

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]

NOTES AND STUDIES

A TEXTUAL COMMENTARY ON MARK I.

FOR something like forty years I have been interested in the problem of the textual criticism of the New Testament: and for the last seven years I have been devoting special attention to the Gospel according to St Mark, its exegesis, its relation to the other two Synoptic Gospels, and its text. As to the exegesis I am contributing the section on St Mark to a brief commentary on the whole Bible which may, I hope, appear before the end of 1927. But that commentary is confined to the English version, and, as regards any questions of the text, can only deal with them indirectly and incompletely. I am therefore venturing to put before the readers of this JOURNAL a specimen, covering only the first chapter, of what I should like to do for the text of the Gospel as a whole. The specimen is purely tentative; my object has been to comment on all readings that are important in themselves and on any readings where the text that I have constructed differs from the critical texts in use. I have cited regularly the readings of Westcott and Hort, as the edition of the Greek Testament which (in my view) at present holds the field, and frequently, but not exhaustively, the readings of Tischendorf, which are also the readings of Huck's *Synopsis*. But in order to concentrate attention on the things that seem to me really salient, and to find room for discussion and explanation of variant readings, I have had to limit myself in the list of authorities cited to those only that are the oldest and the most important. In any such selection some personal and subjective element must come into play, and the choice may here and there seem arbitrary. Naturally my ruling idea has been to give prominence to those authorities or groups of authorities in which, according to my judgement, a strain of early tradition may be looked for, especially where it may be argued that insufficient attention has been given to that evidence in the critical editions of the past.

Put in other words, this means that, in company with a good many scholars of our day, I should hold that the chief defect in Westcott and Hort's great work lay in their comparative neglect of what is called the Western text.¹ In so far as their purpose was to put the coping-stone to the achievement of the long and slow process of the replacing of the Received Text by a text based wholly on 'pre-Syrian' testimony,

¹ I say 'comparative neglect', because it is well known that, however timidly, they did give the preference to a number of omissions, especially towards the end of St Luke, guaranteed only by D and Old Latin MSS.

I should have no quarrel with them ; nor should I entirely differ from them in their estimate of the individual excellence of the codex Vaticanus, B. But I cannot resist the conclusion that convergent proof from different quarters and of different sorts does compel us to lay very much more weight than they did on the evidence of 'Western' authorities. And here one is naturally faced at once with the question what exactly one means by 'Western'. For as first used in the eighteenth century the word meant just what it said : it was a symbol to represent the evidence of those MSS and writers, whether Greek or Latin, that belonged to the Western half of the Roman Empire. But in the course of the nineteenth century witnesses to a Western type of text—to a text at any rate that had as marked agreements with strictly Western authorities as with Alexandrian or Neutral authorities—began to be detected in an ever-increasing number in the East. In Syria, if the *Diatessaron* of Tatian derives its Western character from the fact that its Greek original was composed in Rome, the Old Syriac 'Separate' Gospels must have been rendered from a local Greek text. In north-eastern Asia Minor the late uncial codex Θ testifies to the survival in remote corners of a pre-Byzantine, more or less 'Western' text, some centuries after the Lucianic or Byzantine text had come into official use at Antioch and Constantinople. And Dr Streeter, following out indications given by Prof. Lake, would combine the evidence of Θ with the evidence of various important cursives such as the Ferrar group (13-69-124-346 etc.) and the MSS 565 and 700, and would refer this whole branch of the tradition to an original home in Caesarea and Palestine. Finally, Egypt itself, the one district which provides the whole evidence for Hort's Neutral text, does not speak in this respect with a consentient voice. There are divergent witnesses : 'Western' elements can perhaps be detected in the earliest vernacular version of Egypt, the Sahidic, and more markedly in the newly discovered Freer MS of the Gospels (W) and also, as Prof. Burkitt shewed, in Clement of Alexandria.

Now if all these types of so-called Western text are united against the Alexandrian or Neutral text, it is obvious that, whether we regard its age or its wide diffusion, it makes a very strong claim for consideration, and a claim that is stronger now, owing to fresh discoveries, than it was in the days of Dr Hort. But to speak in this sense of a Western text seems to me now so entirely misleading that I prefer to revert to Griesbach's usage, and mean by Western the authorities that are Western geographically. If the word is used in the other and wider sense, it is better to be careful to put it into inverted commas as 'Western' : it is better still, I think, to drop 'Western' in this sense as far as possible, and to group these types of text, whether Western or Eastern, under the common heading 'unrevised'. Such a heading

admittedly implies a contrast with a type of text that is revised, and I feel no doubt that the text contained in the codex Vaticanus is the fruit of a revision—a revision very carefully and very skilfully done, so that B stands out as our best witness to the text of the Gospels, but a revision for all that.

