

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

(continued).

VII. *Particles*: (1) Ὅτι *interrogative*.

1. ii 7 *διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν Ὅτι οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ.*

Matthew gives simply οὗτος βλασφημεῖ, and so probably read ὅτι in Mark, understanding it as = 'that'. So B ⊙ and W-H margin: τί the rest.

2. ii 16 ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει;

τί ὅτι A C Δ etc., διὰ τί N D W with Matthew and Luke. Both these readings are obvious attempts to get rid of the difficulty of ὅτι interrogative. The modern editors give ὅτι.

3. viii 12 καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει Ὅτι ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον;

So C, and Origen *Selecta in Ezech.* xiv 20<sup>1</sup> (Delarue iii 429) ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίῳ Ὅτι ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ; The rest have τί. Matthew and Luke both make it a statement, not a question, and if they drew on Mark must have read ὅτι: but if, as is probable, they drew here from Q, no argument of course can be drawn from their phraseology.

4. ix 11 καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες Ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἡλείαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον;

The Ferrar group for ὅτι substitutes πῶς οὖν: the Ethiopic omits. The Old Latin MSS vary between *quare, quid, quia*, but all imply ὅτι. Matthew has τί οὖν;

5. ix 28 οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν Ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό;

Matthew has διὰ τί (Luke has no parallel), and διὰ τί is read in Mark by A D and others, while a few authorities have ὅτι διὰ τί and a few τί ὅτι. There can be no doubt that ὅτι is original in Mark.

Here are three certain cases of ὅτι as the direct interrogative, and two more probable ones—probable because in each case there are two good authorities in support, and the tendency to get rid of the construction was so obvious (neither Matthew nor Luke ever accepts it), and the change so easy, that I have no hesitation in accepting the evidence of B ⊙ and C Origen respectively on those two occasions.

I add two instances of what I take to be a similar employment of ὅτι as the *indirect* interrogative in Mark.

<sup>1</sup> In *Nouum Testamentum S. Irenaei* p. clxxiii (on Rom. iv 3) the reference is wrongly given as xv 20.

6. viii 16, 17 καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν; καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε;

I think this means 'they discussed with another why they had no loaves': after *διαλογίζομαι* we expect a reference to the question discussed. Matthew, who dislikes (as we have seen) ὅτι *interrogativum*, has to insert *λέγοντες* to make it ὅτι *recitativum*.

7. xiv 60 καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἐπηρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγων Οὐκ ἀποκρίνη οὐδὲν ὅτι οὐτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν;

Ὅτι is read by L W Ψ and (according to Buttmann's edition of B and Huck's *Synopsis* 1) by B also. It is supported by the Latins a c f f k q Vulg., who make no break after οὐδὲν but construct the whole of the high priest's words as one question and not two. In that case ὅτι can only be the indirect interrogative.

Now ὅτι as indirect interrogative can be supported by good classical authority, as Field shews (*Notes on the Translation of N. T.* p. 33) on Mark ix 11; and therefore the last two passages are only cited here to shew that the construction was familiar to, and used by, Mark. It is otherwise with the direct interrogative: and the Revised Version makes a bold attempt to get rid of it, in the three passages (2, 4, 5 above) where external evidence compels us to read ὅτι, by translating ὅτι 'that'. It needs only to cite their renderings to shew their futility.<sup>2</sup>

2. ii 16 'The scribes of the Pharisees . . . said unto his disciples He eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners'.

4. ix 11 'And they asked him, saying, The scribes say that Elijah must first come'.

5. ix 28 'His disciples asked him privately, *saying*, We could not cast it out'.

Of these three renderings in the text of R.V. (there is a relative return to sanity in the margin in each case) the first makes just tolerable sense, the other two are quite impossible, or in Field's language 'simply intolerable'. Classical prepossessions must be frankly thrown overboard when they lead us to such an *impasse*. Even if no authority could be found outside St Mark for the direct interrogative use of ὅτι, Field is certainly right that 'these two instances, occurring in the same chapter of St Mark, must be held mutually to support and sanction each other'. [Cf. A. T. Robertson *Grammar of the Greek N. T.* p. 729, J. H. Moulton *Prolegomena* p. 94 l. 3.]

<sup>1</sup> I have taken the opportunity to verify the point by reference to the photographic edition of cod. Vaticanus: the reading ὅτι is quite clear, and Tischendorf is wrong (how rarely, all things considered, that happens!) in omitting its testimony. W-H read *τί* in the text, ὅτι in the margin.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that all three passages are rightly punctuated as interrogative in Westcott and Hort.

