

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## The Beezebul Sections

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHICAGO.

IT is the purpose of the present paper to discuss the passage Mt. 12 25-32, Mk. 3 23-30, Lk. 11 17-23, 12 10, with a view to determining the channels that lead back from the versions in the present Gospels to the first origin of the sayings, and to give a survey of recent scholarly opinion. The following authorities will be referred to:—

Bacon, B. W., *The Beginnings of Gospel Story*. New Haven, 1909.

Harnack, A., *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*. Leipsic, 1907.

Holtzmann, H. J., *Die synoptischen Evangelien*. Tübingen, 1901.

Jülicher, A., *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. Part II. Tübingen, 1899 (reprinted 1910).

Klostermann, E., *Markus*. Tübingen, 1907. *Matthaeus*. Do., 1909 (in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*.)

Loisy, A., *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*. Ceffonds (now Paris), 1907. (Only Vol. I is cited.)

Montefiore, C., *The Synoptic Gospels*. London, 1909.

Nicolardot, F., *Les procédés de rédaction des trois premiers Évangelistes*. Paris, 1908.

Weiss, B., *Die Quellen der synoptischen Überlieferung*. Leipsic, 1908.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Weiss's results are collected on p. 36 of this work and to this page references are for the most part restricted in the present paper. The details are discussed at greater length in *Die Quellen des Lucas-Evangeliums* (Stuttgart, 1907) and in Vol. I of *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, Pt. 1, Mt., ed. 10, 1910, Pt. 2, Mk.-Lk., ed. 9, 1901 (Göttingen).

Weiss, J., *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. Vol. I, Göttingen, 1906.<sup>2</sup>

Wellhausen, J., *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*. Ed. 2, Berlin, 1911. *Das Evangelium Matthaei*. Do., 1904, —*Marci*, Ed. 2, 1909, —*Lucae*, 1904.

In Mk. 3 23-27, Lk. 11 17-23, Mt. 12 25-30 the relations are exhibited with tolerable clearness in the following table, which gives the total number of words in each vs (or part of a vs) and the number of these words shared by two or more accounts:—

Verses			Total Words			Common Words			
Mk.	Lk.	Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	Mt.	Mk.-Lk.	Mk.-Mt.	Lk.-Mt.	Mk.-Lk.-Mt.
23			12						
	17a	25a		8	7			5	
24—25	17b	25b	24	11	16	5	9	6	4
26	18	26	15	21	16	8	8	11	7
	19	27		20	20			19	
	20	28		16	17			15	
27	21—22	29	26	34	27	5	23	4	4
	23	30		15	15			15	
Total			77	125	118	18	40	75	15
Marcan			77	66	59	18	40	21	15
Non-Marcan				59	59			54	

(The above count is based on Tischendorf's text and in it *μερίῳ* and *διαμερίῳ* have been counted as a single word.)

It is a familiar fact in Synoptic criticism,—obvious enough from the data of this table,—that in Mt. and Lk. two sources, —Mk. and Q,—have been combined. Evidently, too, in Mt. this combination accounts for almost the whole section, for in the Marcan parts of Mt. only 13 words (less than 23 % of all) are not in the parallels, while the non-Marcan section is virtually identical with Lk. On the other hand, Lk. and Mk. are practically independent and only at the beginning of Mk. 26 and Lk. 18 do they agree in more than isolated words. In particular, Lk. 18b and 21—22 are quite different from any-

<sup>2</sup> A few references marked *Ev.* are to *Das älteste Evangelium*, Göttingen, 1904.

thing in Mk.'s immediate context, although Lk. 18*b* has some similarity to Mk. 30.

Taking up the passages in detail, Mt.'s modifications of Mk. are of the slightest, apart from obvious abbreviations<sup>3</sup> of Mk.'s somewhat verbose style. In 25*b* *κατά* is better than *ἐπί* after *μερίσσει* and in 25*c* the addition of "city"<sup>4</sup> makes a triad of illustrations. In 26 the protasis has been so worded (with the aid of Mk. 23*b*) as to reply directly to the charge of the Pharisees. And at the beginning of 29 Mk.'s harsh *ἀλλ' οὐ*—*οὐδεὶς* has been avoided by conforming the wording to that of the parallel question in 26*b*. Evidently there is no critical reason to go beyond Mk. for Mt.'s source here.

