Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

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

Judaism. The Apocalypse, by its omission of all reference to the Incarnation, and by its use of the Jewish Wisdom-Logos theme, may have been regarded by the orthodox as lending support to this heresy. It is not to be wondered at, that this part of the Church questioned and rejected for so long this Book.

But time passed, and with it the peculiarly Jewish elements which remained in the doctrines of the Christian Church. We have learnt to read the Apocalypse anew in the light of the rest of the New Testament teaching. The Jewish elements in it have been sublimated as to their original meaning; but they remain to indicate the essential unity in the revelation that God, who spake in times past by the prophets through His Spirit concerning His Son, gave at last in that Son, His Word Incarnate. The seer read that revelation aright when he declared, 'The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy'.

G. H. DIX.

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL

(continued)

II.

Φέρειν in St Mark

Φέρειν is one of the words specially characteristic of the Second Gospel, and Sir John Hawkins rightly includes it in his list *Horae Synopticae*[2] p. 13. If we make abstraction of the technical usage of φέρειν 'to bear fruit', the figures for the four Gospels are Mark 14, Matthew 4, Luke 4, John 8. Sir John Hawkins leaves the matter there: but examination of the passages concerned reveals the secret of the disproportionate occurrence of the word in Mark. The other three Evangelists, in fact, limit the meaning of φέρειν, speaking generally, to the sense of 'carry': Mark, on the other hand, uses it also, and more frequently, in the sense of 'bring'. The difference is therefore a lexical one. It is well illustrated in the treatment of Mark 2 (ii 3) by Luke, and of Mark 7 (xi 2, 7) by both Matthew and Luke.

1. Mark i 32 ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας. Here ἔφερον, as in the parallel cases 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, means certainly 'brought', not 'carried': and therefore Matthew substitutes προσήνεγκαν and Luke ἤγαγον.

2. ii 3 καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων. So far is Mark from implying the sense of 'carry' in φέροντες that he finds it necessary to add αἰρόμενον to convey the further

idea: 'they bring to him a paralytic, carried by four men'. Matthew again substitutes προσφέρειν: Luke transfers φέροντες to take the place of αἰρόμενον 'men (come) carrying on a bed a man who was paralysed'.

3 a. vi 27 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀποστείλας ὁ βασιλεὺς σπεκουλάτορα ἐπέταξεν ἐνέγκαι τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

b. vi 28 καὶ ἤνεγκεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι.

Here the natural rendering in verse 27 would be 'bring', but in verse 28 we could no doubt say either 'he brought his head on a dish' or 'he bore his head on a dish'. The episode is absent from Luke: Matthew's abbreviated narrative dispenses with the ἐνέγκαι of verse 27, but retains the ἤνεγκεν of verse 28 in the passive form ἠνέχθη 'his head was borne on a dish'.

4. vii 32 καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον. Obviously they 'bring' the man, not 'carry' him. So Matthew (Luke again has no parallel) paraphrases with προσῆλθον . . . ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, once more refusing Mark's usage of φέρειν.

5. viii 22 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαιδάν. καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν. Neither Matthew nor Luke retains the episode: if they had retained it, we may presume that they would have done as they regularly do elsewhere and have avoided the word φέρειν.

6 a. ix 17 διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου πρός σέ.

b. 19 φέρετε αὐτὸν πρός με.

c. 20 καὶ ἤνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν.

Luke reduces the triple use of the word to a single occasion, and there substitutes προσάγαγε. Matthew inserts προσήνεγκα at one point, drops the ἤνεγκα, ἤνεγκαν, of verses 17 and 20, but retains the φέρετε of verse 19. Here (Matt. xvii 17) we have the solitary instance in which Mark's φέρειν = 'bring' retains its place in either of the other Synoptists. Probably the use was felt to be more tolerable in the imperative[1]: possibly it is eased by Matthew's addition of ὧδε. So Matt. xiv 18 of the loaves and fishes φέρετέ μοι ὧδε αὐτούς.

