expression that she ever uses; she would have said "*that* well" for it was distant; but *the well* is intelligible if it was famous, and it was famous only if it was supposed to possess magical qualities, as well it might if it was intermittent even in those days; and if it was magical she might have supposed that once upon a time the cattle drank of it. There could be none greater than *our father Jacob!*

I can see no other explanation that will not accuse the Fourth Evangelist of utter carelessness in interchanging a fountain with a well in that neighbourhood and so of being ignorant of the geography of one of the best-known localities in the land. That he did not know the difference of meaning between the Greek for *fountain* and the Greek for *well* is a hopelessly untenable supposition. Equally untenable is it that knowing the locality he should not have cared to make the place of discourse plain to his readers. Equally untenable is it that if he were of the Twelve he did not know the locality; though his knowledge of it does not prove him the son of Zebedee.

E. C. SELWYN.

EXEGETICA.

I.

"OUR DAILY BREAD."

HERR A. DEBRUNNER (in *Glotta*, 1912, 249 f.) offers an ingenious explanation of the enigmatic ἐπιούσιος in Matthew vi. 11=Luke xi. 3. He regards it as equivalent to ἐπὶ τὴν οὖσαν (sc. ἡμέραν). The latter phrase occurs in full in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (781), e.g., where Sophokles makes Oedipus exclaim: κἀγω βαρυνθεὶς τὴν μὲν οὖσαν ἡμέραν μόλις κατέσχον. Now, at the time when the Gospels were written, Herr Debrunner thinks, ἡ οὖσα ἡμέρα may have been

a current phrase, like ὁ ὢν μήν, and the adjective was naturally formed from it. The old objection that this derivation involves an awkward hiatus is dismissed on the ground that it is not more serious here than in the case of ἐπιετής in Polybius (III. 55. 1) or ἐπιημερινός in the papyri (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vi. 924). The main difficulty, of course, is the lack of any evidence as yet to prove that ἡ οὖσα (ἡμέρα) was current in the Hellenistic Greek of the first century. Herr Debrunner consoles himself by reflecting, however, that perhaps it will be found in a papyrus! In any case, he observes, a linguistic argument which favours the old rendering of "daily bread" will probably be welcome to many people.

II.

The Appendix to Mark's Gospel.

In a short paper contributed to the *Wiener Studien* (1912, pp. 301–317), Herr Adolf Bauer proposes to recover the historical nucleus of Mark xvi. 1–8 by eliminating verses 5–7 as a legendary addition. This involves still further liberties with the text, however. Wellhausen was content to remove ver. 7 as an interpolation, but Bauer's theory cuts ἐξελθοῦσαι out of ver. 8, where it was introduced as a foil to the εἰσελθοῦσαι of ver. 5, and also the words of xiv. 28, which are echoed in xvi. 7 (καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν). By this process he considers that it is possible to recover a historical narrative, emanating from the primitive church, which described the death of Jesus without any hint of a resurrection.

III.

Lysanias.

In the *Revue Biblique* (1912, 533–540) Fr. M. R. Savignac announces the discovery of a new Greek inscription at Soug

ouâdy Baradâ, the site of Abila, the capital of ancient Abilene. He prints a facsimile of the writing, which shows that there was a Lysanias as tetrarch; Nymphaios, the author, describes himself as *Λυσανίου τετράρχου ἀπ[ε]λε[ύ]θερο[ς]*. The inscription seems to be a more perfect copy than the similar one already known in the Corpus of Greek Inscriptions (4521). A reference to the *Σεβαστοί* at the beginning of the inscription helps, according to Fr. Savignac, to fix the date, since Livia who enjoyed the title of Augusta died in 29 A.D. Which tallies with the synchronism of Luke iii. 1.

IV.

"WHAT HAVE I TO DO WITH THEE?"

