Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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 the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

people to write or speak with genius and power, but they did teach a very clear insight into the meaning, nature, and function of language. Perhaps their work may best be seen in two products of these centuries, which have had at any rate a very remarkable permanence—the Roman Codes and the Creeds of the Christian Church.'

Writing now ten years later I might wish to add to or modify these words, but I should still maintain their substantial truth.

F. H. Colson.

P.S.—ἰδιωτισμός. Since writing the above I have noticed that Irenaeus (v 30) speaks of those who ἐσφάλησαν ἐπακολουθήσαντες ἰδιωτισμῷ by which 616 was substituted for 666 in the number of the Beast. The Latin translator keeps *sequentes idiotismum*, but as below where the Greek is not extant it is explained as *peccatum scriptorum* (ἁμάρτημα γραφέων?) by which ι was substituted for ξ, I infer that Irenaeus uses the word for 'error' much as Dionysius uses it.

The thought which this suggests is 'how imperfect is our lexicography of this sort of Greek'. These two examples of ἰδιωτισμός are ignored not only in Liddell and Scott, a work, so far as my experience goes, of little use for later Greek, but also in Stephanus. Yet both come from well-known passages in Greek Fathers and certainly vouch for a shade of meaning different from any there recorded.

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXE-GETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL.

Dr Hort, in the great *Introduction* to his edition of the Greek Testament, lays down as fundamental the principle that 'Knowledge of documents should precede final judgement upon readings' (§ 38), using capitals in the text and italics in the table of contents to call special attention to the importance of the words. I want to enter a similar plea for what I conceive to be an even more important principle, namely that 'Knowledge of an author's usage should precede final judgement' .alike as to readings, as to exegesis, and—in this case—as to the mutual relations of the Synoptic Gospels. The studies that follow are intended to be a contribution to the textual criticism and the exegesis of St Mark, and also to the better understanding of that department of the Synoptic problem which is concerned with the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. So long as it is supposed that there is a residuum of agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in matter taken from Mark—apart, that is, from passages found also in Q—which cannot be explained without assuming literary contact either of Matthew

and Luke with one another or of both with some other document than our extant Mark, so long will research into the Synoptic question be hampered and final solution delayed. We can only see things in their true proportions if we consider the evidence over a wide field, and note not only the agreements but the disagreements of the two later Synoptists in the handling of their common material. 'Use large maps' is a piece of advice that applies to other people besides politicians.

I propose therefore to treat in succession various characteristic Marcan usages, isolating each usage and examining it over the whole field of the Gospel. So and so only shall we be able to establish our inductions on a secure basis. And I cannot help thinking that the method proves itself to be unexpectedly fruitful in results.

I.

The Impersonal Plural.

By the impersonal plural is here meant the use of a plural verb with no subject expressed, and no subject implied other than the quite general one 'people'. This form of phrase, common in Aramaic as a substitute for the passive, is very characteristic of St Mark's narrative, and is generally altered in the other Synoptists either by the insertion of a definite subject or (and this especially in St Luke) by the substitution of the passive voice for the impersonal active. With the exception of two passages which present rather more difficulty than the rest and are therefore reserved for the end, the order of the Gospel is followed.

1. i 21, 22 καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν· καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων.

There is no subject to ἐξεπλήσσοντο, though we can of course supply 'the congregation'; but I think what Mark meant was simply 'people were astonished'. Luke eases the construction by transferring ἦν διδάσκων αὐτούς from the second part of the sentence to the first, so that αὐτούς explains ἐξεπλήσσοντο. Matthew characteristically inserts οἱ ὄχλοι, 'the multitudes were astonished'.

2. i 29, 30 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἀνδρέου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. ἡ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα· καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς.

St Mark means, I think, 'immediately He is told about her': he does not mean that 'Simon and Andrew with James and John' told Him, to the exclusion of the family in the house. Matthew, with his usual tendency to compress a story, omits the detail. Luke retains, only changing present to past tense and substituting a more definite word ἠρώτησαν, 'consulted Him', for Mark's recurring and colourless λέγουσιν.

3. i 32 ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης . . . ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας.

Matthew retains, with the past tense προσήνεγκαν. Luke inserts a nominative πάντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις.

4. i 45 ἔξω ἐπ᾽ ἐρήμοις τόποις ἦν· καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.

Matthew, omitting the whole verse, offers no parallel. Luke inserts ὄχλοι πολλοί.