7 a. xi 2 εὑρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον . . . λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ φέρετε.

b. 7 καὶ φέρουσιν τὸν πῶλον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

Both Matthew and Luke substitute ἀγάγετε in a, ἤγαγον in b. Luke therewith makes his regular alteration: Matthew for once deserts προσφέρω for ἄγω, presumably because 'leading' is a natural word to employ of an animal.

8 a. xii 15 φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον να ἴδω.

b. 16 οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν.

Matthew ἐπιδείξατέ μοι . . . οἱ δὲ προσήνεγκαν. Luke δείξατε, omitting the addition that a δηνάριον was then brought. Neither would talk of

[1] See for the imperative also Luke xv 23 (quoted in the next note), and Jo. xx 27 φέρε τὸν δάκτυλον.

φέρειν in connexion with a coin : but Luke's normal substitution of ἄγειν was inappropriate here, and he had to find another word.   That he and Matthew should have found the same substitute for φέρετε in δείξατε (ἐπιδείξατε) naturally challenges our attention.   But coincidences will happen : they have no significance unless they bear an undue proportion to the total number of cases in which they could happen.   And if the chances were—as presumably they were—that one or other of the group of Pharisees and Herodians had a *denarius* on his person, then 'shew me one' was an even more natural phrase than 'bring me one'.

9. xv 22 (ἀγγαρεύουσιν . . . Σίμωνα . . . ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ) καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Γολγοθὰν τόπον . . . (καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτόν).

Mark uses αἴρω, as in ii 3, for 'carrying' the cross : Luke, as there, substitutes φέρειν.   Mark's φέρειν for 'bring' him to Golgotha is of course rejected by both Matthew and Luke, who agree in simplifying the sentence into the form 'on their arrival (ἐλθόντες, ὅτε ἀπῆλθον) at Golgotha . . . they crucified him'.   Again a coincidence, but surely a very obvious one, once it is postulated that the word φέρειν had somehow to be got rid of, and that the four verbs connected by καί in Mark xv 22–24 offered an irresistible temptation to revision.

In the result, out of fourteen instances of φέρειν in Mark, the word is never retained by Luke,[1] once only by Matthew ; though Luke twice (v 18, xxiii 26) transfers it to the immediate context, displacing Mark's αἴρειν to make room for it.   For φέρειν Luke's favourite alternative is ἄγειν (three times) or προσάγειν (once).   Mark only once has ἄγειν in the ordinary transitive use : Matthew, save in the episode of the 'bringing' of the colt to Jesus, shares Mark's avoidance of ἄγειν, and replaces φέρειν by προσφέρειν (four times), a word which he employs nearly twice as often as the other three Evangelists put together.

III.

εἰς and ἐν in St Mark

[On εἰς (εἰς and ἐν) in the New Testament see Winer-Moulton *Grammar of New Testament Greek*[9] pp. 514, 516–518, who give the older view that there is no, or next to no, real confusion between the two prepositions : on the other side J. H. Moulton *Prolegomena to a Grammar of New Testament Greek* (1906) pp. 62–63, and especially 234 ; Fr. Blass *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (1896) § 39. 3 (4, 5) pp. 119–121 ; L. Radermacher *Neutestamentliche Grammatik : Das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache*

_____

[1] Yet compare Luke xv 23 φέρετε τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν (again however in the imperative, as Matt. xiv 18, xvii 17, see above under **6** *b*), Acts v 16 φέροντες ἀσθενεῖς.

(1911) pp. 16, 10 : and for εἰς in modern Greek A. Thumb *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache* (1895) § 202, p. 120.]

