

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

# The Journal of Theological Studies

OCTOBER, 1915

## NOTES AND STUDIES

### W AND Θ: STUDIES IN THE WESTERN TEXT OF ST MARK.

SINCE the discovery of the Sinai Palimpsest in 1892 the two Greek codices of the Gospels here called W and Θ are undoubtedly the most important accessions to our stock of information about the text. The two MSS are conveniently discussed together, because they have remarkable affinities with each other and with what used to be called 'Western' authorities, particularly in St Mark's Gospel.

#### W.

W is the Washington MS, bought in Egypt by Mr C. L. Freer in 1906. It has been designated W by Gregory and ε 014 by von Soden. A complete collation, with full Introduction, has been published by Henry A. Sanders, Professor of Latin in the University of Michigan (New York, 1912), and the whole text has also been published by him in facsimile.

W is a well-preserved uncial codex of the fourth or fifth century, containing the Greek text of the Four Gospels in the 'Western' order (Matt. John Lk. Mk.). It not only has the 'Longer Conclusion' to St Mark's Gospel (xvi 9-20), but is remarkable for containing a longer form of xvi 14, otherwise only known, and that in part, from a quotation by St Jerome. This additional passage is what is now often called 'the Freer Logion'.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Sanders's straightforward and modest Introduction makes the general character of the text of W clear. The greater part, including all Matthew and the latter two-thirds of Luke, agrees in the main with the Constantinopolitan text (v. Soden's *K*), and there seems also to be a large *K*-element in John. But Lk. i-viii 12 goes generally with the text now called Hesychian (v. Soden's *H*, i. e. Hort's 'Neutral' or 'Alexandrian'), while Mk. i-v 30 has a large 'Western' element, i. e. it has many agreements with the Old Latin and the 'Old Syriac and with Codex Bezae (D). The rest of Mk. has many *K*-readings, but a large peculiar element remains.

It is the text of Mark in W that challenges particular and detailed

<sup>1</sup> On this, see Dr Swete's study of it called *Zwei neue Evangelienfragmente* (Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte* 31).

attention, because the problems raised are both interesting in themselves and also have not yet received satisfactory solution. The *K*-text was dominant at Constantinople, certainly from A. D. 400, perhaps earlier; it is always associated with Byzantine supremacy, and consequently may have influenced any Greek text produced within the Empire. The *H*-text belongs especially to Egypt; it has almost certainly some connexion with the Biblical labours of Origen, whose works are the earliest witness to it. It creates no surprise to find *H*-elements and *K*-elements in a Greek MS written in Egypt about A. D. 400. What needs investigation in *W* is the 'Western' element, i. e. that represented strongly in the Old Latin, the Old Syriac, and a group of Greek MSS, of which *D* is the oldest and the most famous.

Ⓞ.

Ⓞ is the Koridethi Gospel-book, called Ⓞ 038 by Gregory, and ε 050 by v. Soden. It has been admirably edited by G. Beermann and C. R. Gregory (Leipzig, 1913), where the strange story of its discovery in the wilds of the Caucasus may be read in full. The main thing is that, like Codex 565 (Tischendorf's 2<sup>no</sup>, v. Soden's ε 93), it is a survival from the region round about Trebizond. As we shall see, it has some most noteworthy points of connexion with 565, but in some respects it is a very different MS. Palaeographically Ⓞ and 565 are as different as two Greek codices can be. 565 is written with gold ink on purple vellum in the earliest and most beautiful minuscule hand, easy for the native Greek to read, though I venture to think it would be puzzling for a foreigner. The rules of spelling and of writing are observed quite as much as in any Christian MS of its date (ninth century). There are critical and harmonistic notes in silver uncials written in the margin, which speak of various readings in 'ancient' MSS: altogether it is a scholarly as well as an artistic production. Ⓞ, on the other hand, is the handiwork of illiterate men, to whom Greek and the rules of writing Greek were equally unfamiliar.<sup>1</sup> It is almost impossible to believe that Ⓞ was ever *read*, either aloud or privately, by any human being.<sup>2</sup> I do not think it is older than the end of the ninth century, for the rules of palaeography tell us nothing about sheer barbarian work. I have the impression that Ⓞ is a mere copy of an older Greek MS, the work of a scribe whose acquaintance with Greek was limited to the alphabet, if indeed he even knew the sounds of the letters he was copying.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> One example will suffice. Mk. xii 41\* runs in Ⓞ thus: Κα εστωσοῑσ̄ | κατε-  
ναντιτ | ουγαζοφυλ | ακιου· εθεω | ρειπωσ̄ ὁ ὄχλ | οσβαλλιτον | χαλκονειστ | ογαζοφυλα |  
κιον :|.

<sup>2</sup> There are Lection marks (ἀρχ. and τελ.) *prima manu*, no doubt copied mechanically from the exemplar.

<sup>3</sup> In the Rylands Library at Manchester may be seen a Syriac MS of Isaiah, the work of a Chinese copyist who evidently could not read what he was copying.

The importance of W and © does not depend upon their age, because in any case the readings which excite our interest were antiquated long before the MSS were written. Moreover the irregular distribution of these readings, unevenly distributed even over the Gospel of Mark, is in itself a proof that we are dealing with accidental survivals, rather than with a living local recension. Neither of the Greek codices which we are particularly considering seems ever to have been *used*. W has no liturgical marks or important corrections, such as are found in N, C, D<sub>2</sub>, &c. © seems to have been a sort of holy object from the beginning, intended perhaps, like the Book of Deer, for the registration of oaths and wills rather than for liturgical purposes, while 565 appears to have been an *evangeliarium de luxe* for an Empress,<sup>1</sup>—possibly it was a copy of some Book of the Gospels kept at a particular shrine. The three MSS have further this in common, that they come to us from the very frontiers of the Byzantine Empire, if not from outside; nearer Constantinople their eccentricities might have been discovered and smoothed away.

*On irregular 'mixture' in MSS.*

A few words of general Introduction may not be out of place. The Four Gospels in our MSS are found written together in a single volume, and this 'four-fold Canon' is established by Church authority. Speaking generally, therefore, the Four Gospels in any locality or community have had the same textual history. The Latin Vulgate (A. D. 384), the Peshitta (after 411), the Harclean (616), all have approximately the same textual character throughout the Gospels. The chief exception to this rule is connected with the unwritten history of the earliest Versions. It is likely enough that one Gospel may have been translated before the others, St Matthew coming (as it seems) first, both in Latin and in Syriac; but the evidence is slight and inconclusive. What is certain, however, is that there is more variation in our 'Old-Latin' MSS of Mark than in the other Gospels: here as elsewhere the African type (*k, e, Cyprian*) stands apart from the rest, but in addition there are two distinct types of European text, best represented by *a* and *b* respectively. That any special attention was paid to the text of St Mark in the fourth century is improbable: what is most likely is that a revision of the other Gospels was made first for liturgical reasons, while that for Mark was made afterwards for completeness, and St Mark being then (as now) less used, both in public and in private, there was less tendency towards uniformity of text and the restriction of alterations.

