

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]

The Journal of Theological Studies

JULY, 1927

DOCUMENTS

THE VENICE EXTRACTS FROM THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.

IN view of the rarity of MSS of the Greek text of the Testaments it seems worth while to put into print these extracts which occur in Cod. Venet. Marc. Gr. 494, between the Commentary of Andrew of Crete on the Apocalypse and the Hymns of Symeon Maurus. The MS is a paper one, assigned to cent. xiii. The hand of the pages I have transcribed (from a rotograph) is terribly contracted, so much so as almost to amount to shorthand.

The excerptor is principally interested in the Christian prophecies in the Testaments, and passes rapidly over those of them which do not contain such matter.

I give a diplomatic copy of the text, adding the modern chapter and verse numeration in the margin.

M. R. JAMES.

Ἐπὶ διαθήκῃσ ἀντιγράφου τοῦ πατριάρχου ρουβίμ υἱοῦ Ἰακώβ· ἐξ
ᾧν εἶπεν ἀποθνήσκων τοῖσ ἀδελφοῖσ καὶ τοῖσ υἱοῖσ αὐτοῦ λέγων.

/ Ἀκούσατέ μου ἀδελφοὶ καὶ τέκνα ἃ ἴδον περὶ τῶν ζ̄ πνευμάτων τῆσ 2
πλάνησ ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ μου· Ἐ̄ πνεύματα ἐδόθη κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παρὰ 2
τοῦ βελιάρ καὶ εἰσὶ ταῦτα κεφάλη τῶν ἔργων τοῦ νεωτερισμοῦ· καὶ ζ̄ 3
πνεύματα ἐδόθη τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐπὶ τῆσ κρίσεωσ παρὰ τοῦ κτιστοῦ τοῦ
εἶναι ἐν αὐτοῖσ πᾶν ἔργον ἀνθρώπου. Ἄ̄ πνεῦμα ζωῆσ μεθ' ἧσ ἡ 4
σύστασισ κρίζεται. β̄ ὁράσεωσ μεθ' ἧσ γίνεται ἐπιθυμία· Ἰ̄ πνεῦμα 5
ἀκοῆσ μεθ' ἧσ γίνεται διδασκαλία· δ̄ πνεῦμα ὁσφρίσεωσ μεθ' ἧσ ἐστι
γεῦσισ δεδομένη εἰσ συνολκὴν ἀέροσ καὶ προῆσ. Ἐ̄ πνεῦμα λαλιᾶσ μεθ' 6
ἧσ γίνεται γνῶσισ· Ἐ̄ πνεῦμα γεύσεωσ μεθ' ἧσ γίνεται βρωτῶν καὶ 7
ποτῶν καὶ ἰσχυσ ἐν αὐτοῖσ κρίζεται ἥτοι τῆσ βρώσεωσ τε καὶ πόσεωσ
ἡ ὑπόστασισ τῆσ ἰσχύοσ· Ἐ̄ πνεῦμα σποράσ καὶ συνουσίασ μεθ' οὐ 8

- 9 συνεισέρχεται διὰ τῆσ φιληδονίας ἢ ἁμαρτία / Διὰ τοῦτο ἔσχατόν ἐστι
 τῆσ κτίσεωσ καὶ πρῶτον τῆσ νεότητοσ ὅτι ἀγνοίας πεπλήρωται καὶ
 αὐτὴ τὸν νεώτερον ὀδηγεῖ ὡσ τυφλὸν ἐπὶ βόθρον καὶ ὡσ κτῆνοσ ἐπὶ
 3 1 κρήμνον. / ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοισ ὀγδοόν ἐστι πνεῦμα τοῦ ὕπνου· μεθ' οὗ
 2 ἐκτίσται ἔκστασισ φύσεωσ καὶ εἰκὼν τοῦ θανάτου· / τούτοισ τοῖσ
 3 πνεύμασι συμμίγνυται τὸ πνεῦμα τῆσ πλάνησ· / ἃ τὸ τῆσ πορνείασ ἐν τῇ
 φύσει καὶ ταῖσ αἰσθήσεσιν ἔγκειται· β πνεῦμα ἀπληστίας ἐν τῇ γαστρί·
 4 / γ πνεῦμα μάχησ ἐν τῷ ἥπατι καὶ τῇ χολῇ· δ πνεῦμα ἀρεσκίασ καὶ
 5 μαγκυρίας· ἵνα διὰ περιεργίασ ὠραίοσ ὠφθῇ· / ε πνεῦμα ὑπερηφανίας
 ἵνα κινήται καὶ μεγαλυνθῇ ἐπὶ τε φρονήσει καὶ ἰσχυεί· ζ πνεῦμα ζήλουσ
 καὶ ψεύδουσ τοῦ πλατῶν εἶναι αὐτὴν ἐκ γένουσ καὶ οἴκου καὶ πλοῦτου·
 6 / ζ πνεῦμα ἀδικίασ· μεθ' οὗ κλοπὴ καὶ γρυπίσματα ἵνα ποιήσῃ φιληδονίαν
 καρδίασ αὐτοῦ ἢ γὰρ ἀδικία συνεργεῖ τοῖσ λοιποῖσ πνεύμασι διὰ τῆσ
 7 δωροληψίασ· / περὶ πᾶσι τούτοισ ὀγδοόν ἐστι πνεῦμα τοῦ ὕπνου· μεθ'
 8 οὗ συνάπτεται πλάνη καὶ φαντασία [Col. 2] / καὶ οὗτοσ ἀπώλεται πᾶσ
 νεώτεροσ σκοτίζων τὸν νοῦν ἀπὸ τῆσ ἀληθείασ καὶ μὴ συνίων ἐπὶ τῷ
 9 νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ μήτε ὑπακούων νουθεσίασ πατέρων αὐτοῦ / καὶ νῦν τέκνα
 5 5 τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀγαπᾶτε καὶ αὐτὴ φυλάξει ὑμᾶσ· / φεύγετε οὖν τὴν
 πορνείαν τέκνα μου καὶ προστάσσετε ταῖσ γυναιξίν ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖσ θυγά-
 τρασιν ὑμῶν ἵνα μὴ κοσμῶνται τὰσ κεφαλὰσ καὶ τὰσ ὄψεις αὐτῶν· ὅτι
 πᾶσα γύνη σκολιευομένη ἐν τούτοισ εἰσ κόλασιν τοῦ αἰῶνοσ τηρεῖται
 6 / οὕτωσ γὰρ ἔθελξαν τοῖσ ἐργηγόροσ πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ· κἀκεῖνοι
 συνεχῶσ ὀρώντεσ αὐτὰσ ἐγένοντο ἐν ἐπιθυμία ἀλλήλων· καὶ συνέλαβον
 τῇ διανοίᾳ τὴν πρᾶξιν· καὶ μετεσχηματίζοντο εἰσ ἀνθρώπουσ. καὶ ἐν
 7 τῇ συνουσίᾳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν συνεφαίνοντο αὐταῖσ· / κἀκεῖναι ἐπι-
 θυμοῦσαι τῇ διανοίᾳ τὰσ φαντασίασ αὐτῶν τοῖσ γίγαντασ ἔτικτον·
 ἐφαίνοντο γὰρ αὐταῖσ οἱ ἐργήγοροι ἕωσ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ φθάνοντεσ καὶ
 6 1 ὠραίοι σφόδρα· / φυλάσσεσθε οὖν ἀπὸ τῆσ πορνείασ. / ἢ γὰρ πορνεία
 οὔτε σύνεσιν οὔτε εὐσέβειαν ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῇ· ἀλλὰ πᾶσ ζῆλοσ κατοικεῖ ἐν
 5 αὐτῇ ἥτοι ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ καὶ ἡδονῇ αὐτῆσ· / διὰ τοῦτο ζηλώσατε τοῖσ
 7 υἱοῖσ λευί· / τῷ γὰρ λευὶ ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριοσ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τῷ Ιούδα τοῦ
 8 εἶναι ἐπὶ ἀρχοντασ· / διὰ τοῦτο ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν ἀκούειν τοῦ λευί· ὅτι
 αὐτοσ γινώσεται νόμον κυρίου καὶ διαστέλλει εἰσ κρίσιν καὶ θυσίασ ὑπὲρ
 παντοσ Ἰσραὴλ· μέχρι τελείωσεωσ χρόνων ἀρχιέρεωσ χριστοῦ ὃν εἶπεν
 9 ὁ κύριοσ· / ὀρκῶ ὑμᾶσ τὸν θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· ποιήσατε ἕκαστοσ πρὸσ
 τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἀλήθειαν καὶ σώζεσθαι

Ἀντίγραφον β διαθήκησ συμεῶν περὶ φθόνου· φησὶ γάρ.

- 3 1 Καὶ νῦν τέκνα μου φυλάξασθε ἀπὸ τῶν πνευμάτων τῆσ πλάνησ καὶ τοῦ
 2 φθόνου· / καὶ γὰρ ὁ φθόνουσ κυριεύει πάσησ τῆσ διανοίασ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
 καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσιν αὐτὸν οὔτε φαγεῖν οὔτε πιεῖν οὔτε ποιῆσαι τι ἀγαθόν

' παντότε γὰρ ὑποβάλλει ἀνελεῖν τὸν φθονούμενον καὶ ὁ μὲν φθονού- 3
 μενος παντότε ἀνθεὶ ὁ δὲ φθονούμενος (φθονῶν) μαραίνεται· ἔχετε 4
 φόβον θεοῦ· ἡ γὰρ λίθισ τοῦ φθόνου διὰ φόβον θεοῦ γίνεται· ' ἐάν τις 5
 ἐπὶ κύριον καταφύγη ἀποτρέχει τὸ πονηρὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ φθόνου ἀπ' αὐτοῦ·
 καὶ γίνεται ἡ διάνοια κουφή ' καὶ λοιπὸν συμπαθεὶ τῷ φθονουμένῳ καὶ 6
 οὐ καταγινώσκει τῶν ἀγαπῶντων αὐτὸν καὶ οὕτως παθεταὶ τοῦ φθόνου
 / ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μέγας φαινόμενος ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος 6 4
 καὶ σώζων ἐν αὐτῇ τὸν ἀδάμ [μαργ. προφητεία σαφῆς περὶ χριστοῦ·
 ζητητέον δὲ εἰ δεκταὶ αὗται αἱ διαθήκαι] ' τότε δοθήσεται πάντα τὰ 6
 πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης εἰς καταπάτησιν καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων
 βασιλεύσουσι τῶν πονηρῶν πνευμάτων / ὅτι θεὸς σῶμα λαβὼν καὶ 7
 συνεσθίων ἀνθρώποις ἔσωσεν ἀνθρώπους· καὶ νῦν τέκνιά μου ὑπακούετε 7 1
 λευὶ καὶ ἐν Ἰουδα λυτρωθήσεσθε καὶ μὴ ἐπαίρεσθε ἐπὶ τὰς δύο φύλας
 ταύτας ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ' ἀναστήσει 2
 γὰρ κύριος ἐκ τοῦ λευὶ ὡς ἀρχιερέα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰουδα ὡς βασιλέα θεὸν
 ἀνθρώπων. οὗτος σώσει πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τὸ γένος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

Ἀντίγραφον Γ' διαθήκης λευί.

