

general impression of the passage. How far, indeed, he is prepared to go in such paraphrase (and highly controversial paraphrase at that) may be seen from his rendering Christ's words at the Last Supper by, 'it (or in Luke, This) means my body'. The word *δίδαχῆ* is neutral, being used of teaching good or bad; for the bad sense see, for example, Matt. xvi 12; Acts v 28; Heb. xiii 9; Rev. (Apoc.) ii 14-15. The word *τύπος* is used in the somewhat unusual but obvious sense of 'form' or 'kind', of which there is no other clear example in the New Testament; but we may refer to Plato's *Republic* p. 387c, near the beginning of the third book, *ἀλλὰ ὅσα τούτου τοῦ τύπου ὀνομαζόμενα*.

Perhaps some prejudice will be felt against the translation which I am advocating from the fact that the words *ἐκ καρδίας*, 'from the heart', are used, which might be thought almost necessarily to imply what is good. But a very little study of the use of the word in the New Testament will dispel this idea. It may suffice to refer to Matt. xv 18-19; Mark vii 21-22: all manner of vices are said to proceed from the heart. It must be remembered that to a large extent the psychological connotation (so to speak) of the physical organs has moved upward; Holy Scripture often speaks of the heart where we should rather say there was question of the head, and it mentions the bowels where we should find it more natural to allude to the heart.

C. LATTEY.

P.S.—I should wish to add (accepting a suggestion made to me) that *τύπος διδαχῆς* appears to refer more especially to the Mosaic Law, mentioned in the context both before (Rom. vi 15) and after (vii 1). This would tend to confirm the view that a large proportion of the Roman Christians were Jews. The gentiles among them, however, are directly addressed in Rom. xi 13.

### ST MATTHEW xxvi 50

I HAVE lately come across two passages, which seem to me to throw a great light on the meaning of this disputed passage. But before dealing with them let me give the evidence for the text and the current interpretations of it (chiefly from A. H. McNeile *The Gospel according to St Matthew*, 1915).

Greek *ἐράϊρε, ἐφ' ᾧ πάρει* Eus. D. E. Chrys. and a few less important MSS.

*ἐφ' ὃ*  $\aleph$  A B C D etc.

*ἐραίρε* after *πάρει* D, Lat. vers. a c f  $\aleph$  sin. pesh Ephr<sup>diat.</sup> Diat<sup>ar.</sup>

Latin versions                      ad quod venisti

and so § sin.

Vulg. ad quid ; and so Ephr. and probably § sin (Burkitt).

Diat<sup>ar</sup> and § pesh. assume an ellipse 'Was it for this thou camest?'

The A.V. translates 'Friend, wherefore art thou come?'

The R.V. 'Friend, *do* that for which thou art come', in accordance with the practice, as McNeile says, of 'most writers' who 'supply some such word as *ποιήσον*'. McNeile says 'Possibly ἐφ' ὃ, τι (= δι' ὃ, τι) "wherefore" should be read, τι having fallen out before π'.

I cannot myself believe that ὃς can ever be used as a direct interrogative, and in this belief I am supported by Blass, *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, trans. by Henry St John Thackeray, 1905, p. 176, 'The employment of ὄστις or even of ὃς in a direct question is quite incredible, except that ὃ, τι appears to be used as an abbreviation for τί ὃ, τι *why*, St Mark ix 11 et al. . . .' So Stallbaum says on Plat. Rep. 559 A 'ὄς semper finitum est, referturque ad certam aliquam rem vel personam: τίς quaerit de eo quod est infinitum atque incertum. Ex quo patet alterum cum altero non potuisse commutari.' To the same effect Lobeck *Phryn.* p. 57, Moulton *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, p. 93.

