

It is not improbable that the branch of the family which traced descent through Zerubbabel and the long line of kings of Judah was more exposed to the jealousy of the Hasmonaeans than the family of Nathan; and it may well be that they deemed it politic to settle outside Judaea. We have no certain *data* to go upon, and can only consider what would be likely to happen, the political circumstances being as they were. If, however, we may suppose—and there is no great improbability in the supposition—that in the first century after Christ there were living in Palestine *two* families claiming descent from David through Solomon and Nathan respectively, we have ready to hand a simple explanation of the discrepancy between the first and third Gospels in the lineage of Joseph. The first evangelist, or the source which he followed, assumed that Joseph was the heir of David through the Solomonic line; the third evangelist, who may be supposed to have had access to a genealogy of the descendants of David through Nathan, assumed, or was informed, that it was to this branch that Joseph belonged. This indeed is mere conjecture, but conjecture which takes account of whatever *data* are available need not be lightly set aside. Certainly in the Apostolic age more was known about the descendants of David than a casual reading of the Old Testament would lead us to expect. If ‘the family of Nathan’ remained in Judaea, it may perhaps have perished in the troubles of the siege of Jerusalem; and after A. D. 70 ‘the family of David’ who traced descent through Solomon may well have been the sole surviving hope of those who still looked for the restoration of David’s rule.

R. H. KENNETT.

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

### VII. *Particles (continued)*

#### (2) Ὅτι *recitative (after λέγειν or similar verbs).*

MUCH more common in St Mark than the odd use of ὅτι interrogative, discussed in the number of this JOURNAL for October 1925 (xxvii 58–62), is the idiom of a superfluous ὅτι after the verb ‘to say’ or the like, introducing not the *oratio obliqua*, as we should expect, but the *oratio recta*. In the large majority of cases, as will be seen, Matthew and (where a parallel is extant) Luke, drop the particle.

I proceed to catalogue some forty instances.

I. i 14, 15 κηρύσσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ [καὶ] λέγων ὅτι Πεπλήρωται

ὁ καιρὸς . . . μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεῦετε . . . Ὅτι is undisputed in Mark, and disappears in Matthew: there is no Lucan parallel. What is doubtful in Mark is λέγων which is omitted by Tischendorf and by W-H margin. But the authorities for omission are quite inadequate (N\* Origen c syr-sin), and the constant use of λέγων in the passages to be cited in this list is practically decisive of Marcan usage.

2. i 37 καὶ εἶρον αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὅτι Πάντες ζητοῦσίν σε. No parallel in Matthew or Luke.

3. i 40 λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι. Ὅτι is dropped by both the other Synoptists. Their influence has caused it to disappear from many authorities in Mark, including C D L W @ 28 and most Latins: but it has rightly survived in N A B Δ a.

4. ii 12 ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντας ὅτι Οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἶδαμεν. Matthew alters the last half of the clause and omits ὅτι: Luke retains. In Mark λέγοντας is omitted by B W b: but the combined evidence of Luke and of Marcan usage is too strong to be overthrown even by B.

5. ii 17 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὅτι Οὐ χρειάν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ . . . οὐκ ἤλθον καλέσαι δικαίους. Both Matthew and Luke omit ὅτι: and in this familiar saying of our Lord their texts have exercised even more than their usual disintegrating influence on the authorities for Mark: but ὅτι is rightly retained by B Δ @ 565.

6. iii 11 τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα . . . ἐκραζόν λέγοντες ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. No parallel in Matthew: Luke, as in 4, retains λέγοντα ὅτι (iv 41), though λέγοντες, not λέγοντα, must I think be right in Mark. There is the same mixture of masculine and neuter in the story of the demoniac in Mark v 10-13: and the change by scribes of λέγοντες to λέγοντα is far more probable than the converse one. λέγοντες is read only by N D W 69 and a very few others, followed by Tischendorf and W-H margin.

\*7. iii 21 ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι Ἐξέστη. There is no parallel in the other Synoptists. But for Marcan usage, we could of course treat ἐξέστη as *oratio obliqua*. [I mark with an asterisk this single instance of past tense after λέγειν ὅτι].

8. iii 22 ἔλεγον ὅτι Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει, καὶ ὅτι Ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια. Both Matthew and Luke have εἶπον without ὅτι: in Mark only D omits.

[9. iii 28 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων . . . Matthew omits ὅτι: Luke has no parallel. No authorities omit in Mark. I place within square brackets those instances where ὅτι follows ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, since Matthew towards the end of his Gospel not infrequently retains ὅτι in this connexion, see on 34: so too Luke in 32, 34.]

10. iv 21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Μῆτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον

τεθῆ; No parallel in Matthew: and the introductory words as far as ὅτι are dropped in Luke. Most authorities in Mark omit ὅτι: the Ferrar group substitutes ἴδετε: for ὅτι we have B L 892 sah and Marcan usage.

11. v 23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλά, λέγων ὅτι Τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει. Matthew omits ὅτι: Luke changes the construction. In Mark some Westerns—D and the Ferrar group: so too the best Old Latins, but in such cases versions must be cited with caution, or perhaps not at all, because the earliest translators rendered with some regard to the genius of their own language—wrongly omit ὅτι.

12. v 28 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὅτι Ἐὰν ἄψωμαι κὰν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ, σωθήσομαι. Matthew omits ὅτι: Luke is not strictly parallel. In Mark only 28 and 33 of Greek MSS omit.

13. v 35 ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγωγῶν λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανεν. Matthew has no parallel: Luke retains the ὅτι, as do all our authorities in Mark.

14. vi 4 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ. Matthew again omits: no Lucan parallel. In Mark only Δ and the Ferrar group, with a few others, omit.

15. vi 14, 15 ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάνης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν . . . ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἡλείας ἐστίν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Προφήτης . . . Matthew has no parallel to verses 14 and 15: Luke, as in 13, retains ὅτι, but in each case he has aorist tenses after ὅτι, so that *oratio obliqua* is more easily suggested than by the present tenses of Mark. There is no variation in Mark.

16. vi 18 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάνης τῷ Ἡρώδῃ ὅτι Οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἔχειν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. Once more Matthew drops, and there is no Lucan parallel. Omission in Mark is supported only by D 28 and a very few others.

17. vi 23 καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῇ ὅτι Ὁ ἐάν με αἰτήσης δώσω σοι. No Lucan parallel, and in Matthew a change of construction. In Mark we have dissident witnesses in B Δ ὅτι ἐάν, and D εἴ τι ἄν.

18. vi 35 προσελθόντες [αὐτῷ] οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἐρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος . . . ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς. Both Matthew and Luke omit the ὅτι: but the authorities in Mark are unanimous for it.

19. vii 6 a εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν . . . The construction is changed, and ὅτι omitted, in Matt. In Mark the authorities are divided: those who retain ὅτι here omit it later in the sentence (see no. 20), and *vice versa*, save that Δ © 33 omit in both places. No witness gives it in both places: yet Marcan usage suggests that it is right in both. A D W etc. give it here.

20. vii 6 b Καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἡσαΐας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται ὅτι Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσίν με τιμᾷ . . . Matthew drops ὅτι:

Luke ceases to offer any parallels till no. 23. In Mark only three witnesses support *ὅτι*, **N B L** (syr-sin) : but Marcan usage puts aside any doubt of their being right.