The following list of passages is intended to justify the conclusion that in Mark's usage εἰς is frequently used in the place of ἐν, ἐν perhaps occasionally where we should rather expect εἰς (see **2, 10**): that the other two Synoptists, and Matthew more consistently than Luke, dislike the confusion of the two prepositions and generally alter Mark's phraseology : and that the volume of evidence for εἰς = ἐν as a favourite usage of Mark is sufficient to turn the scale where the witnesses happen to be divided, some giving an εἰς = ἐν reading and others either having ἐν in place of εἰς (**6, 15**) or more often introducing into the text a verb of motion (**3, 4, 14**).

1. i 9 ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην. It is quite impossible, in my judgement, to suppose that by this phrase Mark means anything at all different from i 5 ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ : the phrases were to him synonymous. Matthew retains ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ of the multitudes, and for the baptism of Jesus alters the construction to παραγίνεται . . . ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην . . . τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι. Luke omits both ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ and εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην.

[2. i 16 ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. Matthew more correctly βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν : Luke has no parallel. Most MSS of Mark insert a noun (some ἀμφίβληστρον from Matthew, others, possibly rightly, τὰ δίκτυα) to give ἀμφιβάλλοντας an object : but the insertion only makes the use of ἐν odder still.]

3. i 21 ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν. So ℵ C L Δ 28 33 Ferrar group syr^sin Origen : εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν A B D W Θ latt. The latter group is in itself the stronger, and I cannot regard ℵ Origen as more than a single witness. But Westcott-Hort give the shorter reading a place in their margin, and the close parallels of 4 and 14 suggest that the scholar who produced the B text, whenever he found εἰς without any idea of motion expressed, systematically put matters right from a grammatical point of view by the insertion of the verb ἔρχομαι (εἰσέρχομαι). Still in view of the Latin evidence, and of the Greek support for the same reading, the decision is perhaps less easy than in any other instance of reading on our list. Neither of the other Synoptists has a parallel text here.

4, 5. i 39 καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. So A C D W Δ latt syr^sin : ἦλθεν ℵ B L Θ. With regard to the prepositions, Matthew changes εἰς both times into ἐν, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν : Luke retains εἰς on the first occasion, but by combining the two phrases into εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Γαλιλαίας [Ἰουδαίας] avoids the second. With regard to the verb, Matthew changes to περιῆγεν 'went about', Luke has ἦν. It is much

more likely that Luke repeated ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς from Mark than that he
altered ἦλθεν εἰς into ἦν εἰς. It is further much more likely that scribes
or editors of Mark should have substituted ἦλθεν εἰς for ἦν εἰς than
vice versa. I cannot doubt that אּ B represent here an intentional
correction of a non-literary usage of St Mark.

6. ii 1 ἠκούσθη ὅτι εἰς οἶκόν ἐστιν. So A C Δ and the margin of
Westcott-Hort: ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν אּ B D W Θ 33. Versions hardly count;
but authority, it is clear, is preponderant for ἐν οἴκῳ: it is only the con-
sideration that the temptation to alter εἰς οἶκον to ἐν οἴκῳ was infinitely
greater than the converse which makes it likely that the inferior witnesses
are right. There is no parallel in either Matthew or Luke.

7 *a.* iv 7 ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας.

   b. 18 οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι.

Both Matthew and Luke alter Mark on the first occasion, the former
to ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας, the latter to ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν: both, on the other
hand, retain Mark's εἰς on the second occasion. There is indeed some
authority for ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας both times in Mark, C D 33 in verse 7,
אּ C Δ in verse 18: the former is doubtless borrowed from the parallel
in Matthew. And the parallel in Jeremiah iv 3 must not be overlooked,
νεώσατε ἑαυτοῖς νεώματα, καὶ μὴ σπείρητε ἐπ᾽ ἀκάνθαις.

8. iv 8 ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν.

   cf. verse 20 οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες.

Here Matthew changes εἰς to ἐπί in verse 8,[1] thus giving ἐπί in both
places. Luke, more tolerant than Matthew of the Marcan use of εἰς,
retains it[2] in Mark's verse 8, while he changes ἐπὶ τήν to ἐν τῇ in Mark's
verse 20.