But since B may be said, since the publication of Westcott and Hort's edition in 1881, to hold the field, some brief summary must be given *in limine* of the sort of reasons which seem to me to qualify its sureness as a guide, and to reduce it to a lower pedestal than that on which Hort placed it. If B is, as I think it is, a product of the highest kind of Alexandrine scholarship, we have to begin by asking ourselves on what lines Alexandrine criticism was accustomed to treat classical authors. And among classical authors Homer is for our purpose supreme, because Homer presents the nearest parallel, in the temper of veneration with which his writings were approached, to the Bible of Christians. This temper almost inevitably led to 'recension', to the omission for instance of anything that seemed *ἀπρεπές* or *ἀπίθανον*. Do we not see just the same temper at work in Mc. i 41 when *ὄργισθείς* is replaced by *σπλαγχνισθείς*, in Mc. xv 34, where *ὠνεΐδισας* has made way for *ἐγκατέλιπες*, or again, to cite a case where B^N stand alone save for a small handful of cursives, in vii 4, the emendation of *βαπτίζονται*—as being consecrated in Christian usage to the sacrament of Baptism—into *ῥαντίζονται*. Once more, Alexandrian scribes or editors, with a great inheritance of Greek culture to live up to, were under a strong temptation to correct even an evangelist (to them it would seem the corrupted text of an evangelist) into accord with Greek grammar and literary usage: in viii 2 *ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένονσίν μοι* is emended into *ἡμέραις τρισίν*, in viii 3 *ἤκασιν* is turned into *εἰσίν*, in ix 8 *οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλά* becomes (with Matthew) *οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ*, while the preposition *εἰς*, which Mark frequently uses for *ἐν*, is regularized by the insertion of *εἰσελθεῖν* or the like, as in Mc. i 21, viii 26. Less common, but still worthy of notice, are the indications that alternative readings with an introductory *ἢ* had been jotted down by some scholar in the margin of some early Alexandrian ancestor of B (and other MSS), and in the next copy incorporated in the text, e.g. Lc. x 41 *ὀλίγον δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἐνός*, Lc. xii 47 *καὶ μὴ ἐτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας*. And finally the tradition represented by B is unfortunately not quite exempt from the temptation to supplement one Gospel from another, or to assimilate it to another even by a process of omission. Mark is perhaps the Gospel which has suffered most in this way: compare the additions in i 34 *χριστόν εἶναι* (from Lc. iv 41), or in iii 14 *οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν* (from Lc. vi 13), and the omission in x 19 of *μὴ ἀποστερήσης* (in accord with Mt. xix 18, Lc xviii 20).

As to the date and place of origin of B, Dr Ropes in his new edition of the Acts (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part III) has drawn out very persuasively, following Rahlfs, the arguments which bring it into relation with St Athanasius: and as it is quite certain that so sumptuous a MS can only have been written for a great person or a great church, I am disposed to regard with favour the conjecture which identifies it with a copy prepared under Athanasius about A. D. 340 for the emperor Constans.

Similar considerations convince me that codex **N**, a no less sumptuous MS, must also have been written with some similar purpose: and I want to ventilate the hypothesis—I do not propound it as more than a hypothesis—that its origin should be brought into connexion with the known activity (twice mentioned by Jerome) of the bishops Acacius and Euzoios of Caesarea, about the middle of the fourth century, in causing the worn out papyri of the famous library of their church to be copied on the more durable material of vellum. If it is objected that the text of **N** is of an Alexandrian type rather than of the type which Dr Streeter has adduced reasons for calling Caesarean, I should meet the point by asking further whether **N** may not have been, in part or in whole, transcribed from the papyrus rolls which Origen, rather more than a century earlier, may be presumed to have brought with him when he left Egypt to settle in Palestine. I cannot pretend to have made more examination of the available material than covers the first twenty-four verses of Mc. i: but in these verses there are seven significant readings where Origen *in Jo.* sides with **N** against B, and the first of them is the highly important omission of *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* in Mc. i 1, where **N** Origen stand nearly alone. There is here at least, I am sure, a case for inquiry. And I cannot think it open to question that Jerome had had access to **N** before he published his edition of the Vulgate Gospels.

But something must also be said, however briefly, in support of the stress which it seems to me should be laid on the evidence of D and of the best of the Old Latin MSS. When D stands alone, it cannot indeed be safely trusted as a guide: but the case is different when it has the support of any one of the three leading Old Latins, cod. Bobiensis (*k*), cod. Palatinus (*e*), or cod. Vercellensis (*a*). I will not attempt on this occasion to do more than enumerate three objective tests which, as I think, combine to recommend these authorities to our close attention.

(i) The use of *Nomina Sacra*. Of Greek MSS D comes next to B in its sparing use of any but the four universal abbreviations of *θεός, κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός*. Of Latin MSS *k* stands alone in never abbreviating the word which was first added to these four, namely *πνεῦμα* = spiritus: one hand of B is the only parallel to this

feature in *k* among Greek MSS. There is a presumption that MSS which distinguish themselves in respect of limiting the *Nomina Sacra* that are subject to abbreviation, represent the earliest types of text.

(ii) The supposed agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in those parts of their Gospels which are taken from Mark : by 'agreements' in this sense is meant of course agreements in changes which do not look as though Mt. and Lc. would have hit on them independently. In comparison with Tischendorf's edition, Westcott and Hort by help of B had already removed a certain number of these, e. g. Mc. ii 9 ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὑπάγε Tischendorf, where Mt. and Lc. for ὑπάγε have περιπάτει, and W-H read περιπάτει also in Mc. with ABCδce: περιπατεῖν is a specially Marcan word. But on Western evidence (and as often without D as with it) we can take a long step further in abolishing other supposed agreements: four instances will illustrate this, Mc. vi 43, ix 19, xii 8, xiv 72. (1) In vi 43 Mt. Lc. and Jo. all appear to agree against Mc. in giving some form of the verb περισσεύω, while the editors give in Mc. ἦραν κλάσματα [or κλασμάτων] δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα. But *affi* [neither *e* nor *k* is here extant] have 'reliquias fragmentorum', with 33 τὰ περισσεύματα. Read ἦραν [περισσεύματα] κλασμάτων and all is clear: a line was lost in a very early copy, not so early however but that the archetype of the oldest Latin version had escaped the loss. (2) In ix 19 Mc. has ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος, the parallels in Mt. and Lc. are printed as ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, and it would be in the highest degree unlikely that Mt. and Lc. had independently added the second adjective from Deut. xxxii 5. But then we find that in Lc. it is omitted by Marcion (on the testimony of both Tertullian and Epiphanius), by *a* and by *e*. Once more Western witnesses solve the difficulty for us. (3) In Mc. xii 8 ἀπέκτειναν καὶ ἐξέβαλον, the heir is murdered in the vineyard and the body thrown outside: in our texts of Mt. and Lc. the two verbs are inverted, and the heir is first ejected and then killed. But in Mt. xxi 39 we ought to replace ἀπέκτειναν καὶ ἐξέβαλον on the testimony of DΘabcffh Iren. Lucif. (4) For Mc. xiv 72 ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαυεν the other Synoptists are edited as giving ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς. But the phrase in Lc. (xxii 62) is omitted by *abeffi*l* and is bracketed by W-H. Omit it as an interpolation from Mt., and once more all is plain sailing.

