a past tense: k, for the first time since it has come to our assistance (from no. 7 onwards), deserts the plural. As in no. II, Matthew retains the plural, while Luke gives ἦγγισεν.

13. xi 11 καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερόν. καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα . . .

Here I read the plural with a very small group, Θ i (cum introissent) k (et introierunt): syr-sin as in nos. 2 and 7, combines plural and singular 'and they entered Jerusalem, and he entered the Temple'. All our other authorities, with Matthew and Luke, have the singular. But, on the strength of 'Marcan usage', I venture to believe that the three authorities which give the plural are right.

14. xi 12 καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον ἐξεληθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Βηθανίας ἐπένασεν.

The only recalcitrant witnesses here are D b c ff—not however a d i k. Thus the older Old Latins go with our Greek authorities: the ungrammatical ἐξεληθόντα of D, where d has cum exissent, may safely be neglected. Matthew has the singular: Luke has no parallel.

15. xi 15 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν . . .

The singular is only offered by D (again against its Latin column intrauerunt) b i and syr-sin. Matthew and Luke both omit the first clause, and therewith the plural, entirely.

16. xi 19, 20, 21 ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως· καὶ παραπορευόμενοι πρῶτῃ εἶδον τὴν συκὴν . . . καὶ ἀναμνηθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ . . .

ἐξεπορεύοντο A B W Δ Ψ 124 565 c d arm W-H text: ἐξεπορεύετο the rest (with Θ k sah syr-sin). There is no parallel in the other Synoptists to account for the singular: and as παραπορευόμενοι εἶδον is quite certain, it is just possible that ἐξεπορεύοντο is a scribal assimilation to this following plural, and that ἐξεπορεύετο is original here. Decision is therefore less easy than usual.

17. xi 27 καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ . . .

ἔρχεται only D with all the older Old Latins (b e f f i k) except a:

compare no. 12 above. Matthew has the singular : Luke omits the first phrase, and so retains only the singular.

18. xiv 18 καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθιόντων ὁ Ἰησοῦς<sup>1</sup> εἶπεν . . .

Matthew retains (omitting ἀνακειμένων καὶ), Luke puts ἀπέπεσεν (singular) into a previous verse, and thus gets rid again of the plural.

19. xiv 22 καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβῶν ἄρτον . . .

Matthew retains plural and singular : Luke again omits the phrase containing the plural.

20. xiv 26, 27 καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον . . . καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . .

Matthew again retains unchanged : Luke again omits ὑμνήσαντες and, instead of 'they went out', writes 'he went out and they followed'.

21. xiv 32 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸ χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανεὶ· καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ . . .

No variation in the text of Mark : but both Matthew and Luke change plural into singular.

Of the fourteen passages where our authorities differ, B is right in 12, N in 11, W in 10, Θ in 9, sah in 11, a in 8, d in 8 : k in six out of nine where it is extant. D and syr. sin have the worst record : on three occasions running, 14 15 16, d is right where D is wrong.

ii. *The singular followed by mention of the disciples (or the Twelve).*

1. i 35, 36 καὶ πρῶτ' ἔννυχα λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθεν . . . καὶ κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ. They are not yet 'the disciples', still less 'the Twelve', but 'Simon and his companions'. Peter takes the first place—or it was Peter who told the story, 'I and my companions'. There is no parallel in Matthew, while in Luke (iv 42) οἱ ὄχλοι take the place of Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ.

2. ii 15 καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶνα καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.

Matthew repeats Mark's statement : Luke omits the mention of the disciples.

3. ii 23 καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν . . . παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο . . .

The mention of the disciples at this point is necessary to the story, and is repeated by both the other Synoptists.

4. iii 7 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησεν . . .

It is Matthew on this occasion who omits mention of the disciples, while Luke follows Mark by retaining it.

<sup>1</sup> ὁ Ἰησοῦς is omitted by a e ff syr-sin, and the place of the words varies in our other authorities : see p. 2 note 1 above.