In the non-Marcian section the problem is to recover the original wording of Q by comparing Mt. with Lk. Mt. in 25*a* has *ἐνθυμήσεις*, while Lk. 17 has *διανοήματα*. B. Weiss (p. 36) and Jülicher (p. 219) think that Lk. has accredited Christ with a more supernatural knowledge. But this is not necessary, Lk. never uses this word elsewhere (indeed, it is unique in the NT.), while Mt.'s phrase is a simple duplicate of 9 4. Hence Lk. seems the more original. Mt. 28 has *πνεύματι*, Lk. 20 has *δακτύλῳ*. Lk. again is probably more original, for he is fond of references to the Spirit (18 times against 12 for Mt. and 6 for Mk.) and so would not be likely to omit the word, while Mt. needs it here to prepare for vv. 31—32. And contrast Lk. 10 21 with Mt. 11 25 and Lk. 11 13 with Mt. 7 11.<sup>5</sup> Of minor matters, Lk.'s love for compounds is undoubtedly responsible for *διαμερισθεῖσα* in 17 as against the simple verb in Mt. 25 while Mt.'s *καί* in 27 and his simple *καί* in 26 are preferable to Lk.'s *δέ* and *δέ καί* (an intensely common Lucan com-

<sup>3</sup> Loisy (p. 703) suggests that Mt. may have thought that the *ἐν παραβολαῖς* ought not to have been used before the parable chapter.

<sup>4</sup> This addition of "city" probably gives "house" a wrong sense (Jül., p. 221, Loisy, p. 704).

<sup>5</sup> Incidentally, *δακτύλῳ* here is very Hebraistic (e. g., Ex. 8 15,—cf. Bacon, p. 86) and, as Wellh. (*Mk.*, p. 27) points out, is an exact synonym of *πνεύματι*,—something that the Gentile Lk. could scarcely have felt. Yet Harnack (p. 20, cf. Holtzm., p. 366) cites Lk. 1 51. 66. 73 as examples of Lk.'s fondness for anthropomorphisms. But they are hardly relevant and, besides, they probably are not due to Lk. but to some source (B. Weiss, p. 36).

bination) in 19 and 18 respectively. (The discussion of the force of the differences in Jülicher, p. 222, is perhaps over-refined.) The absence of *ἐγώ* (Mt. 28) from Lk. 20 is largely a textual question but if the word is not read in Lk.'s text, its omission by Lk. is harder than its addition by Mt. And, similarly, the addition of *οὖν* in Mt. 26 is easier than its omission by Lk. in 18.<sup>6</sup>

Turning now to Lk.'s version, it is characterized by very few specifically Lucan touches. For *οἶκος* (18) as opposed to *οἰκία* (Mt.-Mk.) Lk. has an undoubted fondness (34:25 Ev., 25:12 Acts, as contrasted with 9:25 for Mt. and 12:19 for Mk.,—if metaphorical uses be disregarded these figures become 29:24, 17:12, 8:25, 12:18). *ἐπέρχομαι* in 22 is a Lucan word (Lk. 1 35, 21 26, Acts 1 8, 8 24, 13 40, 14 19, not Mk. or Mt.). *λέγω* followed by the infinitive in 18*b* is a construction for which there is no certain evidence in Q but which is found Lk. 20 41 (introduced into Mk. 12 35), 23 2, 24 23, besides the cases in 9 18, 20, 20 27 which are from Mk. (8 27, 29, 20 27) and eight times in Acts. Otherwise there is no evidence for Lucan style, as *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα* (21) is a Q word (Lk. 12 44, Mt. 24 47), and in Acts occurs only 4 32 (elsewhere in Lk. 8 3, 12 15, 14 33, 16 1, and in Mt. 19 21, 25 14). On the other hand, for the Greek of 21—22 the LXX of Is. 49 25 (*ἐάν τις αἰχμαλωτεύσῃ γίγαντα, λήμψεται σκύλα· λαμβάνων δὲ παρὰ ἰσχύοντος σωθήσεται*) and Is. 53 12 (*καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκύλα*) offers obvious parallels, accounting for *σκύλα* (here only in the NT.) and for *(δια)μερίεσθαι*, elsewhere in the Gospels only Mk. 6 41, Lk. 12 13. Finally, it may be noted that *καθοπλίεσθαι* is found here only in the NT. and *πανοπλία* only here and Eph. 6 11, 13.

<sup>6</sup> Lk. 18*b* is an isolated statement not paralleled in either Mt. or Mk. Loisy (p. 704, Holtzm., p. 365) thinks it a reminiscence of Mk. 3 30 but it would be difficult to parallel such a misplaced and awkward reminiscence of Mk. in Lk. Jül. (p. 222) thinks that it is meant to clinch the argument of 18*a* but this hardly seems possible. Rather, it reads like an attempt to connect 18*a* and 19, helping the transition from the general truth to the more personal matter (perhaps helping also the transition from "Satan" to "Beezebub"). Its omission by Mt. is easier than its addition by Lk. and in Q it may well have arisen to join two sayings that belong to different occasions.