At a still later period we have the influence of the Vulgate. From the time of Gregory the Great the Vulgate was practically everywhere

<sup>1</sup> Theodora II, mother of Michael III (842-857), herself a native of Paphlagonia.

the dominant text in the Latin Church: after that all corrections or alterations in Latin MSS were made from the Vulgate. Naturally such corrections to a standard text are far from complete, and this in two ways: the corrector may stop short without going through the Gospel, from want either of time or of industry; this results in whole portions of text escaping correction. Or he may not do his work thoroughly; this results in a few ancient readings occurring here and there in an otherwise conventional text. Or again he may make just a few corrections here and there, whereby we find a few Vulgate readings in an otherwise pure Old-Latin context. Examples of all of these may be found in *c*, the twelfth-century Cod. Colbertinus from the south-west of France. Apparently it was made up from a European text of Matthew and John, and an African text of Luke and Mark; but this African text had been usually corrected, in the exemplar from which *c* was copied, to agree with the ordinary mediaeval Vulgate. In Lk. xxii-xxiv the corrector had confined himself to adding a few striking passages which were absent from the genuine African text. A good many African readings also survive in Mark.

For practical purposes, therefore, the value of *c* as an independent witness is confined to those passages where it differs from the Vulgate.

I have set down the facts about *a* and *c*, familiar as they are to textual critics, partly because I shall be quoting some of their readings later on, but partly because I am sure that we must regard *W* and *Θ* in much the same way. What corresponds to the Latin Vulgate in the case of *c* is the Constantinopolitan Vulgate, in other words *v*. Soden's *K* or Hort's Antiochian text. It is not a matter of undervaluing the Constantinopolitan text in itself, or of speculating about its genesis and ancestry. What is certain is that a text, akin in all essentials to the *Textus Receptus* and the early editions of the New Testament in Greek, was dominant in the Byzantine Empire from about A. D. 400 onwards, as is proved by the Gospel quotations of St Chrysostom and later Greek Fathers. When, therefore, we find a MS of St Mark like *W* in which the first few chapters differ widely from this dominant text, while the later chapters mainly agree with this text, *though containing many noteworthy readings of the same character as those in the earlier chapters*, it is reasonable to suppose that these later chapters have been corrected, though imperfectly corrected, to the dominant text. And further, for the purpose of reconstructing and judging the value of the basal text of *W* it is reasonable generally to exclude those readings which agree with the dominant ordinary text. It is just as if we were dealing with codices of which only fragments are extant.

*Intentional and unintentional change.*

When Dr Hort characterized the Western readings he started by mentioning 'a love of paraphrase', the famous Western additions coming afterwards for consideration (Intro. § 173). This was how the matter appeared to a trained student of the text; to tyros and amateurs it is generally the other way, and the 'Interpolations' are thought of in the first place. I have no doubt that Hort was right. The 'Interpolations' cannot satisfactorily be judged apart from the other features of the Western texts. In St Mark, especially, scribes seem in early times to have felt themselves authorized to take very great liberties.

The last sentence is somewhat controversial. It implies a view of the transmitted variants in our Greek MSS and early versions that is tacitly excluded by a vigorous school of textual critics, to which I fancy that Professor Sanders, the editor of W, himself belongs. We are faced here by a question of principle and method, that needs clear expression at the beginning of our investigation. According to the view that I am opposing, early Christian scribes made a *minimum* of intentional changes in the text of the Gospels, including St Mark. The actually transmitted variants are as far as possible to be derived from inadequate translations in the case of Latin or Syriac texts, and from inadequate retranlations in the case of Greek MSS. The Golden Rule is supposed to be: 'Accept that explanation of any given variant which involves the least amount of verbal change.' For instance, in Mk. iv 32 W has *αὔξει* (of the mustard-seed), where the other Greek MSS have *ἀναβαίνει*. The Latin Vulgate has *ascendit*, but some Old-Latin texts (*ber*) have *crescit*. Here, therefore, W and lat.vt go together, and Prof. Sanders (p. 68) reckons it as a clear case of Latin influence on W. Apparently the argument runs thus: *crescit* originated as a sense-translation of *ἀναβαίνει*, which is an odd word to use of plants; *αὔξει* is a literal retranlation of *crescit*, foisted into an ancestor of W, when the Greek text of W formed one side of a bilingual MS. But this explanation is nothing but a guess: it is a mere hypothesis that a bilingual Greco-Latin MS was one of the ancestors of W. It remains equally possible that the transcriber of an ancestor of W thought *ἀναβαίνει* an awkward word in the context and so intentionally substituted *αὔξει* for it. Such a transcriber could have had very little respect for the transmitted text, but I venture to think that most of the variants in the Greek text of Mark originated in this bold type of alteration.

One further example may be given here, the main object of which is to shew that the variants recorded in the full collation of W must

have been to a certain extent due to intentional change rather than palaeographical or linguistic error. In Mk. iii 34, when our Lord said, 'Behold my mother and my brethren!' He looked round those sitting about Him in a circle as He spoke (*περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους λέγει*). At least, this is the text given in  $\aleph$  B C L  $\Delta$ , and it seems in accordance with St Mark's redundant and careless, yet picturesque, style. It is true that *περὶ αὐτόν* and *κύκλῳ* mean much the same thing: perhaps it was for that reason that the 'received text' (headed by A) puts *κύκλῳ* after *περιβλεψάμενος*. But redundant as the text is, it did not (in the opinion of some early Christians) tell us enough, for how do we know that these hearers of the word were worthy? Following the lead of Matthew, therefore, we find *μαθητᾶς* prefixed to *καθημένους* in 565 700 and the Ferrar Group (13&c). D omits *περὶ αὐτόν*, and there are other variants, all of which may be represented as follows:—

*καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους λέγει*

*κύκλῳ*] *hoc loco*  $\aleph$ BCLA . . . *post τοὺς* D 1&c 13&c 28 700 . . . *post περιβλ.*  $\zeta$  A *rell* (*incl.* W) | *περι αὐτον*] *om.* D | *τοὺς περι αὐτον*] *αὐτου* W | *καθημενος*] *ρν. μαθητας*  $\Theta$  13&c 565 700 sah arm . . . + *τοὺς μαθητας* W | *λεγει*] *ειπεν* DG $\Theta$  13&c 28 700 *a c ff.*

