

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:



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



<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:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

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

to St Columban personally? The same inscription is, so far as I recollect, universal in all Bobbio MSS: and it means no more than that the book belonged to the monastery of St Columban at Bobbio.

C. H. TURNER.

MARK i 1 AND THE REVISERS.

THROUGH a correspondence which I have had lately with the Editorial Superintendent of the British and Foreign Bible Society about the true reading in Mark i 1, my attention has been called to the fact that both *Palmer* and *Scrivener* give Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ as the reading underlying the Text of the Revisers. I likewise did so on the margin of the Greek Testament, which I prepared for the Bible Society:

‘SR^t Xp. υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ.’

But surely this is one of the cases of injustice done to the Revisers, of which I spoke in this JOURNAL, April 1904, p. 461. Certainly, the Revisers did not intend to support the latest of three variants here in question, that which is called ‘Syrian’ by Westcott-Hort, but the other, which these editors style ‘pre-Syrian’, attested by the MSS N^a BDL, the reading υἱοῦ Θεοῦ without article. Of course the difference is not one of sense, but of principle. It needs to be remembered that the editions of Palmer and Scrivener frequently do not mention readings, which are much better attested than those of Stephanus, and can just as well claim to correspond to the Revised Version.

I cannot enter here into the discussion of the question, which is the true reading in this passage, (1) Gospel, alone, with no genitive, or (2) Gospel of Jesus (28*), or (3) Gospel of Jesus Christ (N^a 28* 255*), or (4) Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God (without article); the last reading, with article, does not come into competition. But I may point out that the omission is now also attested by an Armenian MS: see Plate viii in the *Atlas zum Katalog der armenischen Handschriften* of the University of Tübingen, 1907. In this MS, written in the year 1113, after a copy of the year 893, ‘the Son of God’ is omitted by the first hand, and supplied by a later hand on the margin. Whether this is the case also in other MSS of the Armenian Version, I do not know. At all events Dean Burgon’s statement (*The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* p. 286), ‘The clause is found in all the Versions’, needs now a little limitation; and it seems worth while to point out, that while the two readings υἱοῦ Θεοῦ and υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ make no difference of sense and have been treated almost generally as one, Westcott-Hort shewed their usual accuracy on this point also, clearly distinguishing between the two, styling the one pre-Syrian, the other Syrian.

EB. NESTLE.