Lastly, the account of Mk. This is typically Marcan in style, with its repetition of the same words and phrases, the superfluous introduction question in 23*b*, the marring of the formal parallelism by ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει in 26, and the double negative in 27. Mk.'s motive in the use of some of these phrases may perhaps be divined. So in 23*a* the ἐν παραβολαῖς seems to prepare for ch. 4 (Nicol., p. 236),<sup>7</sup> 23*b* evidently is formed out of what follows (Jül., p. 222, Klost., p. 31, Nicol., p. 236), possibly (in part) to help the change from Beezebul in 22 to Satan in 26; and the ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει is to emphasize Christ's victory (Jül., p. 223, Nicol., p. 236,—with a particularly interesting note on p. 237). The removal of such phrases doubtless brings the narrative nearer to the source used by Mk. but, naturally, tells nothing as to the character (written or oral) of this source (or sources).

Comparing now Lk. and Mk. The only connected words in common are those at the beginning of Lk. 18 and Mk. 26 but even among these (δι)εμερίσθη is the only one at all characteristic and this may be due in both cases to a reminiscence of Is. 53 12. Still a reminiscence of Mk. by Lk. is very possible, although the wide variation of the accounts and the disuse of Mk. by Lk. after 9 50 make it very unlikely that Lk. had Mk. open in front of him here.<sup>8</sup> In any case, however, a reverse dependence of Mk. on Lk.'s Greek source cannot be supported by this slight contact in wording.

The chief difference between Lk. 17*b* and Mk. 24—25 is in the use of "house." In Mk. the "house" is a *family* ("the smallest organism," Jül., p. 221, cf. J. Weiss, p. 94, Klost., p. 31,—"a political domain", Wellh., *Mk.*, p. 26), which, like a kingdom, falls if divided against itself. In Lk., however, the "house" is a *building* and the imagery of one building toppling over on the next illustrates the completeness of the desolation of the divided kingdom,—at least, this is the literal meaning of the Greek. One may question, however, if Lk. meant it to

<sup>7</sup> Loisy, however, thinks (p. 703) that the phrase was carried over from some earlier source.

<sup>8</sup> Hence Loisy's suggestion (p. 703),—that Lk. omitted ἐν παραβολαῖς as not justified by what follows,—is needless.

be so understood and, indeed, he may have changed *οἰκία* into *οἶκος* as a protection against such an interpretation. But at all events it cannot be original (Jül., p. 222, Loisy, p. 704, —contra B. Weiss, p. 36), for the ruined houses are quite out of the picture. But is this variation due to Lk. or to the author of Q? The latter is distinctly the more probable, for an abbreviation that so perverts the sense would be quite contrary to Lk.'s usual method of procedure. Furthermore, it may be questioned whether even the author of Q meant the text to have the sense that the Greek now requires and it is more likely that, with the first illustration in mind, he abbreviated the second without noticing that he had changed the meaning.

In 21—22 Lk. contains a true parable told in the narrative form, while in Mk. 27 the corresponding matter is stated in an argumentative negation that makes it conform to the context. Moreover, Mk. lays the stress on the spoiling of the goods, while the point in Lk. is the superior power to enter and conquer (J. Weiss, *Ev.*, p. 168).<sup>9</sup> Hence the preference is to be given to Lk.'s version (B. Weiss, p. 36, J. Weiss, p. 432, Jül., p. 227, Loisy, p. 707, Nicol., p. 237, —contra Holtz., p. 366). To detect evidence of redaction in Lk.'s version taken by itself is a delicate matter, especially, as has been said, as the two verses present no linguistic evidence of Lk.'s hand. Jül., however (p. 229, followed by Loisy, p. 708, Nicol., p. 237), thinks that somewhere there has been enlargement from an original form, which stated simply something like "When a strong man is seen bound and plundered, ye know that a stronger than he has come upon him,"—all the other details being unnecessary. This, of course, hangs together with Jül.'s "minimum" theory of the parables. But in the present case (at least) this theory seems to be pressed too rigorously, for the parable as it stands is certainly not over-long and the "unnecessary" details add considerably to the graphic effect.

<sup>9</sup> Jül. (p. 221—222) notes that Q contains a general rule applied to a particular case rather than a true parable,—the *ῥῆμα* in Lk. 17 (Mt. 25) is out of true parable style,—while Mk. contains two true parables. But this involves too strict a limitation of the possibilities of the parable form. On the other hand, Jül. (p. 221) considers the *ἐρημοῦρας* of Q preferable to the *οὐ θέναται στήλαι* of Mk.