5. ii 2, 3 καὶ συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ . . . καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον. καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικόν.

Obviously a new nominative must be supplied with ἔρχονται—'there arrive people bringing a paralytic . . .' So in terms Luke, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες φέροντες . . . : Matthew is content with καὶ ἰδοὺ προσέφερον, but then, having omitted the previous verse of Mark, he has at least had no rival nominative in his preceding words.

6. ii 18 καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες. καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Διατί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν;

A singularly instructive example. It does not seem to me doubtful that St Mark means, neither that John's disciples came to put the question, nor that the Pharisees came, but simply that the question was put. Some of the people of the place noticed that there was a remarkable difference of religious observance at the moment between two sections of 'disciples' and a third: and they apply to the head of the section which was in a minority for an explanation of its difference from the others. But neither Matthew nor Luke likes to leave the matter so. They interpret Mark, and both of them interpret him to mean that it was one of the two opposing sections which put the question: Matthew places it in the mouth of the disciples of John, inserting οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου, Luke with οἱ δὲ εἶπαν treats the interlocutors as those of the preceding verses οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν.

7. iii 1, 2 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς συναγωγήν, καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπος . . . καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασιν . . .

Mark's εἰς συναγωγήν is I think almost exactly 'He went to church'. There is therefore no nominative to παρετήρουν, and the equivalent English is 'watch was kept on Him to see if . . .' Matthew having written εἰς συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν has an implied nominative ready for his verb ἐπηρώτησαν, Luke inserts οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.

8. iii 31, 32 καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν· καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου . . .

Clearly it is not the crowd who give the message. The porter or some one of that sort is charged to convey to Jesus the news that His mother wants to see Him: the inserted words καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν

ὄχλος logically belong to *v.* 34 ; but Peter visualizes the scene as he remembers it. . Luke excellently represents the impersonal plural by the passive ἀπηγγέλη. Matthew's text, xii 47, offers a problem of some difficulty. It seems preposterous at first sight· to suppose that words can be genuine which are absent from ℵ B L, the African Latin (*k*), the Old Syriac, and the Sahidic. But a sound instinct led Westcott and Hort to admit the words at least to their margin. For in the first place they are necessary to the sense : and in the second place experience of manuscripts establishes no rule on a more certain basis than that, where *homoioteleuton* will account for omission, ·the omitted words are probably genuine. It is therefore possible to say with some confidence that Mt. xii 47 is genuine, and that Matthew represented Mark's λέγουσιν by εἶπεν δέ τις. But even if they are not genuine, Matthew's τῷ λέγοντι in the next verse shews that he avoided the impersonal plural.

9. v 14 καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς. καὶ ἦλθον ἰδεῖν τί ἐστιν τὸ γεγονός.

What St Mark of course means is that the inhabitants of the town and the villages came to see what had happened : Luke too thought that the words εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς sufficiently prepared for the change of subject, and retained Mark's language practically unaltered. Matthew on the other hand inserted πᾶσα ἡ πόλις as nominative.

10. v 35 ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανεν.

'Messengers come from the ruler of the synagogue's house with the news that . . .' Matthew's form of this story is an extreme instance of his tendency to compression : three successive verses in Mark, v 35–37, are entirely unrepresented, so we can only say 'no parallel'. Luke's ἔρχεταί τις . . . λέγων reminds us of Matthew's εἶπέν τις in no..8. Nothing is clearer throughout the series of these passages than the independence of Matthew and Luke in their treatment of the Marcàn material. For the solitary coincidence between them see no. 12.

11. vi 14 καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται . . . ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον . . . ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον . . . ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρῴδης ἔλεγεν . . .

An interesting instance, because of the doubt as to the reading in the case of the first ἔλεγον. Most authorities give ἔλεγεν, 'Herod said'. The authorities which give the plural are few but good: B D, now reinforced by W, and some Old Latins. And the plural is absolutely certain, for it is guaranteed by the parallel in Mark viii 28 (τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν, καὶ ἄλλοι Ἠλείαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι Εἷς τῶν προφητῶν), and it is implied by the reproduction of the passage in Luke ix 7, διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι

ὑπό τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ... Matthew omits all reference to the divergent contemporary views about Jesus, and therefore offers no real parallel. St Mark assuredly meant ' His reputation was now consider-able, and different ideas were held about Him in different circles by His contemporaries: people were saying, Why, it's John the Baptizer *redivivus*, others No, it's Elijah, and others again A new prophet, just as there have been prophets from time to time before'.