Πνεῦμα συνέσεως κυρίου ἦλθεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ καὶ πάντα σ' ἐώρων ἀνθρώπους 2 3
 ἀφανίσαντας τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι τείχη ὠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῇ ἡ ἀδικία.
 καὶ ἐπὶ πύργου ἢ ἀνομίας κάθηται ' καὶ ἐλυπούμην περὶ τοῦ γένους τῶν 4
 ἀνθρώπων· καὶ ἠξάμην κυρίῳ ὅπως σῶσῃ με ' τότε ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ 5
 ὕπνος· καὶ ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ μου ἔθεασάμην ὄρος ὑψηλόν. τοῦτο ὄρος
 ἀσπίδος ἐν ἀβελμασούλ ' καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεώχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἄγγελος 6
 κυρίου εἶπε πρὸς με· λευὶ εἴσελθε· ' καὶ εἰσῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου 7
 οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὸν δεύτερον. καὶ ἰδὼν ἐκεῖ ὕδωρ κρεμάμενον ἀνὰ μεσὸν
 τούτου κάκειου· ' καὶ ἰδὼν Γ' οὐρανὸν πολὺ φωτεινότερον ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο. 8
 καὶ γὰρ ὕψος ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ ἀπειρον· ' καὶ εἶπον τῷ ἀγγέλῳ· διὰ τί οὕτως· 9
 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος πρὸς με· μὴ θαύμαζε περὶ τούτου ἄλλους γὰρ 8
 οὐρανοὺς ὅψει παιδροτέρους καὶ ἀσυγκρίτους ' ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖ ὅτι σύν- 10
 εγγυσ κυρίου στήσει καὶ λειτουργὸς αὐτοῦ ἔσει καὶ μυστήρια αὐτοῦ
 ἐξαγγελεῖς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· καὶ περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος λυτρωσθαι τὸν 11
 Ἰσραὴλ κηρίξεισ· ' καὶ διὰ σου καὶ Ἰουδα ὠφθήσεται κύριος ἐν ἀνθρώποις 11
 σώζων ἐν αὐτοῖς πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων ' καὶ ἐκ μερίδος κυρίου ἡ ζωὴ 12
 σου καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου· [[263 b]] ἀγρὸς· ἀμπελῶν καρποὶ· χρυσίον καὶ
 ἀργύριον· ἄκουσον οὖν περὶ τῶν ζ' οὐρανῶν· πρώτος διὰ τοῦτο ἐστὶ 3 1
 στυννότερος ἐπίδη οὗτος πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν ὑποφέρει ἀνθρώπων· β' ἔχει 2
 πῦρ· χιῶνα· κρύσταλον· ἄτινα εἰς ἡμέραν προστάγματα κυρίου ἐν τῇ
 δικαιοκρίσει τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐν αὐτῷ εἰσὶν πάντα τὰ πνεύματα· τῶν ἐπαγωγῶν
 εἰς ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἀνόμων· ' ἐν τῷ γ' εἰσὶν αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν παρεμβολῶν 3
 οἱ ταχθέντες εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως ποιῆσαι ἐκδίκησιν ἐν τοῖς πνεύμασι

4 τῆσ πλάνησ καὶ τοῦ βελιάρ· ἐν δὲ τῷ δ' ἐπάνω τούτου ἅγιοί εἰσιν ὅτι
 ἐν τῷ ἀνωτέρω πάντων οὐρανῶν καταλύει ἡ μεγάλη δόξα ἐν ἁγίῳ ἁγίῳ
 5 ὑπεράνω πάσης ἁγιότητος. ἔν τῷ μετ' αὐτὸν ἔ εἰσιν ἄγγελοι τοῦ
 προσώπου κυρίου οἱ λειτουργοῦντες καὶ ἐξιλάσκοντες πρὸς κύριον ἐπὶ
 6 πάσαισ ταῖσ ἀγνοίαισ τῶν δικαίων· ἄ προσφέρουσι δὲ κυρίῳ ὁσμὴν
 7 εὐδοκίας λογικὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον προσφορὰν ἔν τῷ ε' εἰσιν οἱ ἄγγελοι
 8 οἱ φέρουτες τὰσ ἀποκρίσεις τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου· ἔν δὲ
 9 τῷ ζ' εἰσὶ θρόνοι· ἐξουσίαι· ἐν δὲ ὦ ὕμνοι ἀεὶ τῷ θεῷ προσφέρονται· ὅταν
 οὖν ἐπιβλέψῃ κύριος ἐφ' ἡμᾶσ πάντεσ ἡμεῖσ σαλευόμεθα καὶ οἱ οὐρανοὶ
 10 καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ αἱ ἄβυσσοὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆσ μεγαλοσύνησ αὐτοῦ· οἱ
 δὲ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τούτοισ ἀναισθητοῦντεσ ἁμαρτάνουσι καὶ
 4 1 παροργίζουσι τὸν ὕψιστον. / νῦν οὖν γινώσκετε ὅτι ποιήσει κύριος κρίσιν
 ἐπὶ τοῖσ υἱοῖσ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὅτι τῶν πετρῶν σχιζομένων καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου
 σβεννυμένου τῶν ὑδάτων ξηρανομένων καὶ τοῦ πυροσ καταπίσσοντοσ
 καὶ πάσης κτίσεωσ κλονουμένησ καὶ τῶν ἀοράτων πνευμάτων τικο-
 μένων τοῦ ἁδου σκυλευομένου ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει τοῦ ὕψιστου οἱ ἄνθρωποι
 ἀπιστοῦντεσ ἐπιμενοῦσιν ἐν ταῖσ ἀδικίαισ· διὰ τοῦτο ἐν κολάσει κρι-
 2 θήσονται· ἔ εἰσήκουσεν οὖν ὁ ὕψιστος τῆσ προσευχῆσ σου τοῦ διελθεῖν
 σε ἀπὸ τῆσ ἀδικίας καὶ γίνεσθαι αὐτῷ υἱὸν καὶ θεράποντα καὶ λειτουργόν
 3 τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ· ἔ φῶσ γνώσεωσ φωτινὸν φωτιεῖσ ἐν ἰακώβ· καὶ
 4 ὡσ ὁ ἥλιος ἐπὶ παντὶ σπέρματι ἰσραὴλ. ἔ καὶ δόθησεται σοὶ εὐλογία
 καὶ παντὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου· ἐπισκέψεται κύριος πάντα τὰ ξηθὰ ἐν
 σπλάγχνοισ, υἱοὶ (-οῦ) αὐτοῦ ἕωσ αἰῶνοσ· πλὴν οἱ υἱοὶ σου ἐπιβαλοῦσι
 5 χεῖρασ ἐπ' αὐτὸν τοῦ ἀποσκολῶησαι αὐτόν· ἔ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δέδοται σοὶ
 6 βουλὴ καὶ σύνεσισ τοῦ συνετίσαι σε τοῖσ υἱοῖσ σου περὶ αὐτοῦ· ὅτι
 ὁ εὐλογῶν αὐτὸν εὐλογηθήσεται οἱ δὲ ἔ καταρώμενοι αὐτὸν ἀπολοῦνται·
 5 1 / καὶ ἤνοιξέ μοι ὁ ἄγγελος τὰσ πύλασ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· καὶ ἶδον τὸν ναδν
 2 τὸν ἅγιον· καὶ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξησ τὸν ὕψιστον· ἔ καὶ εἶπε μοὶ λευί· σοὶ
 δέδωκα τὰσ εὐλογίας τῆσ ἱερατείας ἕωσ οὗ ἔλθω παροικῆσω ἐν μέσσω
 3 τοῦ ἰσραὴλ· ἔ τότε ὁ ἄγγελος ἤγαγέν με ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἔδωκέ μοι ὄπλον
 καὶ ῥομφαίαν καὶ εἶπε· ποιήσου ἐκδίκησιν ἐν σιχέμ ὑπὲρ δῖνασ καγῶ
 5 ἔσομαι μετὰ σου, ὅτι κύριος ἀπέσταλκέ με· ἔ εἶπον δὲ αὐτῷ· δεόμεαι κύριε·
 6 εἶπέ μοι τὸ ὄνομά σου ἵνα ἐπικαλέσομαι σε ἐν ἡμέρα θλίψεωσ· ἔ καὶ
 εἶπεν· ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ παρετόμενοσ τὸ γένος ἰσραὴλ τοῦ μὴ
 πατάξαι αὐτοῖσ εἰσ τέλος· ὅτι πᾶν πνεῦμα πονηρὸν εἰσ αὐτὸν προ-
 7 βάλλει· ἔ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὡσπερ ἔξυπνοσ γενόμενοσ· εὐλόγησα τὸν
 ὕψιστον. καὶ τὸν ἄγγελον τὸν παραιτούμενον τοῦ γένουσ ἰσραὴλ καὶ
 8 1 πάντων τῶν δικαίων· / καὶ μέθ' ἡμέρασ τινασ ὄντοσ μου ἐν βεθὴλ εἶδον
 2 πρᾶγμα ὡσπερ τὸ πρότερον· ἔ καὶ ἶδον ζ' ἀνθρώπουσ ἐν ἐσθῆτι λευκῇ
 λέγοντάσ μοι· ἀναστὰσ ἔνδυσε τὴν στολὴν τῆσ ἱερατείας· καὶ τὸν
 στέφανον τῆσ δικαιοσύνησ καὶ τὸ λόγιον τῆσ συνέσεωσ καὶ τὸν ποδήρι

τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ τὸ πέταλον τῆς πίστεωσ' καὶ τὴν μίτραν τοῦ σιμείου,
 καὶ τὸ ἐφοῦδ' τῆς προφητείας· ' Καὶ εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ἕκαστον βαστά- 3
 ζοντες ἐπέθηκέν μοι καὶ εἶπεν· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν γίνου εἰς ἀρχιερέα κυρίου·
 σὺ καὶ τό σπέρμα σου ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος· ' καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἤλειψέ με ἑλαιῶ 4
 ἀγίῳ καὶ ἔδωκέ μοι ῥαβδὸν κρίσεωσ'· ' β' ἔλουσέ με ὕδατι καθαρῶ, καὶ 5
 ἐψώμισέν με ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον· ἅγια ἅγια· καὶ περιέθηκέν μοι στολὴν
 ἁγίαν ἔνδοξον· ' γ' βυσσίην με περιέβαλεν, ὁμοίαν ἐφοῦδ'· ' Δ ζωνὴν μοι 6, 7
 περιέθηκεν, ὁμοίαν πορφύρα· ' ε' κλαδὸν μοι ἑλαιᾶσ' ἔδωκεν ποιότητος· 8
 ' Ϛ' στέφανόν μοι τῆ κεφαλῇ περιέθηκεν· ' ζ' διαδήμᾳ μοι τῆς κεφαλῆσ' 9, 10
 περιέθηκεν ἱερατείας· καὶ ἐπλήρωσε τὰς χεῖρας μου θυμιάματος
 [COL. 2] ὥστε ἱερατεύει με τοῦ κυρίου· ' εἶπεν δὲ πρός με· λευί· εἰς 11
 τρεῖς ἀρχὰς διαιεθήσεται τὸ σπέρμα (? σου), εἰς σημεῖον δόξης κυρίου
 ἐπερχομένου· ' καὶ ὁ πιστεύσας πρῶτος· ἔσται κληρὸς μέγας· ὑπὲρ 12
 αὐτὸν οὐ γενήσεται· ' β' ἔσται ἐν ἱερωσύνῃ· ' γ' ἐπικλήθησεται αὐτῶ 13, 14
 ὄνομα καινόν, ὅτι βασιλεὺσ' ἐκ τοῦ ἰούδα ἀναστήσεται· καὶ ποιήσει
 ἱερατεῖαν νέαν, κατὰ τὸν τύπον τῶν ἔθνῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· ' ἡ δὲ 15
 παρουσία αὐτοῦ ἄφραστο· ὡσ' προφήτησ' ὑψιστοῦ, ἐκ σπέρματος
 ἀβραάμ τοῦ πατρὸσ' ὑμῶν· ' πᾶν δὲ ἐπιθυμητὸν ἐν Ἰσραὴλ σου (σοι) ἔσται, 16
 καὶ τῶ σπέρματί σου· καὶ ἔδουαι πᾶν ὥραιον ὄρασει, καὶ τὴν τράπεζαν
 κυρίου διανεμήσει τὸ σπέρμα σου· ' καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔσονται ἀρχιερεῖσ', καὶ 17
 κριταὶ καὶ γραμματεῖσ'· ' Ὅτι ἐπὶ στόματι αὐτῶν, φυλαχθήσεται τὸ ἅγιον·
 ' καὶ ἐξυπνισθεῖσ' συνηκα, ὅτι τοῦτο ὅμοιον τοῦ πρωτέρου ἔστιν· ' καὶ ἔκρυσα 18, 19
 τοῦτο ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου, καὶ οὐκ ἀνήκειλα αὐτῶ παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐπὶ τῆσ'
 γῆσ' / καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας δύο ἀνέβημεν ἐγὼ τε καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου καὶ ἰούδασ' 9 1
 πρός Ἰσάκ· ' καὶ εὐλόγησέν με ὁ πατήρ τοῦ πατρόσ' μου, κατὰ πάντασ' 2
 τοὺσ' λόγουσ' τῶν ὀρασέων μου ὧν ἴδον· / καὶ νῦν τέκνα ἔγγων, ἀπο- 14 1
 γραφήσ' ἐνώχ τοῦ δικαίου· ὅτι ἐπὶ τέλει, ἀσεβῆσ' ἔστε ἐπὶ κύριον τὰς χεῖρας
 ἐπιβάλλοντες ἐν πάσι κακία· καὶ αἰσχυνθήσονται ἐφ' ὑμῖν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ
 ὑμῶν καὶ πᾶσι τοῖσ' ἔθνεσι γενήσεσθε χλευασμός· ' καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατήρ 2
 ἡμῶν Ἰσραὴλ, καθαρὸσ' ἔσται ἀπὸ τῆσ' ἀσεβείασ' τῶν ἀρχιερέων· οἵτινεσ'
 ἐπιβάλλουσι τὰσ' χεῖρας αὐτῶν, ἐπὶ τὸν σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου· ' καθαρὸσ' 3
 ὁ οὐρανὸσ' ὑπὲρ τὴν γῆν, καὶ ὑμεῖσ' οἱ φωστῆρεσ' τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡσ' ὁ ἥλιος
 καὶ ἡ σελήνη· ' τί ποιήσουσι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐὰν ὑμεῖσ' σκοτισθῆτε ἐν 4
 ἀσεβείᾳ· καὶ ἐπάξτετε καταρὰν ἐπὶ τὸ γένουσ' ὑμῶν· ὑπὲρ τὸ φῶσ' τοῦ
 κόσμου, τὸ δόθειν ἐν ὑμῖν εἰσ' φωτισμὸν παντὸσ' ἀνθρώπου· τοῦτον θέλουτεσ'
 ἀνελεῖν, ἐναντίασ' ἐντολάσ' διδάσκοντεσ' τοῖσ' τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιώμασιν·
 ' τὴν προσφορὰν κυρίου ληστεύσητε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν μερίδων αὐτοῦ κλέψητε· 5
 καὶ πρὸ τοῦ θυσιάσαι τῶ κῶ, λήψεσθε τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ ἐν καταφρονήσει
 ἐσθίουτεσ' μετὰ πορνῶν, ' ἐν πλεουεξία τὰσ' ἐντολάσ' κυρίου διδάξητε, 6
 τὰσ' ὑπάνδρουσ' βεβηλώσητε· καὶ τὰσ' παρθένουσ' ἱεροουσαλήμ μιάνητε·
 καὶ πορναιῶσ' καὶ μοιχαλισί συναφθήσεσθε· θυγατέρασ' ἔθνῶν λήψεσθε

- εἰς γυναῖκα καθαρίζοντες αὐτὰς καθαρισμῷ παρανόμῳ· καὶ γενήσεται
 ἡ μίξις ὑμῶν σόδομα καὶ γόμορρα ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ· 'καὶ φυσιωθήσεσθε ἐπὶ
 τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπαιρόμενοι· οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ
 8 κατὰ τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ θεοῦ φυσιοῦμενοι· 'καὶ καταπαίξετε τὰ ἅγια, ἐν
 15 1 καταφρονήσει γελοιάζοντες. / ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ὁ ναοὸς ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξεται κύριος,
 ἔρημος ἔσται ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ· καὶ ὑμεῖς αἰχμαλῶτοι ἔσεσθε εἰς πάντα
 2 τὰ ἔθνη, 'καὶ ἔσεσθε βδέλυσμα ἐν αὐτοῖς. καὶ λήψεσθε ὄνειδισμὸν καὶ
 3 αἰσχύνῃν αἰώνιον, παρὰ τῆς δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ· 'καὶ πάντες οἱ
 4 θεωροῦντες ὑμᾶς, φεύξονται ἀφ' ὑμῶν· 'καὶ εἰ μὴ δι' ἄβραάμ· καὶ ἰσὰκ·
 16 1 ληφθῆ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. / Καὶ νῦν ἔγνω ἐν βίβλῳ ἐνώχ, ὅτι ἐβδομήκοντα
 ἐβδομάδας πλανηθήσεσθε· καὶ τὴν ἱερωσύνην βεβηλώσητε καὶ τὰς
 2 θυσίας μιάνητε· 'καὶ τὸν νόμον ἀφανήσητε, καὶ λόγους προφητῶν
 ἐξουδενώσητε· ἐν διαστροφῇ διώξητε ἄνδρας δικαίους, καὶ εὐσεβεῖς
 3 μισήσητε· ἀληθίνοισ λόγους βδελύξησθε· 'καὶ ἄνδρα ἀνακαινοποιοῦντα
 νόμον ἐν δυνάμει ὑψίστου, πλάνον προσαγορεύσητε· καὶ τέλος ὡς
 νομίξετε ἀποκτενεῖτε αὐτόν, οὐκ ἰδόντες αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀνάστημα· τὸ ἄθῳον
 4 αἶμα ἐν κακίᾳ ἐπὶ κεφαλᾷ ὑμῶν ἀναδεχόμενοι· 'δι' αὐτὸν ἔσται τὰ
 5 ἅγια ὑμῶν ἔρημα· ἔωσ ἐδάφους μεμιαμένα· 'καὶ οὐκ ἔσται τόπος ὑμῶν
 καθάρος· ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔσεσθε εἰς καταρὰν καὶ εἰς διασκορπισμὸν·
 ἔωσ εἰς αὐτὸν πάλιν ἐπιστρέψητε, καὶ οἰκτηρίσας προσδέξεται ὑμᾶς ἐν
 18 2 πίστει καὶ ὕδατι / Καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα πάλιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· 'τότε ἐγερεῖ
 κύριος ἱερέα καινὸν ὁ (ὧ) πάντες οἱ λόγοι κυρίου ἀποκαληφθήσονται·
 καὶ αὐτὸς ποιήσει κρίσιν ἀληθείας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐν πληθί ἡμερῶν·
 3 'καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον αὐτοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ ὡς βασιλεὺς, φωτίζων φῶς
 γνώσεωσ ἐν ἡλίῳ ἡμέραισ· καὶ μεγαλυνθήσεται ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ
 4 [264a] 'οὗτος ἀναλάμψει ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ γῇ, καὶ ἔξαρει πᾶν
 5 σκότος ἐκ τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανῶν· καὶ ἔσται εἰρήνη ἐν πάσι τῇ γῇ· 'οἱ οὐρανοὶ
 ἀγαλλιάσονται ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραισ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ γῆ χαρίσεται· καὶ νεφέλαι
 εὐφρανθήσονται καὶ ἡ γῆνωσις κυρίου χυθήσεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὡς ὕδωρ
 θαλασσῶν· καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῆς δόξης τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου, χαρίσονται
 6 ἐν αὐτῷ· 'οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἀνοιγήσονται· καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς δόξης ἦξει ἐπ'
 αὐτὸν ἅγιασμα μετὰ φωνῆσ πατρικῆσ· ὡς ἀπὸ ἄβραάμ πατρὸσ ἰσαάκ,
 7 'καὶ δόξα ὑψίστου ἐπ' αὐτὸν ῥηθήσεται· καὶ πνεῦμα συνέσεωσ ἁγιασμοῦ,
 8 καταπαύσει ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι· 'αὐτὸς δώσει τὴν μεγαλωσύνην
 κυρίου τοῖσ υἱοῖσ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· καὶ οὐκ ἔσται διαδοχῇ
 9 αὐτῷ εἰς γενεὰσ καὶ γενεὰσ ἔωσ τοῦ αἰῶνοσ· 'καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερωσύνης
 αὐτοῦ ἐκλείψει πᾶσα ἁμαρτία, καὶ οἱ ἄνομοι καταπαύσουσιν εἰς κακά, οἱ
 10 δὲ δίκαιοι καταπαύσουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ· 'καὶ γε αὐτὸς ἀνοίξει τὴν θύραν
 τοῦ παραδείσου καὶ στήσει τὴν ἀπειλοῦσαν ῥομφαίαν κατὰ τοῦ ἀδάμ·
 11 'καὶ δώσει τοῖσ ἁγίοισ φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆσ. καὶ πνεῦμα