Nor is it at all clear that these details have allegorical significance, as, for instance that the armor signifies the demons in which Satan trusted (so Jül., p. 228, apparently emphasizing some connection between *πανοπλία* and *πάντα δαιμόνια*,—cf. Loisy, p. 708) or that distributing the booty meant only returning the bodies of the exorcised into the control of their former owners.<sup>10</sup> Certainly when Loisy (p. 708) writes that Lk. understood the whole passage allegorically he assumes more than the text warrants and in any case this would not prove that the allegory was originally intended. On the other hand the use of the LXX of Is. 53 12 probably points to redaction in the Greek (Loisy, p. 708, refers this specifically to Lk, but the author of Q is quite as likely), but it is at least not impossible that a use of Is. in the Aramaic was recognized and rendered into Greek with the phraseology of the Greek version. Hence there seems to be no critical necessity for going back of the narrative about as it stands in Lk.

The development of Mk.'s account from something like Lk.'s account presents no difficulties. This, however, is a different matter from supposing a direct literary relation that would make Mk.'s account arise from a redaction of Q (so B. Weiss, p. 36 and *Mk. ad loc.*, J. Weiss, *Ev.*, pp. 168—169, Bacon, pp. 38—39, Nicol., p. 235). The two versions undoubtedly do go back to some common original but there is nothing to show that the Mk. and Lk. traditions touched after leaving that original,—in especial there is nothing to show that they have any relation in their Greek forms. The further (tentative) hypothesis of J. Weiss that Mk. is a combination of Q with Petrine Memoirs (*Ev.*, p. 169) is quite incapable of demonstration (cf. Nicol., p. 235).

That the eventual origin of these sayings should be traced back to Jesus seems not to be questioned. Wellh. alone (Mk., p. 26) is suspicious of Mk. 27, on account of its "loose connection" and its emphasis on a positive fact while the context is concerned only with a negation. But this is too refined and at most affects only the place of the saying.

<sup>10</sup> B. Weiss (*Mt., ad loc.*) finds in the contrast a reference to the Temptation. This is even more artificial.



As to the non-Marcan sections, the question is whether their present context is correct. That of Lk. 23 (Mt. 30) is almost certainly wrong, for it deals with impossibility of neutrality although the adversaries in the present context *desired* to be known as hostile (Jül., p. 233, Klost., p. 243, Loisy, p. 708).<sup>11</sup> Nor is the position of Lk. 19—20 (Mt. 27—28) wholly satisfactory, for 18, 21, 22 form a single argument, while 19—20 deal with the subject from a different angle. Moreover, after 20 the "stronger one" of 22 should be the Kingdom of God,—i. e., there is an awkward change of subject. And again 18*b* is very clumsy and reads like an attempt to soften a transition.<sup>12</sup> Such arguments are, of course, not conclusive but they establish a certain degree of probability.<sup>13</sup> Loisy (p. 707,—cf. Montef., II, pp. 621—622) argues further that 19 and 20<sup>14</sup> do not belong together, as in one case Christ's exorcisms are paralleled with those of the Jews while in the other their uniqueness is insisted on,—as the two verses stand at present the Jewish exorcisms could be taken as proofs of the advent of the Kingdom (similarly Jül., p. 232, Wellh., *Mt.*, p. 62). But such a complete equation of the Jews' exorcisms with Christ's was scarcely to be apprehended (Klost., p. 243; cf. Holtzm., p. 68).<sup>15</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Wellh. (*Mt.*, p. 62) notes, moreover, that the *ἐμοῦ* is too restricted to suit the universal principle of the preceding verse.

<sup>12</sup> Holtzm. (p. 243,—cf. Loisy, p. 706, Nicol., p. 235) argues further that Mt. 27—28 disjoin *πῶς* in 26 and *ἢ πῶς* in 29. This is not relevant, however, for in 29 Mt. has returned to *Mk.* On the other hand, the change in Q from "Satan" to "Beezebul" may not be without significance.

<sup>13</sup> Bacon (pp. 43, 39, cf. Holtzm., p. 128) finds that *Mk.* has produced a more advanced Christology by dropping the references to the Spirit in Q, so that the miracles are referred to Christ's personal power. If, however, Q has introduced these references from another context, Bacon's comment loses relevancy.

<sup>14</sup> Mt. 28 is one of the few places in Mt. where *βασιλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ* (not *—τῶν οὐρανῶν*) is used. Loisy, p. 707, thinks that a special source is indicated. But this is quite needless, the form of the phrase is due to *πνεῦματι τοῦ θεοῦ* immediately preceding.

<sup>15</sup> B. Weiss (*Mt.*, *ad loc.*) argues for an entirely different interpretation that makes the comparison with "your sons" irony. This relieves the difficulty discussed above but is not very generally accepted. For a still different interpretation cf. Zahn (*Mt.*, *ad loc.*).