12. vi 33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἔγνωσαν πολλοί· καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς.

Obviously[1] the many who recognized them were not the same necessarily as the people who ran on foot from all the cities. Rather the many who recognized the intention of Jesus and His disciples spread the news, and with many to circulate the report a large concourse of people from different directions could collect, all heading for the place of landing on the other side. I am not even sure that we should not put a comma after ὑπάγοντας, and translate 'And they were seen going, and many recognized them, and people ran on foot to the common meeting-point and anticipated their arrival'. All these details seemed to the later Evangelists superfluous, and they pruned them remorselessly. Both reduce Mark's four verbs to the single word—the only single word which would express the complete idea—ἠκολούθησαν : both supply οἱ ὄχλοι as again the only single noun which would cover those who saw, those who recognized, and those whose concourse was directed to the landing-place.

It should be noted that this is the solitary occasion on our list where Matthew and Luke make the *same* rectification of Mark's impersonal plural. But it has just been shewn what an obvious change it is: and Matthew inserts the same noun ὄχλοι on two other occasions in our list (1 and 15), Luke on one (4).

13. vi 42, 43 καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἦραν κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα.

It was not the 5,000 who ate and were filled who picked up the frag-ments. Luke correctly interprets Mark when he substitutes ἤρθη for ἦραν. So still more expressly the Fourth Evangelist—who in the story of this miracle follows in Mark's footsteps—λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα (Jo. vi 12). Matthew alone retains Mark's phrase unaltered.

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

We have now arrived at the long lacuna in Luke's copying of Mark:

---

[1] I think it quite obvious : but I have to admit that Swete *in loc.* appears to take πολλοί as subject to all the three verbs.

for our three instances 14, 15, and 16 there are no parallels in the third Synoptist.

Mark meant that the people of the district where Jesus landed recognized Him : Matthew states that expressly, ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου.

15. vii 31, 32 καὶ πάλιν . . . ἦλθεν . . . εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας . . . καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον.

Matthew generalizes from Mark's single instance, inserting ὄχλοι πολλοί as the subject, καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, ἔχοντες μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν χωλοὺς τυφλοὺς κωφοὺς κυλλούς.

16. viii 22 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν· καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν.

Those who came to Bethsaida were our Lord and His disciples. Those who brought the blind man to Him were people of the place : our English equivalent would probably be 'and a blind man was brought to Him'. The whole passage is absent from Matthew (though it presumably contributed the τυφλούς to Matthew's generalization· in xv 30, see just above under 15) as well as from Luke.

17. x 1, 2 καὶ συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι.

The passage is included here with a little hesitation : but I believe both that this is the true reading, and that ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν is the impersonal plural—not 'the multitudes asked Him' but 'the question was asked of Him'. It would not be reasonable to suppose that the question of divorce was the dominant one in the minds of the crowds : Peter simply remembered the question being raised at that time. There is no parallel in Luke : Matthew supplies προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, from which many authorities have borrowed προσελθόντες οἱ Φ. for the text of Mark.

18. x 13 καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅψηται.

Luke retains the impersonal plural : Matthew substitutes the passive, τότε προσενέχθησαν αὐτῷ παιδία.

19. x 49 καὶ εἶπεν Φωνήσατε αὐτόν. καὶ ἐφώνησαν τὸν τυφλόν.

This passage is again included doubtfully, since it is possible to understand St Mark as meaning that our Lord addressed the command 'Call him' to definite persons who obeyed the command. I should rather understand the Evangelist to mean that our Lord ordered generally that Bartimaeus should be called, and that the order was carried out by somebody or other. In any case the detail was omitted by Matthew and only indicated by Luke.

20. xiii 9-11 βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς· παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε . . . καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε.

Both Matthew and Luke retain the impersonal plural here—it is the

solitary instance in our series in which both do so, but then it is also the solitary instance in our series in which the idiom is employed in the record of our Lord's words [1]—but in an earlier place in Matthew (x 17, where the substance of the Marcan passage is much more closely reproduced than it is at xxiv 9) we have, instead of βλέπετε ἑαυτούς, προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, and in that way a subject is supplied.

21. xiv 12 καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον.

Matthew, either because he thought the information superfluous or perhaps because he thought it absolutely misleading, omitted the clause ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον. Luke transposed the impersonal active, as in 8, 11, 13, into a passive, ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα.