ἀγιωσύνησ ἔσται ἐπ' αὐτοῖσ· ' καὶ ὁ βελίαρ δεθήσεται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ 12
 δώσει ἐξουσίαν τοῖσ τέκνοισ αὐτοῦ, τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρὰ πνεύματα·
 ' καὶ εὐφρανθήσεται κύριος ἐπὶ τοῖσ τέκνοισ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὐδοκήσει 13
 κύριος ἐπ' αὐτοῖσ· καὶ εὐδοκήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τοῖσ ἀγαπητοῖσ αὐτοῦ ἕωσ
 τῶν αἰῶνων· ' τότε ἀγαλλιάσεται ἀβραὰμ καὶ ἰσαὰκ καὶ ἰακώβ· καὶ γὰρ 14
 χαρίσομαι καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι ἐνδύσονται εὐφροσύνην· / καὶ νῦν τέκνα μου 19 I
 πάντα ἠκούσατε· ἔλεσθαι οὖν ἑαυτοῖσ ἢ τὸ σκότος, ἢ τὸ φῶσ· ἢ νόμον
 κυρίου ἢ ἔργα κυρίου· ' καὶ ἀπεκρίθημεν ἡμεῖσ τῷ πατρὶ λέγοντες· 2
 ἐνώπιον κυρίου πορευσάμεθα, κατὰ τὸν νόμον αὐτοῦ· ' καὶ εἶπεν ὁ πατὴρ 3
 ἡμῶν· μάρτυσ κύριος, καὶ μάρτυρες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ· καὶ μάρτυσ ἐγώ,
 καὶ μάρτυρες ὑμεῖσ περὶ τῶν λόγων τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν καὶ εἰπωμεν
 μάρτυρες, ' καὶ οὕτωσ ἐπαύσατο λευὶ ἐντελλόμενος τοῖσ υἱοῖσ αὐτοῦ 4
 καὶ ἐξέτειπε τοῖσ πόδασ αὐτοῦ, καὶ προσετέθη πρὸσ τοῖσ πατέρασ
 αὐτοῦ· ζήσασ ῥλζ' ἔτη, ' καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸν ἐν σωρῶ· ὕστερον δὲ ἄραυτες 5
 τὰ ὀστέα αὐτοῦ, ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐν χεβὼρ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ.

'Αντίγραφον διαθήκησ λούδα δ' περὶ ἀνδρείασ καὶ φιλαργυρίας, καὶ
 περὶ τῆσ βασιλείασ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ δι' ὧν ψηφίν.

"Ὅτι οἱ βασιλεύοντες ἔσονται ὡσ κῆτοι καταπίνοντες τοῖσ ἀνθρώ- 21 γ
 πουσ ὡσ ἰχθύασ· θυγατέρασ καὶ υἱοῖσ ἐλευθέρουσ καταδουλώσιν· οἴκουσ·
 ἄγρουσ· ποιμνια· χρήματα ἀρπάσωσιν· ' καὶ πολλῶν σάρκασ ἀδίκωσ 8
 κόρακασ καὶ ἴβεισ χορτάσουσιν, καὶ προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ κακόν, ἐν
 πλεονεξία ὑψοῦμενοι· ' καὶ ἔσονται ὡσ καταγιγδοσ ψευδοπροφήται, καὶ 9
 πάντασ δικαίουσ διώξονται· / Ἐπάξει δὲ αὐτοῖσ κύριος διαιρέσεισ κατ' 22 I
 ἀλλήλων, καὶ πόλεμοι συνεχεῖσ ἔσονται ἐν Ἰσραήλ· ' καὶ ἐν ἀλλοφύλοισ 2
 συντελεσθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία μου, ἕωσ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.
 "Ἐωσ παρουσίας τοῦ θεοῦ τῆσ δικαιοσύνησ· τοῦ ἡσυχάσαι τὸν ἰακώβ ἐν
 εἰρήνῃ, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· ' καὶ αὐτὸσ φυλάξει κράτοσ βασιλείασ μου 3
 ἕωσ τοῦ αἰῶνοσ· ὀρκῶ γὰρ ὧμοσαί μοι κύριος μὴ ἐκλείψειν τὸ βασιλεῖον
 μου καὶ τοῦ σπέρματόσ μου πάσασ τὰσ ἡμέρασ ἕωσ τοῦ αἰῶνοσ. / πολὺ 23 I
 δὲ λύπη μοι ἔστι τέκνα μου διὰ τὰσ ἀσελγίασ καὶ γοιτίασ καὶ εἰδωλο-
 λατρείαν· ἄσ ποιήσετε εἰσ τὸ βασιλεῖον· ἐγγαστριμύθοισ ἐξακολουθοῦντες.
 κλῖδωσι καὶ δαιμόσι πλάνησ· ' τὰσ θυγατέρασ ὑμῶν μουσικὰσ καὶ 2
 δημοσίασ ποιήσετε· καὶ ἐπιμύνησθαι ἐν βδελύγμασι ἔθνῶν· ' ἀυθ' ὧν 3
 ἤξει κύριος ἐφ' ὑμᾶσ λιμὸν καὶ λοιμὸν θάνατον καὶ ῥομφαίαν ἐνδικούσαν
 πολυορκίαν· ' καὶ ἐπάξει κύριος πάντα τὰ κακὰ ἐφ' ὑμᾶσ. / καὶ μετὰ 24 I
 ταῦτα, Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον μὲν ἐξ ἰακώβ ἐν εἰρήνῃ· καὶ ἀναστήσεται
 ἀνθρωποσ ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματόσ μου ὡσ ὁ ἥλιοσ τῆσ δικαιοσύνησ· συμ-
 πορευόμενος τοῖσ υἱοῖσ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πραότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ· καὶ
 πᾶσα ἁμαρτία, οὐχ εὐρεθήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ· ' καὶ ἀνοιγήσονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν 2
 οἱ οὐρανοί, ἐκχέε πνεύματοσ εὐλογίαν πατροσ ἁγίου· καὶ αὐτὸσ ἐκ

3 [col. 2] χέει πνεῦμα χάριτος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· ' καὶ ἔσεσθε αὐτῷ εἰς υἱοῦς
 4 ἐν ἀληθείᾳ· ' καὶ πορεύσεσθε ἐν προστάγμασι αὐτοῦ πρώτοις καὶ
 5 ἐσχάτοις· ' οὗτος ὁ βλαστὸς θεοῦ ὑψίστου καὶ αὕτη ἡ πηγὴ εἰς ζωὴν
 6 πάντων σαρκὸς· ' τότε ἀναλάμψει σκίπτρον βασιλείας μου, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς
 6 ρίζης ὑμῶν γενήσεται πυθμὴν· ' καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀναβήσεται ῥαβδὸς δικαιο-
 σύνης τοῖς ἔθνεσι, κρίναι καὶ σῶσαι πάντα τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους
 25 ἰ κύριον. / καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστήσεται ἄβραᾶμ καὶ ἰσαὰκ καὶ ἰακώβ εἰς
 ζωὴν· καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου, ἕξαρχοὶ σκίπτρον ὑμῶν ἐν Ἰσραὴλ
 ἐσόμεθα· λευὶ πρῶτος· δεύτερος ἐγώ· τρίτος ἰωσήφ· καὶ καθεξῆς
 26 (2) πάντες. / ταῦτα λέγων τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐκοιμήθη, ὧν ἑτῶν ριθ ἰούδας.

ἔ διαθήκη, ἀντίγραφον ἰσαχάρ· οὗτος οὐδὲν περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐφθέγγετο.
 ἐκτῆ διαθήκη ἀντιγράφου ζαβουλῶν· ἐν ἧ μετὰ πολλὰς παραινέσεις
 πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ, εἶπε καὶ περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ ταῦτα.

8 ἰ Καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν τέκνα μου ἔχετε εὐσπλαγχνίαν ἐπὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους
 2 ἐν ἑλπί· ἴνα καὶ ὁ κύριος εἰς ὑμᾶς σπλαγχνισθῆ· ἐλεῆσαι ὑμᾶς· ' ὅτι
 καὶ γε ἐπ' ἐσχάτων ἡμερῶν ὁ θεὸς ἀποστελεῖ τὸ σπλάγγνον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ
 3 τῆς γῆς· καὶ ὅπου εὕρη σπλάγγνα ἐλέους, ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ· ' ὅσον γὰρ
 ἀνθρωπος σπλαγγνίζεται εἰς τὸν πλησίον, τοσοῦτον κύριος εἰς αὐτόν
 4 ὅτε γὰρ κατήλθωμεν εἰς αἴγυπτον ἰωσήφ οὐκ ἐμνησικακήσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς·
 9 8 / καὶ μετὰ ὀλίγα πάλιν· εἶπεν· ' καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν αὐτὸς
 ὁ κύριος φῶς δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἴασις καὶ εὐσπλαγχνία ἐπὶ ταῖς πτέρυξιν
 αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς λυτρώσεται πᾶσαν αἰχμαλωσίαν υἱῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκ τοῦ
 βελίαρ· καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα πλάνης πατηθήσεται· καὶ ἐπιστρέψει πάντα τὰ
 ἔθνη εἰς παραζήλωσιν αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὄψεσθαι θεὸν ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου ὃν
 9 ἂν ἐκλέξηται, καὶ ἡ ἱερουσαλὴμ ὄνομα αὐτῷ· ' καὶ πάλιν ἐν πονηρίᾳ
 λόγων ὑμῶν παροργίσετε αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπορυφήσεσθαι ἔωσ καιροῦ συντε-
 10 ἰ λείας· / καὶ νῦν τέκνα μου μὴ λυπεῖσθαι ὅτι ἀποθνήσκω ἐγὼ μήδε
 2 συμπίπτετε ὅτι ἀπολείπω· ' ἀναστήσομαι γὰρ πάλιν ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν ὡς
 ἡγούμενος ἐν μέσῳ υἱῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐφρανθήσομαι ἐν μέσῳ τοῖς φίλοις
 μου ὅσοι ἐφύλαξαν νόμον κυρίου. καὶ ἐντολὰς ζαβουλῶν πατρὸς αὐτῶν·
 3 ' ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς ἐπάξει κύριος πῦρ αἰώνιον καὶ ἀπολέσει αὐτοὺς
 4 ἔωσ γενεῶν. ' ἐγὼ εἰς τὴν ἀνάπασίν μου ἀποτρέχω ὡς οἱ πατέρες μου·
 5 ' ὑμεῖς δὲ φοβεῖσθαι τὸν κύριον καὶ θεὸν ἡμῶν ἐν πάσι ἰσχύι πάσας τὰς
 6 ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν· ' καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη.