As to the historical origin of these non-Marcian verses, in the case of 23 a question is raised by the contrast with Mk. 9 40. This contrast is very familiar, however, and needs no discussion. There is no real reason why both sayings should not be original (so most scholars,—cf. Montef., II, p. 622), while J. Weiss (p. 305) and Loisy (p. 708) prefer the version in Q (noting in particular the very artificial context of Mk. 9 40). Wellh. (*Einl.*, p. 62) is about the only dissenter, arguing that “gather” and “scatter” can be understood only of the “herd” (i. e., the *Church*) and that the *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* doctrine is prepared for. This argument, however, can scarcely be taken seriously. Against 19 can be urged that it proves too much,—an objection that has been discussed above. Loisy (p. 709) suggests that 19 has been founded on Mk. 9 38-39 (or the source of this passage), in view of such a narrative as that of Acts 19 13-17; the association with 20 being designed to distinguish between (p. 707) “the exorcisms of the Jews, performed in the name of God or Christ, and those which Jesus accomplished by means of the Spirit of God”. But this is entirely too obscure; Lk. 19 centers not around the Jewish exorcisms but around Bezebul as the supposed means of Christ’s exorcisms, and Loisy leaves unexplained how a Christian writer could have formed the verse in such a way as to shield the legitimacy of Christ’s exorcisms behind those of the Jews. This last comment seems decisive,—the tone of the verse is entirely contrary to the spirit of the Apostolic Age and the words must be referred to Jesus himself. Similarly Lk. 20 seems to run counter to Apostolic ideas, as it places the advent of the Kingdom back in the *lifetime* of Jesus. This is perhaps not impossible for Apostolic ideas (cf. J. Weiss, p. 305, Loisy, p. 707,—very tentatively) but it is certainly opposed to the ordinary NT. concepts which date the advent of the Kingdom (in as far as it was not thought to be wholly future) from the Resurrection or Crucifixion, but never from the beginning of the exorcisms. Certainly, again, the balance of probability favors Jesus as the source of these words.

The Lucan parallel to the verses that follow in Mk. (28--30) and Mt. (31--32) is in an entirely different context (L. 12 10)

but the relations between the three Evangelists are the same as those just discussed. Again Mt.'s text is a combination of Mk. and the source used by Lk. and again most of the differences between Mt.'s and Lk.'s wording have arisen in Mt. through this combination of sources. In place of Lk.'s future indicative in a general condition (an unusual construction, even if not precisely un-Greek) Mt. 32 has adopted Mk. 29's aorist subjunctive. Lk. has τῷ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι but in 31 Mt. has already adopted ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία from Mk. 29 and consequently in 32 conforms the second clause to the first (and in so doing obscures the sense, for to "speak against the Spirit" need not mean quite as much as "blaspheme the Spirit"). The very awkward λόγος εἰς in Lk. (due, apparently to the following βλασφημ. εἰς,—Acts 6 11 is the only approach to a NT. parallel) has been smoothed in λόγος κατὰ and Lk.'s τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα has yielded to Mk.'s τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. On the other hand, Lk.'s fondness for participial constructions makes it probable that in place of τῷ βλασφημήσαντι Q had πᾶς ὅς βλασφημήσει as in the first part of the verse. But, with this exception, a form of Q identical with that of Lk. explains perfectly the form of Mt. and is therefore to be postulated.

To compare Mt. with Mk. Between the parallels (29 and 31) to Mk. 27 and 28 Mt. has inserted a verse (30) from Q and consequently has changed Mk. 28's ἀμήν into διὰ τοῦτο (31). Mk.'s ὅτι recitative is dropped. "Sons of men" is changed into "men," partly because the combination is very unusual and partly to avoid the contrast with "Son of Man" about to be introduced from Q. Mk. 28c is superfluous. Mt. 31c introduces βλασφημία to take up the same word immediately preceding, so replacing Mk. 29a's βλασφημία. After the insertion from Q in Mt. 31b—32b, Mk. 29b is expanded in Mt. 32c into a more solemn phrase (which avoids Mk.'s αἰῶνα—αἰωνίου). Mk. 30 is quite needless and is dropped. Hence all of Mt.'s variations from Mk. and Lk. are due to redactorial motives, making Mt. of no importance as independent testimony, and, as before, the problem reduces to a comparison of Mk. and Lk. (i. e., of Mk. and Q).