Some light upon the meaning of the phrase, *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί*; in the reply of Jesus to his mother (John ii. 4) is furnished by the contemporary usage of similar phrases in Epictetus. One of these occurs in i. 22. 15 (*τί μοι καὶ αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐ δύνασαί μοι βοηθῆσαι; καὶ πάλιν, τί μοι καὶ αὐτῷ, εἰ θέλει μὲ ἐν τοιούτοις εἶναι ἐν οἷς εἰμι*), the petulant complaints of a man about the carelessness of Zeus. 'What is he to me? What have I to do with him?' Again in i. 27. 13 (*λοιδορῶ τὸν Δία καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς ἄλλους· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐπιστρέφονταί μου, τί ἐμοὶ καὶ αὐτοῖς;*). Here the phrase is associated with a resentment of indifference, whereas in John it is occasioned by a resentment of interference, but the employment of it by Epictetus corroborates the Septuagint evidence, and tells against the view, recently advocated by Professor Burkitt (*Journal of Theological Studies*, 1912, pp. 594–595), that in John it only means, "Never mind; don't be worried," as if it were equivalent to *τί ἡμῖν*, "What have you and I to do with that?"

V.

"If it were not so."

The ordinary rendering of John xiv. 2 is, *If it were not so* (i.e. if there were not μοναὶ πολλαί in my Father's house)[1] *I would have told you: for* (ὅτι) *I am going to prepare a place for you.* But the ὅτι here is ὅτι recitativum, and the passage probably should be read as a question. *If it were not so, would I have told you that I was going to prepare a place for you?* This is Weizsäcker's translation, and it has been adopted by Merx (*Das Evangelium des Johannes nach der Syrischen im Sinaikloster gefundenen Palimpsesthandschrift*, 1911, pp. 365 f.), Heitmüller, and W. Bauer recently. The objection usually taken to this rendering is that Jesus has not told the disciples previously that He was going to prepare a place for them, but the thought is at any rate anticipated in xii. 26, and, even apart from such earlier allusions, it is not uncommon in the Fourth Gospel to find similar references (e.g. x. 25, xi. 40), where Jesus reminds His hearers of something which the evangelist has not recorded.[2] It is too strong language to call the ordinary version of the passage "der Gipfel der Plattheit," as Merx does. But the interrogative rendering does yield an adequate sense, and one which harmonises with the context.

VI.

Gamaliel.

In Acts v. 34 f. the Jewish Sanhedrim are persuaded by Gamaliel to refrain from putting Peter and the rest of the

[1] This is much more natural than to regard ver. 2*a* as parenthetical, and connect εἰ δὲ μή with the πιστεύετε of ver. 1, as Dr. Abbott suggests (*Johannine Grammar*, 2080–2086), meaning, "if you will not believe that at least believe me when I say I am going to prepare a place for you." The ὅτι here may be interrogative just as much as in the Septuagint.

[2] Spitta holds that he did record it in a passage which has been omitted.

apostles to death. Gamaliel was a Pharisee who, according to Derenbourg (*Histoire de la Palestine*, 1867, pp. 209 f.), owed his position and influence in the council mainly to Queen Cypros. According to Herr Böhlig (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1913, pp. 112–120), Pharisaic doctrine underlies his advice to the Sadducean majority. *Refrain from these men and let them alone. For if this plan or work be of men, it will be overthrown; and if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them. Maybe, it will be found that you are actually fighting against God!* According to Josephus (*Antiq.* xiii. 5. 9, xviii. 1. 3, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14), the Pharisees taught a form of synergism; a modified freedom of will was left to man, under the overruling providence of God. The Sadducees emphasised the freedom of man, to the depreciation of divine ruling; they laid no stress on predestination. Even when allowance is made for a Greek bias in the evidence of Josephus, his general representation corresponds upon the whole to what is known otherwise of the tendencies prevalent in the two parties, and Herr Böhlig interprets Gamaliel's reason for abstinence from severe measures as a confident belief in God's ability to overthrow this upstart group of heretics. The Pharisee speaks with an undernote of irony against the Sadducees' disposition to forget the overruling will of God, but not with any sympathy for the Nazarenes; their enterprise is a human device, and the God of Israel can be and must be left to deal with it.

JAMES MOFFATT.