Of the Fathers Chrysostom (quoted by Blass *Beitr. zur. Förd. Chr. Theol.* fourth year, fourth part, p. 45) says (*in Matt.* p. 793 B) μετὰ . . . τὸ δεῖξαι τὴν ἰσχὺν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ (in ref. to St John xviii 4 seq.) τότε λοιπὸν συνεχώρησεν which Blass says implies an imperative, and so conjectures αἶρε or ἐταῖρε αἶρε (van der Valk *ἔπαυρε*); but the likelihood of this conjecture is weakened by the fact, that (*vide sup.*) ἐταῖρε in many authorities follows πάρε. Chrysostom's words certainly imply an imperative, but not necessarily expressed. Blass also compares dub-Chrys. *de prod-Judae* vol. ii p. 723 A B πλήρωσον τὰς κακὰς συνθήκας, which conveys the same implication. Isid. Pel. ap. Cramer *cat. in Matt.* p. 226, 9-10, apparently regards the sentence as a direct question, and so clearly Theophylact *in loc.*

When I was working at the *Acts of Carpus, Papyrus, and Agathonica* for a translation of some Acts of the early martyrs published by the Oxford Press I came on a phrase precisely similar to that of Matt. xxvi 50—ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφ' ὃ πάρεμι (§ 44 *Acts of Carpus* etc. Knopf, *Ausgewählte Märtyreracten*; Harnack, *Die Acten des Karpus* etc., Text. und Unters. 3, 3 f, 440-454). It is said by Agathonica, who appears, according to the account as it now stands, to have given herself up to martyrdom. Duchesne, however (*Early Hist. of the Church*, Eng. trans. vol. i p. 193 note), believes that something has dropped out, and that she was really arrested with the two others. The crowd have been shouting, 'Have pity on your son'. She replies that God will look after him—ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφ' ὃ πάρεμι. She then proceeds to cast off her outer garment and clasp

the stake. Harnack translates 'Wherefore am I here?', but, apart from the grammatical difficulty, the rendering 'I (emphatic, contrasted with my son) must do that for which I am here' makes much better sense: the context requires action and is followed by action. Here, as in St Matthew, there is a variant ἐφ' ᾧ, but this is of no importance, ἐπί with the dat. often signifies purpose, though not so often as ἐπί with the acc.

When my book was going through the press a reader mentioned, in a note on this passage, that he had seen in a private collection a beaker of the first century with the inscription ΕΥΦΡΑΙΝΟΥ ΕΦ Ο ΠΑΡΕΙ (I asked for further information, but was told that the owner did not wish its whereabouts to be known). He translated 'Enjoy yourself[, which is] what you are here for'; but the sense may just as well be 'Enjoy yourself. Do that for which you are here' (if we had not the other examples to compare it with, we might translate 'Enjoy yourself on that for which you are here'). The evidence, very strong otherwise, for the sentence in St Matthew being elliptical and not interrogative becomes in the light of these additional passages conclusive. Moreover thus understood this sentence has a remarkable congruence with that other in St John (xiii 27) 'That thou doest, do quickly'.

One other point. The elliptical character of the phrase, its vagueness, and its occurrence in the same form in three entirely different contexts suggests that it is a colloquialism. The nearest illustration in English that I can think of is 'What you will', but numerous other instances similar in their vagueness and universality of application will occur to any one ('your turn', 'I am up against it', etc.). If so, it may be compared with other expressions of our Lord, 'What have I to do with thee?' (St John ii 4), 'Thou sayest' (St Luke xxiii 3), and His use of homely proverbs, 'Physician, heal thyself', 'the camel and the needle's eye'. The retention of this vivid Greek phrase by St Matthew alone would bear on the question of the relative authority of that Gospel, and even of the language in which it was originally written. If my conjecture is right, there ought to be other examples of this use, which I hope other correspondents may be able to supply.

E. C. E. OWEN.

## PROPHECY AND THE SABBATH.

(A note on the teaching of Jeremiah.)

THE Sabbath is mentioned only once in the book of Jeremiah, but the passage is a striking one (Jer. xvii 19-27). In the dark days at the end of the seventh century B.C. the Prophet is represented as promising victory to kings and prosperity to Jerusalem on the one condition that