Mk., again, is thoroughly in the Evangelist's style and ends (30) with what is explicitly an editorial note that may be disregarded for the present. Wellh. (*Mk.*, p. 26, Klost., p. 32, Montef., I, p. 117) calls attention to the disagreement of *δσα* with *βλασφημίας*, arguing that *τὰ ἀμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασφημίας* may be an importation into Mk.'s text from Mt.'s. This is certainly possible but Mk. is not a strict enough writer to give such an argument great weight, while Mt.'s text is better explicable from Mk.'s as the latter now stands than it would be if these words were omitted. For the omission of *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* from Mk. 29 Wellh. (*Mk.*, p. 27) cites D and the Latin versions but, again, the words are in accord with Mk.'s prolix style and their omission is more easily explained than their addition. On the other hand, Mk. 28—29 certainly contain a badly drawn distinction between blasphemy in general and blasphemy against the Spirit, for blasphemy is not blasphemy except against God, and the Spirit (to the Jew) is simply a quality of God (cf. Wellh., *Mk.*, p. 27, Nicol., p. 241). Possibly Mk. has been influenced by Christian terminology, which admitted a distinction between "God" and "the Spirit" in a way that the Jewish did not. Finally the form of Mk. 28—29 is very clumsy, for in 28 a universal rule is laid down and amplified and then in 29 a vital exception is brought in an entirely new sentence.<sup>16</sup>

To compare now Mk. and Q. Nearly all of the Greek words in Q are found also in Mk. but these words are not at all characteristic and their order is entirely changed, as is the grammatical construction. Hence it is impossible to prove that the two versions are derived from the same *Greek* source,<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Perhaps Mk. 29c is due to Mk.'s "hardening" theory (Nicol., p. 241, —cf. J. Weiss, p. 95).

<sup>17</sup> E. g., Loisy (p. 711) thinks that Mk. has simply glossed Q. More generally, for the dependence of Mk. on Q, Loisy (p. 710) and Nicol. (p. 239) argue that Mk. 30 uses *ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα* very abruptly at the close of a passage that has spoken entirely of "Beezebul" and "Satan." This new phrase, however, could be explained readily if Mk. were using a document in which the next verse was Lk. 11 15 (Mt. 12 24), for then Mk. simply closed his redaction of one passage with the opening words from the next. It might be added, also, that there is a curious parallelism

although that they are derived from a common source of some kind is obvious. Now, if this source is to be identified with either of the present forms, the priority of Q to Mk. seems critically certain. For Q uses blasphemy in accord with Jewish terminology, while Mk. does not. Q states two distinct offences in clear terms, while Mk. is very confused. And,—most important,—the evolution of Mk. from Q would be in accord with Apostolic feeling, while the reverse development would be almost impossible. For Mk., who regarded a man's attitude towards Christ as determining that man's eternal destiny (Mk. 8 38, etc.), naturally classed words against Christ among the most heinous offences possible. Yet he wished to use a saying that singled out words against Christ as pardonable. The difficulty was resolved by including such words in "sins and blasphemies" of every sort,—they were pardonable in the sense that any blasphemy against God might be pardonable. In this way the sense of the original seemed to be preserved conscientiously, while an echo of the phraseology of Q was kept in the unique and almost impossible phrase "the sons of the men." This process is clear enough. On the other hand, if Q is supposed secondary, it becomes necessary to assume that a Christian writer undertook to minimize the offence of speaking against the Lord and for this purpose modified an entirely general statement so as to introduce this teaching explicitly. Such a procedure seems incomprehensible and equally incomprehensible would be the general reception of the document that was so produced. Consequently the priority of Q appears assured (so B. Weiss, J. Weiss, p. 96, Loisy, p. 711, Bacon, p. 39, Nicol., p. 241).

between Mk. and Q in that at the beginning both narratives (Mk. 3 28 and Lk. 11 24 = Mt. 12 43) speak of "Beezebul" and then change abruptly to "Satan",—in fact, Mk.'s isolated mention of "Beezebul" is as strange as his *πνεῦμα ἀδύνατον* and may be used similarly as indicating a use of Q. But, in the face of the wide divergence of the texts of Mk. and Q in the passage proper, these arguments are inconclusive,—the most they need mean is that Mk. had read Q and remembered some of it. This is, in fact, more than probable (in other parts of Mk. a close use of Q seems certain) but it is very different from the supposition that in this section Mk. was acting simply as the (free) editor of a document.

These considerations seem ignored in the counter-argument of Wellh. (*Einl.*, p. 66,—cf. *Klost.*, p. 244, *Montef.*, I, p. 117). Wellh.'s chief point is that Q is self-contradictory, for the blasphemy against the Spirit consists in words against the Son of Man, so that the assumed two offences are really only one. But this overlooks the fact that the present instance is only a particular case of a much wider principle and that the very point here lies in the coincidence of the two offences (cf., especially, J. Weiss, pp. 96, 305). Although the words are against the Son of Man it is not for that reason but because they are *also* against the Spirit that they are unpardonable. Wellh. argues further that the general "sons of men" in Mk. has become reduced in Q to the particular "Son of Man" and then the latter has been set in relation to "blasphemy" instead of to "forgive." The evolution must have gone this way, for the reverse process would be unthinkable. But the above discussion has shown that it is not only entirely thinkable but that it is the only change that accords with what is known of the trend of tradition. As a third argument, Wellh. writes that blasphemy can be directed only against God, while "the Son of Man is not God." The point of this, however, is difficult to catch, for Q does *not* say "blasphemy against the Son of Man" in either Mt.'s or Lk.'s version,—as Wellh. goes on to state explicitly. Evidently none of these arguments can weigh against those on the other side.