21. vii 20 ἔλεγεν δὲ ὅτι Τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐκείνο κοινοὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Matthew drops the introductory words ἔλεγεν δὲ ὅτι altogether, so offers no real parallel. No variant in Mark.

22. viii 4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι Πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεται τις ὧδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐπ' ἐρημίας; Matthew, as we should guess he would, omits the *ὅτι* : even in Mark it is found in only three authorities **B L Δ**, but Marcan usage of course proves it right, and both Tischendorf and W-H accept it.

23. viii 28 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν . . . ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι εἰς τῶν προφητῶν. Small wonder that this strange phrase with its tautology εἶπαν λέγοντες is not reproduced by either Matthew or Luke—both drop *ὅτι*, Matthew drops λέγοντες, and Luke changes it to ἀποκριθέντες. In Mark **N\*B** (syr-sin) are the only witnesses to give *ὅτι*, of course rightly.<sup>1</sup>

24. ix 31 καὶ ἔλεγεν ὅτι Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων. Matthew omits *ὅτι* : Luke changes the construction, and so gets rid of it. All authorities retain it in Mark.

[25. ix 41 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ. There are no parallels in the other Synoptists : in the text of Mark *ὅτι* is supported by **N B C\* D L W Δ ⊕** syr-sin and, exceptionally, by several Latins including k.]

26. x 32, 33 ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν, ὅτι Ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα . . . Both Matthew and Luke omit *ὅτι* : but there is no variant in Mark.

27. xi 17 Οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πάντων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; Both Matthew and Luke turn the question into a statement of fact, and both omit the *ὅτι*. Omission of *ὅτι* in Mark is confined to a small group including **C D 69**.

28. xii 7 ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν ὅτι Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν. Again both the other Synoptists drop the *ὅτι* : and again the omitting group in Mark is small, **D ⊕ I 28 565** being the only Greek authorities on that side.

29. xii 19 Διδάσκαλε, Μωσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὅτι Ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ . . . Once more *ὅτι* disappears in Matthew and Luke : but in Mark it is only absent from **D 69 108** of Greek MSS.

30. xii 28, 29 Ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρώτη ἐστὶν Ἄκουε Ἰσραὴλ . . . Matthew and Luke both abbreviate here, and both drop not only *ὅτι* but the words that immediately follow.

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted here that **k** faithfully reproduces εἶπαν λέγοντες by *dixerunt dicentes* : for *dicentes* and not *omnes* is the true reading of the MS.

The omitting group in Mark tends to be stereotyped: here it is D W ⊙ 1 28 565 with three other cursives.

31. xii 32 Καλῶς, διδάσκαλε' ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπες ὅτι Εἰς ἐστὶν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ. There are no parallels in Matthew or Luke: and no dissentient voices in Mark.

[32. xii 43 Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Ἡ χήρα αὐτῆ ἢ πτωχὴ πλείον πάντων ἔβαλεν. Ὅτι is retained by Luke (there is no Matthean parallel) and is found without variant in Mark. As often, the phrase λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι passes unchallenged.]

33. xiii 6 πολλοὶ ἐλείπονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐγὼ εἰμι. A striking instance, where the agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark in the omission of ὅτι well reflects the 'usage' of the three writers. In Mark D ⊙ 33 omit.

[34. xiii 30 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆ . . . Ὅτι is read by all authorities in Mark and almost all in Luke: in Matt. xxiv 34 the reading is doubtful, but B D L ⊙ *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13 give ὅτι, and they outweigh **N**. The phrase λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι is not so unusual or so repellent to the sense of style as the ordinary Marcan λέγει ὅτι in narrative: and towards the end of the Gospel, as will be seen, Matthew who consistently rejects the latter, not infrequently accepts the former, see nos. 36, 37, 39.]

35. xiv 14 εἶπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότη ὅτι Ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει ποῦ ἐστὶν τὸ κατάλυμά μου; In Mark some twenty MSS (but none of importance) omit, influenced no doubt by omission in both Matthew and Luke.

[36. xiv 18 Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με. ὅτι is without variant in Mark and Matthew, cf. no. 34: in Luke there is no parallel.]

[37. xiv 25 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῶ ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου . . . Again no parallel in Luke: again no variant in Mark, but as in 34 authorities are divided over ὅτι in Matt. xxvi 29. For omission are **N** D Z ⊙ 1 33 and half a dozen others: for insertion A B C L Δ W and the rest. It is rather surprising that W-H omit without even a marginal variant.]

38. xiv 27 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε. Ὅτι is without variant in Mark, and omission is without variant in Matthew: no parallel in Luke.

[39. xiv 30 Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι Σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ . . . τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. Ὅτι is without variant in Mark and Matthew: but omission is without variant in Luke.]

40. xiv 57, 58 ἔψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ . . . Ὅτι without variant in Mark: omission without variant in Matthew: no Lucan parallel.

41. xiv 58 ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τούτου

τὸν χειροποιήτρον . . . The details are the same exactly as in the last case, Matthew omitting ὅτι.

42. xiv 69 ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἤρξατο πάλιν λέγειν τοῖς παρεστώσιν ὅτι Οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστίν. Ὅτι is omitted by both Matthew and Luke, but is without variant in Mark.

43. xiv 71 ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο . . . ὀμνῆσαι ὅτι Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Transferred without change by Matthew to his own Gospel. Luke, not liking to say that Peter 'cursed and swore', abbreviates the sentence, and in the process drops ὅτι.

44. xiv 72 καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρὶν . . . τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. Ὅτι is given by all three Synoptists on the practically unanimous testimony of all Greek MSS other than D.

45. xvi 7 εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ ὅτι Προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Ὅτι is retained by Matthew, but the whole sentence undergoes drastic rearrangement in Luke and ὅτι disappears in the process. Did Matthew, towards the end of the Gospel, tire of making as many changes as in the earlier part in the process of making the Marcan material his own? He retains ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι first in 34 (Matt. xxiv 34), and ὅτι in other connexions only in 43, 44, 45 (Matt. xxvi 74, 75, xxviii 7).

What are the results to be gathered from this long enumeration?

In the first place, that in all these forty-five instances not more than four verbs are employed in introducing the ὅτι clause. Three times γράφειν γράφεσθαι (of Scripture), 20, 27, 29: twice ὀμνῆσαι, 17, 43: twice ἀποκρίνεσθαι, 22, 30: but thirty-eight times λέγειν (εἰπεῖν). The mere statement of 'Marcan usage' is enough to prove that in the one case where our authorities differ, I, λέγων must be right. Nothing emerges, I think, more decisively from the whole series of notes on 'Marcan usage' than the immense superiority in Mark of the text of B to the text of N. The edition of Tischendorf (and to a less extent that of W-H) is vitiated by the too great deference shewn to the latter MS.