ξ διαθήκη δὲν ἀντίγραφον περὶ θυμοῦ καὶ ψεύδους ἐν ἧ μετὰ πλείονας
 παραινέσεις προσέθηκε λέγων τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ :

(in margin) εἰς Βαβυλῶνα λέγει

5 7 Καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ ἰούδα ἔσονται ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ ἀρπάζοντες τὰ ἀλλότρια ὡς
 8 λέοντες· ' διὰ τοῦτο ἀπαχθήσεσθαι σὺν αὐτοῖς ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ, κακέει

ἀπολήψεσθε πάσας τὰς πληγὰς αἰγύπτου· καὶ πᾶσαν πονηρίαν τῶν
 ἐθνῶν· **᾿**καὶ οὕτως ἐπιστρέψαντες πρὸς κύριον ἐλεηθήσεσθε· καὶ ἦξει 9
 ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ ἅγλασμα αὐτοῦ, βοῶν ὑμῖν εἰρήνην· **᾿**καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἐκ 10
 τῆσ φυλῆσ ἰούδα καὶ λευὶ τὸ σωτήριον κυρίου· καὶ αὐτὸσ ποιήσει πρὸσ
 τὸν βελίαρ πόλεμον· καὶ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τοῦ νίκουσ, δώσει πέρασιν
 ὑμῶν· **᾿**καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν λαβεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ βελίαρ ψυχὰσ ἀγίων, καὶ 11
 ἐπιστρέψει καρδίασ ἀπειθεῖσ πρὸσ κύριον· καὶ δώσει τοῖσ ἐπικαλου-
 μένοισ αὐτὸν εἰρήνην αἰώνιον, **᾿**καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐν τῇ ἐδὲμ ἁγιοῖ· καὶ 12
 ἐπὶ τῆσ νέασ ἱερουσαλήμ εὐφρανθήσονται δίκαιοι, ἦτισ ἔσται εἰσ
 δόξασμα θεοῦ ἕωσ τοῦ αἰῶνοσ· **᾿**καὶ οὐκέτι ὑπομενεῖ ἱερουσαλήμ 13
 ἐρήμωσιν, οὐδὲ αἰχμαλωτίζεται ἰσραήλ· ὅτι κύριοσ ἔσται ἐν μέσω
 αὐτῆσ· τοῖσ ἀνθρώποισ συνασαστρεφόμενοσ, βασιλεύων ἐπ' αὐτοῖσ ἐν
 ταπεινώσει καὶ ἐν πτωχείᾳ· καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῶ, βασιλεύσει
 ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐν τοῖσ οὐρανοῖσ· / καὶ νῦν φοβῆσθαι τὸν κύριον τέκνα μου, **6** 1
 καὶ προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖσ ἀπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ, καὶ τῶν πνευμάτων αὐτοῦ· **᾿**οἶδα 4
 γὰρ ὅτι ἐν (ῆ) ἡμέρα πιστεύσει ἰσραήλ, συντελεσθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία
 τοῦ ἐχθροῦ· **᾿**ἔσται δέ· ἐν καιρῶ ἀνομίασ τοῦ ἰσραήλ, ἀφιστάμενοσ 6
 ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κύριοσ μετελεύεται ἐμπροσθεν ποιοῦντων θέλημα αὐτοῦ·
᾿τὸ δὲ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἐν παντὶ τόπω ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἐν τοῖσ ἔθνεσι 7
 σωτήρ· **᾿**τηρήσατε οὖν ἑαυτοῖσ τέκνα μου ἀπὸ παντοῦσ ἔργου πονηροῦ 8
 [[264 b]] **᾿**καὶ ἂ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατροῦ ὑμῶν, μεταδοτε καὶ ὑμεῖσ 9
 τοῖσ τέκνοισ ὑμῶν ἵνα δέξηται ὑμᾶσ ὁ πατήρ τῶν ἐθνῶν, ἔστω γὰρ
 ἀληθῆσ καὶ μακρόθυμοσ· πρᾶοσ καὶ ταπεινοσ, καὶ ἐκδιδάσκων διὰ τῶν
 ἔργων νόμον κυρίου· **᾿**καὶ θάψατέ με ἐγγυσ τῶν πατέρων μου. / καὶ **7** 1
 ταῦτα εἰπὼν κατεφίλησεν αὐτοῖσ, καὶ ἐκοιμήθη ὕπνου αἰώνιον.

Ἡ διαθήκη ἀντίγραφον νεφθαλίμ· ἐν ῆ καὶ αὐτὸσ μετὰ πολλῶν νου-
 θεσιῶν, εἶπε τοῖσ ἰδίοισ τέκνοισ περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ ταῦτα.

Μὴ ἀποχωρίζεσθαι λευὶ καὶ ἰούδα· διὰ γὰρ τοῦ ἰούδα, ἀνατελεῖ **8** 2
 σωτηρία τῶ ἰσραήλ· καὶ ἐν αὐτῶ εὐλογηθήσεται ἰακώβ. **᾿**διὰ γὰρ τοῦ 3
 σκήπτρου αὐτοῦ ὠφθήσεται κύριοσ ὁ θεόσ· κατοικῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποισ ἐπὶ
 τῆσ γῆσ, σῶσαι τὸ γένουσ ἰσραήλ· καὶ ἐπισυνάξει δικαιοουσ ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν
᾿γίνεσθαι οὖν σοφοῖ ἐν θεῶ καὶ φρόνιμοι· ἰδόντεσ τάξι ἐντολῶν θεοῦ, 10
 καὶ θεσμοῖσ παντοῦσ πράγματοσ ὅπωσ ὁ κύριοσ ἀγαπήσει ὑμᾶσ, **᾿**καὶ
 ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη.

Θ διαθήκη, ἀντίγραφον γὰδ· ἐλάλησεν αὐτὸσ τοῖσ υἱοῖσ αὐτοῦ πολλὰσ
 παραίνεσεισ· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτοῖσ περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ ταῦτα.

᾿Εξάρατε οὖν τὸ μῖσοσ ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀγαπᾶται ἀλλήλουσ **7** 7
 ἐν εὐθύτητι καρδίασ· **᾿**εἶπατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖσ ταῦτα τοῖσ τέκνοισ ὑμῶν, **8** 1
 ὅπωσ τιμήσωσιν ἰούδα καὶ λευὶ· ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ κύριοσ, σωτηρίαν

2 τῷ Ἰσραήλ· ἔγνω γὰρ ὅτι ἐπὶ τέλει, ἀποστήσονται τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀπ' αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ποιηρία καὶ κακώσει· καὶ διαφθορὰ ἔσονται ἐνώπιον κυρίου· καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη.

Ἰ διαθήκη, ἀντίγραφον ἀσὴρ· παρακαλέσασ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελεῖν τῆς ἀρετῆς, καὶ ἐκφεύγειν πᾶσαν κακίαν· προσθεῖς καὶ περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐλάλησεν (?) αὐτοῖς οὕτως λέγων.

- 7 2 Οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἁμαρτήσετε, καὶ παραδοθήσεσθε εἰς χεῖρας ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν· καὶ ἡ γῆ ὑμῶν ἐρημωθήσεται· καὶ ὑμεῖς διασκορπισθήσεσθε εἰς τὰς δὲ γουῖας τῆς γῆς· καὶ ἔσεσθε ἐν διασπορᾷ ἐξουδενόμενοι ὥσπερ ὕδωρ ἄχρηστον, ἕως οὗ ὃ ὕψιστος ἐπισκέψῃται τὴν γῆν· καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλθὼν ὡς ἄνθρωπος μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐσθίει καὶ πίνων· καὶ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ συντρίβων τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ δράκοντος δι' ὕδατος· οὗτος σώσει τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, θεὸς εἰς ἄνδρα ὑποκρινόμενος· εἶπατε οὖν ταῦτα τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν μὴ ἀπειθεῖν αὐτῷ· ἀνέγνω γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὅτι ἀπειθοῦντες ἀπειθήσετε αὐτῷ· καὶ ἀσεβοῦντες ἀσεβήσεται εἰς αὐτόν· μὴ προσέχοντες τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων· διὰ τοῦτο διασκορπισθήσεσθε, ὡς γὰρ καὶ ὡς δὴν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ οὔτινες χώρας αὐτῶν ἀγνοήσουσιν, καὶ φυλὴν γλώσσαν αὐτῶν· ἀλλ' ἐπισυνάξει ὑμᾶς κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐν πίστει, δι' ἐλπίδα 8 1 εὐσπλαγχνίας αὐτοῦ· διὰ ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ εἰπὼν αὐτοῖς ταῦτα ἐκοιμήθη.

Ἰα διαθήκη, ἀντιγράφον ἰωσήφ· διδάξασ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ· περὶ ὑπομονῆς καὶ μακροθυμίας καὶ σωφροσύνης, εἶπεν καὶ αὐτὸς περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ· ὅσα ἦν διεγνωκῶς, ἐν ὧς φησί.