(iii) The third test is that of Marcan usage: I will confine myself to the citation of three instances of absence of particles (*καί, ναί, οὖν*), and one of plural for singular in describing the movements of our Lord and the disciples. i 22 ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς DΘbce: the rest καὶ οὐχ with Mt. vii 28 Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια κτλ DWΘfam. 13 565 bcfi syr-sin.: the rest ναί, Κύριε with Mt. x 9 δ ὁ θεὸς συνίεζεν Dk: δ οὖν ὁ θεὸς the rest with Mt. xi 11 καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς Ἱερσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερόν Θi k: the rest εἰσῆλθεν with Mt. and Lc.

These preliminary remarks are adequate, I hope, to bespeak a patient hearing for the deference paid from time to time in the following pages to Western evidence, even where a reading is only guaranteed by one or two authorities. I do not claim more than to have made out a case for consideration. Least of all must I be supposed to be supporting indiscriminately the majority of Western readings against the majority of the readings of B: I have only tried to consider each case on its merits.

TEXT OF MARK I.

¹ ΑΡΧΗ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ² (καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ

Ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου·

³ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ

Ἔτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβοις Ἰαγού⁴)

⁴ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. ⁵ καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ

3. [τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν]

1-4. Ἄρχῃ . . . ἁμαρτιῶν : to be constructed, with Origen, Basil, and Victor of Antioch, as a single sentence, verses 2 and 3 being parenthetical. See *J. T. S.*, Jan. 1925 (xxvi 146). Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ : omitted by **N*** Θ, two cursives and some patristic quotations. But these quotations are in all cases directed to the comparison of the different openings of the four Gospels, in particular to their appropriateness to the respective evangelic symbols : and with this view they tend to omit as much intervening matter as possible. Thus Irenaeus, to whom Mark is the eagle of the four, finds the point of appropriateness in the prophetic afflatus from on high, and hurries on to the prophetic reference : Victorinus, making Mark the lion, omits not only 'Son of God' but also the quotation from Malachi, in order to put the 'vox clamantis in deserto' as near the forefront as possible : the words υἱοῦ θεοῦ, not conferring anything to the purpose of either father, are simply dropped. To conclude that the words did not stand in their copies of the Gospel would not be warranted : Irenaeus in fact twice gives the words in other citations. Origen indeed stands in another category, for as he omits the words five times it must be presumed that they were absent from his text : but in view of his close relation to **N** we have in **N** Origen really not two witnesses to deal with but only one. And it is (against Tischendorf and W-H text) infinitely more probable that in two early authorities **ΤΤ** **ΘΤ** had dropped out after **ΙΤ** **ΧΤ** than that the majority of good texts (including B D) are wrong in retaining words which correspond so entirely to the contents of the Gospel (cf. i 11, iii 11, viii 38, ix 7, xii 6, xiv 61, xv 39). 2. ἀποστέλλω (without ἐγώ) B D Θ 28 latt. Iren. W-H : *praem.* ἐγώ **N** W most Greek MSS Orig. ἐγώ is an assimilation to Mt. iii 10 and Mal. iii 1 (**N*** A Q T). 3. αὐτοῦ : τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν D Old Latins and apparently Iren. This may be, and perhaps is, an assimilation to Isa. xl 3, but the alternative that αὐτοῦ is an assimilation to the parallels in Mt. Lc. cannot be quite excluded. 4. Ἰωάννης : here and in verses 6, 9, B only ; see below on verse 29 (B D). ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων B 33 W-H : *praem.* καὶ ante κηρύσσων Tisch. with the other MSS. A good example of the excellence of B : scribes did not realize that in Mark's usage (vi 14, 24) ὁ βαπτίζων meant 'the Baptist', for they were only familiar with ὁ βαπτιστής. So they regarded βαπτίζων and κηρύσσων as two participles in the same construction 'John who was baptizing and preaching', and connected them with καί. They forgot that, strictly speaking, it was the preaching that was done 'in the wilderness' ; the baptizing was 'in the river Jordan', verse 5.

Ἱεροσολυμῆται πάντες, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. ⁶ καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος ἄβηρον καμήλου ⁷ καὶ ἔσθων ἀκριδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

⁷ Καὶ ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων Ἐρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω [μου], οὗ οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανὸς κύψας λύσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ. ⁸ ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

⁹ Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρετ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου. ¹⁰ καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαίνον εἰς αὐτόν. ¹¹ καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν

6. Ἰρίχας¹ ⁷ καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ 9. ⁷ δ

6. *δέρριν* D (*δερρην*) *a* (*pellem*): *τρίχας* (Tisch. W-H) the rest (*def. e* to *i 20*). It is so difficult to account for *δέρρις*—a rare word, meaning ‘skin’ of an animal—that the agreement of D (not *d*) with *a* claims for it more than a place in the margin. Assimilation to Mt. ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου would account for supersession of a rare, probably vulgar, word by the more familiar word of the more familiar Gospel. Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v. *δέρρις* assert that in the ‘Western text’ here *δέρρις* ‘has been transferred from Zech. xiii 4’ ἐνδύσονται δέρριν τριχίνην ἀνθ’ ὧν ἐψεύσαντο—which is surely very improbable—and quote Hesychius *δέρρις*: τὸ παχὺ ὕφασμα, ᾧ εἰς παραπέτασμα [= a hanging] ἐχρῶντο. It is a not unlikely word for Mark, and I suspect that it is genuine.