In the second place, if we classify our forty-five instances according to the type of the ὅτι clause, we find

(a) that seven times it occurs not in narrative but in direct statements of our Lord, 9, 25, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι . . ., and that the other two Synoptists retain ὅτι in these cases much oftener than in the rest: Matthew accepts it in 34 (probably), 36, 37 (probably), 39—he has no parallel to 25 and 32; Luke has no parallel to 9, 25, 36, 37, but retains ὅτι in 32 and 34. That is to say, Matthew only drops ὅτι once, in 9, Luke only once, in 39. Clearly, then, in dealing with ὅτι *recitativum*, we must isolate these cases from the rest: and indeed they are not strictly 'recitative' at all.

(b) that, of the remaining thirty-eight cases, (i) three introduce quotations from Scripture, **20, 27, 29**; (ii) two introduce questions, **10** and **22**; (iii) ten<sup>1</sup> introduce statements in the third person which, if they stood alone, might be treated as *oratio obliqua*, **7, 8, 14, 15, 19, 21, 24, 30, 31, 42**; (iv) in the other twenty-three cases *ὄτι* is followed by a first or second person, so that these are necessarily in *oratio recta*. Now of all these cases, Luke omits *ὄτι* in all but five (**4, 6, 13, 15, 44**), Matthew in all but three (**43, 44, 45**), sometimes of course by changing the construction, more often by simply dropping the particle. As there are many more parallels in Matthew (thirty-one) than in Luke (twenty-two), the proportion varies as between the two, Luke retaining *ὄτι* five times out of twenty-two, or nearly one in four, Matthew only three times out of thirty-one, or one in ten.

On twelve occasions Matthew and Luke agree in simply dropping the *ὄτι* of Mark, **3, 5, 8, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 42**. Twelve agreements, then, of the two later Synoptists against Mark are cleared off the ground on examination of 'Marcan usage'.

### (3) *Asyndeta or absence of particles in Mark.*

The following rough list is probably not at all exhaustive,<sup>2</sup> but it is sufficient to illustrate my point, and it is reinforced (see § 4 below) by the special cases of *ναί*, *οὐν*, and *ιδού*.

1. i 8 *ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι*. So **N B L** ③ 33 69 Origen b c Aug: the rest add *μέν* with Matthew and Luke.

2. i 22 *ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς*. So **D** ③ b c d e: the rest read *καὶ οὐχ* with Matthew: Luke omits the last half of the phrase.

3. i 27 *τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινῆ*. So **N B L** 33 (*fam.* 1). Not in Matthew: Luke *τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ . . .* The remaining authorities in Mark prefix *τίς ἤ*.

4. ii 8, 9 *τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε . . . ; τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον . . . ;* So Luke: Matthew *τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον . . . ;*

5. ii 17 *οὐ χρειαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ισχύοντες ἰατροῦ . . . οὐκ ἤλθον καλέσαι δικαίους . . .* As in the last case Luke follows Mark, and Matthew inserts *γάρ, οὐ γάρ ἤλθον καλέσαι . . .*

6. ii 21 *οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ῥάκου ἀγράφου ἐπιράπτει. οὐδεὶς δέ* Matthew (followed by **D** and a few Latins in Mark): *ὅτι οὐδεὶς* Luke.

7. ii 25, 26 *οὐδέποτε ἀέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυεὶδ . . . ; εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ . . .* So **B D** (and a 'et'): the remainder *πῶς εἰσῆλθεν* with Matt.: *ὡς εἰσῆλθεν* Luke, though **B D** omit as in Mark, perhaps rightly.

<sup>1</sup> But in only one of these, **7**, is the statement in the past tense.

<sup>2</sup> I have omitted all instances where there is no parallel in Matthew or Luke.

8. iii 27 οὐ δύναται οὐδεὶς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ εἰσελθόν . . . So A D W and most Greek MSS, e and most Latins, and syr-sin: **N** B and a few other good authorities prefix ἀλλά, but ἀλλά at the beginning of a sentence is extraordinarily rare in Mark, xiii 24 being the only other example. Luke is not strictly parallel: Matthew has ἡ πῶς . . .

9. iii 34, 35 ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου. ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ . . . So B b e (and 'et' a c Aug): the rest read ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ. Matthew ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ: Luke again has no exact parallel.

10. iv 24 βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε· ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. In what are practically the parallels, Matt. vii 2, Luke vi 38, γάρ is added by both the other Synoptists.

11. viii 15 ὁράτε βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων . . . Matthew ὁράτε καὶ προσέχετε ἀπὸ, Luke προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ: βλέπειν ἀπὸ in the sense 'to beware of' is a Marcan vulgarism (cf. xii 38), which the other Synoptists instinctively avoid. In Mark the reading is not doubtful: but three separate attempts are made in different authorities to emend the text and get rid of the asyndeton or of the double verb: D **Ⓞ** *fam.* 1 565 omit ὁράτε, Δ omits βλέπετε, C *fam.* 13 insert καί between the verbs.

12. ix 38 ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης. No parallel in Matthew: Luke ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶπεν. In Mark all authorities but **N** B D Δ **Ⓞ** sah and a few of the best Old Latins including k, with syr-sin, avoid the asyndeton, either by adding δέ or by prefixing καί.

13. x 9 ὁ ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωρίζετω. No parallel in Luke: Matthew ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς . . ., and from Matthew most MSS of Mark. The true reading without οὖν is preserved only in D and k.

14. x 14 ἄφετε τὰ παιδιά ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά. Both Matthew and Luke alter to καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά, and they have drawn after them a large majority of the MSS of Mark. But the shorter reading has for it B W Δ, a dozen more uncials and some eighty cursives.

15. x 24, 25 πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν· εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμῃλον. . . Matthew ὅτι εὐκοπώτερον, Luke εὐκοπώτερον γάρ. Evidence for the asyndeton in Mark is only qualified by δέ in A, and γάρ in a few others.

16. x 27 ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . ἐμβλέψας δέ Matthew, ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Luke. Most MSS of Mark follow Matthew: the true reading survives in **N** B C\* Δ 1 syr-sin.

17. x 28 ἤρξατο λέγειν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ. τότε ἤρξατο Matthew, εἶπεν δὲ Luke. In Mark we find καὶ ἤρξατο, ἤρξατο δέ, τότε ἤρξατο, ἤρξατο οὖν: but ἤρξατο without connecting particle in **N** A B C W Δ **Ⓞ** syr-sin, and a good many others.

18. x 29 (the fourth asyndeton in five verses) ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Matthew ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: Luke ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. In Mark only **N** B Δ



give ἔφη alone, and it is possible that with the rest we ought to prefix ἀποκριθεὶς: but even so most of them retain the asyndeton.

19. xii 9 τί ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνου; τί οὖν ποιήσει Luke, and similarly Matthew ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνου, τί ποιήσει . . . In Mark only B L (syr-sin sah) give the shorter reading without οὖν: but they are certainly right.

20. xii 17 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Τὰ Καίσαρος ἀπόδοτε (al. Ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος) Καίσαρι. Matthew ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος, Luke τοῖνυν ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος. This time only a few authorities in Mark insert οὖν.

21. xii 20 ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν. Luke ἑπτὰ οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν, Matthew ἦσαν δὲ παρ' ἡμῶν ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοί. In Mark  $\aleph$  A B C\* L W  $\Delta$   $\Theta$ , the great majority of Greek MSS, syr-sin and k, read as above.

22. xii 23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει . . . τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή; Both Matthew and Luke insert οὖν: omitted in Mark by  $\aleph$  B C\* L  $\Delta$ , many other Greek MSS, and k.