For *τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν καθημένους* the Syriac (*S-vg*) has 'those sitting by Him', the Latins have

*eos* (*om. d q*) *qui in circuitu eius* (*om. b*) *sedebant* *vg b d f f f q.*  
*qui circa eum sedebant a.*  
*eos qui circum sedebant e.*

Truly a welter of disagreement! And W has actually added to the number of 'various readings'. I quote them here at the outset for a special purpose; not to discuss their origin, e.g. whether *μαθητᾶς* comes directly from Matt. xii 49, or through the expression of the word

Tatian's Diatessaron, nor even to enquire whether *circum* in *e* corresponds to *κύκλῳ* or to *περὶ* [*αὐτόν*]. What I want to point out is (1) that it is not likely that W alone has preserved the original by mere fidelity, and (2) that nevertheless the reading of W makes good grammar and sense. It reads:

*καὶ περιβλεψάμενος κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ καθημένους τοὺς μαθητᾶς λέγει*

Now whatever be the original reading of the passage, the reading of W is too neat to be the result of slavish and anxious equating of two (or more) texts, whether they formed opposite sides of a bilingual codex or belonged to different documents. It seems to me to be the work of a stylist, who considered he had the right to be dissatisfied with the text of St Mark's Gospel as he found it, and also the authority to rewrite it in accordance with his own ideas. The difference here between the

text of W and the text approved by Westcott and Hort and by v. Soden is like the difference that often exists between a schoolboy's exercise and the schoolmaster's suggested correction. The changes are not palaeographical at all. They are not accidental, but deliberate.

Naturally it is not to be supposed that the transcriber of Codex W was this bold innovator. W is a beautifully written volume, with very few corrections. It is probably a faithful copy of its immediate exemplar. And again, it is probable that the variations of W from the original text, in any single passage, may belong to more than one stage of alteration. It may very well be that there was a damaged or faded exemplar at one stage, that this exemplar was badly and unintelligently copied, and that the resulting text really needed correction. What I doubt is that such correction was always made by means of another roll or codex: I think there were early Christians who thought themselves quite capable of making such corrections by mere instinct, i. e. conjecture, and by their general memory of what the text ought to be. Hence we often find a tendency to harmonization with parallel narratives, rather than accurate assimilation to another Gospel.

‘*Harmonization*’ and ‘*Synoptic criticism*’.

It is important also to consider at the outset what are the general principles which should guide our judgement in dealing with ‘harmonistic’ readings, because different factors in the problem might at first sight seem to point to opposite conclusions. On the one hand it is obvious that there must have been at all times a tendency in Christian scribes to harmonize parallel passages. *Magnus siquidem hic in nostris codicibus error inolevit, dum quod in eadem re alius euangelista plus dixit, in alio quia minus putauerint addiderunt; uel dum eundem sensum alius aliter expressit, ille qui unum e quattuor primum legerat ad eius exemplum ceteros quoque aestimauerit emendandos. Vnde accidit ut apud nos mixta sint omnia, et in Marco plura Lucae atque Matthæi . . . inueniantur.* The well-known words of St Jerome are perfectly true of all Western texts, and he deserves great praise for the carefulness with which he eliminated this source of inaccuracy. In our days, however, St Jerome’s judgement as to the cause of harmonistic readings has been challenged, and many of them have been supposed to be due to one definite cause, viz. the influence of Tatian’s *Diatessaron*. Those who use v. Soden’s apparatus are aware, by the constantly recurring symbol T, how frequently this is thought to be the case.

Here I would plead for a very definite suspension of judgement. That the influence of Tatian’s *Diatessaron* upon early Syriac texts was considerable no one would doubt, but the work seems to have been almost unknown in the West till Victor of Capua rediscovered a text of



it—a text which was very possibly Greek and not Latin at all. There are two special reasons why we should suspend judgement. In the first place, it is only likely that any plausible assimilation of one text of the Gospel to its parallel in another should agree with the transmitted text of Tatian, which professes to be a harmony of the text. But besides this, it should be remembered that we are not well acquainted with the actual text of Tatian's Harmony. The Arabic Diatessaron is a late recension in which the wording has been almost wholly assimilated to the renderings of the Syriac Vulgate (i. e. the Peshitta). In doing this the reviser identified the various phrases as coming from Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John, and labelled them as such by critical marks. This was certainly not the method of Tatian, whose proceedings were far more drastic. It will suffice here to refer to Dom Connolly's articles upon the subject in this JOURNAL, particularly to his careful summing-up in vol. xii p. 273.

The results of Synoptic criticism have seemed to some scholars to suggest conclusions opposite to those suggested by St Jerome. From considerations quite independent of textual change, such as the order of the incidents and the general contents of the several Gospels, it has been practically established that Mark is the source of Matthew and of Luke in those narratives where all three Gospels run parallel. One of the reasons which have led to this conclusion, though not the only one, is the actual amount of verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark, Luke and Mark, and all three together, coupled with the extremely small and unimportant verbal agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. It has been pointed out that the harmonization of two narratives originally expressed in different words is not the only form of textual corruption. It might happen that scribes had introduced differences where there had been original agreement; if Mark be the source of Matthew and Luke, why resort to the hypothesis of an *Ur-Marcus* to explain the residual agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark? Is it not possible that in some of these cases it is merely the existing texts of the Gospels that are at fault?

It is therefore not enough to suggest harmonization as an operating cause in all variants which resemble the wording in parallel passages; it becomes necessary to consider in what circumstances the agreement of, say, Mark with Matthew may be considered more primitive than the difference of Mark from Matthew.

A couple of instances of the reverse case will explain best what is meant. Matt. xvi 16, 20 is parallel to Mk. viii 29, 30. But in Matthew, between vv. 16 and 20 we find the blessing on 'Simon bar-Jona' and the passage about Peter and the Rock (vv. 17-19). This is explained by supposing that our First Evangelist here incorporated a traditional

saying of Christ to Peter into the Marcan narrative. Similarly, Matt. xx 28 is parallel to Mk. x 45. But D and many Western texts add to Matt. xx 28 a long passage, roughly corresponding to Lk. xiv 7-10. Here, however, it is generally agreed that the addition is not due to the Evangelist but to a later editor or scribe. The same is also asserted by most critics about the addition concerning the Face of the Sky, Matt. xvi 2, 3, which has no parallel in Mk. viii 12; and also about the addition concerning the piercing by a spear in Matt. xxvii 49, which roughly corresponds to John xix 34 but has no parallel in Mk. xv 36. It is evident that two opposing canons of genuineness are here tacitly employed. Again, in the story of the Rich Young Man, our Lord says 'Why callest thou me Good?' according to Mark and Luke and the inferior MSS of Matthew, while the best MSS of Matthew have 'Why askest thou Me about what is Good?' This is explained as an alteration of the story by the Evangelist, who was unwilling to seem to make Jesus disclaim the epithet of Good, while the reading of the inferior MSS of Matthew is regarded as mere harmonization to the other Gospels.