Of these twenty-one passages there are three for which there is no Matthaean parallel, 4, 10, 16, and four for which there is no Lucan parallel, 14, 15, 16, 17. Again, the actual phrase in which the impersonal plural occurs is dropped on four occasions by Matthew, 2, 11, 19, 21, and on one by Luke, 19. There remain fourteen passages in Matthew, sixteen in Luke, to consider.

The most common expedient in both Matthew and Luke is the insertion of a nominative as subject for the verb, which thus ceases to be impersonal. The expedient is adopted eight times by Matthew, 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, seven times by Luke, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12. Each of them uses τις once, Matthew 8, Luke 10 : for the rest they used plural nouns or nouns of multitude. Only once do they agree on the nominative inserted, 12, where οἱ ὄχλοι is common to both. Since the particular word ὄχλος was one of the most obvious nouns, if not the most obvious, to insert, the single coincidence is nothing unnatural.

Besides this, there was the possibility of using what we should feel in English the most idiomatic method of rendering St Mark's usage, and substituting a passive. Matthew does this once, 18, Luke four times, 8, 11, 13, 21.

These two expedients reduce the series to five passages apiece in Matthew and Luke, where the impersonal plural is retained. The evidence shews conclusively that the idiom is a regular and common one in Mark's narrative, and that on two occasions on an average out of three it is in some way got rid of by the other Synoptists.

With these results before us, let us now consider the two reserved passages, Mark iii 21 (22), xiv 1 (23).

22. iii 21 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι Ἐξέστη.

[1] Matthew and Luke shew a fair number of instances of the idiom in the record of Christ's teaching. What is remarkable is Mark's fondness for it, and their dislike of it, in narrative. No doubt they allowed themselves far larger latitude in recasting Mark's own story than in recasting the record of the Λόγοι of Christ.

The impression ordinarily and naturally caused by these words is that our Lord's family left home to get hold of Him, because they thought He was out of His senses. But in the light of what we now know of Mark's fondness for the impersonal plural, an alternative rendering becomes at once possible, 'for it was reported that He was out of His senses'. And the possible rendering becomes I think probable, or more than probable, if we consider the weakness of the reason given, on the ordinary view, for the action of Christ's family. They said He was mad : on what grounds? On the rather inadequate ground that the crowd was so great that nobody had room to eat. But on the view now proposed, St Mark has rounded off his story of the Call of the Twelve by the summary statement that the call was followed by a resumption of the work at Capernaum. Then begins a new paragraph, verses 21– 35, dealing with two alternative explanations offered by those who criticized the new teacher's work : ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἐξέστη, ἔλεγον ὅτι Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει. The former was a local criticism, which reached the ears of His family at Nazareth, and they left home to see what restraining influence they could exert over Him : the latter was the suggestion of emissaries from Jerusalem. This is dealt with first : it is the sin against the Holy Ghost, the refusal to recognize that good deeds must come from the good God. The story then returns to the former. It is over-subtle to regard the intercalation of verses 22–30 as intended to allow time for the journey from Nazareth to Capernaum. It is rather that the mention of the earlier and more naïve criticism of people at Capernaum suggests at once to the writer the other more evil-minded but more logical theory of people from Jerusalem, and being reminded of it he deals with it first.[1]

23. xiv 1 ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας, καὶ ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς πῶς αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσαντες ἀποκτείνωσιν· ἔλεγον γὰρ Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, μή ποτε ἔσται θόρυβος τοῦ λαοῦ.

'Next day was the Passover : and the chief-priests were on the look out for some underhand way of arresting Him : for it had been urged that an (open) arrest at the feast might lead to a riot.' That is I think what St Mark means. The emphasis in the second clause is, as the position of the word indicates, on δόλῳ : and what reason would there be for any emphasis on δόλῳ, if the point were that they were going to make *no* arrest during the festival? But if the conditions were (1) that the chief-priests were determined to arrest Jesus before He left Jerusalem, (2) that some of the Sanhedrists, to whom they felt bound to defer in

---

[1] I think myself that by the ἔλεγον of verse 30, ὅτι ἔλεγον Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει, St Mark means again the impersonal plural 'because it was said', though it is of course possible that he is harking back to 'the scribes' of verse 22.