23. xii 24 ἔφη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. So in Mark  $\aleph$  B C L  $\Delta$  33 k, much as in 21 and 22, but without support from later MSS: καὶ εἶπεν Luke, ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ . . . εἶπεν Matthew.

24. xii 36 αὐτὸς Δαυεὶδ εἶπεν. So without particle  $\aleph$  B L W  $\Delta$  *fam.* 13 28 565 a k sah: the other MSS mostly αὐτὸς γάρ with Luke. Matthew πῶς οὖν . . .

24 bis. xii 37 αὐτὸς Δαυεὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον. So in Mark  $\aleph$  B D L W  $\Delta$   $\Theta$  28 565 a i k sah (syr-sin). The rest add οὖν after αὐτὸς with Luke Δαυεὶδ οὖν: Matthew εἰ οὖν Δαυεὶδ καλεῖ . . .

25. xiii 5, 6 βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ· πολλοὶ ελεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου . . . So  $\aleph$  B L W: the rest add γάρ with Matt. and Luke.

26. xiii 7 μὴ θροεῖσθε· δεῖ γενέσθαι. So only  $\aleph$  B W and the Egyptian versions: the rest have δεῖ γάρ after Matthew and Luke.

27. xiii 8 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν· ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λιμοί. The first ἔσονται with  $\aleph$  B D L W 28 124 and the Egyptian versions, the second ἔσονται with  $\aleph^e$  B L (W) 28 sah: the rest in each case prefix καί. Matthew and Luke combine the two ἔσονται clauses into one, Matthew connecting with the ἐγερθήσεται clause by καί, Luke by τε.

28. xiii 8 ὁ ἀρχὴ ὀδίνων ταῦτα. So without connecting particle Mark: but Matt. πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὀδίνων: no parallel in Luke.

29. xiii 23 ὑμεῖς δὲ βλέπετε προεῖρηκα ὑμῖν πάντα. So B L W 28 a: the rest follow Matthew's ἰδοὺ προεῖρηκα . . . No parallel in Luke.

30. xiii 34 ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος ἀφείς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ δούς τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν . . . So all the best authorities in Mark: but many MSS borrow γάρ from Matthew ὡς περ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἀποδημῶν . . . No parallel again in Luke.

31. xiv 3 ἦλθεν γυνὴ ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυ-

τελοῦς· συντρίψασα τὴν ἀλάβαστρον κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς. So only **N B L**: the rest prefix καί το συντρίψασα. Matthew, omitting συντρίψασα τὴν ἀ., gives καὶ κατέχεεν. Luke omits the whole incident, having related a parallel story in vii 36–50: this covers also **32, 33**.

**32.** xiv 6 τί αὐτῇ κόπους παρέχετε; καλὸν ἔργον ἠργάσατο ἐν ἐμοί. So all but a few MSS of Mark: **N W fam.** 13 28 have καλὸν γὰρ ἔργον with Matthew's ἔργον γὰρ καλὸν . . .

**33.** xiv 8 ὃ ἔσχει ἐποίησεν προέλαβεν μυρίσαι μου τὸ σῶμα εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν. The asyndeton is without variant in Mark: Matthew adds γάρ, βαλοῦσα γὰρ αὐτῇ τὸ μύρον τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματός μου.

**34.** xiv 19 ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς κατὰ εἰς· Μῆτι ἐγώ; So **N B L** Origen in Mark: nearly all the rest avoid the asyndeton by οἱ δὲ ἤρξαντο . . ., not on this occasion following Matthew's καὶ λυπούμενοι σφόδρα ἤρξαντο λέγειν . . . There is therefore somewhat less certainty in this case: yet Marcan usage, combined with the excellent record of B in the whole series of passages here enumerated, is I think decisive. Luke, as so often in the Passion narrative (cf. **35**), has no parallel.

**35.** xiv 41 καθυδέτε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα, ἰδοὺ παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . So with few exceptions (**D W** and Old Latins) the texts of Mark: Matthew omits the difficult ἀπέχει, and substitutes ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται . . .

**36.** xiv 63, 64 τί ἐτι χρεῖαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας.<sup>1</sup> No important witness differs in Mark save **N**, which follows Matthew ἴδε νῦν ἠκούσατε . . . Luke αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἠκούσαμεν . . .

**37.** xvi 6 μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρητὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον. Mark leaves us in doubt whether the second clause is a statement or a question: Matthew with οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι . . . ζητεῖτε interprets in the former sense, Luke with τί ζητεῖτε in the latter.

**38.** xvi 6b ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε. So Mark without variant: Matthew οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἠγέρθη γάρ. Luke οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη.

These passages are enough to prove to demonstration, in the first place, Mark's fondness for asyndeta—it corresponds to his rough unliterary style—and, in the second place, the constant tendency in Matthew and Luke to remove the asyndeta by providing particles to supply some sort of connexion with what precedes. Sometimes, as we should expect, they provide the same particles, sometimes different ones. Out of some twenty-five cases where both Matthew and Luke have parallels to the Marcan text, Luke retains the asyndeton twice (**4** and **5**),<sup>2</sup> Matthew never: in twelve cases they give different supple-

<sup>1</sup> I think 'Marcan usage' is decisive against **W-H**'s punctuation ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας; Compare e. g. ii 7, the statement βλασφημεῖ between two questions.

<sup>2</sup> Possibly also in **7**.

ments, in ten cases the same, namely **1** μέν, **10** γάρ, **14** καί, **16** δέ, **18** δέ, **19** οὖν, **22** οὖν, **24** bis οὖν, **25** γάρ, **26** γάρ. Ten cases may seem a large proportion: but the supplements are always natural ones, or indeed the most natural ones, and the agreements against Mark—side by side with a rather larger number of divergent supplements—mean no more than that the two later Synoptists, editing the text of the earlier Gospel, often hit independently on the same obvious improvements.

But further we learn of course something of the relative value of our authorities for the text of St Mark. In this particular section of our enquiry, the excellence of B stands out unchallenged: in eight instances the asyndeton is practically without variant, at any rate in all the older authorities, but in the remaining thirty-one B is right—on the assumption that an ‘asyndeton’ reading is to be preferred—in no less than twenty-eight, the exceptions being **2**, **8**, and **13**. **Σ** is right in twenty-one cases; the exceptions (besides the three just mentioned, which it shares with B) are **7**, **9**, **14**, **19**, **29**, **32**, **36**. D is right in only nine cases, though it should be noted that in **2**, **7**, **12**, **13**, **28**, it gives the shorter reading with only a few companions. But k, for the part of the Gospel for which it is extant (from **12** onwards), has a better record than D of asyndeta: **12**, **13**, **21**, **22**, **23**, **24**, **24** bis, four times against D. In **13**, a quite certain case, D k stand alone with the right reading.