But it is the main object of this instalment of my Notes to produce outside authority. The first of the following citations comes from Field.

LXX. 1 Chron. xvii 6 *εἰ λαλῶν ἐλάλησα πρὸς μίαν φυλὴν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ ποιμαίνειν τὸν λαόν μου λέγων Ὅτι οὐκ ᾤκοδομήκατέ μοι οἶκον κέδρινον*; So both A.V. and R.V. 'Why . . .', so too Lagarde's Lucianic text, *Διὰ τί . . .*; So Tischendorf's LXX: and it can only be considered another freak of judgement if the Cambridge small LXX text prints *λέγων ὅτι Οὐκ . . .*

### 1. *Hermas* Similitudes.

Of the four passages which follow the first two are from the printed texts, the last two depend on the testimony of the newly discovered papyrus (said to be of the third century) belonging to the University of Ann Arbor, Michigan. I am indebted to the generosity of Prof. Campbell Bonner of that University, who is in charge of the publication of the text, for my knowledge of the readings of this most important witness: in his article in the *Harvard Theological Review* for April 1925 he has himself called attention to the passage where the interrogative *ὅτι* is direct, *Sim.* VIII 6. 2.

*Sim.* II 10 *μακάριοι οἱ . . . συνιέντες ὅτι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου πλουτίζονται*. In the Palatine version 'felicis qui . . . sentiunt quomodo a domino locupletantur': though the older 'vulgate' version mistranslates it 'sentiunt se locupletari'.

*Sim.* V 6. 4 *ὅτι δὲ ὁ κύριος σύμβουλον ἔλαβε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἐνδόξους ἀγγέλους . . . ἄκουε*: rightly rendered by both Latin versions 'quare autem dominus in consilio adhibuerit ('in consilium adhibuit' Pal.) filium honestosque nuntios . . . audi'.<sup>1</sup>

*Sim.* VIII 1. 4 (according to the new papyrus) *ἀφῆς δέ, φησί, πάντα ἴδης, καὶ δηλωθήσεται σοι ὅτι ἐστίν*. Latin versions 'exspecta et [+ 'cum uniuersa uideris' Pal.] tunc demonstrabitur tibi quid significet'. Our other Greek authority, the late and bad Athos MS, has *τὸ τί for ὅτι*.

*Sim.* VIII 6. 2, according to the new papyrus, *Ὅτι οὖν, φημί, κύριε, πάντες οὐ μετενόησαν*; Latins 'Quare ergo, domine, [+ 'inquam' Pal.] non omnes egerunt paenitentiam?' The Athos MS has corrupted *ὅτι* into *οὔτοι*, doubtless because the scribe of the MS or its exemplar was puzzled by *ὅτι interrogatiuum*.

Hermas then in a corrected text comes to the support of St Mark, and the Latin translator understood him rightly. It might be a profitable topic to compare the Greek of Hermas with the Greek of Mark in some detail: on the present occasion it must suffice to call attention to the parallel between the *συμπόσια συμπόσια* of Mark vi 39 and the *τάγματα τάγματα* (supported by both the Athos MS and the new

<sup>1</sup> In the printed texts of the Vulgate version of Hermas the sentence is hopelessly confused and corrupt: I give the reading of the best MS, Bodl. Laud. misc. 488.

papyrus) of *Sim.* VIII 2. 8 ἤλθον τάγματα τάγματα, καὶ ἐπεδίδουν τὰς ῥάβδους τῷ ποιμένι. Shall we be told that 'the construction' in Hermas 'is Hebraistic'?

### 2. *Barnabas* Epistle.

To Tischendorf's note on Mark ii 16 I owe three references to Barnabas for the construction of ὅτι interrogative.

vii 9 προσέχετε· τὸν μὲν ἕνα ἐπὶ τὸ θουσιαστήριον, τὸν δὲ ἕνα ἐπικατάρατον. καὶ ὅτι τὸν ἐπικατάρατον ἐστεφανωμένον; ἐπεὶδὴ ὄψονται αὐτὸν . . . The editors do not mark a question: but the old Latin version has 'et quare is qui maledictus coronatus?'

viii 5 ὅτι δὲ τὸ ἔριον ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον; ὅτι ἡ βασιλεία Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ξύλου. Latin 'quare ergo et lana in ligno est?'

x i ὅτι δὲ Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν· Οὐ φάγεσθε χοῖρον . . .; τρία ἔλαβεν ἐν τῇ συνέσει δόγματα. Latin 'quare autem Moyses dicit . . .?'

Of these three passages only the second is quite certainly interrogative: but it establishes Barnabas' use of the construction, and the translator's witness is clear.