9. iv 8 εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑξήκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑκατόν (with variant εν).

   cf. verse 20 εν τριάκοντα καὶ εν ἑξήκοντα καὶ εν ἑκατόν.

By a curious freak of the Greek language εις εν can mean, according
as breathing and accent differ, either the two correlated prepositions εἰς
ἐν, or the masculine and neuter of the cardinal number one, εἷς ἕν. And
since breathings and accents were not part of the usage of MSS at the
time when our Gospels were written, we are thrown back on internal
evidence to decide between possible interpretations. Matthew on each
occasion substitutes ὃ μὲν . . . ὃ δὲ . . . ὃ δέ: he would therefore seem to

---

[1] εἰς tends to take the place of ἐπί (πρός) as well as of ἐν in Mark. i 10 καταβαίνων
εἰς αὐτόν is changed by both Matthew and Luke to ἐπί: xiii 3 καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς
τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, Matthew writes ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους (see no. 19 below): and the very
odd καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ of iv 1, where Matthew omits ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ (Luke again
gives no parallel), would at least be less odd if Mark had written ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης.
But εἰς τὸ πέραν (iv 35, v 1, 21, vi 45, viii 13) and εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (vi 41, vii 34) are
freely reproduced by Matthew and Luke, and have precedent in classical usage.

[2] If D here, Luke viii 8, has ἐπί, *a c d* 'super', the variant is probably due to
a simple assimilation to Matthew.

have read ἐν, and certainly to have understood Mark to mean 'one . . . another . . . another'. Luke, with the dislike of an educated Greek for the Jewish use of symbolic numbers, omits the details on both occasions.

εἰς in verse 8 would be ungrammatical after ἄλλα, and if we translate with Matthew 'one . . . another . . . another' we must read the neuter ἓν throughout, against the testimony of אֵ B C* L Δ. The Latins followed Matthew's interpretation, and rendered *unum* : and so among moderns Blass *op. cit.* § 46. 2 p. 142. But in view of the Semitic idiom, which uses the preposition 'in' to mean 'at the rate of', I suspect that Mark had in his mind here the preposition and not the numeral. Further, if the mass of evidence adduced in these notes convinces us that the evangelist used the two prepositions ἐν and εἰς almost interchangeably, it becomes simple enough to suppose that he had the same idiom in his mind whether he expressed it by ἐν, as certainly in verse 20, or by εἰς, as perhaps in verse 8. Nay, it becomes even possible that cod. B is right in interchanging the two in a single verse : in verse 8 if B's εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν is the true text, we can the better understand why אֵ should have εἰς . . . εἰς . . . εἰς and A D ἐν . . . ἐν . . . ἐν.

[10. iv 36 παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. As in [2] above, this is an instance not of εἰς where we expect ἐν, but of ἐν where we expect εἰς. Luke omits the detail : Matthew restores the more correct use, ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον.[1]]

11. v 14 ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς. An instance on the border-line, where εἰς might just be rendered 'announced it to the city', though it is hardly doubtful that the real meaning is 'in the city and in the country'. So, while Luke retains the Marcan phrase unaltered, Matthew, with his more rigid canon of exactness in respect of this preposition, inserts ἀπελθόντες before εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν.

12. v 34 ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην. Once more Matthew omits the phrase, and Luke, with the change of ὕπαγε into πορεύου, retains it. While μετ' εἰρήνης and ἐν εἰρήνῃ are common in the LXX, εἰς εἰρήνην is the characteristic use, following the Semitic idiom, with πορεύου and βάδιζε. Mark's phrase is therefore not destitute of precedent, though it is more likely that Luke consciously sheltered himself under this than that Mark did.

13. vi 8 ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδόν . . . μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν. Here the usual conditions are reversed, and it is Luke who omits, Matthew who retains, εἰς τὴν ζώνην. It is of course just possible

---

[1] It was suggested at our Seminar that ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ might be taken not with παραλαμβάνουσιν but with ὡς ἦν, 'just as he was, i. e. in the boat'. But Matthew obviously took the phrase with παραλαμβάνουσιν.

to·say 'take no money for your purse ', though the more natural phrase is undoubtedly ' in your purse '.