5. vi 1 και ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν και ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ και ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

Matthew is wholly silent about the disciples here, because they play no part in the episode. Luke, too, omits them, and necessarily, for he transfers this visit to Nazareth to a point in his history (iv 16) before the call of any of the disciples.

6. viii 27 και ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς και οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κόμας Καισαρίας τῆς Φιλιππου.

The question to the disciples 'Whom do men say that I am?' is of course an integral part of this story, and all three Evangelists mention them in that connexion: but in the introductory phrase Matthew drops the allusion to them.

7. x 13 και προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία . . . οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς . . .

The rebuke by the disciples being necessary to the episode, it is retained by both the derivative accounts.

8. xiv 12, 13 και τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων . . . λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἐτοιμάσωμεν . . .

Strictly speaking, this passage does not fulfil the requirement of singular before plural: but I include it here for purposes of comparison with St Luke, for it illustrates again the underlying principle that Mark tells the story from the point of view of the disciples. While Matthew exactly reproduces, Luke omits the initiative of the disciples, and writes (xxii 7, 8) ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων . . . και ἀπέστειλεν . . .

9. xiv 17 και ὀψίας γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα . . .

The other two Synoptists agree, save that for 'the Twelve' Matthew substitutes 'the twelve disciples', Luke 'the apostles'.

These variations are instructive. Mark uses οἱ δώδεκα ten times: iii 14, 16 ἐποίησεν [τούς] δώδεκα, iv 10 οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα, vi 7 προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα, ix 35 καθίσας ἐφώνησεν τοὺς δώδεκα, x 32 παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα, xi 11 ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα, xiv 10 Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριῶθ ὁ εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, xiv 17 (the passage under discussion), xiv 20 εἰς τῶν δώδεκα ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ, xiv 43 παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰούδας, εἰς τῶν δώδεκα—and only once<sup>1</sup> οἱ ἀπόστολοι, and that on the special occasion when they returned from the Missionary Journey, vi 30, where the noun corresponds to the ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο of vi 7 (cf. iii 15, of the purpose of the call of the Twelve, ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν . . .): neither οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταὶ nor οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι occurs in his Gospel. In other words ἀπόστολος has not lost with him its

<sup>1</sup> In Mk. iii 14 the words οὗς και ἀποστόλους ἀνόμασεν, in spite of the strong authority for them (NB Δ Θ 28 Ferrar group sah), are in my judgement nothing but an insertion borrowed from Lk. vi 13. They are omitted by Tischendorf with ADLW 1 33 all latins (O.L. and Vulg.) syr-sin arm.

original sense of 'missionary', and there were other qualified 'missionaries' in the early Church besides the Twelve, while *οἱ δώδεκα* 'the Twelve' is the special phrase which in the latter part of his Gospel (side by side with *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*) denotes the small company of those whom the Master had singled out for closest intimacy and training as his representatives. Here the Pauline epistles are the best commentary on Marcan usage. St Paul does not use *οἱ δώδεκα* himself: but we find the phrase in the Creed-summary of 1 Cor. xv 5, which he had 'received' from, and shared with, those who were in Christ before him. Similarly St Paul recognizes the original sense of *ἀπόστολος* as a 'missionary' 'one formally sent' (2 Cor. viii 23, Phil. ii 25), and can even write, in the additions which he makes in 1 Cor. xv 6-8 to the inherited Creed-form, *τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν* (verse 7) in contrast to *τοῖς δώδεκα* of verse 5.

On the other hand Matthew never uses the phrase *οἱ δώδεκα* (save in the phrase *εἰς τῶν δώδεκα* xxvi 14 = Mk. xiv 10, and xxvi 47 = Mk. xiv 43), but always *οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί*, Matt. x 1, xi 1, xx 17<sup>1</sup>, xxvi 20, or *οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι*, Matt. x 2: in Matt. x 5 *τούτους τοὺς δώδεκα* may seem an exception, but it takes up *οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι* of verse 2. That is to say, though Matthew can say *εἰς τῶν δώδεκα* or *οἱ τοὶ δώδεκα*, he never says *οἱ δώδεκα simpliciter*. Like Mark, he only uses *ἀπόστολος* once, but it is significant that on that one occasion (x 2) it is in reference to the call of 'the twelve apostles': cf. Apoc. xxi 14 'the twelve apostles of the Lamb'.