But Barnabas and Hermas are not the only early Christian authors whose translators were familiar with the construction of ὅτι interrogative, and indeed it has been introduced into contexts where it is probably or certainly alien to the intention of the original writer. The evidence to be cited is, however, valid as shewing that in the circles in which early translators moved—possibly we ought to paraphrase this as 'in early Roman Christian circles'—the construction belonged to the Greek with which they were familiar.

### 3. *The earliest Latin version of the Gospels.*

The earliest version known to us is that represented by *k* and St Cyprian. It emerges, that is to say, in Africa about A.D. 250: but it was doubtless half a century older than that, and it may well have been brought to Africa from Rome.

Matt. vii 13, 14 ap. Cypr. *Testimonia* iii 6 (Hartel I 119): 'De hoc ipso cata Mattheum Quid lata et spatiosa uia est quae ducit ad interitum . . . quid arcta et angusta uia est quae ducit ad uitam?' The reading *quid* is guaranteed by the best manuscripts, V L P B R T U (Bodl. Laud. misc. 105, s. x ineunt.) X\* (Rylands-Crawford MS s. viii). It corresponds to the Greek ὅτι πλατεία καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἡ ὁδὸς ἢ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν, . . . ὅτι στενή καὶ τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς ἢ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζώην, and the only possible explanation is that the translator, however mistakenly, took the sentence as interrogative, and ὅτι as a particle of interrogation.<sup>1</sup>

### 4. *St Irenaeus* adv. hereses.

In two passages the Latin translator has used *quid* where the Greek

<sup>1</sup> I have no doubt that the reading of *k* 'quia data' is a corruption of 'quid lata'

had either certainly, as in the first of the two, or possibly, as in the second of the two, *ὅτι*. In the second passage, the Greek, whether *τί* or *ὅτι*, was intended to be interrogative; in the first the interrogation is a misrendering by the translator.

III xxxi [xxii] 2 'Nec dixisset *Quid tristis est anima mea?*' Matt. xxvi 38 (Ps. xli [xliv] 5). The Greek happens to be preserved in Theodoret's Dialogue *Ἀτρεπτος*: Οὐδ' ἂν εἰρήκει ὅτι περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. There is no *ὅτι* in the text of St Matthew, but in the Psalm we have *ἵνα τί περίλυπος . . .* and so the translator was led to render *εἰρήκει ὅτι* by 'said why' rather than by 'said that'. For though the Latin MSS are divided between *quid*, *quia*, *quod*, the best MS (C) has *quid*, and *quid* best explains the genesis of the other two, *quia* and *quod*: it must therefore be presumed that the Latin translator took *Ὅτι περίλυπός ἐστιν*; as a question, and *ὅτι* as the interrogative particle.

IV x 1 [v 3] 'Quid enim *credidit Abraham Deo et deputatum est ei ad iustitiam?* Primum quidem quoniam ipse est factor caeli et terrae, solus Deus: deinde autem quoniam faciet semen eius quasi stellas caeli'. Here St Irenaeus' meaning is clearly 'What was it that Abraham believed and it was counted to him for righteousness?' And the answer he gives appears to shew that he is thinking not of Rom. iv 3, at all (as the editors of Irenaeus followed by the *N. T. S. Irenaei* have assumed) but directly of Gen. xv 6, and that therefore the *Quid enim* that introduces the quotation has nothing to do with the *τί γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει*; of Rom. iv 3. But the Armenian version of Irenaeus has, corresponding to *Quid enim*, 'And that'. Since we have found reason to think that the Latin translator was acquainted with the idiom *ὅτι* = 'why?', it is natural to reconcile the apparent discrepancy between the two versions by supposing that Irenaeus wrote *ὅτι ἐπίστευσεν* and that one translator rendered 'what?', and the other 'that'. If so, as the sentence is certainly interrogative, St Irenaeus himself must have employed the interrogative *ὅτι*. But while I have no sort of doubt that Mark and Barnabas and Hermas and Latin translators of early Greek Christian writings used (or rendered) that construction, I should hesitate to place Irenaeus in the same category, and I think it more likely that the *ὅτι* which lay before the Armenian translator was a corruption of *τί*.

*Ὅτι* interrogative belongs to a different stratum of society, not to the writers of literary Greek, but to less cultivated Christian circles such as those which in the first and second centuries after Christ still talked Greek in the capital. Is it an accident that of the writings cited in this note Mark and Hermas certainly, in all probability the first translations of the Gospels and of Hermas, and possibly the translations of Barnabas and Irenaeus, were produced in the Church of Rome?