

That *אָנָּן* can be used, with accusative, for 'answer for,' as well as for 'answer,' is sufficiently shown by Gn 30<sup>33</sup> and by other passages.

E. E. KELLETT.

London.

---

### The Position of the Temple Cleansing in the Fourth Gospel.

THE Rev. Greville P. Lewis has done students of the Fourth Gospel a great service by developing in the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES an amended form of the theory which he propounded when a member of the Birmingham New Testament Seminar, and which he kindly allowed me to summarize in *The Fourth Gospel on Recent Criticism and Interpretation*. The theory frankly abandons the objective test of numerical calculation which gave to Spitta's earlier theory its chief attraction. It was this test which gave feasibility to the theories of those who followed in Spitta's steps, Mr. Warburton Lewis and Mr. J. M. Thompson, Dr. Bernard and Dr. Macgregor.

I must not take up space in these columns discussing ground which I have tried to cover in the book to which Mr. Lewis makes such kind reference, but on one point I may perhaps be allowed to write a few lines, the more so because your generous reviewer of that book raised the same issue. The reviewer wrote (xliii. p. 64): 'It may be doubted, in passing, whether the preference for the Johannine, instead of the Marcan, dating of the cleansing of the Temple is really justifiable.' To those of us who were brought up to think of the Marcan order as the one sure thing in Gospel chronology, it is not easy to think of the incident of the Temple cleansing as having any other place than during the last week of our Lord's life. In spite of the efforts of the *Formgeschichtler*, I still think that Mark preserves in rough outline the course of the ministry of Jesus in Galilee. But Mark records no visit of Jesus to Jerusalem until the last week. He has, therefore, no other place in which to anchor any floating traditions of conflicts between Jesus and the authorities at Jerusalem. In the second place, the old assumption that John is here opposed to the Synoptics as a whole has been undermined. In his Passion narrative, Luke relies upon a peculiar source. This did not contain the story of the Cleansing of the Temple, for here we find what is obviously an insertion from Mark in the narrative of Proto-Luke. This fact was brought out clearly

by Dr. Vincent Taylor in *Behind the Third Gospel* (pp. 95 f.). He went so far as to say then, 'On its merits, the earlier Johannine date for this incident is preferable, but the additional evidence afforded by the silence of Proto-Luke and by the Third Gospel itself is decisive' (*ibid.*, 238).

Now, in his latest book, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (p. 179 n.), Dr. Taylor approaches the question again, though from a different angle. Considering the matter in the light of *Formgeschichte* he writes: 'Having always preferred the Johannine date of the Cleansing, I am naturally interested in the possibility that here we may have a suggestion of the way in which Mark comes to associate this event with the Last Week.' It seems to me that Mr. Lewis must deal with these considerations before determining that the case for the rejection of the Johannine position of this incident is very strong. Mr. Lewis asks, 'Could Jesus, as a comparatively unknown provincial, have thus routed the powerful vested interests of the Temple?' Johannes Weiss, even when discussing this story in its Marcan setting, says that success was achieved only by the personality of Jesus, whose clear consciousness of right, expressing itself with irresistible power of will and prophetic zeal, triumphed over the bad conscience and hesitation of the traffickers, especially when the crowd shouted its approval of the reformer who had so unexpectedly appeared in their midst' (*Die Schriften des N.T.*, ed. 3, i. 179). Mr. Lewis's other difficulties are met by Johannes Weiss elsewhere, when he urges (a) that our Lord's zeal for the outward and ceremonial purity of the Temple is more in keeping with the opening of His ministry than at the close, after so much stress had been laid upon the supreme importance of the inwardness of true religion, and (b) His action would be more likely to succeed at a time when the hostility of the authorities had not yet been focused upon Him. There is yet one further point. Mr. Lewis asks with incredulity if the accusers of Jesus were quoting against Him (Mk 14<sup>58</sup>), a two-year-old saying (Jn 2<sup>19</sup>). Yes, for if it had been spoken but a few days before when keen-witted and bitterly hostile agents were hanging upon His lips for evidence to quote against Him, it would not have taken so long to secure this saying as condemnatory self-witness. Perhaps we may even say that its misquotation is not due to malice altogether, but to vague and inaccurate remembrance of a saying half-forgotten by now.