The view here taken of ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἐξέστη was originally suggested to me, at the close of a discussion about impersonal plurals in St Mark, by the Rev. R. H. Lightfoot of New College. It is, I understand, accepted by Sir John Hawkins.

order to secure unanimity, made a timid *caveat* against any action which might involve the chance of a riot at the moment of arrest, then the need for δόλος explains itself. An arrest effected by δόλος would avoid the chance of a riot, whether it was effected during the festival or no. Hence the value to them of Judas, and of the information which enabled them to carry out their *coup* in the late evening and at a retired spot.

It has been suggested that the mysterious directions given by our Lord to disciples in xi 2 and xiv 13, where no names are named, were intended to prevent Judas from obtaining previous knowledge of our Lord's movements which he could convey to the Jewish authorities. However that may be, it seems clear that δόλος meant just the securing of a time and place for the arrest where popular support for Jesus would have no opportunity of asserting itself. It is difficult to suppose that it is intended to imply a contrast between an arrest on Thursday and an arrest on Friday. And the solitary change which Matthew makes in copying Mark is in this respect very instructive : for, understanding ἔλεγον to refer back to the chief priests, he alters ἔλεγον γάρ into ἔλεγον δέ. The chief priests, that is to say, determined to arrest Jesus, but determined at the same time that an arrest during the feast must be avoided. Later exegesis has, as in so many other passages, interpreted Mark by Matthew. But if Mark's account is taken as the primary one, ἔλεγον γάρ gives the reason for δόλος. On the ordinary view, St Mark ought to have written ' Next day being passover, the authorities deter· mined to effect the arrest of Jesus before passover began : for they said, Not during the feast . . .' But that is not what St Mark says. He says, ' The feast being now imminent, the authorities determined to avoid a direct and open arrest, for the objection had been taken that such methods were too dangerous at such a time : they had to have recourse therefore to some secret *coup* '.

I add, by way of appendix, yet one more passage, where, if we may assume the use of the impersonal plural, the reading which is perhaps the more probable would receive its explanation and justification :

24. xv 10 (8-11) καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς. ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων Θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ἐγίνωσκεν γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτόν. οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς.

The above reading, παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτόν without οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς to follow, is that of B I *k* and the Sinai Syriac, and is supported by Matt. xxvii 18 ᾔδει γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν : and since it was certainly not the multitude who had handed Jesus over to the governor, we must take παραδεδώκεισαν as impersonal plural, and translate ' it was

for envy's sake that Jesus had been brought before him'. The alternative reading supplies a nominative to παραδεδώκεισαν: but it would be awkward even for Mark to end one sentence with οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς and begin the next sentence with οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς, and I incline to think that the first οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς is just an early scribal insertion, or more probably gloss, intended to make the sense of παραδεδώκεισαν clear to the reader.

I should like it to be understood that, while the idea and for the most part the material of this and the following papers are my own, the final form owes much to the help and criticism of the members of my Seminar.

(*To be continued.*)

C. H. TURNER.

˙THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE.

HAVING read with great interest Dr Caldecott's article on Dr Robert Eisler's views about the Cleansing of the Temple (*J. T.S.* xxiv, p. 382), together with Mr Cheetham's paper on 'Destroy this temple' (*J. T. S.* xxiv, p. 315), I feel impelled to make some remarks of my own.

I.

First of all, Dr Caldecott did very well in calling attention to Eisler's view. Dr Eisler is an astonishingly learned man, as his *Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt* proves, not to speak of his many other works. And further, the Cleansing of the Temple is an incident of extraordinary interest to Christians—or it should be. As a rule it is taken as a matter of course, a thing that needs no explanation. I feel that too often this is the case only because no satisfactory explanation is forthcoming.

The particular interest and importance to us of the Cleansing of the Temple, so it seems to me, is that it is almost the only spontaneous action of our Lord. If He healed the lepers it was because He had met them, if He fed the multitudes it was because they had followed Him. He was crucified, because the authorities arrested and condemned Him. But He went out of His way, so to speak, to 'cleanse' the Temple —He need not have done it if He had not thought proper. Therefore it ought to be for us a very significant index of His mind and purpose: we Christians ought to have very clear ideas about it.

Let us first take Dr Eisler's point about the 'den of robbers'. Dr Eisler is certainly right in saying that the words of Jesus are a quotation or allusion to the Old Testament. It is certain that 'a House of Prayer for all the nations' is a reference to Isa. lvi 7, and that 'den of robbers' is a reference to Jer. vii 11, and that the meaning of these phrases in our Lord's mouth is what they mean in the original, not what they happen to sound like in the Greek of the Gospels or the English