These things raise rather thorny questions, which are not entirely answered by labelling the additions to Matt. xvi 2 and xx 28 'Western Interpolations', and calling the shorter text in Matt. xxvii 49 a 'Western Non-Interpolation'. I do not propose to answer them here, but I bring them up now in order to point to one characteristic these readings have in common, in which they might conceivably differ from similar readings in Mark.

The common characteristic they have is that the aberrant or longer reading is in all cases secondary and inferior from the strictly historical point of view. Take the case of Matt. xvi 2, 3. The narrative of Matthew is here, as we believe, based on Mark. Who can doubt that *on that occasion* Jesus brought forward no sign, either by word or deed? The Saying about the Face of the Sky may be a true reminiscence of words uttered by Jesus, but if so it belongs to another time and place. The same is true of the other examples, while most likely the alteration in the story of the Rich Young Man, while genuine as part of the text of Matthew, is simply unhistorical regarded as a report of the incident.

Speaking generally, where Matthew and Mark are telling the same story the differences of Matthew from Mark represent at best additions from some other document, probably belonging to some other event, if genuine in any sense; and at the worst represent inferior paraphrases by the later narrator. But we cannot say the same of the differences of Mark from Matthew, of the source from the copy. Who can doubt for instance that the notice of the anger of Jesus (Mk. iii 5), of the boat

prepared for Him for privacy (iii 11), of the final secret journey through Galilee (ix 30), of the uneventful inspection of the Temple immediately after the Entry (xi 11), although they are absent from Luke and Matthew, are fragments of real historical reminiscence? It is needless to give more examples. In a word, the true text of Mark is historically superior to the corresponding sections of Matthew and Luke, and its differences from them may include some of the most historically valuable parts of the narrative.

All this is outside the proper province of textual criticism, and the conclusions arrived at have been reached by considerations independent of the transmitted various readings. But if the argument be sound it must to some extent influence our judgement upon some of the readings. The genuine text of Mark will be historically superior to the altered text: if the Western text (or texts) preserve original elements, Western readings ought with corresponding frequency to be historically superior to the rival readings.

It is one of the chief objects of this Paper to point out that this is not the case, at least except very occasionally, and to consider what bearing this fact has upon our reconstruction of the history of the text of the Gospels in the Church.

*Some characteristic 'Western' readings.*

I begin with a number of readings which have this in common, that the 'Neutral' text (*H*), generally supported by the 'Constantinopolitan' text (*K*), is clearly more primitive than the 'Western' text or texts.

(1) Mk. iii 21 ff.

<sup>21</sup> καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν, ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη. <sup>22</sup> καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον ὅτι Βεελζεβούλ ἔχει κτλ. . . . <sup>31</sup> καὶ ἔρχονται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν. . . .

So  $\zeta$  (i. e. the *Textus Receptus*) and Westcott and Hort, except that W.-H. have Βεελζεβούλ with B, and in  $\nu$ . 31  $\zeta$  has ἔρχονται οὖν οἱ ἀδ. καὶ ἡ μήτηρ. αὐ., and φωνοῦντες for καλοῦντες.

The variants of W in  $\nu$ . 21 and 22 are περι for οἱ παρ | + οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ after αὐτου | ἔλεγον | ἐξηρηνηται αὐτου for ἐξέστη | 22. omit οἱ γραμματεῖς | + γραμματισ (sic) after καταβαντες.

When these substitutions are made we get—

'And the scribes and the rest hearing about Him went out to lay hold of Him, for they said "They have attached themselves to Him", and the scribes coming down from Jerusalem said "He has Beelzebul".'

There can surely be no doubt that the texts of  $\aleph$  B and  $\zeta$  are here primary and that of W secondary. οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ in  $\nu$ . 21 are no doubt some of the family of Jesus; it is only our familiarity with the story that

prevents us from being amazed that it has retained a place in the official documents of the Christian Church. Our Lord's family think He has lost His senses, and they stand outside the house where He is, and send for Him (*v.* 31). No wonder, in the circumstances, that He ignores them (*v.* 33). Here surely, if anywhere in the Gospels, we are listening to the unaltered reminiscences of an eye-witness.

I lay emphasis upon the historical trustworthiness of this account in the genuine text of Mark, in order to draw attention to the general parallel between the Western paraphrase and the corresponding narratives in Matthew and Luke. Neither in Matthew nor in Luke is there any hint that Jesus's family thought He had lost His senses, and in Matt. xii 46, Lk. viii 19, we are only told that they came to Him (Lk.), seeking to speak to Him (Matt.). The peremptory summons of Mk. iii 31 is thereby softened, but the story is spoilt, for no reason is assigned why Jesus should so harshly disclaim His own kith and kin. It is only by reading the passages in Matthew and Luke in the light of Mk. iii 21, 31 ff, i. e. in their true historical setting, that the Saying of Jesus becomes comprehensible.

The general effect of the text of W is similar to that of Matt. xii 22-35. It is the crowds who are amazed (*ἐξίσταντο*) at the casting out of demons, so that the Pharisees resort to the explanation that Jesus works by Beelzebul; and then at the end of His sayings in answer to this charge comes His apparently unmotivated refusal to acknowledge His relations.