14. viii 26 μηδε[νὶ] εἰς τὴν κώμην εἴπῃς. There are no parallels from the other Synoptists : but the instance is a most significant one, and the case for the reading adopted above is in my judgement unanswerable. Westcott and Hort *Introduction* § 140 cite this verse with good cause as a typical ' conflate ' reading of the received text : it is demonstrable that behind the form μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ lie two earlier readings, (1) μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς, and (2) μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ, which the Antiochene text has combined. Westcott-Hort treat the two briefer readings as rivals, and decide for the former, which is given by ℵ B L W 1 syrsin. But what if we repeat the process of analysis, and ask whether both (1) and (2) cannot be explained as developements of a reading that lay further back than either of them ? If we bear in mind (a) the accumulation of evidence in favour of the Marcan use of εἰς for ἐν : (β) the tendency of codex B to get rid of this unclassical idiom, on the more startling occasions of its employment, by the introduction of ἔρχομαι or εἰσέρχομαι—see 3, 4 above : (γ) the actual presence of the phrase μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην as part of the reading in D, and of ' ne cui diceret in castellum ' as the whole reading in the Old Latin MS *c* : (δ) the ease with which the other early readings can be explained if we postulate μηδε[νὶ] εἰς τὴν κώμην εἴπῃς as the original source of the different developements : then I do not think it too much to say that the problem has solved itself.[1]

15. x 10 καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν. Luke is no longer parallel to Mark : Matthew drops the whole phrase. But the reading is that of ℵ B D L Δ Ψ, and it must not be assumed that because the Latins give the ablative they found ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ in their Greek exemplars. It cannot be too often repeated that a large element in our critical apparatus is vitiated because it is forgotten that the earliest translators translated by the sense and not by the letter, and followed the idiom of their own language. It is only the late pedantry of the Greek O. T. of Aquila, or the Harclean Syriac, or the English Revised Version of N.T., which so translates as to enable one to reconstruct the exact phraseology and order of their original.[2] So we are free to follow the reading of our best Greek MSS without reference on this occasion to the versions. The temptation to scribes to substitute ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ in so palpable a case of εἰς = ἐν was obvious : it is rather

---

[1] When I first published my Inaugural Lecture, *The Study of the New Testament : 1883 and 1920* (1920), I had not grasped the evidence for St Mark's usage of εἰς = ἐν, and thought that the original text must have run μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην, without any verb : but my friend the Rev. H. N. Bate had already divined the true reading, as I have there recorded (p. 59 *ad fin.*).

[2] The Vulgate was saved from this pitfall of revision because Jerome was not only a good Greek scholar, but a great Latin stylist.

matter for wonder that the few MSS escaped it than that the many fell victims to it.

16. xi 8 πολλοὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν. The verb 'to strew' might be conceived of as implying motion, 'strewed their garments on to the road': and if Mark never used εἰς for ἐν, some such explanation would be feasible. But in view of the evidence here accumulated, it is by far the simpler view that he meant 'on the road'. So certainly Matthew and Luke understood it, since both substitute ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. This is the first occasion on which we find them agreeing on ἐν for εἰς; but see also below, no. **20**.

[**17.** xiii 3 καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, 'as he was sitting on the Mount of Olives'. In English we can only render by 'on'. But that does not mean that the proper Greek word was necessarily ἐν: Matthew's ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους (Luke omits the whole detail) is doubtless more idiomatic. It remains, however, that it is a real example of the encroachments in vulgar use of εἰς upon other prepositions.]