- 19 1, 2 Ἄκούσατε τέκνα μου καὶ ἀναγγεῶ ὑμῖν, ὃ ἶδον ἐνύπνιον· ἶδον γὰρ ὡς ὅτι ἰβ' ἔλαφοι ἐνέμοντο· καὶ οἱ θ' ἐξ αὐτῶν διηρέθησαν καὶ διεσπάρησαν 8 τῇ γῇ, ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ ἕτεροι γ'· καὶ ἶδον ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἰούδα ἐγεννήθη κόρη παρθένος, ἔχουσα στολὴν βυσσίνην· καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς προήλθεν ἄμνος ἄμωμος· καὶ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν αὐτοῦ ὡς λέων· καὶ πάντα τὰ θηρία ὄρμων κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνίκησεν αὐτὰ ὁ ἄμνος καὶ ἀπόλωσεν εἰς καταπάτησιν· 9 καὶ ἔχαιρον ἐπ' αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι· καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ· 10, 11 ταῦτα δὲ γενήσεται ἐν καιρῷ αὐτῶν ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις· ὑμεῖς οὖν τέκνα μου φυλάξατε τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τιμᾶται ἰούδας καὶ λευί· ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ· χάριτι σώζων πάντα τὰ 12 ἔθνη καὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ· ἡ γὰρ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ βασιλεία αἰώνιος, ὅτι οὐ παρασαλεύεται· ἡ δὲ ἐμὴ βασιλεία ἐν ἐμῇ ἐπιτελεῖται ὡς ὄπωροφυλάκιον· 20 1 ὅτι μετὰ τὸ θέρος οὐ φανήσεται· οἶδα ὅτι μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν μου θλίψουσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ αἰγύπτιοι· ἀλλ' ὁ θεὸς ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν ὑμῶν καὶ εἰσάξει 2 ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν· ἀλλὰ συνανοίσετε τὰ

ὄστέα μεθ' ὑμῶν· ὅτι ἀναγομένων τῶν ὄστέων μου, κύριος ἐν φωτὶ ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν· καὶ βελίαι ἐν σκότει μετὰ τῶν αἰγυπτίων· ' καὶ ταῦτα εἶπων 4 ἐκτείνας τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, ἐκοιμήθη ὑπνον αἰώνιον.

Ἰβ διαθήκη ἀντιγράφου βενιαμὶν περὶ διανοίας καθαρᾶς λέγων τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ οὕτως.

Τέκνα μου ἀποδράσατε τῆς κακίας· φθόνου τε καὶ τὴν μισαδελφίαν 8 ἰ καὶ προσκολλᾶσθαι τῇ ἀδελφότητι καὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ· ὁ ἔχων διάνοιαν 2 καθαρὸν ἐν ἀγάπῃ οὐχ ὀρᾷ γυναικα εἰς πορνείαν· οὐδὲ ἔχει μισμὸν ἐν καρδίᾳ· ὅτι ἀναπαύεται ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ. ' ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος 3 οὐ μίενεται προσέχων ἐπὶ κόπρον καὶ βόρβορον· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀμφοτέρα ψύγει, καὶ ἀπελαύνει τὴν δυσωδίαν· οὕτως καὶ ὁ καθαρὸς νοῦς· ἐν τοῖς μισμοῖς τῆς γῆς συνεχόμενος μᾶλλον οἰκοδομεῖ· αὐτὸς δὲ οὐ μίενεται· / ὑπονοῶ δὲ καὶ πράξεις ἐν ὑμῖν οὐ καλὰς ἔσεσθαι, ἀπὸ λόγων γραφῆς 9 ἰ ἐνώχ τοῦ δικαίου. πορ(ν)εύσετε γὰρ πορνεία σοδόμων ἐν ὑμῖν, καὶ ἀπολείσθαι ἕως βραχύ. καὶ ἀνανεόσεσθαι ἐν γυναιξὶ στρίνουσ· καὶ ἡ βασιλεία κυρίου οὐκ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ὅτι εὐθύς αὐτὸς λήψεται αὐτήν· ' πλὴν ἐν μερίδι ὑμῶν ἔσται ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἔνδοξος ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν· 2 ὅτι εὐθύς αὐτὸς ὑψώσει αὐτήν· καὶ Ἰβ φίλοι ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· ἕως οὗ ὁ ὑψιστος ἀποστηλεῖ τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐπι- σκοπῇ μονογενοῦς ' καὶ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὸν πρῶτον ναόν, καὶ ἐκεῖ 3 κύριος ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐξουδενωθήσεται καὶ ἐπὶ ξύλου ὑψωθήσεται, ' καὶ ἔσται τὸ ἄπλωμα τοῦ ναοῦ σχιζόμενον· καὶ καταβήσεται τὸ 4 πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὡς πῦρ ἐκχυννόμενον· ' καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνελθὼν 5 ἐκ τοῦ ἄδου ἔσται ἀναβαίνων ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς οὐρανόν· ἔγνω δὲ οἷος ἔσται ταπεινὸς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ οἷος ἔσται ἔνδοξος ἐν οὐρανοῖς· / ταῦτα γὰρ 10 4 ὑμᾶς διδάσκω καὶ ἀντιδίδομαι ἀντὶ πάσης κληρονομίας· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν μετὰδοτε ταῦτα τοῖς τέκνοις ἀντὶ πάσης κληρονομίας εἰς κατάσχεσιν αἰώνιον· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησαν καὶ ἀβραὰμ καὶ ἰσαὰκ καὶ ἰακώβ ' πάντα 5 ταῦτα ἡμεῖν κατεκληρονόμησαν εἰπόντες ὑμῖν· φυλάξατε τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἕως ὅτε ἀποκαλύψει τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι· ' τότε ὄψεσθαι ἐνώχ· νῶε· σὴμ· ἀβραάμ· ἰσαάκ· καὶ ἰακώβ ἀνηστα- 6 μένουσ ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει, ' Τότε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀναστησώμεθα ἕκαστος 7 ἐπὶ σκήπτρων ἡμῶν, προσκυνούντες τὸν βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν· τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς φανέντα μορφῇ ἀνθρώπου ταπεινώσεως· καὶ ὅσοι ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ γῆς, συγχαρίζονται αὐτῷ τότε· ' καὶ πάντες δὲ ἀναστήσονται· οἱ 8 μὲν εἰς δόξαν, οἱ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν· καὶ κρινεῖ κύριος ἐν πρώτοις τὸν Ἰσραὴλ περὶ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀδικίας· ὅτι παραγενόμενος θεὸς ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλευθερώτην οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν· ' καὶ τότε κρινεῖ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ὅσα οὐκ 9 ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ γῆς φανέντι· ' καὶ ἐλέγξει ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τῶν 10 ἔθνων τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ὥσπερ ἤλεγξεν τὸν ἡσαὺ ἐν τοῖς μαδυναίοις τοῖς

ἀπατήσασιν· ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν γενέσθαι διὰ τῆς πορνείας καὶ τῆς εἰδω-
 11 λολατρείας, καὶ ἀπηλλωτριώθησαν τοῦ θεοῦ· ὑμεῖς δὲ εἰς πορεύεσθαι
 ἐν ἁγιασμῷ κατὰ πρόσωπον κυρίου· πάλιν κατοικήσητε ἐν ἑμοῖ ἐπ'
 12 ἐλπίδι, καὶ συναχθήσεσθαι ἐπὶ κύριον. / ἀναστήσεται γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ
 σπέρματός μου ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀγαπητὸς κυρίου ἀκούων ἐπὶ γῆσ
 φωνῆν αὐτοῦ γνώσιν καινήν· φωτίζων πάντα τὰ ἔθνη φῶς γνώσεως
 3 ἐπεμβαίνων τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν σωτηρίᾳ, καὶ ἀρπάζων ὡς λύκος ἀπ' αὐτῶν
 καὶ διδοὺς τῇ συναγωγῇ τῶν ἐθνῶν· καὶ ἔως συντελείας τῶν αἰῶνων·
 4 ἔσται ἐν συναγωγαῖς ἐθνῶν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄρχουσι αὐτῶν, ὡς μουσικὸν
 καὶ τὸ ἔργον καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἔσται ἐκλεκτὸς θεοῦ ἕως τοῦ
 5 αἰῶνος· καὶ δι' αὐτὸν συνέτησέν με ὁ πατήρ μου ἰακῶβ λέγων, αὐτὸς
 12 ἵ ἀναπληρώσει τὰ ὑστερήματα τοῖς φιλοῖς σου. / καὶ ὡς ἐπλήρωσε τοὺς
 λόγους αὐτοῦ εἶπε· ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν τέκνα μου ἀνεπέγκατε τὰ ὄστα μου
 2 ἐξ αἰγύπτου· καὶ θάψατέ με εἰς χεβρών, ἕγγυς τῶν πατέρων μου· καὶ
 ἀπέθανε βενιαμίν· ὧν ἔτων ρκϛ, ἐν γῆρι καλῶ.

NOTES AND STUDIES

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

(continued)

VIII. *Auxiliary and quasi-auxiliary verbs.*

- i. *The past tense of the substantive verb ἦν ἦσαν with present active, present or perfect passive, participle as auxiliary; exactly equivalent to our English 'was' 'were' with present and past participle (rare in Matthew: frequent in Mark and Luke)*

1. i 6 ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου . . . καὶ ἔσθων ἀκριδας. No parallel in Luke: altered by Matthew. In classical Greek this construction would be quite regular, but the tense would be pluperfect and the meaning 'had been clothed'. Mark means 'was clothed'.

2. i 13 ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ . . . πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, 'was . . . being tempted', though both A.V. and R.V. have, less exactly, 'was . . . tempted'. Neither Matthew nor Luke is strictly parallel. Present passive participle only once again, in 17.

3. i 22 ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, 'was teaching'. The only case where both Matthew and Luke retain the Marcan construction.

4. i 33 ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν. Not (of course) 'had been gathered', but 'was gathered'. No Synoptic parallel.

5. i 39 ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν, 'was preaching'. As pointed out in ch. III of these Notes (*J. T. S.*, Oct. 1924, xxvi p. 15) W-H give a wrong reading here with \aleph B L ἦλθεν, due to the desire to find a construction for εἰς. Not only does the Lucan parallel (iv 44) support ἦν, but Mark i 14 is decisive on the same side: Jesus 'came into Galilee preaching' at the outset of His ministry, here He 'continued preaching'. Luke retains the construction, Matthew alters it.

6. ii 6 ἦσαν δέ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι, 'were sitting there and discussing'. Matthew alters: Luke retains ἦσαν καθήμενοι, but removes it to the opening of the story, v 17.

7. ii 18 ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες. The statement is dropped at this point by both Matthew and Luke.

8. iv 38 αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ . . . καθεύδων. Again altered by both, by Matthew to the imperfect, by Luke to an aorist.

9. v 5 ἦν κράζων καὶ κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν λίθοις, 'continually, night and day . . . he was crying out and cutting himself . . .' The verse is dropped in both derivative accounts.

10. v 11 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ . . . ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη βοσκομένη. Retained by Matthew, probably because the verb need not go with the participle: 'there was there a great herd feeding', rather than 'a great herd was feeding there'. Luke makes that clearer by altering to βοσκομένων.¹

11. vi 52 ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη. No parallels.