There remains the possibility that both the Mk. and the Q versions have been developed from some common source. For such a source Wellh. (*Einl.*, p. 67,—cf. *Klost.*, p. 32) suggests the text of Mk. with the singular τῷ ἑνὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in place of the plural,—the singular, of course, meaning simply "man."<sup>18</sup> A misinterpretation of this as "Son of Man" led to the pluralization in Mk. by some later editor and to the paraphrase in Q. But this is simply hypothesis (cf. Loisy, p. 711). Moreover it leaves unexplained why Mk. did not write ἀνθρώπου or ἀνθρώπων

<sup>18</sup> Wellh. (*Einl.*, p. 67) compares Mk. 2 10. 28. But these passages are hardly relevant, for in both *Mark* certainly understood the phrase in a Messianic sense and so could hardly have used it differently here (on 2 10 cf. Wellh., *Mk.*, p. 16).



in the first place, as elsewhere, and in no way simplifies the difficulty of deriving the Q form from the Marcan,—in fact, it removes the Q form even further from its supposed origin. Other attempts to recover an original form of the saying have ignored the Marcan version and have sought simply to go back of that in Q. But, such attempts, naturally, go outside of the passage itself for their motives and rest on deductions drawn from other passages as to what was or was not possible in the mouth of Jesus. So, for instance, the proposal of J. Weiss (p. 305) to find back of "Son of Man" an original "me." Such a purely mechanical change, of course, could not be detected in the passage taken by itself and is due only to a doubt as to whether Jesus ever used "Son of Man" as a self-designation. Loisy (pp. 711—712,—cf. Nicol., p. 240) thinks that "the distinction introduced between the Son of Man and the Spirit appears to have a theological character, by opposing, as it were, the humanity of the Saviour to his divinity, the exterior of his activity to the supernatural principle of his works." Consequently the original perhaps ran "whosoever shall say a word against any son of man — —," which Q misrendered "the Son of Man,"—without causing offence because a distinction was made between Jesus as man and the Spirit of God which was in him. But this either leaves Mk.'s extraordinary paraphrase unexplained or else requires a very literal use by Mk. of the Greek Q (something, in fact, that Loisy defends). Moreover, if "son of man" were simply the ordinary expression for "man,"—as the translator of Q must have known perfectly well,—the retention of "son of" in the Greek is inexplicable. But, moreover,—and chiefly,—Loisy seems to have raised a difficulty where none exists. There is no theological subtlety whatever in the saying and Jesus certainly could have drawn the distinction quite as naturally as any later writer,—and with much less offence. Such a search for an original form of the saying will be justified only when the demonstration has been completed that Jesus did not use "Son of Man" as a self-designation—and this demonstration is as yet very far from complete.<sup>19</sup> The most

<sup>19</sup> On the linguistic side of the question the following words of Wellh. (*Einkl.*, p. 130) are worth quoting:—"Schon die jerusalemischen Christen



that has been done is to show that the title does not belong in certain passages and to suggest processes (of which suggestions the above are very fair examples) by which the title *could* have crept into the remaining passages. But this is a very different matter from showing that the title *did* so creep into such passages.

Finally, as to the original context of the saying. The meaning in Lk. is far from clear and the exegesis of Lk. 12 9-12 is notoriously difficult. On the surface the passage is very confused,<sup>20</sup> for in 9 denial of Christ is not pardonable while according to 10 pardon can be extended to words spoken against him,—only blasphemy against the Spirit being unpardonable. And then in 11--12 an entirely abrupt change seems to be made to the Spirit as inspiring defence when on trial. Wellh. (*Einkl.*, p. 66) finds different classes of men in 10 *a* (non-Christians) and 10 *b* (Christians). Then the passage becomes something like this:—(9) Denial of me will be punished by condemnation. (10) But by "denial" is not meant any word spoken against me,—such words may be uttered through ignorance (cf. Acts 3 19). If, however, they are spoken by those having the illumination of the Spirit they are unpardonable (cf. Heb. 10 29). (11—12) The offence is all the greater as the Spirit can be trusted to carry one through the trial. This is good Apostolic theology and is very plausible. An alternative, perhaps simpler, is to suppose that both clauses of 10 refer to unbelievers. "Not all of those who attack Christ are past hope,—but some of them are. It is only the latter who will resist your defence and on them will be visited the severest condemnation" (cf. Montef., II, p. 953). In either case the passage is altogether too complicated to account for the *formation* of 10 and too complicated, also, for the original context of this verse,—that there is a "mosaic" here is evident.