#### (4). *Particles absent from Mark.*

##### i. *ναί.*

*ναί* is found eight times in Matthew, v 37, ix 28, xi 9, xi 26, xiii 51, xv 27, xvii 25, xxi 16: four times in Luke, vii 26, x 21, xi 51, xii 5. On two occasions the passages in Matthew and Luke are parallel, Matt. xi 9 = Luke vii 26 *ναί λέγω ὑμῖν περισσότερον προφήτου*, Matt. xi 26 = Luke x 21 *ναί ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἔμπροσθέν σου*: both passages presumably come from Q. But further the two other occasions where *ναί* is found in Luke belong also it would seem to Q sections: Luke xi 51 *ναί λέγω ὑμῖν* (Matthew ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν), xii 5 *ναί λέγω ὑμῖν* (omitted by Matthew). It is possible therefore that Luke never uses *ναί* except where he is following Q.

Of the other six instances in Matthew, five occur in matter not found in Mark: the sixth, Matt. xv 27, is parallel to Mark vii 28. The printed texts give *ναί* in both Gospels as introducing the answer of the Syrophenician woman to our Lord's objection about throwing the children's bread to dogs. There is no other case of the use of *ναί* in St Mark: and ‘Marcan usage’ is reinforced by the testimony of witnesses who omit it even here.

These witnesses are D W @ *fam.* 13 565 b c ff i syr-sin: all ‘Western’

indeed, but Western of very varied types. It is noteworthy that W-H gave the omission of *val* a place in the margin of their edition before the evidence of either W or © or the Sinai Syriac was available: and obviously, whatever was to be said on internal grounds before the new witnesses were known, the external evidence is now very strongly reinforced. The NB group, in fact, have suffered assimilation to Matthew: and the solitary instance of *val* in St Mark disappears.<sup>1</sup>

## ii. οὖν.

οὖν is found in Matthew nearly sixty times, in Luke some thirty times—i. e. in proportion to the length of his Gospel about half as often as in Matthew,—in Mark at the outside seven times: but on three of these seven W-H omit οὖν entirely, and on a fourth they bracket it. The weight of 'Marcan usage' is so strong that omission is presumably right where there is even a small body of good witnesses in support of it; and possibly right, where a parallel in Matthew will account for its insertion, without any external evidence at all.

1. x 9 ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. So word for word Matthew, and so the critical editions of Mark with the vast majority of MSS. But D k omit οὖν: and omission is so like Mark's style, while the correction from Matthew would be so easily and so obviously made, in a terse familiar saying, that I accept the shorter reading without hesitation. See *Asyndeta* 13.

2. xi 31 ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· Διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; Here Matthew has οὖν, but it is important to note that it is absent from Luke: and omission in Mark has for it A C\* L W a b c d f f i k syr-sin. W-H give omission a place in the margin; but where Marcan usage, Lucan parallel, and good Greek and Latin evidence, all coincide, omission is, I think, incontestably right.

3. xii 8, 9 καὶ λαβόντες ἀπέκτειναν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ζῆω τοῦ ἀμπελώνος. τί οὖν ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος; So all MSS of Mark, except B L (syr-sin) sah. But both Luke and Matthew have οὖν, Luke following Mark closely τί οὖν ποιήσει . . ., Matthew inserting it into an introductory clause ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος, τί ποιήσει . . . We shall have therefore no hesitation in accepting, with Tischendorf and W-H, the evidence of B, and in ejecting once more the particle οὖν from the text of Mark.

4. xii 23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει οὖν . . . So (or ἐν τῇ οὖν ἀναστάσει) many MSS of Mark, including A D W © 1 28 565 and most Latins, with Matthew ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει οὖν . . . and Luke ἡ γυνὴ οὖν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει . . .

<sup>1</sup> I have dealt with this reading, more briefly, in my *Study of the New Testament* (ed. 2, 1924) p. 70.

Omit *οὖν* in Mark with **NBC\* L Δ**, very many Greek MSS, and *k*: so also Tischendorf and W-H. See under *Asyndeta* 22.

5. xii 37 *αὐτὸς οὖν Δαυεὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον*. So in Mark A and the great majority of Greek MSS, compare Luke *Δαυεὶδ οὖν κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ*, and Matthew *εἰ οὖν Δαυεὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον . . .* Again omit *οὖν* in Mark with **NBD L W Δ** © 28 565 a i *k*, the Egyptian versions (syr-sin), and the critical editions. See *Asyndeta* 24 bis.

6. xiii 35 *γρηγορεῖτε οὖν οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται*. No variant in Mark: and though *οὖν* may conceivably have been borrowed by the scribes of Mark from Matt. xxiv 42 (there is no parallel in Luke), it would be hazardous to question it without any MS support, the more so that there is another instance to follow where our authorities are unanimous for the word.

7. xv 12 *ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Τί οὖν θέλετε<sup>1</sup> ποίησω ὃν λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων*; Again no variant in Mark, *τί οὖν* in Matthew, and no parallel in Luke. The same considerations apply as in the last case: I am not sure that *οὖν* in Mark is right, but I should not venture to remove it from the text.

Thus out of seven instances *οὖν* should be banished from Mark in five. In three of these both Matthew and Luke have the particle: that is to say, three instances of agreement between the two other Synoptists against Mark are seen to be meaningless, because we have once more the key to the solution in 'Marcan usage'.

### iii. *ἰδοὺ* in narrative.

Neither Mark nor John ever uses *ἰδοὺ* in narrative: Luke employs it fairly often (sixteen times), Matthew twice as often (thirty-two times) as Luke. In Luke it is regularly in the form *καὶ ἰδοὺ*: that is also the predominant form in Matthew, but *ἰδοὺ* is also found in this Gospel with a genitive absolute preceding it as often as nine times. In both Matthew and Luke the usage is found alike in portions that are parallel to Mark and portions that are not—about three-quarters of the instances in Matthew and something over half of the instances in Luke belonging to the 'triple tradition'.

There are in fact some twenty-five passages where one or other of the later Synoptists grafts *ἰδοὺ* on to the Marcan stock, three of these being peculiar to Luke, sixteen peculiar to Matthew, and six common to both. Again it may be asked, Is not this a high percentage of agreement?

<sup>1</sup> W-H omit *θέλετε* with **NBC Δ** *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13 33 and the Egyptian versions: but the omission I believe to be due either to assimilation to Matt. xxvii 22 or to a desire to get rid of the construction *θέλετε ποίησω*. Tischendorf retains *θέλετε*.

In two out of every three cases where Luke uses it Matthew has it too, and can this be due to chance? The answer is twofold.

In the first place Matthew uses the phrase so commonly, when a new character or new element in the story is introduced, that it is not wonderful that Luke, using it much more sparingly, should be found to coincide with Matthew in a high proportion of his relatively few cases. If *ἰδοὺ* were to be introduced at all, certain occasions would stand out as specially calling for it. The six occasions common to Matthew and Luke are in fact (a) the commencement of three stories of miracles, Mark i 40, ii 3, v 22: (b) the appearance of Moses and Elias at the Transfiguration, Mark ix 4: (c) the appearance of Judas in the Garden, Mark xiv 43: (d) the appearance of the angel or angels who announced the Resurrection, Mark xvi 5.