18. xiii 9 παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε. How is the sentence to be punctuated? Luke, omitting δαρήσεσθε entirely, is able to construct a simple sentence with two pairs of parallel nouns, παραδιδόντες εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ φυλακάς, ἀπαγομένους ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας. Matthew (x 17) sacrificed the connexion of συνέδρια and συναγωγάς, constructing the former with the verb that precedes it and the latter with the verb that follows it, παραδώσουσιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια, καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε. I cannot doubt that Matthew is so far right that εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε was intended by Mark to be taken together, and that therefore εἰς συναγωγάς means nothing more nor less than 'in synagogues'. But I am also inclined to believe that Luke interprets correctly when he joins συναγωγὰς καὶ φυλακάς—i. e. συνέδρια and συναγωγάς—in one construction: for it seems as odd to think that Mark meant to contrast the usage to be experienced in sanhedrins and in synagogues respectively,[1] as that he should have contrasted governors and kings. If I am right, Mark's thought implies a comma after ὑμᾶς, and another after δαρήσεσθε: 'they shall give you in charge, in sanhedrins and synagogues shall you be beaten, and before governors and kings shall you be made to stand'. The absolute use of παραδιδόναι is found in i 14 μετὰ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην, and in frequent references to Judas and the Betrayal of Christ.

---

[1] The suggestion was made in our Seminar that συνέδρια are the courts which pronounce the sentence, and συναγωγαί the scene of its execution. That appears to me a rather artificial contrast: but in any case if εἰς is to be taken in two different senses, 'to' and 'in', in the same line, the process of the suppression of ἐν in favour of εἰς must have gone already a long way.

Anyhow a clear case is established of $\epsilon i s = \epsilon \nu$: Mark, we may be quite sure, had no thought of 'the simplest rendering "Ye shall be scourged into the synagogues"', even though it 'presents no archaeological difficulty' (Winer-Moulton⁹ p. 518).

19. xiii 10 καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. 'Preached to all nations' would be a possible rendering: but when Matthew xxiv 14 wrote κηρυχθήσεται . . . ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ (Luke has no parallel), he must have taken Mark to be once more using εἰς for ἐν.

20. xiii 15, 16 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω [εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν] μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω τι ἆραι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἆραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ. Both the other Synoptists recognize the clear implication of ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν 'the man in the field'; Matthew writes ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, Luke οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις. For the second time (see **16** above) they agree in the very obvious substitution of ἐν for εἰς.

21. xiv 20 ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ [ἓν] τρύβλιον. As in **16**, it is possible to argue that ἐμβάπτεσθαι implies motion, so that 'dips into the dish' could stand. But Matthew at any rate (Luke omits the whole phrase) interpreted Mark's εἰς as equivalent to ἐν, ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ. I think it not unlikely that the ἓν of B in Mark does not really mean 'the one dish' (there seems no trace in Marcan usage of τὸ ἕν = 'the same') but is the descendant of a marginal gloss suggesting the substitution of ἐν for εἰς.

These instances, taken together—even after allowance is made for the two, **2** and **10**, where ἐν appears instead of εἰς, and another **17**, where εἰς has ousted ἐπί rather than ἐν—do seem to establish a definite tendency in Marcan usage for εἰς to encroach on ἐν. That encroachment is not peculiar to Mark, though among New Testament writings there is none where the encroachment is so marked as in his Gospel. The process which was commencing in the common speech of our Lord's time has ended in the complete supersession of ἐν in modern Greek. But it was still resented by scribes and scholars, or at any rate by some of them, in the first and second centuries A.D. If Matthew regularly, and Luke frequently, are found to desert Mark's use in this respect, it is reasonable to expect that the same tendency will have influenced scribes, and not least the more skilled among them. The evidence of undoubted cases like **1, 15, 18, 20,** may fairly be used to turn the scale where the evidence is divided, and justifies the conclusion that the scribe of codex B or its ancestor, admirable as is his general fidelity, did not rise superior to the temptation of altering an incorrect idiom into accordance with the traditions of literary Greek.

(*To be continued*)

C. H. TURNER.