καμήλου D *a b d f f t*: *add. καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ* the rest, with Tisch. W-H. I have treated the shorter reading as a ‘Western non-interpolation’, because it is not unlikely in itself that Mt. (iii 4) should have supplemented Mark’s description by drawing from the description of Elijah, the Baptist’s prototype, in 4 Reg. i 8 the words *καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην* [*περιεζωσμένους*] *τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ*, and that scribes should have assimilated Mark’s text to Mt. Mark depends less on O.T. language than the other Synoptists. In Mt. *ζώνην* has a proper construction (*ἔλχεν*), and so too in Apoc. i 13 (*περιεζωσμένον*).

7. *μου*: *ομι*. B Orig., a much stronger combination than N Orig., and I have (though with much doubt) followed W-H against Tisch. in bracketing the word.

8. *ὑδατι . . . πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* B vg W-H. A variation where the other Synoptic texts are bound to have had influence on the scribes of Mark: Mt. gives *ἐν ὕδατι . . . ἐν πνεύματι* without variant (and cf. Jo. i 26, 31, 33), Luke *ὑδατι . . . ἐν πνεύματι* practically without variant (so Acts i 5, xi 16, and this must be definitely taken as the Lucan usage), and in view of the wide divergence of the witnesses in Mark, a reading like *ὑδατι . . . πνεύματι*, unsupported elsewhere in N.T., has strong claims.

9. *Ἰησοῦς* Tisch. W-H: I have given δ Ἰησοῦς (D Δ Θ etc.) a place in the margin, because, just as we have in verse 6 δ Ἰωάννης, so it seems natural to expect the article here. And δ Ἰησοῦς seems to be Mark’s usage: cf. i 14, i 17, i 25, ii 17, ii 19, etc. 11. *φωνή*, without verb (W-H margin Tisch.) N* D f f t; *φωνή . . . ἠκούσθη* Θ 28 is evidence on the same side, as also Mt.’s *φωνή . . . λέγουσα*: *add. ἐγένετο* N^c A B L W sah etc. W-H text, but the verb has probably come from Luke iii 22 *φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι*. In the corresponding episode at the Transfiguration the textual phenomena are much the same: Mt. as here *φωνή . . . λέγουσα*, Luke apparently *φωνὴ ἐγένετο . . . λέγουσα*, Mark (ix 7) *ἐγένετο φωνὴ* N B C L Δ, *ἦλθεν φωνή* A D Θ and most Old Latins with syr-sin, *φωνή* alone W *fam.* 1 and *k*: the rival verbs in Mark, with

Σὺ εἶ ὁ γίος μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

¹³ καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, ¹³ καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ· καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διεκόνουν αὐτῷ.

¹⁴ «ΜΕΤΑ ΔΕ» τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον [τῆς βασιλείας] τοῦ θεοῦ, ¹⁵ ἵνα ἴδωμεν ὅτι

Πεπληρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ·
μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεῦετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

14. «καὶ μετὰ»

15. ἵνα

the omission of verb in Mt., seem to me to point to omission (evidenced by three good authorities) as right in Mark. ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός : I have printed these words without comma after μου (against Swete), and in quotation type (against W-H), because I believe that they are an echo of Gen. xxii 2 λάβε τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν, 12, 16, οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι' ἐμέ, and that the meaning of ἀγαπητός in connexion with υἱός is the same here as there, namely not 'beloved' but 'only'. St Paul also gave a Christian application to the passage in Genesis, and also interpreted ἀγαπητός as 'his own son', Rom. viii 32 τοῦ ἰθιου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο (where the verb seems decisive of the reference to Gen. xxii 12, 16). See the discussion of the phrase in *J. T. S.* xxvii (Jan. 1926), especially the passages of Ath. *Or. c. Ar.* iv 24, 29, loc. cit. p. 126, where the equivalence of τὸ μονογενές and τὸ ἀγαπητόν is emphasized: the idiom was unfamiliar in Athanasius's day, but he appeals to pagan scholars "Ἕλληνες ἴσασι οἱ δεῖνοι περὶ τὰς λέξεις.

14. Μετὰ δέ *NAL Δ Θ W*, most O.L. MSS and vg, Tisch. : Καὶ μετὰ *BD* (not *d*) a syr-sin *W-H*—so good a combination that one relegates it to the margin with diffidence. As we know, St Mark's normal way of commencing a new paragraph is with καί, while the other Synoptists, Luke especially, prefer δέ : what are we to say when the authorities in Mark are divided? Let us look at the other instances where a paragraph begins with δέ. They are (if we except xv 16, where I am sure a smaller division than a paragraph should be made) only three in number in *W-H*, vii 24, x 32, xiv 1, and they are each significant of a great break in the story. At vii 24 our Lord passes for the first time outside the confines of Palestine : at x 32 Jerusalem is for the first time mentioned as the objective of our Lord's movements : at xiv 1 the Ministry is over, and the Passion story commences. Is there any similar emphasis at i 14? *W-H* imply that there is not, for they print the first words of verse 9 in capitals, and make no break beyond an ordinary paragraph at verse 14. If καί is right, their arrangement may be right, though in that case καί must be wrong (and *B* right to omit it) in verse 9. But I cannot think that this absence of break at verse 14 corresponds with the intention of the Evangelist : I think the commencement of the Ministry must have been marked by him as a crucial moment, while on the other hand the previous verses belong to the Preparation. John the Baptist was but a precursor : he pointed to one who was to follow, and his baptism of the Christ was the culmination of his work, after which he passes out of the story. So though there is a break between verses 8 and 9, there is also still a connexion between John and Jesus : and the greater break comes when the Preparation is complete, and the Ministry of John is succeeded by the Ministry of Christ. Moreover this is the commencement of Peter's continuous story as an eye-witness. On internal grounds then I prefer δέ in verse 14. τῆς

¹⁶ Καὶ παράγων παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σίμωνος ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ (ἦσαν γὰρ ἀλεεῖς), ¹⁷ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου· καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἀλεεῖς ἀνθρώπων. ¹⁸ καὶ [εὐθὺς] ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. ¹⁹ καὶ προβάς ὀλίγον εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα· ²⁰ καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαῖον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ. ²¹ καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ.

Καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν· ²² καὶ ἐξεπλήσ-

18. [εὐθέως]

βασιλείας A D W Γ a r vg : om. N B L Θ i 28 33 b ff t syr-sin sah Orig. Tisch. W-H. External evidence is no doubt stronger for omission : internal evidence tells the other way, for τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is a favourite phrase of Mark's, and as a rule absolutely 'the good news'. In i 1 τοῦ εὐ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ means 'the good news of', i. e. about, 'Jesus Christ' : he is in fact the good news. You could therefore say 'the good news of the kingdom', i. e. the establishment by Jesus Christ of the Kingdom of God upon earth : but it is difficult to see that 'the good news about God' is a natural phrase. On the whole I think it probable that a line τῆς βασιλείας—11 or 12 letters are the size of a line in a papyrus roll of the primitive Gospel type—dropped out of a very early copy. We should then have in the Evangelist's summary the two phrases which he immediately repeats in our Lord's own words, the 'kingdom of God' and the 'good news', i. e. of the coming of the Kingdom. 15. λέγων N* A D a b ff r t sah : καὶ λέγων B L W Θ W-H text : om. N* c syr-sin Orig. Tisch. W-H marg. Omission can appeal to evidence in i 25 N* A*, i 27 ε, ii 12 B W b : but the more or less pleonastic ὅτι is thoroughly characteristic of Mark's style, and is always preceded by a verb like λέγων (see *J. T. S.*, Oct. 1926, xxviii 9-15). The real question is the genuineness of καί. There is a parallel in i 40 παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν, [καί] λέγων : and in both cases it is perhaps easier to understand the insertion of καί than its omission.

18. εὐθὺς. On this occasion the evidence for εὐθὺς (against εὐθέως) drops to its lowest : N L 33 (add here Θ) are the only constant quantities. The critical texts assume, probably with justice, that εὐθὺς is Marcan usage, and should be read even in doubtful cases. εὐθέως is the regular Κοινή word, and is largely preponderant over εὐθὺς in the texts of Matthew and Luke as given by modern editors : in Mark it is given throughout by A D, and B C Δ only rally to εὐθὺς after some hesitation on the earlier occasions of its use. Why Mark should have preferred εὐθὺς we cannot tell. Perhaps we should refer both the frequency and the form of the word to a mannerism of St Peter in his oral Gospel teaching.

21. ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν. So N C L Δ syr-sin Orig. Tisch. W-H mg. If it were not for Mc.'s habitual use of εἰς for ἐν, the authority for this reading would be inadequate, and we should prefer to follow A B D W Θ O. L. and add εἰσελθῶν with W-H text. But this is a good case of the coincidence of the more difficult reading with well-established Marcan usage (see *J. T. S.*, Oct. 1924, xxvi 15), and I have little doubt that εἰσελθῶν was put in to ease the construction, as in viii 26 (εἰσελθῆς for εἶπης), i 39 (ἦλθεν for ἦν). 22. οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς D Θ b c d e (def. a) : the rest with the editors prefix καί, but the asyndeton before οὐχ is in Mc.'s jerky style

σοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς.

²³ Καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, ²⁴ καὶ ἀνέκραξεν λέγων Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς· ἰοὶδᾶ ἰ σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. ²⁵ καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων Φιμώθητι καὶ ἕξελθε ἰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ. ²⁶ καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον καὶ φωνῆσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἕξῃλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. ²⁷ καὶ ἔθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες, ὥστε συνζητεῖν αὐτοὺς λέγοντας Τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακού-

24. ἰοὶδαμεν ἰ

25. ἰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἰ

(cf. x 14), and the addition of καὶ with Mt. is easier to explain than its omission. See *J. T. S.*, Oct. 1926, xxviii 15-19.

24. λέγων $\aleph^* \text{BDW} \Theta 565$ Old Latins and Vulg., syr-sin (*def. sah*): + $\epsilon\alpha$ (from Luke) practically all others. I note this variant reading simply to illustrate (i) the enormous influence a parallel passage in the other Synoptists can exert, (ii) the value of our new witnesses W Θ , (iii) the agreement of a very few of the best or oldest Greek MSS with the best and oldest versions. ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς. A statement or a question? Mc.'s command of Greek particles is so inadequate that here and elsewhere (e. g. xvi 6) he leaves us in doubt. Lc., our only parallel account (iv 34), copies Mc. literally: but I incline to think that the words should be constructed closely with what follows, and that Tisch. is right against W-H in printing it as a statement. οἶδα: οἶδαμεν (Tisch. and W-H margin) $\aleph \text{L} \Delta$ only among MSS, and only the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic among versions. So far the case seems clear: doubt arises only on two grounds, (i) that Luke has certainly οἶδα, (ii) that many fathers, Greek and Latin, have οἶδαμεν (*scimus*), and as they can hardly have found it in Luke, might be presumed to derive it from Mark. But apart from Origen derivation from Mark cannot be proved: and that Origen is once more in agreement with \aleph can cause no surprise. Internal evidence is neutral, if indeed it does not favour the singular (there is an equally curious alternation of plural and singular in Mark v 7-13), compare verse 25 αὐτῷ . . . Φιμώθητι. οἶδαμεν may well have arisen out of mere assimilation to the preceding plurals ἡμῖν, ἡμᾶς. 25. ἐξ αὐτοῦ: ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου DW (Θ) Old Latins and vg., apparently by assimilation (which in most of the group extends further than this phrase) to Mc. v 8; yet αὐτοῦ may equally well have been borrowed from the parallel in Lc. iv 35. Tischendorf is in error if I understand him rightly as suggesting that 'de homine' in Latins suggests ἀπό rather than ἐκ: 'de' is the representation of ἐκ in the earliest Christian terminology, e. g. 'deum de deo' in the Nicene Creed. 26. φωνῆσαν $\aleph \text{BL} 33$ only: rightly, for if κράξαν had stood in the text, no one would have altered it. φωνεῖν φωνῆ seemed inappropriate in a δαιμόνιον (Luke transfers the noun to the man possessed, iv 33), though all four Gospels use the verb of the cock crowing. 27. συνζητεῖν αὐτοῦς $\aleph \text{B}$ and the Old Latins *b e ff*; rightly, for συνζητεῖν is a rather favourite word of Mark's and his rule is to use it absolutely, viii 11, ix 10, xii 28 (in ix 14, 16 συνζητεῖν πρὸς αὐτοὺς is 'to discuss with them', i. e. the disciples, not 'with one another'): συνζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς the rest, influenced by the Lucan parallel *πνεύματα πρὸς ἀλλήλους*. Τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι κτλ. Text $\aleph \text{BL} 33$ (Θ *fam.* 1): but Luke, and most scribes of Mark following Luke, make the three clauses into one. Mark is fond of such triple co-ordinate clauses, cf. i 24, ii 7, xiv 63, 64, xvi 6, one