12. ix 4 καὶ ἦσαν συνλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Both Matthew and Luke alter, Luke to the imperfect συναλάουον, Matthew by suppressing ἦσαν and connecting the participle with the preceding verb.

13. x 22 ἦν γὰρ ἔχων χρήματα [v. l. κτήματα] πολλά. Here it is Matthew who retains the Marcan construction, Luke who alters it (ἦν πλούσιος): but see further, on this verse and context, § v 15 below, p. 359.

14. x 32 ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Luke omits the verse, Matthew quite alters the construction.

15. x 32 ὁ καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. No parallels.

16. xiv 4 ἦσαν δὲ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς. No parallel in Luke: Matthew alters to the aorist.

17. xiv 40 ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καταβαρυνόμενοι. Matthew retains the construction but alters the present to the perfect participle: by so doing he may keep the letter of grammatical rule, but it is to the havoc of the sense, for the pluperfect is quite out of place. Their eyes 'were being weighed down', not 'had been weighed down'. There is no parallel in Luke.

18. xiv 49 καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων. Altered by Luke to a participle, ὄντος μου (avoiding two verbs connected with καί), by Matthew, because he disliked the construction, to ἐκαθεζόμεν.

19. xiv 54 ἦν συνκαθήμενος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν. Here for the first time both Matthew and Luke make the same alteration, substituting ἐκάθητο for ἦν συνκαθήμενος—though one has μετὰ τῶν with Mark and the other μέσος αὐτῶν. But it is not beyond the ordinary doctrine of chances that in this solitary case out of a list of twenty-four passages the two later Evangelists should independently hit on so simple a change.

20. xv 7 ἦν δὲ ὁ λεγόμενος Βαραββᾶς μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν δεδεμένος. 'Now the fellow called Barabbas was . . . lying in prison': A.V. wrongly separates ἦν from δεδεμένος, rendering 'there was one . . . Barabbas which lay bound'; R.V. is ambiguous. Mark's whole reference to Barabbas is so awkwardly expressed, that it is not to be wondered at that the story is re-drafted by the other two Evangelists.

21. xv 26 ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη. Both the others change, partly perhaps because the brevity of the Marcan account

¹ βοσκομένη in Luke viii 32, in spite of the strong authority of \aleph B D (not d) Θ a, looks like an assimilation to Matthew (and Mark).

seemed to call for expansion: Mark e. g. does not tell us where the inscription was put.

22. xv 40 ἦσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι. Retained by Matthew, probably for the reason suggested on no. 10 above: altered by Luke.

23. xv 43 ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Altered by both, by Luke to the imperfect of the same verb, by Matthew to the aorist of another verb.

24. xv 46 ἐν μνήματι ὃ ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας, 'which was hewn out' A.V. rightly: R.V. which had rendered the idiom rightly in 1, 4, 11, 21, at last found a chance to hark back to the classical pluperfect, 'which had been hewn out'. But Marcan usage is clear. Matthew changes to the active ὃ ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ, Luke to the shorter but perhaps more ambiguous phrase ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ.

The number of instances cited shews that we have here a favourite locution of Mark. No difference has been made in the list between instances of the present active (or passive 2, 17) participle and instances of the perfect passive participle, because it does not appear that Mark made any. But his most characteristic usage is with the present participle, ([2], 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, [17], 18, 19, 22, 23, or three out of every four cases), and it is exactly equivalent to our own use of the auxiliary verb and participle for the imperfect 'he was teaching' 'they were fasting' 'he was in the stern sleeping'. Similarly the construction with the perfect passive participle corresponds closely enough to our 'he was clothed'. Matthew very rarely uses any form of the construction; never with the present participle, except in the few cases he takes over unaltered from Mark, 3, 10, 13, 22. Luke on the other hand is not averse to it in the rest of his Gospel, but he prunes it away drastically from his Marcan material, leaving it only in the three first cases of his meeting with it, 3, 5, 6.

It might almost be said that this construction with the auxiliary verb is for Mark, as for us, the real imperfect: for his use of the proper imperfect is little, if at all, removed from his use of the aorist. In cases such as ii 27 ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον κτλ., or v 30 ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἔλεγεν Τίς μου ἦψατο; it seems quite impossible to read into ἔλεγεν any sense different from that of εἶπεν. When Mark wants to give the continuous sense of the imperfect, he uses ἦν with the present participle: just as when he wants to give another shade of the imperfect, the inchoative sense, 'began to do' a thing, he uses what is in effect another auxiliary verb, as we shall now see.¹

¹ Both uses, ἦν with present participle and ἤρξατο with present infinitive, reflect Aramaic use, as I learn from the Rev. C. H. Dodd of Mansfield College, who supplies me with references to G. Dalman *Die Worte Jesu* pp. 28, 21.

ii. *The verb ἄρχομαι (ἤρξατο ἤρξαντο) with present infinitive as auxiliary for the imperfect (Matthew 10 times, Mark 26, Luke 18).*

1. i 45 ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν . . . Matthew omits the verse: Luke has a (roughly parallel) imperfect.

2. ii 23 οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες . . . Matthew retains ἤρξαντο: Luke again substitutes an imperfect.

3. iv 1 καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. Both Matthew and Luke omit the phrase.

4. v 17 καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν . . . Both the other Synoptists change into an aorist.

5. v 20 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν . . . No parallel in Matthew: Luke substitutes a participle, ἀπῆλθεν κηρύσσων.

6. vi 2 καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου ἤρξατο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ. No parallel in Luke: Matthew gives the imperfect.

7. vi 7 ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο, καὶ εἰδὼν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν . . . No strict parallel in either Synoptist: but for the imperfect εἰδὼν both substitute the aorist ἔδωκεν. Here, and often in Mark, ἤρξατο marks a 'beginning' in the sense of a new departure rather than a continuous process.

8. vi 34 καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά. The whole phrase disappears from both the other accounts: but in the next verse Luke ix 12 has ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν. That is to say, he borrows Mark's ἤρξατο, but transfers it to something to which 'beginning' was strictly appropriate: 'the sun began to get low'.

9. vi 55 καὶ ἤρξαντο ἐπὶ τοῖς κραβάττοις τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας περιφέρειν. The whole paragraph is absent from Luke: Matthew substitutes an aorist, προσήνεγκαν.

10. viii 11 καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἤρξαντο συνζητεῖν αὐτῷ. Matthew has an imperfect: Luke has the Q account of the demand for a sign (xi 29), and therefore leaves out Mark's account.

11. viii 31 καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ . . . Retained by Matthew: Luke has an aorist participle.

12. viii 32 καὶ προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ. So also Matthew: Luke omits the episode.

13. x 28 ἤρξατο λέγειν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ. In both the other accounts εἶπεν.

14. x 32 ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν: just as viii 31, no. 11. Once more both Matthew and Luke have simply εἶπεν.

15. x 41 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν . . . Luke, to save the credit of two leading apostles, omits all personal references in this episode: Matthew leaves the main story untouched, but for ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν substitutes the aorist ἠγανάκτησαν.

16. x 47 (of Bartimaeus) ἤρξατο κράζειν καὶ λέγειν . . . Very probably

he did begin and go on with repeated cries: but both Matthew and Luke are, as usual, content with an aorist.

17. xi 15 ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας. Matthew again has the aorist: Luke by exception (and so in no. 18) retains the Marcan phrase.

18. xii 1 καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν Ἀμπελῶνα Matthew, having just inserted in the Marcan framework the parable of the Two Sons, naturally omits the whole phrase: Luke follows Mark again, as in the last preceding case.

19. xiii 5 ἤρξατο λέγειν αὐτοῖς Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ. As in no. 11, it is a real commencement of new matter, the eschatological discourse. Notwithstanding, both the other Synoptists prefer to treat our Lord's words simply as an answer to the question put to Him, 'When shall these things be?' and so introduce them with an aorist.

20. xiv 19 ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ Matthew retains ἤρξαντο: Luke omits this and the following verse, perhaps because it seemed impossible that any but the actual traitor could have needed to put the question 'Is it I?'

21. xiv 33 ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν. Matthew once more retains ἤρξατο: Luke omits the whole verse.

22. xiv 65 καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτεύειν αὐτῷ. For this Matthew has an aorist, Luke (better) an imperfect.

23. xiv 69 καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἤρξατο πάλιν λέγειν. For this Matthew has a present tense, Luke an aorist. B and the Sahidic, moved by just the same considerations as the two Evangelists, substitute εἶπεν in St Mark for the characteristic language of the author.

24. xiv 71 ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν. So too Matthew: Luke, not liking to attribute oaths or curses to the apostle, contents himself with the statement of fact 'Peter said'.

25. xv 8 ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι The verse has nothing corresponding to it in the other two accounts.

26. xv 18 καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀσπάζεσθαι αὐτόν. Cf. no. 22: there, as here, Matthew has, instead of ἤρξαντο, an aorist. No parallel in Luke.

Out of these twenty-six instances, there are parallels in Matthew to nineteen, in Luke to fifteen: Matthew gets rid of ἤρξα(ν)το thirteen times, or twice in every three, Luke twelve times, or four times out of every five. As with regard to the substantive verb and participle, so here Matthew is averse to the construction himself, and where he does use it it is more often than not (six times out of ten: see 2, 11, 12, 20, 21, 24) taken over straight from Mark; while conversely Luke is again not so disinclined to the usage on his own account, but leaves it unaltered in Mark less often than Matthew, 17, 18, and see on 8.

iii. *The verb δύναμαι as auxiliary (altogether Matthew 27 times, Mark 33, Luke 26).*

Not only is the verb δύναμαι more common in Mark than in either Matthew or Luke, but in many cases its force is so weakened that it becomes almost an auxiliary verb, and corresponds to our 'can' 'could' or even 'may' 'might'. Translation of this shade of meaning is therefore easy in English, and the Authorized Version uses ordinarily 'can' and 'could', but in iv 32 'may', in xiv 5 'might have been sold', and in iv 33 'as they were able'. In about half the cases of the use of δύναμαι in St Mark, there is nothing remarkable about it, and they will not be cited here: where there are parallels in the other Synoptists, they do not shrink from repeating Mark's phraseology; where, as in the majority of cases, a negative is expressed or implied, we could paraphrase 'it is impossible'. But in the other half Mark's usage of δύναμαι is tending towards an auxiliary sense, and any rendering like 'it is not possible' would exaggerate his meaning: R.V. (though it may be right in substituting 'are able' for the 'can' of A.V. in Mark x 38, 39) goes wrong when it tries to represent the future δυνήσεται (iii 25, viii 4, ix 39) by 'will (shall) be able': for the 'can' of A.V. all that is necessary is to put 'could'.