I am grateful to Mr. Greville Lewis both for his brilliant article, and also for the opportunity it gives me to plead again that this chronological question

should be carefully studied once more without prejudice on either side.

Birmingham.

W. F. HOWARD.

### A Note on the Work of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 'Ad Baptizandos.'

AFTER the sixth volume of my *Woodbrooke Studies*, containing the second part of the work of Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Ad Baptizandos*, had passed through the press—a book which exhibits one of the most important texts in the domain of Christian theology and Church history—I found two more quotations from it that had escaped my notice when I wrote the prefatory note to the volume. These quotations are very important, as they emanate from early Fathers, and it would be useful to draw the attention of scholars to them. One of them is by Facundus, an admirer of Theodore, and the other is by Cyril of Alexandria, a Father whose views on the Incarnation were not always in harmony with those of Theodore.

In perusing the second volume of the late Dr. Swete, *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Comment*, 1882, I found on p. 332 the following quotation of Theodore's book *Ad Baptizandos*, in the works of Facundus :

[Fac. iii. 2 : 'tertio decimo libro codicis quem Mysticum appellavit.' Hesychius (*ap. Act. Conc. CP. ii. v.*): 'Mysticos Sermones.' Ebedjesu.]

'Book XIII.

Angelus diaboli est Samosatenus Paulus, qui purum hominem dicere praesumpsit dominum Iesum Christum, et negavit existentiam diuinitatis Unigeniti, quae est ante saecula.'

This quotation is found in the second part of Theodore's work *Ad Baptizandos*, as follows<sup>1</sup> :

'An angel of Satan is Paul of Samosata, who asserted that Christ our Lord was a simple man, and denied (the existence) before the worlds of the person of the Divinity of the Only Begotten.'

This quotation proves that the division of the

<sup>1</sup> *Woodbrooke Studies*, vi. 40.

work of Theodore, in the manuscript of my collection, into two different books is not correct, because if we count the ten chapters of the first part of the work, dealing with the Commentary on the Nicene Creed, and the first three chapters of the second part, which deals with the Lord's Prayer and the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, we shall have thirteen chapters, which corresponds exactly with the thirteen chapters of Theodore's work as counted by Facundus. Theodore's work in the Greek manuscript lying before Facundus was, therefore, one continuous text, divided into sixteen chapters, ten of which belong to the part dealing with the Nicene Creed, and six to the second part, which in my Syriac manuscript deals with the Lord's Prayer and the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist.

Cyril of Alexandria's quotation is on pp. 326-327 of Swete's work :

[*Act. Conc. CP. ii. v.* ('Cyrillus. certe et in allocutionibus quas fecit ad baptizandos iterum dixit idem Theodorus.')] ]

'Hoc uero non ex nobis ipsis inuenimus testimonium, sed ex diuina edocti sumus scriptura ; quoniam et beatus Paulus ita dicit ; *ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus* ; non quod ex Iudaeis et secundum carnem est, qui super omnia Deus est, sed hoc quidem ad significandam humanam naturam dixit, quam ab Israelitico genere esse sciebat ; illud autem ad ostendendam diuinam naturam, quam supra omnia et omnibus dominantem sciebat.'

This quotation is found in the first part of Theodore's work as follows<sup>2</sup> :

'They did not make use of these words out of their own heads, but they took them from the teaching of Holy Writ. The blessed Paul said : "Of whom Christ is the flesh, who is God over all," not that He is God by nature from the fact that He is of the House of David in the flesh, but he said "in the flesh" in order to indicate the human nature that was assumed. He said "God over all" in order to indicate the Divine nature which is higher than all, and which is the Lord.'

A. MINGANA.

*Selly Oak.*

<sup>2</sup> *Woodbrooke Studies*, v. 37.