Very well, then, W has an inferior text. Certainly that is so: but I wish further to point out (i) that it does not stand alone, and (ii) that neither W nor its allies are directly harmonized to the other Gospels. There are in this verse really two various readings, as is shewn by the groups into which the attesting authorities fall, of which one reading relates to the *persons* who wish to apprehend Jesus, while the other relates to the *charge* they make against Him. As for the persons, *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ* is changed into *περὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ* in DW *ab(c)*<sup>1</sup> *effgirfq* and the Gothic, i. e. the whole phalanx of pre-Vulgate Latin texts: when St Jerome in the Vulgate translated *ἐξέστη* by *in furorem uersus est* it must have been the first time (with one exception, to be noticed later) that the Latin-speaking Church had ever heard that our Lord's relations had gone out to apprehend Him because they thought He was beside Himself. For the charge, we find wide diversity. (1) D\*<sup>o</sup> 13&c 565 read *ἐξέστανται* for *ἐξέστη*: this is simply perf. for aorist, and does not change the sense. (2) W has *ἐξήρτηνται αὐτοῦ*, i. e. 'they (the crowds) have attached themselves to Him': this bold alteration is

<sup>1</sup> *c* has 'scribes and Pharisees'.

not found elsewhere, nor has it any connexion with the parallel narratives in the other Gospels. (3) The 'European Latin' (*abdfiq*) has *essentiat eos*. It seems to be agreed that this means *attonitos facit populos* (to use Wordsworth and White's dignified language), but I cannot find that the word *essentiare* (*exentiare*) occurs elsewhere. (4) The 'African' Latin (*ce*) simply leaves out the latter half of *v. 21* and the beginning of *v. 22*: we cannot tell whether this is mere haplography or a deliberate omission of a difficulty.<sup>1</sup> (5) D\* has *ἐξεσται αὐτοῦ*, which a later hand has corrected into *ἐξέσται αὐτοῦ*: I cannot translate either reading, as both *ἐξεσται* and *ἐξέσται* must be intransitive. That D<sup>gr</sup> here has been corrected to agree more or less with the Latin is suggested by the fact that for *ἀκούσαντες* at the beginning of *v. 21* it reads *ὄτε ἤκουσαν*. W, on the other hand, shews no sign of Latin influence, for *essentiat eos* and *ἐξήρτηται αὐτοῦ* cannot be equated.

I venture to think we must give the following account of the textual changes; the ordinary text (supported by *ς*, *NB*, and the Syriac) is original, the sense being so 'offensive to pious ears' that it was modified independently by Matthew and by Luke; a very early Greek text, earlier than the earliest Latin version, changed *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ* (i. e. our Lord's family) into *περὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ* (i. e. certain opponents of Jesus hearing about Him); further, the verb *ἐξέστη*, or *ἐξέσται*, was interpreted by the earliest Latin version to mean 'He makes *them* mad', the Greek of Codex Bezae being at a later period unskillfully corrected into passable agreement with this; finally, *ἐξέστη* or *ἐξέσται* was altered to *ἐξήρτηται αὐτοῦ* in the ancestor of W, but this last change was independent of, and subsequent to, the original Latin version.

According to the Arabic Diatessaron Tatian inserted Mk. iii 21 between what corresponds to Mk. ii 28 and iii 1, and this arrangement occurs also in *a*, so that the text runs—

. . . *filius hominis dominus est etiam ipsius sabbati. Et cum audissent qui ab eo erant exierunt detinere eum, dicebant enim quia extitit mente. Intrauit iterum in synagoga, &c.*

It will be noticed that the wording of this is quite different from the wording of *a* in Mk. iii 20-22.

I have examined Mk. iii 21 at full length, because the internal evidence is particularly clear, both as to the relative originality of the variants, and also as to the independence of W in regard to the specifically Latin readings. Nearly all the chief features of the text of W emerge in connexion with Mk. iii 21: the examples that now follow will give illustrations of these several features.

<sup>1</sup> It is worth notice that in De Bruyne's African *Capitula* (Mk. § xvi) the opponents of Jesus here are called Pharisees (= *c*). \*

(2) Mk. v 33 :

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.  
 ειπεν αυτω] + εμπροσθεν παντων W 13&c  
 αληθειαν] αιτιαν W (1) 13&c (28).

Here again we have a general resemblance to the parallel narrative (Lk. viii 47), but not mechanical assimilation.

(3) Mk. vi 13 :

ἐξέβαλλον] ἐξεπεμπον W.<sup>1</sup> This seems to be the arbitrary and unpalaeographical substitution of a synonym, perhaps for a supposed improvement in style.

(4) Mk. vi 29 :

(John's disciples came *and took up* his corpse.)

καὶ ἦραν] κηδεύσαι W 28. Another stylistic paraphrase, which introduces a word foreign to the Greek Bible. No version has any trace of κηδεύσαι, nor is there any approach to it in Matt. xiv 12. It is therefore an arbitrary change in the Greek, a fact that should be borne in mind when considering other variants in the text now represented to us by W and 28, e. g. in (1) Mk. iii 21 ἐξήρτηνται αὐτοῦ, and (7) Mk. viii 10 τὸ ὄρος.

(5) Mk. vi 35 :

ἤδη ὥρα πολλή.

πολλή] παρηλθεν W. Syr. S has 'past', the Latins mostly *praeteriuit*, followed by the English A.V. But with the other examples before us, it seems to me absurd to explain the aberration of W here from all other Greek MSS by saying that it is 'following the Version-tradition', or that it has been 'corrected' from a bilingual codex. 'The hour is *much*' seemed an odd expression, and I believe the man who turned καὶ ἦραν into κεδεύσαι turned πολλή into παρηλθεν.

(6) Mk. vii 31 :

εἰς προ προς

εἰς την δεκαπολιν, προ δεκαπολεως.

So Prof. Sanders's collation of W with 5. But it is worth while to point out that this simple-looking pair of variants contain in themselves when fully expanded evidence for some very drastic treatment of the text of Mark. 'As the questions are stylistic and geographical, questions of editing not of scribal error, the texts must be given at length.

The true text of Mk. vii 31 (N B L Δ 33 boh aeth, D @txt 28 565 700 lat. vt-vg) is

καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὀρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὀρίων Δεκαπόλεως.

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Sanders calls this 'a sure case of retranslation from the Coptic', but he does not explain why the Coptic words should be held to represent ἐξεπεμπον rather than ἐξέβαλλον. πεχ εβολ corresponds to ἐβάλλειν in Lk. xiii 32.

Now this is open to two objections, one trifling and linguistic, the other more serious and geographical. It may be said that *εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν* means 'into the sea', and accordingly we find *πρὸς* substituted for *εἰς* in  $\zeta$  followed by A N and the mass of Greek MSS, but none of real critical value<sup>1</sup>: W here agrees with B and D. But besides this bit of school pedantry it may be said that the journey here indicated is contradicted by the map, for Sidon does not lie between Tyre and the Sea of Galilee or the Decapolis, but is north of Tyre. The answer to this may be seen in Dr Swete's Note on the passage, or in my *Gospel History and its Transmission* p. 92 note: the way indicated was not the direct way, but is a well-known route and eminently suitable in the circumstances, for Jesus had only gone to Phoenicia in order to be out of Galilee.