ουσιν αὐτῶ. ²⁸ καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

²⁹ Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξεληθόντες ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἀνδρέου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάνου. ³⁰ ἡ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα, καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῶ περὶ αὐτῆς. ³¹ καὶ προσελθὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρός· καὶ ἀφήκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς. ³² ὄψιας δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος, ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους· ³³ καὶ ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυννηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν. ³⁴ καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις, καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλεν· καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν τὰ δαιμόνια λαλεῖν, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν.

³⁵ Καὶ πρῶτῃ ἔννυχα λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθεν, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον

32. ἔδυσεν

34. λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια

of them at least (but never all of them) being interrogative. The central clause is generally the briefest, as ii 7 *βλασφημεῖ*, and one would like with W-H to punctuate after *καινή*; but verse 22 connects *κατ' ἐρουσίαν* with *διδασχῆ*, and I punctuate accordingly.

28. *πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας*: a redundant expression quite in Mark's style, but because redundant altered by Luke to *εἰς πάντα τόπον τῆς περιχώρου*, and by most authorities in Mark by the omission of *πανταχοῦ*. Luke's *πάντα τόπον* shews that he read *πανταχοῦ* in Mark with \aleph^c B C L W *fam.* 13 *b e*.

29. *ἐξεληθόντες ἦλθον* \aleph A C L Γ Δ vg. (*def. sah*) Tisch. W-H text, and so Marcan usage (*J. T. S.*, April 1925, xxvi 228): *ἐξεληθὼν ἦλθεν* B W Θ *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13 (D Old Latins: *def. a*) with the singular of Matt. and Luke. The whole phrase in Mark is so odd that change was tempting: it inevitably suggests 'we left and came into our house with James and John' as the original from which it was derived. Ἰωάνου B D W-H: I follow this spelling which is almost universal in B D, and the agreement of our two most primitive MSS seems all but decisive. If indeed Hort were right in supposing that the spelling Ἰωάνης points to a Roman origin for B, the agreement would lose most of its force: but it is now universally, I think, admitted that B was written in Alexandria. 32. *ἔδυσεν* B D W-H: *ἔδυσεν* the rest and Tisch. *ἔδυσεν* is the older classical form, *ἔδυσεν* came into more frequent use later on. I follow B D, if with more hesitation than in the last note: in Lc. iv 40 D has *δύσαντος*, and Origen and most of the Latins bear witness to a past tense, so that the same aorist form may be genuine there as well.

34. *τὰ δαιμόνια λαλεῖν* B, and the order is so far supported by Lc. (and D Θ and the Latins and syr-sin in Mc.) *αὐτὰ λαλεῖν*: *λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια* the rest with Tisch. W-H. *ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν* \aleph^* A D etc., the Latins, syr-sin, Victor's catena, Tisch.: + *Χριστόν* (or *τὸν Χρ.*) *εἶναι* \aleph^c B C L W Θ *fam.* 1 *fam.* 13 28 33, W-H text, from Lc. iv 41. A clear example of assimilation, to which most of our Alexandrian authorities, even the best, have succumbed.

35. *ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν* ('he left Capernaum and went away to a desert place'): *ἐξῆλθεν* only B 28 565, *ἀπῆλθεν* only W *b d e ff.* The double phrase is very Marcan, and either accidental omission of a line or a conscious intention to prune away the apparent redundancy will account for the reading of B: versions hardly count, for an early Latin translator e. g. might easily have contented himself with a single verb. But a syr-sin have two verbs. *κάκει* \aleph B C L Δ Θ , and so in verse 38 \aleph D L, xiv 15 \aleph D 565: *καὶ ἐκεῖ* the rest, but in xiv 15 many authorities have *ἐκεῖ* without *καί*. I incline to think that Mark may have been the more likely, scribes of Mark

κάκει προσήρχετο. ³⁶ καὶ κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν Ἰσίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, ³⁷ καὶ εἶρον αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὅτι Πάντες ζητοῦσίν σε. ³⁸ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Ἀγωμεν ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις, ἵνα ἰκάκει κηρύξω εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξήλθον. ³⁹ καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐβάλλων.