In the second place, as Mark is *never* found to use the phrase in narrative, we can hardly explain any coincidences of Matthew and Luke against Mark as pointing back to a more original text of Mark. It was not Mark, but much more probably the Old Testament, that taught Matthew, and to a less degree Luke, the value of the employment of *ἰδοὺ* to give vigour and movement to the narrative.<sup>1</sup>

### VIII. 'The disciples' and 'the Twelve'.<sup>2</sup>

Eduard Meyer, in his important work *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (3 vols., Stuttgart and Berlin, 1921-3), attempts to analyse the sources of St Mark and assumes a distinction between a 'disciples' source and a 'Twelve' source according as *οἱ μαθηταὶ* or *οἱ δώδεκα* is the phrase employed (i 133-147).

These 'Notes on Marcan usage' are being put together primarily as a contribution to the examination of the history of the text and of the Synoptic problem. But it is also part of their purpose to test, and if the evidence tends that way to establish the truth of, my own working hypothesis that the authority of St Peter stands, as tradition has always indicated, very closely behind the authority of the Evangelist.

Of course it goes without saying that that hypothesis applies especially

<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting that in several of the cases where Matthew and Luke have *ἰδοὺ*, it replaces an *ἐρχεται* of St Mark: Mark i 40, ii 3, v 22.

<sup>2</sup> The following pages were originally written as an appendix to 'Marcan usage: V. 'The movements of Jesus and his disciples and the crowd' (*J. T. S.* April 1925, xxvi 225-240), where I tried to emphasize the indications in Mark, as contrasted with Matthew and Luke, of the evidence of an eye-witness, indications which appear to be spread over practically the whole story of the Ministry. It seems simpler now to print this examination of a rival theory as an independent section of my Notes.

to the period between St Peter's call (i 16) and the flight of the disciples (xiv 50). For the story of the Baptism<sup>1</sup> and Temptation the ultimate authority must be that of Jesus himself, though it must have reached the Evangelist through the medium of some personal disciple to whom Jesus had confided it—naturally, in this case, St Peter. For the story of the Crucifixion and (so far as the extant part of the Gospel extends) the Resurrection one primary authority is presumably that of the holy women or one of them—if one must select, that one whose name is otherwise unknown to us, Mary the mother of James and Joses.

But it does not follow that, even if the authority of St Peter stands in the main behind the narrative i 16–xiv 50, it stands in equal degree behind every part of it. Distinction must be made in the first place between that part of the story where we may presume that he was spectator or auditor, and those exceptional passages where the contrary was certainly or probably the case. There is the story of Herod and John the Baptist, vi 14–29: there is perhaps the journey of our Lord to Tyre and back, vii 24–37, where from the absence of any allusion to disciples it may not improbably be deduced that the journey was undertaken without companions.

Even in these passages the information may still have reached the Evangelist by way of St Peter. But I should not want to exclude the possibility that there may be episodes which the Evangelist derived from other sources and has interwoven into the Petrine tradition. Such in particular might be the second account of miraculous feeding, viii 1–9, of which the most probable explanation seems to me to be that it is a variant, derived by Mark from another source, of the first (Petrine) account in vi 34–44.<sup>2</sup>

But returning, with the reserves indicated, to the working hypothesis that the account of the Ministry is a homogeneous whole depending on the Petrine tradition, let us see whether the actual use or interchange of the phrases 'the disciples' and 'the Twelve' suggests an actual inter-

<sup>1</sup> Note that in St Mark's Gospel, and in his Gospel only, the Baptism is related throughout as our Lord's experience: i 10 ἀναβαίνων . . . εἶδεν, i 11 σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός. Matthew changes the latter part, and, as in the Transfiguration where the Voice from heaven is addressed to the three apostles (Mk. ix 7 = Matt. xvii 5 = Lk. ix 35), writes οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου . . ., while Luke changes the former part into a historical statement, ἐγένετο . . . ἀνεψιχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν . . . καὶ φωνῆν . . . γενέσθαι: Matt. iii 17, Lk. iii 21, 22.

<sup>2</sup> See Dr Headlam's *Jesus the Christ* (1923), p. 14. As Dr Headlam points out, the second distinguishes itself from the first by the absence of those vivid details which we are accustomed to call 'Marcan touches'. But if these details are found in the Petrine, and are absent from the non-Petrine account, the important conclusion results that the vivid touches of the Evangelist go back in the main to the apostle. It does not follow, of course, that the disciple and 'interpreter' has not caught something of the style and spirit of his master.

change of sources or whether it grows naturally out of the situation in the process of development described in St Mark's Gospel. That is the first test of all theories of partition of sources, whether in this or any other document.

*Μαθηταί* are first mentioned in ii 15, when we are told that they were now 'many' and were beginning to collect round him and 'follow' him: before that we have only (1) the call of four disciples who came 'after him' (*δπίσω*, i 17, 20)—these form at once a group of four (i 29): it may be only these four, it may already be others, who are included in the 'Simon and his companions' of i 36—and (2) the call of a fifth personally named disciple,<sup>1</sup> with the summons 'Follow me', in ii 14. Then we hear (in the next verse) of the 'many disciples' who were 'following' Jesus. From this point onwards begins the regular usage of the word, perhaps 'thy disciples'<sup>2</sup> ii 18, at any rate 'his disciples' in ii 23, iii 7, 9.

Obviously the term 'the Twelve' cannot be used till the formal separation of an inner group among the disciples, iii 13 ff, and obviously at that point the use of some such phrase was imperative to express what was happening, and all three Synoptists agree so far. Luke (vi 13-17), unlike Matthew, keeps close to the order of Mark, but inverts the call of the twelve apostles and the notice of the wide districts from which hearers were now being attracted. In Mark it may be supposed that it was just the extension of the work which caused our Lord to create the first rudiments of organization in selecting the Twelve to be his

<sup>1</sup> Levi, son of Alpheus, who is not identified either by Mark, or by Luke who follows Mark (Luke v 27-29), with Matthew. On the other hand we should naturally suppose that one whose call is thus given in detail was in fact one of the Twelve, as his brother 'James son of Alpheus' (Mark iii 18) certainly was. The Western text solves the difficulty by reading 'James [not Levi] son of Alpheus' in Mark ii 14; but St Luke's support of 'Levi' seems to disprove this otherwise attractive solution. We may perhaps either suppose that *Λεββαίων* of the Western text is right in the list of the Apostles iii 18—*Θαδδαίου* would then have come in from Matt. x 3—and that *Λεββαίος* is a variant form of *Λευείν* (Origen has *δ Λεββης τελώνης*); or alternatively that we should read in iii 18 *Ἰακώβον [καὶ Λευείν] τὸν Ἄλφαιου*. If the mention of Levi had accidentally dropped out from a very early copy, we could understand both the presence of the variants *Θαδδαίος* and *Λεββαίος* in Mark and Matthew and the appearance in Luke of a new name *Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου*. The number of the Twelve had somehow to be filled up. [I think I owe this suggestion to the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson].

<sup>2</sup> Probably B is right in omitting *μαθηταί*, and reading *οἱ δὲ σοὶ οὐ νηστρεύουσιν*: for (1) Luke has not got the word, which a little suggests that he did not find it in Mark, (2) the MSS which give it differ among themselves as to the place where they put it. I think it has come in from Matt. ix 14; and, if so, the reason of Mark's phrase may be that Jews hardly recognized the new Teacher's followers yet as organized 'disciples' in the same sense as those of the Baptist and of the Pharisees—it is something like 'Your people'.



companions and his delegates. Of the actual call Luke's account is limp in its clearness, 'He called his disciples, and chose out of them twelve, whom he named "apostles", Simon, whom he named Peter, and . . .' Doubtless Luke understands himself to be giving the sum of Mark's rather involved account, 'He called whom he would and they came to him and he appointed twelve to be' his companions and apostolic delegates; 'and he appointed the Twelve and gave Simon the name Peter, and James . . .': and it is just this involved character of Mark's account which prompts Meyer to see in it, quite unnecessarily as I think, a conflation of two separate strata of tradition.