Luke does not share Matthew's avoidance of the phrase 'the Twelve': Lk. viii 1, ix 1<sup>2</sup>, ix 12, xviii 31, xxii 3, xxii 47. But he is the first evangelist to introduce, as an alternative to 'the disciples' or 'the Twelve' the additional phrase 'the Apostles'—which in the Acts he uses of course quite regularly and consistently—Lk. ix 10 [= Mk. vi 30], xvii 5, xxii 14, xxiv 10. Like Matthew, but unlike Mark, he uses the noun 'apostles' in connexion with the Calling of the Twelve, vi 13.

Our passage, Mk. xiv 17 = Matt. xxvi 20 = Lk. xxii 14, is therefore of special interest as indicating characteristic usages of the three Synoptists, *οἱ δώδεκα*, *οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί*, *οἱ ἀπόστολοι*.

<sup>1</sup> *τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς* B C W 28 33 Ferrar group latins (O.L. and Vulg.) sah and W-H margin. The authority would be preponderant, even without the argument from Matthaean usage. Omission of *μαθητὰς* is due to the influence of the parallel texts in Luke and Mark.

<sup>2</sup> There is good, and perhaps sufficient, authority for adding *ἀποστόλους*, N C L 0 33 Ferrar group a c e Vulg.

iii. *The Lord, the disciples, and the multitude.*

1. iii 9 καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα πλοιάριον προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα μὴ θλίβωσιν αὐτόν.

Mention of the disciples at this moment disappears entirely from Matthew and Luke. It had, in fact, no point save as a personal reminiscence.

2. iv 1, 2, 10 καὶ συναγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πλείστος . . . καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν. καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλά . . . καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας, ἠρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα τὰς παραβολάς.

Here in Mark we have four elements, the Lord, the Twelve, the disciples outside the Twelve, and lastly the multitude. The intermediate elements distinguished by Mark—the Twelve are now a group by themselves among the disciples, but they are not yet isolated into a separate company—are massed together both by Matthew ('the disciples') and Luke ('his disciples'). All three share mention of the 'crowd', but Luke suppresses all details, and even in Matthew the detail disappears that the crowd was unusually big, πλείστος. \*Οχλοι πολλοί is a sort of standing phrase with him (Matt. iv 25, viii 1, xiii 2 [our passage], xv 30, xix 2), though he does employ ὁ πλείστος ὄχλος in xxi 8.

3. iv 34 χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίους μαθηταῖς ἐπέλκεν πάντα.

Luke is not parallel here: Matthew retains the first or negative part of the sentence and caps it with a prophecy (Ps. lxxviii [lxxvii] 2), but says nothing of the interpretation to the disciples.

4. iv 35, 36 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς . . . Διέλωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν. καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ.

Both Matthew and Luke are silent as to the action of the disciples; ἀφέντες and παραλαμβάνουσιν alike disappear. In Luke the 'crowd' drops out as well.

5. vii 17 καὶ ὅτε εἰσηλθεν εἰς [τὸν] οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολήν.

We have reached the long lacuna in Luke: Matthew, who has inserted additional matter since the mention of the summoning of the crowd (Mk. vii 14 = Matt. xv 10) has no place here for the crowd, and loses the characteristic Marcan contrast of ὄχλος and μαθηταί.

6. viii 1 πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων τί φάγωσιν, προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγει αὐτοῖς . . .

There is, as before, no Luke: Matthew retains the substance, but by compressing misses Mark's juxtaposition of 'crowd' and 'disciples'.

7. viii 9, 10 ἦσαν δὲ ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι· καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτούς. καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς [αὐτὸς] εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἦλθεν . . .

Matthew for the rest copies Mark meticulously, but he omits the disciples altogether and emphasizes his concentration on the Lord and the multitude by repeating the noun ὄχλος (τοὺς ὄχλους for αὐτούς).

8. viii 34 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς . . .

Mark's characteristic combination of the crowd and the disciples fails as usual to find full echo in the other two Synoptists: for Matthew here omits the crowd, and Luke groups both elements together under the common heading πάντας.

9. ix 14 καὶ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτούς . . .

Mark is careful to note that Jesus, who had selected three of the disciples to accompany him on the Mount of the Transfiguration, now once more reunited the company. That does not in itself interest the other Synoptists: both of them note the crowd, neither of them says anything at this stage of the disciples.

10. x 46 καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἱερειχῶ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ . . .

Matthew (xx 29) avoids the separate mention of 'disciples' by the use of the plural participle ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν, and connects the 'crowd' by the expedient of his favourite word ἀκολουθέω.<sup>1</sup> Luke concentrates attention on the principal actors, Jesus and the blind beggar, leaves out the disciples altogether, but skilfully introduces the crowd when the blind man hears it passing by.

11. xii 41-43 καὶ καθίσας κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου θεώρει πῶς ὁ ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν . . . καὶ ἐλθοῦσα μία χήρα πτωχὴ ἔβαλεν . . . καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν . . .

Matthew omits the whole story. Luke tells it without any specific reference to the disciples.

iv. 'His disciples' 'the disciples' (οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, οἱ μαθηταί).

Very early in the history of the Christian Society, μαθητής, οἱ μαθηταί, became the regular term for an individual follower of Jesus of Nazareth or for the members of the Society generally: and it is so used throughout the Acts. It is earlier than the word 'Christian', which, being of Latin or Greek coinage, belongs only to the period when Christianity began to establish itself in Gentile centres: Acts xi 26 ἐγένετο . . . χρηματίσαι πρῶτως ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς. As contrasted with 'Nazarene', it is the term which the followers of Jesus used of

<sup>1</sup> On ἀκολουθεῖν see below p. 238.

themselves, while to the Jews they were 'the Nazarenes', Acts xxiv 5 *πρωτοστάτην τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων<sup>1</sup> αἰρέσεως*.

But originally, when 'disciples' collected first round Jesus of Nazareth, his were not the only disciples. There were 'disciples of John', there were 'disciples of the Pharisees', Mk. ii 18, Lk. v 33, vii 18, xi 1, Jo. i 35, iii 25; and therefore the followers of Jesus in his Ministry were not 'the disciples' but 'his disciples', not *οἱ μαθηταί* but *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*.

This was of course the phraseology of the Jews<sup>2</sup>: 'Why are the disciples of John and the disciples of the Pharisees fasting, but thy disciples are not fasting?' 'Why do not thy disciples walk according to the tradition of the elders?' 'I said to thy disciples that they should cast it out'; Mk. ii 18, vii 5, ix 18. It is that of Jesus himself: 'Where is the guest-chamber where I may eat the passover with my disciples?' (Mk. xiv 14 and parallels): 'he cannot be my disciple,' Lk. xiv 26. But it is also the phraseology of the earliest stratum of the evangelic narrative. Mark writes *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* some thirty-two times out of about forty: Luke has *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* rather oftener than *οἱ μαθηταί*, of which the first independent occurrence is Lk. ix 18: Matthew too, though his divergence from Marcan usage is much greater, uses *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* consistently until Matt. xiii 10: and even in the latest of the Gospels *οἱ μαθηταί* without *αὐτοῦ* is not found in St John till xi 7. That is to say, at one end of the evangelic tradition St Mark's Gospel distinguishes itself by its close adherence to the archaic phrase, at the other St Matthew's is the only Gospel where *οἱ μαθηταί* without *αὐτοῦ* becomes preponderant, especially in the nominative (Matt. xiii 10, xiv 15 19 (*bis*) 22, xv 12 33 36 (*bis*), xvi 5, xvii 6 10 13 19, xviii 1, xix 10 13 25, xxi 6 20, xxiv 3, xxvi 8 17 35 56).