The roundabout journey indicated by the true text is therefore appropriate to the historical context. But it seemed odd to some who only considered the route apart from the circumstances: hence we get the corrected Constantinopolitan text, which reads 'Tyre and Sidon' instead of 'Tyre through Sidon', here followed by W. The really interesting thing about this variant is that it is attested by syr. *S* and by the Sahidic, facts which at once prove its antiquity. It is characteristic of the variations in the Gospel that the oldest are on the most extensive scale, and are generally of the greatest intrinsic importance. First we get the drastic rewriting of the narrative of Mark by Matthew and Luke, then come the bold Western alterations, and last of all are the trifling stylistic corrections characteristic of the Constantinopolitan Vulgate.

Mk. vii 31 is not the only instance where a geographical detail which at first sight presents a difficulty, though on closer consideration it proves appropriate, is better preserved in Latin texts than in the Syriac. Latin scribes often make a sad mess of Semitic proper names, but their total unfamiliarity with Palestinian Geography saved them from making conjectural interpretations based on a not quite adequate knowledge of the Holy Places.<sup>2</sup>

In any case the corrector of the exemplar of W went further still, making the journey of Jesus end in the Decapolis after passing 'by the borders' of the Sea of Galilee. It is not a really satisfactory change,

<sup>1</sup> The Lectionary directions by the original hand of  $\Theta$  appear to enjoin the reading of *πρὸς* for *εἰς*.

<sup>2</sup> Another instance is *Bezatha-Bethesda* (John v 2): see my *Syriac Forms of N. T. Proper Names*, p. 21 (*Proc. of the British Academy*, vol. v). It should be noticed that the reading of syr. *S* in Mk. vii 31 is not quite certain as the word corresponding to *καὶ* or *διὰ* is illegible. But *Σιδωνος* certainly comes before *ἤλαθεν* syr. *S*.

for the next departure (viii 10) is by boat. But it is characteristic of the text of W that it should present a further change in passages where other variants occur (see nos. 1 and 8).

(7) Mk viii 10:

εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά

εἰς] προσ W | τα μερη] τα ορια D<sup>s</sup> c f (k), τα ορη N, το οροσ W 28 syr. S | Δαλμ.] Δαλμανουθα B, Δαλμανουvai W, *Dalmanounea* arm; Μαγαδα D<sup>1</sup> (Μελεγαδα D\*), Μαγεδα 565, Μαγεδαν 28, *Mageda ck*, *Magedan a*, *Magedam bffir*, *Magidan d*, 'Magdan' syr. S; Μαγδαλα ① 1&c 13&c 271 347, *Magdalam* goth, 'Magdal' (sic) syr.palest.

It should further be noticed that the true text of Matt. xv 39 is εἰς τὰ ὄρια Μαγαδάν (τησ Μαγαδαν D, *Magedan* latt), but Μαγδαλα ζ. The Syriac texts have 'Magdan' S (as Mk.), 'Magdun' C, 'Magdu' syr. vg (i. e. Megiddo).

The text of Matt. xv 39 is presumably an interpretation of that of Mark, but it is at best somewhat obscure and must have been so in early times, as is seen by the variants Μαγδαλά, i. e. a town on the west shore of the Sea of Tiberias, and Megiddo, i. e. a town in Esdraelon. But the obscurity of the text very likely comes from our comparatively meagre geographical information. I see no valid reason why we should not accept the statement of Eusebius (*OS* 282<sub>al</sub>), who says: Μαγεδαν· εἰς τὰ ὄρια Μαγεδάν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐπεδήμησεν, ὡς ὁ Ματθαῖος. καὶ ὁ Μάρκος δὲ τῆσ Μαγεδάν μνημονεύει. καὶ ἔστι νῦν ἡ Μαγεδανὴ περὶ τὴν Γερασάν. According to this, the district round Gerasa was called *Magedan*, or at least some name that could be similarly spelt. The Greek form in Eusebius makes one think that the information (? from Origen) was gathered locally. Possibly the Semitic form was ܡܓܕܢܐ, like ܡܕܢܐ (Ma'danta) in Ephraim (*Opp. Syr.* i 22 f). It would then be parallel to Matthew's substitution of Gadarenes for Gerasenes in the story of the swine. In the present instance the way the whole story is told in Matthew is geographically so vague, that any district in the Decapolis would be almost equally appropriate. The mention of 'the borders of Magadan', in fact, merely tells us that St Mark's text was as obscure to Matthew as it is to us.

According to the context in Mark, on the other hand, the locality intended ought to be some place actually on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias. Jesus comes to the place in a boat, and goes away from it in a boat. Nevertheless no place Dalmanutha is known. Yet when it is considered that the whole of the evidence for Magedan or Magdala in Mark is explicable as a later assimilation to the parallel narrative in Matthew, while 'Dalmanutha' is inexplicable as a correction, it is evident that Dalmanutha is the more primitive reading.

What appears to have escaped notice is that τὰ μέρη is quite as odd



as *Δαλμανουθά*. If Dalmanutha be so important a place that you do not simply say *εἰς Δ.*, like *εἰς Βηθσαιδάν* or even *εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα*, then it is inexplicable that the name should be unfamiliar. And that this difficulty was felt in ancient times we see from the crop of various readings.<sup>1</sup> Probably therefore there is a primitive graphical error not only in the place-name, but also in *τὰ μέρη*. I now think that

*εἰς* ΤΑΜΕΡΗΔΑΛΜΑΝΟΥΘΑ

may be a corruption of

*εἰς* ΤΙΒΕΡΙΑΔΑΑΜΑΘΟΥΣ

(or some such form). Probably St Mark wrote *εἰς Ἀμαθοῦς*, and on second thoughts wrote *Τιβεριάδα* above the native name, and so the double form may have been perpetuated by all copyists. That Tiberias was called *Am(m)athus*, i. e. the Biblical Hamath (2 Kings xiv 25), before its new foundation by Herod we know from Josephus (*Ant.* xviii 2, 3; *B. I.* iv 1). When it is considered that we are in search of an important town, containing Pharisees, on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and further that a hurried visit there makes Jesus refer to 'the leaven of Herod' (*Mk.* viii 15), it is difficult not to think that Tiberias must be meant. And when the inexplicable *τὰ μέρη* is included in the letters supposed to contain the corrupted form of the name, the very name Tiberias in the required accusative case is found almost intact.

Here again, then, though no branch of transmission has escaped error, the most primitive form is that found in **SB** and **ς**, and all the Western texts are conjecturally emended. The agreement of **W** 28 and the Sinai Palimpsest in interpreting *τὰ μέρη* as *τὸ ὄρος* is particularly noticeable. This probably is ultimately based on a combination of *Matt.* xv 29 with xv 39, i. e. the sort of inaccurate Harmony that most persons make in their own minds from a general acquaintance with the Gospels, rather than that combination of parallel accounts that is sought to be attained by actually verifying the references.