In the first place, then, when Mark says 'he called whom he would and they came to him and he appointed twelve', I do not think he means to describe two acts, as Luke thought, but one. 'He summoned whom he would' is in fact the selection of the Twelve: and so Matthew appears to understand him when writing 'He summoned his twelve disciples' Matt. x 1—odd as is the phrase *τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητάς αὐτοῦ*, when we have so far heard nothing about the disciples being twelve. Mark's *καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα* is a characteristic piece of redundancy, due to his desire to emphasize the formal nature of the act, and should not be separated from the preceding verse by more than a comma.

So far any difficulty has been removed by exegesis and punctuation: for the next problems textual evidence must be called in to assist. Modern critics seem fairly unanimous in following Tischendorf, as against Westcott and Hort, and ejecting the words *οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν* from verse 14 as a plain contamination from Luke vi 13. Decision is not quite so simple as to the opening words of verse 16, *καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα*: but the omitting and inserting groups are so nearly the same as in the last case that, if there is anything in the principle *nosciat a sociis*, this phrase is naturally treated as a companion interpolation and should also disappear.<sup>1</sup> The names in the accusative, verses 17-19, will then depend directly on *ἐποίησεν* of verse 14, an awkwardness which Matthew removes by commencing a new sentence, 'Now the names of the Twelve Apostles were these'. Meyer's mountain has by now crumbled down to the rather ungrammatical parenthesis 'and he gave Simon the name Peter'.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν* absent from A<sup>2</sup> D L W all Latins syr-sin and Armenian: found in N B C\* (*ut vid*) Δ Θ Ferrar group 28 sah. *καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα*, absent from A<sup>2</sup> D L W ⊖ *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13 all Latins syr-sin sah and Armenian: found in N B C\* Δ 565 700. The latter insertion may have been a marginal gloss to *καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα* of verse 14: the glossator wanted to substitute 'the Twelve' for 'twelve', and fearing that a mere *τοὺς* would not make his meaning clear, wrote the phrase in full.

<sup>2</sup> If with the Ferrar group and sah we could for *ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα* read *πρῶτον Σίμωνα*, the last difficulty would go. But the evidence is far too slight, I am afraid.

Our Lord had thus formed an inner circle, for intimate companionship and for missionary work, out of the whole number of his disciples. That is exactly the situation reflected in the two next mentions of the Twelve. In iv 10 'those who were round him with the Twelve' *οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα*, ask of him the meaning of the parables. In vi 7 he summons the Twelve, and sends them out in pairs on a missionary tour, *προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο*: in vi 30 the 'apostles' or 'missionaries' return and report to him the results, and he retires with them privately to the wilder country across the lake.

That is to say, he is from now onwards more and more concentrating himself on the training of a select few, more and more withdrawing himself from his public ministry in Galilee. It was not done at any definite moment. There is a transition period, during which he reappears from time to time in Capernaum and its neighbourhood. 'His disciples' is a general term describing those who were associated with him at any particular moment. It becomes therefore a synonym for the Twelve, just in proportion as he journeys about more and more exclusively with them. Only the Twelve were with him in the desert place to which he retired for privacy, so that *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* in the episode of the feeding of the multitudes who had followed him there (vi 35-41) are naturally the Twelve. On the other hand when he returned to the west of the lake and the neighbourhood of Capernaum, 'his disciples' (vii 2) may reassume the larger meaning, though it should be noted that 'his disciples' who enter the house with him (vii 17) cannot have been an indefinitely large company.

From vii 24 to vii 37 there is no mention either of the Twelve or of the disciples: Jesus was, it would seem, alone. The succeeding verses, viii 1-10 are probably a variant tradition of vi 35-45. In the continuous narrative 'his disciples' first therefore reappear at viii 27 on the road to Caesarea Philippi, on the occasion of the great confession of faith which forms the climax of the earlier part of the Ministry. If I read the Gospel rightly, the 'disciples' are from this point onwards practically identical with the Twelve, and I do not think that the Evangelist or his authority intended to make distinction between them. Perhaps the summoning of 'the crowd with his disciples', viii 34, may denote the older and larger body of followers. But the interval, if it was an interval, was a brief one, for less than a week (ix 2) separates the Confession from the Transfiguration, and the disciples of viii 27 are presumably also the disciples of ix 14. From Caesarea Philippi to Jerusalem the record is one of almost continuous movement. Once indeed Jesus revisited the scene of his earlier preaching, but it was, if one may use the phrase, *incognito*: 'they passed along through

Galilee, and he would not that any should know,' for the subject-matter of his teaching was appropriate to a narrower circle only, ix 30, 31. Three times the Evangelist reiterates the prophecy of the Passion, viii 31, ix 31, x 33. On the first occasion the recipients were apparently the group of disciples who accompanied Jesus on the way to Caesarea Philippi, since when Peter was shocked by what was told him and burst into vehement protest, Jesus 'turned round and saw his disciples', viii 32, 33. On the second occasion the teaching was again addressed to 'his disciples', ix 31; on the third to the Twelve, x 32-34. There is an increasing definiteness of detail in the prophecy, but there seems to be no suggestion that those to whom it is addressed are other than before.

No other interpretation of the later chapters of the Gospel, viii 27 onwards (with the possible exception of viii 34), is so simple and so satisfactory as that which treats the phrases 'the disciples' and 'the Twelve', *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* and *οἱ δώδεκα*, as practically synonyms.

'He was teaching his disciples . . . and they came to Capernaum, and after going indoors he asked them what they had been talking about . . . and he called the Twelve . . . and set a child in the middle of them,' ix 31-35. Is it reasonable to think that one set of persons had been discussing who was greatest, and that the moral was pointed to a different set?

The next two examples of the use of 'the disciples' tell us just the same tale. 'And when he was in the house the disciples again put questions to him about' the teaching he had been giving on divorce, x 10. Again we remind ourselves that those 'in the house' must have been a limited number, as in vii 17 and ix 33. And when 'the disciples' rebuked the forwardness of the mothers who brought children for his blessing, our Lord expressed his indignation in similar words and with the same action, *ἐναγκαλισάμενος*, as he had employed on the last occasion of the mention of the Twelve, x 13-16, cf ix 36, 37.<sup>1</sup>

After the episode of the rich young man, 'Jesus looked round on his disciples' with the saying 'How hard it will be for those with possessions to enter into the Kingdom of God', x 23. But immediately after, x 24, the disciples are addressed as *τέκνα*—here only in the Gospels, save for

<sup>1</sup> If these two episodes stood alone, there would no doubt be something to be said for Meyer's hypothesis: the 'Twelve' source and the 'disciples' source had each, it might be suggested with some reason, an episode which emphasized by an appropriate action the necessity of the childlike spirit, the two stories being really variant accounts of the same thing. But they do not stand alone. We have in fact abundant evidence for the repetition by Jesus of the same teaching on different occasions, and also for the indifferent use by Mark, in the later chapters of his Gospel (ix 31, 35; xi 11, 14; xiv 12, 17), of the two phrases 'his disciples' and 'the Twelve' in reference to the same occasions.