It may be worth while just to examine the few exceptions in St Mark, for some of them are not really exceptions at all.

iv 34 *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυνε πάντα*. Here obviously *ἰδίους* takes the place of *αὐτοῦ*.

vi 41 *ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς*. In the middle of the story of the Feeding

<sup>1</sup> *Ναζωραῖος* is the only form known to Matthew, John, and Acts: *Ναζαρηνός* the only form in Mark: Luke in his Gospel uses *Ναζαρηνός* iv 34 (= Mk. i 24), *Ναζωραῖος* xviii 37 (= *Ναζαρηνός* Mark x 47), while in xxiv 19 the authorities are divided between the two forms. As we know, *Ναζαρηνός* Nazarenes was the form which established itself in Greek and Latin usage. It looks as though *Ναζωραῖος* was the word used in the early period in Jewish circles, in place of which Mark, writing for Roman and Gentile readers, substituted the form intelligible to them.

<sup>2</sup> It is hardly credible that Matthew can have made the Jews say (xxvii 64) to Pilate 'lest the disciples come and steal him away', in spite of NB (unsupported indeed here by any other authorities), Tischendorf and W-H text, though not their margin; and we must certainly read with all other witnesses *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*.

of the Five Thousand, the full phrase occurring just before, vi 35, and just after, vi 45.

viii 1 προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητάς. Add probably αὐτοῦ with A B W ⊕ sah syr-sin (African Latin is defective).

ix 14 ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς. Here the omission of αὐτοῦ is really natural, because three of the apostles were already with our Lord.

x 10, 13 are certainly exceptions to the ordinary usage. Like the other evangelists, Mark it would seem tired of the repetition of αὐτοῦ. Perhaps we may also take into account the consideration that οἱ μαθηταί at this point of the Gospel has become simply equivalent to 'the Twelve': Mark would never have written, like Luke at the Entry into Jerusalem (xix 37), ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν.

x 24 οἱ δὲ μαθηταί may simply take up τοὺς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ of verse 23: but some good authorities actually add αὐτοῦ, D ⊕ 1 Old Latins (including k).

xiv 16 ἐξῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ἦλθον. Not 'the disciples' generally, but the two particular disciples who had been commissioned for the purpose.

#### v. 'The crowd', or 'the Multitudes'.

ὄχλος (ὄχλοι) is found thirty-seven times in Mark, forty-eight times in Matthew, thirty-nine times in Luke. Allowing for the relative lengths of the three Gospels, the preponderance is clearly with Mark. Thus in the story of Jairus's daughter he uses ὄχλος five times (v 21-31): 'a big crowd gathered', 'a big crowd followed', the woman 'came in the crowd', Jesus 'turned about in the crowd', the disciples remonstrate 'You see the crowd, and yet . . .' Luke reduces the five occasions to three, Matthew (whose compression of the whole episode is unusual even for him) has the word only once.

In Mark the noun is with one exception used in the singular: the crowd is visualized as one, and an ascending scale of adjectives πολὺς, ἱκανός, πλείστος, defines on occasion its size. The single exception, x 1 συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι, perhaps emphasizes the numbers who collected from different directions on the journey through Peraea, where our Lord was known by report but not personally. Matthew, on the other hand, prefers the vaguer and more general plural (thirty-one plural to seventeen singular): Luke uses both indifferently.

Of Mark's adjectives πολὺς is of course the commonest, 'a big crowd' (v 21, 24, vi 34, viii 1, ix 14). Matthew, too, has both ὄχλος πολὺς and, more commonly, ὄχλοι πολλοί. Luke like Mark prefers the singular, having ὄχλοι πολλοί only with a συν-verb (v 15 συνήρχοντο, xiv 25 [= apparently Mk. x 1] συνπορεύοντο).

Mark has once  $\delta$  πολλὸς ὄχλος, xii 37, where the rendering 'the common people heard him gladly' (A.V.) is probably just what Mark meant.<sup>1</sup>

πλείστος ὄχλος once, iv 1, with  $\aleph$  B C L  $\Delta$ : Matthew once (xxi 8)  $\delta$  πλείστος ὄχλος.

ὄχλος ἱκανός once, x 46. It is a favourite epithet with Luke, and he employs it with ὄχλος Lk. vii 12, Acts xi 24, 26, xix 26.

πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ii 13, iv 1, ix 15, xi 18. Matt. xiii 2 (= Mk. iv 1), Lk. vi 19, xiii 17. Note the idiom by which this phrase governs a plural verb, Mk. iv 1 ἦσαν  $\aleph$  B C L  $\Delta$   $\odot$  33 d, ix 15 ἰδόντες ἐξεθάμβησαν  $\aleph$  B C D L W  $\Delta$  ( $\odot$  ἰδὼν ἐξεθάμβησαν) *fam.* 1 and *fam.* 13, 28, 33, a b c d ffi<sup>2</sup> sah syr-sin, xi 18<sup>3</sup> ἐξεπλήσσοντο  $\aleph$   $\Delta$  c sah syr-sin, Lk. vi 19  $\aleph$  B L W b e (l) vulg. sah: i. e. Mark 2 (3) out of 4, Luke 1 out of 2.

For other instances of the same idiom see iii 7, 8 καὶ πολλὸ πλῆθος . . .<sup>3</sup> πλῆθος πολὺ, ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἐποίει, ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν: and perhaps xv 1 where I suspect that a stop should be put after γραμματέων, and a fresh clause begin καὶ ὄλον τὸ συνέδριον δήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπῆνεγκαν.

Luke can use ὄχλος or πλῆθος of disciples (Lk. vi 17, xix 37): Mark never does. 'Disciples' are always to Mark a limited company.

#### vi. *The word 'to follow', ἀκολουθεῖν.*

Ἀκολουθεῖν has of course in all the Gospels the possibility of a metaphorical or spiritual sense, in which the literal sense tends almost to be forgotten. Instances in St Mark are the call of the apostles Simon and Andrew i 18, the call of the rich young man x 21, the summons of Jesus to all who would 'follow him' that they should take up the cross viii 34, the profession of St Peter that he and his fellow-apostles had 'left all and followed him' x 28.

But the notable points about the 'Marcan usage' of ἀκολουθεῖν appear to be (i) that the literal sense is in some passages obviously the only one; (ii) that it is not obscurely present in the background in the instances of the metaphorical use—'to follow about'; (iii) that,

<sup>1</sup> L.S. quote  $\delta$  λεὼς  $\delta$  πολλὸς from Lucian *Rhet. Praec.* 17.

<sup>2</sup> Vulg. codd. opt. (A  $\mathcal{P}$ \* F H\* Y St Gall) 'stupefactus est expauerunt'. That is to say, either St Jerome had not made up his mind between the two alternatives, or more probably he meant to correct the O.L. expauerunt into the singular stupefactus est, and his amanuensis failed to make his intention clear.

<sup>3</sup> ἠκολούθησεν (-αν) in the editions is I think an insertion from Matthew iv 25 (xii 15): see immediately below, p. 239. But even if it is genuine, some of the oldest authorities who give the word ( $\aleph$  C, followed by Tischendorf) give it in the plural. Luke, who is fond of πλῆθος, rarely uses the plural with it (Lk. xix 37), though on two occasions he appears to combine plural and singular, Lk. xxiii 1 καὶ ἀναστὰν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ἠγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πειλᾶτον, Acts xxi 36 ἠκολούθει τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ κρίζοντες.

with one possible exception in the earlier half of the Gospel, it is not used in narrative of or to the apostles, who did not 'follow' but rather accompanied their Master.

(i) In v 24 'a big crowd followed' Jesus: allowed in the literal sense, and when the woman came in the crowd and touched him, she was behind, *ὀπισθεν*. In xi 9 part of the crowd 'goes in front', the other part 'follows behind', *οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες*. In xiv 54 Peter 'followed a long way behind' to the high priest's residence. The verb is once used of the apostles on the journey to Jerusalem, x 32, and there anything but a literal meaning is excluded. Jesus went on ahead, the disciples 'followed' at a distance, and then he took them up again into his company: *ἦσαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ . . . καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα . . .* That is to say, their normal position was at his side, he in the midst of them: it was exceptional that they should be behind him.