(8) *Mk.* ix 49:

*πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀλισθήσεται.*

*αλισθησεται]* *αλιωγηθησεται* **W**

As is well known, this verse is very variously transmitted in our MSS, but *ἀλιωγηθήσεται* (i. e. 'shall be polluted') was hitherto unknown.

The exact meaning of the imagery of the Saying is rather obscure, but the text as given above is the only one that both fits the context and also could give rise to the other variants. For *ἀλισθήσεται* we find (besides *ἀλιωγηθήσεται* in **W**) *ἀναλωθήσεται* in **Θ Ψ** and *κ*, *δοκιμασθήσεται* in three minuscules and in *g*. In the Old Latin and in **D** the whole

<sup>1</sup> The Latin equivalents are: *ad finem k*, in *finibus cf*, in *terra i*, in *partem bqr*, in *partes adffv*. The Syriac Vulgate has 'to the place of Dalmanutha'.

phrase is changed to *πάσα γὰρ θυσία ἀλλ' ἀλισθήσεται*, and in the Constantinopolitan text this is added to *πᾶσ γὰρ π. ἀλ.* with *πάσα γὰρ* changed into *καὶ πάσα*. Finally, a couple of minuscules, supporters of the Constantinopolitan text, insert *ἄριστος* after *πᾶσ γὰρ*.

This is one of Dr Hort's 'conflate readings', i. e. those in which the Constantinopolitan text has fused together two ancient rival readings instead of adopting one or the other, as is usually the case. That the longer reading is not original is strongly suggested by the fact that no ancient version has it: syr. *S* here supports Dr Hort, while the Latins, including *k*, go with D.

Another reason, equally cogent, is that the shorter reading (*πᾶσ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἀλισθήσεται*) is the only one that fits the context. There is really nothing in the whole set of Sayings about sacrifices; to cut off your hand or your foot, if it be a 'scandal' to you, is not a *θυσία* but a precaution. If we are to seek for a theological expression corresponding to being 'salted with fire' I venture to think it would be 'baptized by the Holy Ghost and with fire'. The only salting I know in Hebrew literature of living persons is that alluded to in Ezek. xvi 4, according to which properly cared for new-born infants are washed in salt water. I don't suppose the passage in Ezekiel was in our Lord's mind, but the custom alluded to may have been. The whole context speaks about 'entering into life' and about 'little ones', and *ἀλισθήσεται* may refer to the first bath of a Jewish infant.

But the wording, apart from the context, suggested Lev. ii 13; so we get the Western interpretation, and (at a later period) the curious interpretation of *πᾶσ* as every sacrificial (? eucharistic) loaf. This sacrificial interpretation, in any case, starts from *ἀλισθήσεται*, so that for this reason also *ἀλιγρηθήσεται* and *ἀναλωθήσεται* must be regarded as later alterations of *ἀλισθήσεται*.

It should be noticed that  $\Theta$   $\Psi$  and *k* appear to have arrived at *ἀναλωθήσεται* independently.  $\Theta$  and  $\Psi$  are both supporters of the conflate Constantinopolitan text, but whereas  $\Theta$  has 'for every one shall be consumed (*ἀναλωθήσεται*) with fire and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt',  $\Psi$ , on the contrary, tells us that 'every one shall be salted with fire and every sacrifice shall be consumed'. *k* has *omnia autem substantia consumitur* (sic), where it is supposed that *substantia* stands for *ογσια*, a corruption of *θγσια*, but the false concord of *omnia* seems to shew that the corruption is more extensive.<sup>1</sup> No other Latin text has *autem* for *γάρ* here.

The variants in this verse shew clearly that not palaeographical error

<sup>1</sup> It is possible that *πάσα γὰρ οὐσία ἀλισθήσεται* was the earliest form of the Western text here, and the direct parent of *k* on the one hand and D lat. eur on the other.

but arbitrary conjectural alteration is the main parent of the 'various readings' in our MSS.

Before leaving this passage it may be worth while to note that W changes *ἀναλον γένηται* in *v.* 50 into the more familiar *μωρανθή* of Matt. v 13, Lk. xiv 34. One minuscule does the same. Had this very natural harmonistic change invaded the 'received text' we should no doubt have been told that the occurrence of the characteristic word *μωραίνειν* indicated that St Mark knew and used Q!

(9) Mk. xiii 2 :

'that shall not be thrown down'] + *καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλοσ ἀναστήσεται ἀνευ χειρῶν* W = D lat.vt (incl. Cyprian).

I include this interpolation here for three reasons. (i) In the first place it is eminently a Western reading, found in every Old Latin text, but not elsewhere, except in Codex Bezae: W therefore does contain in this latter part of Mark an element akin to the strongly Western element in the earlier part. (ii) The Greek of W agrees word for word with D, though *ἀνευ χειρῶν* occurs neither in Mk. xiv 58 nor in John ii 19, a fact which tends to make it more probable that the interpolation originated in Greek. (iii) The interpolation does not come from the Diatessaron: Tatian joined the story of the Widow's Mites to John ii 14-22 (*Diat. Arab.* xxxii), but gave what corresponds to Mk. xiii 1-2 much later, in connexion with John xii 36 (*Diat.* xli).

The main object of the foregoing list has been to exhibit the 'Western' tendency to paraphrase and unscientific harmonization. So much has been written in late years about the value of Western readings, that those who are not really familiar with the continuous texts of D, the Old Latin MSS, and (I may add) the Sinai Palimpsest itself, do not realize how often the readings of these authorities are inferior.

When the general inferiority of Western readings is clearly realized, another problem arises. If, after all, the text as edited by Dr Hort (or something very like it) be early and primitive, how did it manage to survive? For the real issue is not the old one so violently championed by Dean Burgon. It is not whether *H* or *K* be better, to use *v.* Soden's notation. Both are 'recensions', i. e. editions in the modern sense of the word, and that comes to mean *corrected* editions of the text. But by what authority were they corrected? Whether we call the authorities which agree with the Old Latin and the Old Syriac 'Western', or label them *I<sup>a</sup>* with *v.* Soden, what right have we to reject these ancient witnesses? If we do reject most of the Western variants, as we must, on the ground of their intrinsic inferiority, we must nevertheless find some historical reason which will plausibly explain the survival of their non-Western rival.