But was this mosaic formed first in Lk. or in Q? Most scholars hold that Lk. first made the combination (B. Weiss,

werden das spezifische barnascha von dem gewöhnlichen barnascha unterschieden haben."

<sup>20</sup> It is hard to see how Nicol. (p. 238) can think the Lucan order natural.

p. 36, J. Weiss, p. 434, Holtzm., p. 370, Loisy, p. 710;<sup>21</sup> Montef, p. 953). But this does not follow simply from the fact (alone urged by most of these scholars) that Lk.'s present narrative is obviously artificial. If Q be supposed to have established the present connection, it is only necessary to assume that the verse had been already applied to the adversaries of Christianity in the oral tradition, which Q simply followed,—Lk. using Q here without Mk. If, on the other hand, Lk. be supposed to have established the connection, then it is necessary to assume that he violated the order of *both* his *written* sources, removed the verse from a place where it fitted perfectly, held it (so to speak) in mid-air, and finally deposited it in an entirely different passage where it not only seemed to be out of relation to the context but to contradict the preceding verse. The first supposition is vastly preferable.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, if Q originally ran as it stands in Lk. 12 2-12, it is easy to understand the formation of the parallel parts of Mt. (ch. 10,—cf. Nicol., pp. 237—240), especially if Q continued beyond Lk. 12 12 as in Mt. 10 21-22. After Mt. 10 16, Mt. turned to this Q passage and began to copy it at the point (Mt. 10 17 = Lk. 12 11) where it would yield a good connection and continued to copy until he had reached the end of the section in Q. Then, after adding two or three verses (Mt. 10 23-25<sup>23</sup> or 24-25) taken perhaps from some other part<sup>24</sup> of Q, he returned (10 26) to the beginning of the section whose latter part he had copied and started to copy the remainder (10 26-33). When he had completed 10 33 (Lk. 12 9), however, he recognized that the next verse (Lk. 12 10) was in a different and better context in Mk. and consequently omitted

<sup>21</sup> Noting, however, that the other alternative may be possible.

<sup>22</sup> If this is right, then a literary use of Q by Mk. involves assuming that Mk. went to an entirely different section of Q to find a saying for the close of his narrative. But even this is less difficult than supposing the reverse process in Lk.

<sup>23</sup> There is considerable reason to think that Mt. 10 23 stood after 10 22 in Q and that this was its original place.

<sup>24</sup> Nicol. (p. 234), however, thinks that these verses all stood in Q in their present Matthaean context. From this he argues again for Mk.'s use of Q, claiming that the *Βερεβοὺλ ἐχεῖ* is an echo of Mt. 10 24-25 (Lk. 6 40). But too many suppositions are involved.

this verse here. Lk., however, in 12 2-12 simply copied Q just as it stood, with some abbreviation of the matter<sup>25</sup> now in Mt. 10 17-18, and after completing 12 12 omitted the remainder of the Q section as unsuited to the present context. This is a very simple explanation and is probably correct.

This, naturally, does not show that Mk.'s context is correct, —something, indeed, that is quite incapable of proof. But the observation of Loisy (p. 712) seems entirely just:—"In whatever occasion Jesus may have spoken of blasphemy against the Spirit, he must have had his own works in view; and the expulsion of evil spirits being the work that was best adapted for this declaration, the combination of the two first Evangelists should have the sort and the degree of truth that is desirable in such matters."

Summarizing:—In the passage discussed Lk. represents practically a transcript of Q. Q, in turn, apart from slight touches, contains the oldest recoverable form of the sayings recorded in it and all of these sayings may, with a high degree of probability, be assigned to Jesus himself. But that they were all uttered on a single occasion does not follow,—the saying in Lk. 11 23 is almost certainly out of place and those in Lk. 11 19-20 may also belong to some other occasion. The saying in Lk. 12 10 was placed in its present Lucan context by the author of Q. Mk. has given a freer version of certain of these sayings. This version shows Marcan touches but there is no particular evidence to show that Mk.'s version is derived from a redaction of Q (even in the Aramaic and still less in the Greek). In especial Mk.'s position for the saying in Lk. 12 10 is much better than that assigned to it in Q. Mt., finally, worked together the narratives in Q and Mk., following Mk. rather than Q for the place of the saying in Lk. 12 10, and contributes nothing independent to the evidence.

<sup>25</sup> An expansion of Q in Mt. 10 17-18 is less likely. But in no case are Mt. 10 17-20 = Lk. 12 11-12 derived from Mk. 13 11, against which they agree in both the position of the saying and in its Greek wording.