(ii) Even in the metaphorical use of 'following' Christ as his disciple, the literal sense is often, in St Mark, not far off. When Simon and Andrew are called to 'follow' in i 18, the parallel phrase in i 20 of James and John is *ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ*. If in viii 34 *ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν* (C\* D W @ a b i, against B c k syr-sin *ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν* with Matthew) is taken as the true text, Mark preserves an indication of the literal meaning in *ὀπίσω μου*. When Bartimaeus was healed of his blindness at the gates of Jericho, x 52, a similar touch of the literal sense is given in the addition 'on the road', *ἀνέβλεψεν καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*, a touch omitted by both Matthew and Luke. Negatively it is most instructive to note that Mark never uses *ἀκολουθῆω* in the intermediate sense of the crowds 'following' Jesus, more or less as his disciples: for in iii 7 the word *ἠκολούθησεν* (or *ἠκολούθησαν* or *ἠκολούθουν*—the very variations in form, and in the position of the word in the verse, are suspicious) is derived from Matt. iv 25 (xii 15) and is omitted by D 28 124 Old Latins and syr-sin. It was borrowed to ease the construction of the lengthy sentence. On the other hand, Matthew regularly uses *ἀκολουθεῖν* of the multitudes, iv 25, viii 1, (xii 15), xiv 13, xix 2, xx 29; Luke preserves something of the literal sense, vii 9, ix 11, xxiii 29.

(iii) As has been said above, Mark avoids the word *ἀκολουθεῖν* in relation to the apostolic company throughout the latter part of the Gospel: the disciples who were with Jesus were by that time not merely his followers but his companions and friends. *Ἀκολουθεῖν* is in fact only used twice of the disciples: in ii 15, on the first mention of *μαθηταί*, we are told that they were now many, and that they were beginning to 'follow him about', *ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοί, καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ*; and in vi 1

Jesus ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ —though I do not feel sure that we should not rather here interpret literally, in the sense that they ‘followed’ at an interval. However that may be, certain it is that in the Gospel as a whole the disciples and their Master are treated as a unit much more definitely than in the other two Synoptists. Mk. iv 36 illustrates this in comparison with Matthew, Mk. ix 38 in comparison with Luke.

In iv 36 it is the disciples who leave (or dismiss) the crowd and take up Jesus into their boat, ἀφέροντες τὸν ὄχλον παραλαμβάνουσι αὐτὸν (the same verb as in x 33, ‘take into company with them’) ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. Matthew on the other hand makes Jesus himself dismiss the multitudes, xiii 36 ἀφείς τοὺς ὄχλους,<sup>1</sup> and the disciples follow him into the boat, viii 23 ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. And in ix 38 Mark writes that John said ‘Master, we saw a man who does not follow us casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because he does not follow us’<sup>2</sup>: but Luke (ix 49) does not like this identification of the ‘following’ of the disciples with the ‘following’ of Jesus, and substitutes μεθ’ ἡμῶν ‘follow with us’. Similar, though in itself less significant, is the change from Mk. xiv 26 ἐμνήσαντες ἐξήλθον into Lk. xxii 39 ἐξεληθὼν ἐπορεύθη . . . ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταί.

Note finally in illustration of St Mark’s consistent use of ἀκολουθεῖν that, though it is never used of the apostles (or at any rate never after vi 1), it is used of the holy women in xv 41. While all the apostles ‘left him and fled’ (xiv 50), there were women watching the Crucifixion from afar, who ‘when he was in Galilee used to follow him about and minister to him’. Their ‘following’ belonged, that is, to the Galilean period of the Ministry: they had not been in his company on the long circuitous journey up to Jerusalem: but they had doubtless come up to the feast in the hope or expectation of seeing him again.

<sup>1</sup> Though Huck in his *Synopsis* does not so print it, it is clear that, as Matt. xiii 34, 35 depends on Mk. iv 33, 34, so this opening phrase of Matt. xiii 36 depends on the opening phrase of Mk. iv 36.

<sup>2</sup> The variations of reading in this verse are puzzling (though in itself the repetition of the words οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν is quite after Marcan usage), but they do not affect the substantial point, which is that Mark writes ‘follows us’. That is certain, in spite of the defection of D a k sah.