The first and most obvious answer to this difficulty, which fits a very

large majority of the cases, is that most Western aberrant readings did not affect the whole of the unrevised texts. There is a great difference between the texts current in the East and in the West, at Edessa and at Carthage, to take the extreme cases. It generally happens that the reading accepted by Dr Hort, principally on the authority of B and  $\aleph$ , is supported either by the Old Latin (or a leading branch of it) or by the best text of the Old Syriac. For instance, in the nine readings examined above, the 'true' text is in all cases supported by the Old Syriac or the Old Latin, or by both, except in Mk. viii 10 (Dalmanutha).

The case of Dalmanutha suggests a second explanation. Assimilation to parallel narratives may take place independently. In this case the change of τὰ μέρη into τὸ ὄρος is not attested by any Latin document, so that the assimilation of Dalmanutha to Magadan (i. e. to Matt. xv 39) may have taken place independently. Certainly in syr. *S* and syr. *C* we have to allow for the influence of early forms of Tatian's Diatessaron, even if the work were unknown in the West.

But these considerations will not explain every case. And there is at least one passage where all the Western phalanxes agree in error. This passage is so important for our judgement of the Western texts and their rival that I give it here at once. It is

(10) Mk. vi 53 f:

καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ καὶ προσωρμίσθησαν.  
<sup>54</sup> καὶ ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου κτλ.

These words are satisfactory enough. The disciples reach the land somewhere in 'Gennesaret' and make the boat safe. That done, they go on shore and Jesus is recognized. But καὶ προσωρμίσθησαν is omitted by

D W  $\Theta$  1 & c 28 565 700 *abcfiqr* syr. *S*-vg arm

i. e. by every single 'Western' Greek MS of interest except the 'Ferrari Group' (13 & c), every extant Old Latin MS, the Sinai Palimpsest, the Peshitta, and the Armenian.

It is true that there is nothing corresponding to καὶ προσωρμίσθησαν in Matt. xiv 34, but that alone is not a sufficient reason for the omission here, though very likely the absence of these words is due to a similar cause, viz. impatience at the inclusion of details not directly edifying. Of course it is possible that the words were omitted independently by the original Latin translator of the Gospel and the original Syriac translator; or, again, that the words were not included by Tatian, and that here, as elsewhere, syr. *S* is influenced by the Diatessaron. But however we look at it, we must acknowledge that the words must have been generally absent from the text of Mark in the first half of the third century.

Yet they must be genuine, for what Christian writer would have thought it worth while to invent them?

It seems to me that this is a clear indication that somebody in the third century really did have access to a very pure line of transmission, i. e., in plain English, to a very ancient MS, and who else could this somebody be but Origen? So far as we know Origen was the first Christian to interest himself in the correct text of the Gospels.

The history of this various reading will then be as follows: the words *καὶ προσωμίσθησαν* are genuine, but they were dropped out by almost all texts in very early times, perhaps by two lines of transmission independently. Origen (if it be he) restored them to the text he used on the authority of some ancient or 'correct' copy, and from Origen's emended copy the words became current in Egypt and ultimately in Constantinople. This may seem a complicated explanation; but I feel that an omission of genuine words, the omission being attested by D and the Old Latin, by W and 28, by @ 565 700, by 1&c, and by the Syriac, indicates so wide an area of omission as to amount practically to disappearance. Now, it is true, the words are in the majority of extant Greek MSS, but this must be by what Dr Rendel Harris once called 'the grace of repentance'.

In any case the evidence with regard to Mk. vi 53 does call for wide generalizations, and it may not be altogether out of place to conclude this part of the present study of W and its allies with a word or two upon ancient recensions of the Gospels. Beyond all controversy we possess one such ancient recension, dating from the fourth century, in the Vulgate Gospels; the Peshitta Gospels is another, dating from the first quarter of the fifth century. What is more, we have in each case a very good idea of what the texts were, of which these recensions were a revision; we know pretty well the kind of texts these two great Vulgates were meant to supersede. The exact type used by St Jerome or Rabbula as the basis does not so much matter, as the main fact that the Latin Vulgate was intended to supersede *k* and *e*, *a b* and *ff*, and the Syriac Vulgate to supersede syr. *S* and syr. *C* and the Diatessaron.

To us modern critics these earlier types of text are of the greatest interest, not only because they illustrate for us the history of the Gospels in the early Church, but because we hope to pick up from them here and there stray fragments of genuine readings, which for one reason or another did not find favour in the texts approved in the fourth and fifth centuries. We can do this at our leisure, without danger in the meanwhile of losing sight of the main lines of the genuine text, for we have *H* and *K* ready to our hands as standards of reference. But this should not make us forget how very much better Jerome's Revised Version is on the whole, compared with *a b* or *ff*, or *e* or *k*, when we

consider these texts not as witnesses to be cross-examined, but as narrators of the Gospel story.<sup>1</sup> And much the same may be said of Rabbula's revision of the Syriac, though Rabbula's work is as much inferior to Jerome's as the text of syr. *S* is more intelligent and intelligible than that of *k*.

But if the text of the Latin Vulgate be more correct than that of the Old Latin codices it must be because St Jerome had access to more correct Greek MSS than those represented by the Old Latin. Professor Sanders and Mr Hoskier sometimes speak of the 'Version-tradition', as if the texts attested by the ancient Latin and Syriac translations were a separate tradition. They are more than that: they *are* tradition. And when we add to them the witness of Clement of Alexandria we have to ask, where could any other traditions have survived? Whence came the materials by which St Jerome could recreate the passages that had been harmonized out of recognition?

These are old questions, but the discovery of the Washington MS gives them fresh urgency. Cod. W proves in very numerous instances to give the Greek text of readings hitherto only known from Old-Latin MSS, readings which therefore were under the suspicion of being no readings at all, but only corruptions current in Latin or paraphrastic renderings of the 'ordinary' Greek text. Now we see that they must have been in the actual text of the Greek MS from which the Old Latin was made.

The history of the text of the Gospels during the second and third centuries must be more or less hypothetical, more or less a plausible attempt to invent causes that will explain the surviving phenomena. Not all of these are fully realized; and, least of all, the fact that a good many readings, which approve themselves as genuine on internal grounds, cannot be traced further back than the days of Origen. Some of these readings were accepted in *K* and so are found in the great majority of Greek MSS, others of the same sort failed to be taken up in *K* and are now attested only by a few MSS. The hypothesis that Origen himself unearthed a very accurate MS, at least of certain parts of the New Testament, seems to me best to explain the facts. And if this hypothesis be true of any book, it will be true of St Mark's Gospel.

F. C. BURKITT.

<sup>1</sup> See above, e. g. on Mk. iii 21, vi 53, viii 10.

(*To be continued.*)