Jo. xiii 33, *τεκνία, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί*—a term indicative of affection and intimacy such as could not be applied outside a very narrow circle. Those to whom he spoke had given up home and everything to follow him (x 28). That need not mean the Twelve only: but it must mean a very few.

'And they were on the road going up to Jerusalem: and Jesus went on ahead . . . and they followed him in fear. And he took the Twelve again into his company', and repeated to them the prophecy of the Passion, connecting it now definitely with the very journey on which they had set out, x 32-34. It is an unnatural exegesis to distinguish between those from whom Jesus for the moment separated himself, and those whom he took 'again' into his company.

Precisely the same conclusion is suggested by the request of the brothers James and John, x 35 ff. It created grave indignation—among whom? among 'the disciples'? No, but among the remaining members of the Twelve, *οἱ δέκα*, x 41. There may have been some few others with him: but it is the Twelve who fill the foreground throughout the journey.

Once more 'his disciples' leave Jericho with Jesus and the crowd, x 46: 'they draw near Jerusalem', and at the Mount of Olives he sends on 'two of his disciples' to prepare for the triumphal entry, xi 1: he entered the city, went into the Temple, swept his glance round over everything, but it was late and he did no more that night, but went out to Bethany—with the Twelve, *μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα*, xi 11. Next day on his return he pronounced the doom of the barren fig-tree 'and his disciples heard it' xi 14. Were the Twelve, then, who went out with him to Bethany in the evening, different from the 'disciples' who came back with him in the morning?

From xi 27 to xii 34 the narrative is occupied by the public debates, if we may so put it, with the authorities at large, with the different parties separately, and with an individual scribe. The crisis is approaching: the breach is complete: for the last time Jesus teaches the crowd, and forces the situation by direct denunciation of the religious leaders of the people. If they give largely to the treasury, their income is extracted from helpless widows: and one such widow, he tells 'his disciples', had given more than any of them, xii 35-44.

As he left the Temple, 'one of his disciples' called his attention to its magnificence: he answered with a prophecy of its destruction. They ascended the Mount of Olives: and the four leading apostles—the only apostles, unless Levi was one, who are mentioned by name (apart from Judas Iscariot) in the Gospel—asked him to explain himself further. It was apparently in answer to their request, and to them only, that he imparted his teaching about the End, xiii 5-37.

So far then in these chapters there seems no valid reason for distinguishing between 'the disciples' and 'the Twelve': and now we come immediately<sup>1</sup> to a very clear case for identification in xiv 12-17, where 'his disciples say to him Where do you want us to go and prepare for your passover? and he sends two of his disciples [Peter and John, according to Luke xxii 8] . . . and the disciples went out and . . . found just what he told them and prepared the passover: and in the evening he came with the Twelve'. Once more we ask, were the disciples who spoke about the passover in the morning a separate set from the Twelve who kept it with Jesus in the evening?

After this the phrase οἱ δώδεκα is not used again, save as a definition of Judas Iscariot, xiv 10,<sup>2</sup> 20, 43: nor οἱ μαθηταί, save in the Garden of Gethsemane, xiv 32, where it must mean those who were at the Last Supper, and in the angelic message, xvi 7, where it is in close connexion with Peter, εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ. 'His disciples' are a group of which Peter is head. It is impossible not to be reminded of the apostolic Creed-form in 1 Cor. xv 3-5 παρέλαβον . . . ὅτι ἠφθθη Κληφῆ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα.

The argument here developed does not imply an absolute identification of the phrases 'the disciples' 'the Twelve' in the latter part of St Mark's Gospel. There may have been a few in the band that accompanied Jesus on his last journey who were on the fringe of the Twelve but not actually belonging to it. What is asserted is that for practical purposes the phrases come to the same thing, and that the Evangelist neither meant a sharp distinction himself between the two nor composed his narrative out of two sources each of which used one, and one only, of them. The discrimination of sources in the case of secondary documents like Matthew and Luke is of course one of the principal tasks of the critic. That every document is constructed on the basis of different literary sources is an assumption and an unjustifiable one. That Mark in particular used a 'disciple' source and a 'Twelve' source is in my judgement pure fantasy—or rather it could only be due to fantasy if it were not in fact due rather to *Tendenz*.

Meyer has made up his mind that Jesus cannot have foreseen the continuity of the movement which he called into being so far as to have equipped it with the rudiments of authority, and in that sense of organization, in the persons of the Twelve. That conclusion can only be established by a ruthless undermining of the evidence of St Mark's

<sup>1</sup> The reading of D and some Latins (not K) in xiv 4 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ is a mere assimilation to Matt. xxvi 8.

<sup>2</sup> xiv 10 ὁ εἰς τῶν δώδεκα N B C\* L. The reading is too strange to be an invention. I take it to mean 'the Judas who was one of the Twelve' as opposed to the Judas who was, according to St Mark's list, not of the Twelve.

Gospel as it stands: and Meyer does not shrink from this. I have tried to shew on the other hand, firstly, that this Gospel represents a natural developement in the Ministry of Jesus by which he gradually restricted his teaching, as it became more advanced and faced more and more clearly the apparent failure of the movement, to a limited number of his followers; and secondly, that the 'disciples' who receive this later teaching being in effect the 'Twelve', the Evangelist uses one or other phrase indifferently to describe them, and that any analysis which attempts to separate the two uses as indicating two rival sources raises so many difficulties that it can only be called, even on literary grounds, a failure.

C. H. TURNER.

### THE MEMORIA APOSTOLORUM ON THE VIA APPIA.

THE excavations which have taken place in recent years beneath the Church of S. Sebastiano have awakened great interest on account of the light thrown by them on the cult of the Apostles Peter and Paul on the site now occupied by that church, which in its present form is a building of the sixteenth century. They have been officially described in the *Notizie degli Scavi*, series v, vol. xx (1923), by G. Mancini and O. Marucchi, and have been the subject of a large literature, to which the most important of recent contributions is the posthumous article of Mgr Duchesne in the *Atti della Pontificia Accademia romana di Archeologia*, series iii, *Memorie* vol. i. Since the work of excavation has, at any rate for the time being, ceased, the time seems opportune for a provisional interpretation of the results obtained in the light of the traditions connected with the site.

The existence of a liturgical cult of the Apostles in this region as early as the fourth century is established by a comparison of the *Depositio martyrum*, a document incorporated in the Calendar of Philocalus (A. D. 354) and the fuller versions of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, which may be presumed to go back to the fifth-century original. In the *Depositio* we have the entry (under June 29) *Petri in Catacumbas et Pauli Ostense, Tusco et Basso Consulibus*; while the fullest form of the entry in the *Martyrologium* reads thus:—*Romae Via Aurelia, natale Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, Petri in Vaticano, Pauli vero in via Ostensi, utrumque in Catacumbas, passi sub Nerone, Basso et Tusco consulibus*. The consular date is A. D. 258, and its presence in the entry can only be explained by some connexion with the celebration *in Catacumbas*, which took place in addition to those