⁴⁰ Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν,

36. Ἰσίμων

38. καὶ ἐκεῖ

the less likely, to prefer the contracted form. 36. κατεδίωξεν NBΘ 28 vg. : rightly, for Mark is fond of a singular verb where mention of more than one person follows, e. g. iii 31 καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ (so NDfam. 1 565 Old Latins), viii 27 ἐξήλθεν ὁ Ἰ. καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (no variant), xiii 3 ἐπρώτα αὐτὸν . . . ὁ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας (again of Peter: so NBLfam. 13 28 33). No doubt the singular contains the implication that the person first mentioned stands out from the rest. Σίμων NB L W 33 : ὁ τε Σίμων Θfam. 1 28 (and presumably the archetype of D : D* has τε, D² τότε) : ὁ Σίμων ACΔ and the mass of MSS. The article with Σίμων is so unusual that one looks about for a reason: and perhaps the reason may be found in the desire to emphasize the first name after the singular verb, see last note. I think therefore that it must at least be given a place in the margin. 37. καὶ εἶρον αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν NB L e, and this is characteristically Marcan: καὶ ὅτε εἶρον αὐτὸν λέγουσιν D Latins (except b c e) syr-sin sah (but versions may be deferring to the idiom of their own language); καὶ εἰρόντες αὐτὸν λέγουσιν ACΔΘ and the mass of MSS; λέγοντες alone W b c. The three verbs co-ordinated with καὶ presented an irresistible temptation to scribes to introduce a subordinate or participial construction. 38. ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις NBC* L 33 Egyptian versions and arm: but (just as in verse 28 πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γ.) the adverb seemed redundant, and ἀλλαχοῦ is omitted by AC³ D W Δ Θ Latins and Syriac. κάκει: see on verse 35. ἐξήλθον NBCLΘ 33 sah (the meaning is 'I left Capernaum', referring back to verse 35): ἐξελήλυθα of AD etc., ἐλήλυθα of W Δ 28fam. 13, are both probably derived from Jo. xviii 37 εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον. But ueni of the Latins must not be quoted for ἐλήλυθα: ueni could hardly be used in this sense. [It is possible that St Jerome wrote for ἄγωμεν . . . ἐξήλθον 'exeamus . . . ueni'—that at least appears to be the reading of the St Gall MS—intending to represent the ἐξ- of the latter verb in his rendering of the former one.] 39. ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς σ. AC D W Δfam. 1fam. 13: rightly, for this is good Marcan usage, see on verse 21; and the Latin and Syriac versions should be cited on this side, for both give 'was preaching', and if they render εἰς τὰς σ. 'in their synagogues' they could hardly do otherwise, since 'into their synagogues' would for them be nonsense: ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς NB L Θ sah, improving the colloquial Greek of Mark. 40. παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν λέγων αὐτῷ, with e 'obsecrans eum et genibus uolans dicens illi'. There are here one important and three less important variations: (1) are we to omit καὶ γονυπετῶν? (2) if not, are we to add αὐτόν after it? (3) are we to read λέγων or καὶ λέγων? (4) are we to omit αὐτῷ? Let us take them separately and in this order. (1) A very strong body of witnesses omit καὶ γονυπετῶν, B D W a b c f f and the Sahidic. But the words were in the copies of Mc. used by both Mt. προσεκύνει αὐτῷ and Lc. περὶ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, and besides it would be very difficult to account for their insertion by NACLΔΘfam. 1 565 e syr-sin and the rest: whereas omission may have been due either to the desire to

λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἐὰν θέλῃς, ἴδύνη¹ με καθαρίσαι. ⁴¹ καὶ ὀργισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Θέλω καθαρίσθητι. ⁴² καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθερίσθη. ⁴³ καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ

40. Ἰδύνασαι¹

avoid so violent a word (note that both Mt. and Lc. have changed it here, just as they drop it in the passages parallel to Mc. x 17) or, perhaps more probably, by the accidental omission of a line in a very early copy of Mc. : the words *καὶ γονυπετῶν* do in fact occupy just a line in N and Θ. (2) Of the authorities that preserve *καὶ γονυπετῶν*, A C Δ and others (versions hardly count here) add *αὐτόν*, and this is the normal construction, Mc. x 17, cf. Mt. xvii 14. But even Mc. might shrink from *αὐτόν* . . . *αὐτόν* . . . *αὐτῷ* in the limit of seven words, and we may suppose that the preceding *αὐτόν* is governed by both *παρακαλῶν* and *γονυπετῶν*. (3) *καὶ* before *λέγων* is omitted only by N* B 69* *e sah*, but *λέγων* is not really parallel to the two preceding participles, and I suspect omission is right. (4) *αὐτῷ* is omitted only by D W, the Latins other than *e*, and *sah* : there are numerous cases up and down the Gospel, where after *λέγει* (*λέγων*) some good authority, even sometimes B, omits *αὐτῷ* (*αὐτοῖς*). It is often no doubt pleonastic, but that is no reason against it in Mc. [Compare for instance in the next verse *λέγει αὐτῷ*, where N W *fam.* 1 *cff* omit *αὐτῷ*, with Mt. and Lc., as redundant, against A B C D Θ and the best Latins. Inadequate as the omitting authorities are—clear as Marcan usage is—Tisch. follows them.] Note then that the 'African' Latin, represented by *e*, is the only text that in all four points gives what seems to be the right reading, *ἴδύνη* B : *ἴδύνασαι* the rest, with the parallel passages in Mt. (viii 2) and Lc. (v 12), and so too Mt. v 36, Lc. vi 42, Jo. xiii 36. Apart from Lc. xvi 2, the only books of N.T. where *ἴδύνη* is found are Mc. (ix 22, 23), Apoc. (ii 2), and also Hermas : see Blass *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* [1896, p. 48], § 23. 2. Clearly therefore it was the more vulgar or colloquial form, and likely to be used by Mc. ; and as B is re-inforced in ix 22, 23 by N D Δ *fam.* 1 28, I feel little hesitation in following it here, even W-H desert it. 41. *ὀργισθεὶς* D *affr* : *b* omits : *σπλαγχνισθεὶς* the rest. The considerations that here dictate decision are : (1) If *σπλαγχνισθεὶς* were original, it is hardly conceivable that any scribe should have substituted *ὀργισθεὶς* : (2) Mt. and Lc. have nothing corresponding to either word ; they had a strong motive for omitting *ὀργισθεὶς*, just as they both omit *ἐμβριμησάμενος* of verse 43, and *μετ' ὀργῆς* of iii 5, but there was none for omitting *σπλαγχνισθεὶς*. (3) *ἐμβριμησάμενος* of verse 43 shews that there was, in the working of this miracle, for whatever reason, indignation on our Lord's part against the man, perhaps because of his doubt of the will to heal, *ἔκτεινας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤψατο* N B L : *ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤψατο αὐτοῦ* D : *ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἤψατο αὐτοῦ* the rest, with Mt. and Lc. Versions could hardly avoid the natural rendering 'stretched out his hand and touched him', and D, the only authority which gives a Greek that corresponds to this, has presumably Latinized here. But our other Greek witnesses, though they are divided into two camps over the position of *αὐτοῦ*, mean all of them to connect *αὐτοῦ* with *ἤψατο*. *τὴν χεῖρα* is the Greek for our 'his hand' (so Mc. iii 5, where W-H, wrongly I think, desert B to read *τὴν χεῖρά σου*, v 23, vi 5, vii 3, vii 32, viii 23, 25, ix 43 *τὰς δύο χεῖρας* 'your two hands', x 16, xiv 46) : would not *τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ* be the other man's hand? As between *αὐτοῦ ἤψατο* and *ἤψατο αὐτοῦ*, N B L are shewn to be right by Marcan usage, see iii 10, (v 30), v 31, viii 22, x 13 (vi 56 would be an exception, but a *b ff* i omit *αὐτοῦ*) : Mt. and Lc. habitually put *αὐτοῦ* after *ἄπτεσθαι*. *αὐτῷ* : see on verse 40. 42. *ἐκαθερίσθη* A B* C L Δ 1 (cf. *τεσσεράκοντα* in i 13, where also

εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν, "καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ "Ορα μηδενὶ [μηδέν] εἶπης, ἀλλ' ἵπαγε, σεαυτὸν δείξον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ἃ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. ⁴⁵ ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζεν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μηκέτι [αὐτὸν] δύνασθαι εἰς πόλιν φανερώς¹ εἰσελθεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔξω ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις [ἦν καὶ] ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν παντόθεν.

45. Ἰφανερώς εἰς πόλιν¹

the second hand of B substitutes the more correct form): a solecism for *ἐκαθαρίσθη*, perhaps genuine only in Mc. 44. *μηδενὶ μηδέν εἶπης* B C Θ and the mass of Greek MSS: *μηδενὶ εἶπης* N A D L W Δ 33 (*fam.* 13) Latins sah, with Mt. and Lc. On the one side we have Mc.'s tendency to pleonasm: on the other side the parallels in Mc. vii 36, viii 26 (where the true text has *μηδενὶ εἶπης εἰς τὴν κόμην*), viii 30; I think the longer reading is right. 45. *αὐτὸν δύνασθαι εἰς πόλιν φανερώς*: the order of these words varies in a puzzling way in the MSS, but (i) *αὐτόν* is omitted by D W, and, if omission is right, we can understand why N inserts *αὐτόν* after *δύνασθαι* and the rest before *δύνασθαι*: (ii) the order *εἰς πόλιν φανερώς* ought to be correct, for the emphasis is rather on *εἰς πόλιν* than on *φανερώς*; but desire on the part of scribes to avoid the hiatus *δύνασθαι εἰς* may perhaps account for the change in A B W Δ Θ etc. to *δύνασθαι φανερώς εἰς πόλιν*. ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις N B L W Δ (*fam.* 13) 28: ἐπί is changed to ἐν by the other MSS and by Lc. The more unusual preposition is doubtless right: but ἐπί c. dat. in a local sense meaning neither 'on' nor 'at' is unusual, and I know of no exact parallel in N.T. Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v. cite however from a papyrus (140 B.C.) ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ καὶ ἐπὶ χώρα. ἦν καὶ ἤρχοντο: *be* omit ἦν καί, and it is possible to translate their reading 'they came to him outside the city in the open country from all sides': B omits ἦν retaining καί, which seems untranslatable, though W-H give B's reading a place in the margin.

Variations of the text above printed from the text or margin of Westcott and Hort.

i I υἱοῦ θεοῦ (so W-H margin): om. W-H text
 6. δέριον: W-H τρίχας with my margin
 καμήλον: W-H add. καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὸν αὐτοῦ with my margin
 11. φωνή: W-H add. [ἐγένετο]
 14. μετὰ δέ: W-H καὶ μετὰ with my margin
 [τῆς βασιλείας]: om. W-H
 15. λέγων: W-H [καὶ λέγων] with my margin
 21. ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν (so W-H margin): W-H text
 εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν
 22. ἔχων, οὐχ: W-H ἔχων καὶ οὐχ
 25. λέγων: W-H [λέγων]
 27. αὐτοῦς (so W-H text): πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς W-H margin
 29. ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον (ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον W-H text): W-H margin
 ἐξελθὼν ἦλθεν
 34. τὰ δαιμόνια λαλεῖν: W-H λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια with my margin
 ἤδεισαν αὐτόν: W-H add. [Χριστὸν εἶναι]
 35. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν: W-H [καὶ ἀπῆλθεν]
 38. κάκει: W-H καὶ ἐκεῖ with my margin
 39. ἦν κηρύσσων: W-H ἦλθεν κηρύσσων
 40. καὶ γονυπετῶν: W-H [καὶ γονυπετῶν] δύνη: W-H δύνασαι with my margin
 41. ὀργισθεῖς (so W-H margin): W-H text σπλαγχνισθεῖς
 45. εἰς πόλιν φανερώς (so W-H margin): W-H text φανερώς εἰς πόλιν with my margin
 [ἦν καὶ]: W-H [ἦν] καί
 In all, sixteen differences between my text and that of W-H: but in six of these the margin of W-H agrees with my text, and in eight their text agrees with my margin.

C. H. TURNER.