The cases that follow are those where the weakened or auxiliary use is probable or at least possible.

1. i 45 ὥστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι εἰς πόλιν φανερώς εἰσελθεῖν. There was no physical impossibility: A.V., R.V., rightly 'could no more'. No parallel in Matthew or Luke.

2. iii 20 ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μηδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν. No parallels: but cf. Mark vi 31 οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν where the sense is practically the same as in iii 20 'They could not even get a meal'. Again no question of physical impossibility.

3. iii 23, 24, 25, 26 πὼς δύναται Σατανᾶς Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; . . . οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι . . . οὐ δυνήσεται στήναι . . . οὐ δύναται στήναι. Probably Matthew and Luke take the passage from Q: in any case they avoid the use of δύναμαι right through. (But Matthew follows Mark iii 27 in using it of the entry into the strong man's house.)

4. iv 32 ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν. Matthew retains Mark's construction but substitutes ἐλθεῖν for δύνασθαι: Luke turns the clause into a statement of fact καὶ . . . κατεσκήνωσεν. Q may once more have affected Matthew and Luke: but anyhow they have in fact both avoided Mark's δύνασθαι, which A.V. very well renders 'may'.

5. iv 33 He spoke the word to them in parables καθὼς ἠδύναντο

ἀκούειν. No parallel in Luke: Matthew omits the phrase. A.V. and R.V. 'as they were able to hear it', but I suspect that Mark does not mean more than 'in proportion to their capacity' 'as they could hear'.

6. vi 5 οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν. No parallel: but obviously Mark means that it was a moral impossibility for Christ to work miracles where there was not faith to correspond. Both our versions rightly 'could there do'.

7. vii 15 ὁ δύναται κουνῶσαι αὐτόν (cf. v. 18). No parallel in Luke: Matthew substitutes the simple κουνῶι, because 'can defile' hardly means more here than 'does defile'.

8. ix 39 οὐδέεις γάρ ἐστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογήσάί με. 'Could easily revile me' is surely the right shade of the meaning, rather than 'shall be able to' of R.V. No parallel in Matthew or Luke.

9. xiv 5 ἡδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ μύρον πραθῆναι . . . So Matthew: no parallel in Luke. 'Might have been sold' A.V. and R.V., rightly.

10. xiv 7 ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε . . . εὖ ποιῆσαι. Matthew omits: Luke again has no parallel. A.V. 'whosoever ye will ye may do them good' is exactly right: 'can do them good' of R.V. is unnecessary, and 'are able to do them good' would be an exaggeration of emphasis.

Consideration of Mark's use of δύναμαι does not perhaps at first sight compel us to conclusions so clear as those of the two preceding sections of this paper. But it cannot be without significance that Mark uses this verb, in proportion to the length of his Gospel, about twice as often as the other two Synoptists: and that being so, I think it is legitimate to apply the presumption to be drawn from his use of auxiliary verbs in general to this particular case. The parallel of our own language shews us how a verb like 'can' has tended to lose something of its original force: 'can you come to lunch to-morrow?' is intermediate between 'will you come?' and 'are you able to come?' Verbs like ἰσχύω begin to replace the stricter meaning of δύναμαι in later Greek. In Mark ix 18 'I said to thy disciples that they should cast it out' καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν, both the other Synoptists substitute οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν, perhaps from οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν of Mark ix 28. Did the father use a stronger word than the apostles?

iv. *The verb θέλω as auxiliary (altogether Matthew 39 times, Mark 25, Luke 28).*

Θέλω is even more definitely an auxiliary in Mark than δύναμαι. It cannot indeed be distinguished from βούλομαι, since the latter word has almost dropped out from the language of the Gospels, and θέλω has replaced it. But θέλω itself hardly expresses the idea of a strong definite wish: for that sense other words have to be found, and θέλω in

Mark can almost always be rendered by our own auxiliary verbs 'will' (in the present tense) and 'would' (in the past). Since, however, we use 'shall' and not 'will' as the auxiliary verb in the first person (singular and plural), the rule does not apply to the forms θέλω θέλομεν: Mark vi 25 θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῶς μοι is really mistranslated by the 'I will' of both A.V. and R.V.: x 35 θέλομεν ἵνα ὁ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσης ἡμῖν is better rendered by them 'we would'; 'I want' or 'I should like' would be the most exact equivalents, and so indeed also, though the existing rendering has too sacred associations to be replaced by any other, in xiv 36.

It is interesting to note further how often in Mark the verbs θέλω and δύναμαι, our 'would' and 'could', stand in context and contrast with one another: i 40 ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι, 'If you would, you could make me clean'; vi 19 ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο, 'she would have killed him, but could not' (A.V. is right: R.V. 'desired to kill him' is wrong); vii 24 οὐδένα ἤθελεν γινῶναι καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη λαθεῖν, 'he would have remained incognito, but could not'; xiv 7 ὅταν θέλῃτε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς πάντοτε εὖ ποιῆσαι, 'if you would, you could be benefiting them continually'.

That θέλω must not be translated 'wish' or 'desire' in St Mark is made abundantly clear by vi 48 ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς, which of course does not mean 'He desired to pass them by', but exactly what we express by 'He would have passed them by'—if they had not noticed Him and stopped Him.

Now let us take some other passages in order, and see how they fit in with the principles of rendering just enunciated.

iii 13 προσκαλεῖται οὓς ἤθελεν αὐτός. Here we approach nearer than anywhere else in the Gospel to the sense of 'choice', and it is possible that this is just what is suggested by the otherwise inexplicable αὐτός. For obviously it cannot mean 'whom he himself selected and not somebody else', so that R.V.'s 'whom he himself would' is pure nonsense: and though St Mark wrote a Greek of his own and not that of the grammars, he meant something by it. *Faute de mieux*, it may therefore not be too bold to suggest that what he did mean by αὐτός was to add the element of personal choice to the colourless word ἤθελεν, and so for A.V. 'whom he would' I would substitute 'whom he willed'.

vi 26 οὐκ ἠθέλησεν ἀθετηῆσαι αὐτήν. For 'he would not reject her' I should be inclined to write 'he did not want to reject her'. That is, I think, the best rendering where a negative precedes θέλω.

viii 34 εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν. A.V. is right with 'will come after me', rather than R.V. with 'would come after me'. Note that in the next verse ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ σῶσαι is strictly parallel to ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολόσσει— for it will hardly be suggested that a 'will to save life' is contrasted

with an accidental or involuntary loss of it. No instance could shew more clearly that θέλω is *practically* an auxiliary verb, and nothing else. So ix 35, x 43.

ix 13 ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον. Both A.V. and R.V. 'what they listed': that is, in modern English, 'what they liked'. Not 'what they willed'.

x 36 τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν; Our authorities vary a good deal in these words, but the reading is borne out by x 51 τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω; xiv 12 τοῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἐτοιμάσωμεν; xv 9 θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν; and possibly xv 12 τί οὖν [θέλετε] ποιήσω; 'What would ye I should do?' or in more modernized English 'What do you want me to do?'¹ The extraordinary reading of N^c B Ψ in x 36 τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω ὑμῖν; is relegated to the margin of W-H, and must presumably be a conflation between two readings ποιήσω and με ποιήσαι.

xii 38 τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν. A.V. 'love' is a shade too strong: but it is nearer the mark than R.V. 'desire'. Our exact equivalent is 'like' to walk in their best clothes.

One remaining word, and it is an important one, must be said about the construction θέλω ἵνα.² It is found three times in Mark, vi 25 θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῶς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάνου, ix 30 καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ, x 35 θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσης ἡμῖν, where the idiomatic rendering is, I think, 'I want you to give me' 'He did not want any one to know' 'We want you to give us': once apiece in Matthew and Luke but in the same phrase, Matt. vii 12 = Luke vi 31 ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε (καθὼς θέλετε) ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, where perhaps the phrase of Q was already so ingrained in Christian use as not to permit of change: once in John, xvii 24. Now θέλω νά is the modern Greek for the future tense: obviously the κοινή of the first century A.D. was already moving in that direction, and Mark of all the Evangelists most nearly represents the κοινή unaffected by literary tradition. The usage of auxiliary verbs was already beginning to establish itself.

v. *The verb ἔχω* (73 times in Matthew, 68 in Mark, 76 in Luke).

The account of auxiliary and quasi-auxiliary verbs would be incomplete without some treatment of the verb ἔχω, which shares with the words hitherto treated a disproportionate frequency of usage in

¹ In ix 5 the ordinary texts give καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, and Luke too has καὶ ποιήσωμεν: but Matthew has εἰ θέλεις ποιήσω, and whence did he derive εἰ θέλεις, unless he read in Mark either θέλεις ποιήσω with D b ff i, or θέλεις ποιήσωμεν with *Θ Jam* 13 565? 'Would you like us to make three tabernacles?'

² The use of ἵνα in Mark demands special treatment. It is found 58 times in Mark, as against 33 and 37 times respectively in the longer Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

Mark as compared with Matthew and Luke, though it is not strictly auxiliary. Only in two passages is there anything like an echo of the low-Latin idiom of *habeo* with the past participle passive which has as we know established itself in the languages of Western Europe: iii 1 ἄνθρωπος ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα, viii 17 πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; That does a little bit suggest *arefactam habens manum*, and Matthew and Luke both instinctively substitute the adjective ξηρά for the participle ἐξηραμμένη: they have nothing parallel to viii 17. The papyri and modern Greek, I am told, shew that Greek as well as Latin developed along the lines of the auxiliary use of 'have' with the perfect participle; and that would account for the two instances in Mark.

But Mark's fondness for ἔχειν goes much farther than this, and the tendency of the two other Synoptists, and especially Luke, to modify Mark's language on many of the occasions of its use, is worth recording. I do not propose to examine all, or anything like all, of the sixty-eight instances where ἔχω occurs: any Greek writer, literary or not, will of course be found to make regular use of the word: what is peculiar to Mark is partly just his fondness for it, partly certain characteristic methods of employing it where a better trained writer like Luke will generally avoid it.

1. i 22 ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων. So Matthew: but Luke gets rid of ἔχων by writing ἦν ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. In ii 10, iii 15, the same phrase is followed by an infinitive, which makes all the difference.

2. i 32 τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας, cf. i 34, ii 17, vi 55. In classical Greek this would be κακῶς πράσσοντας or κακῶς πάσχοντας: and therefore, though Matthew has no objection to the phrase, Luke avoids it here, though he does not alter it where our Lord is the speaker, ii 17 χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν . . . ἰατροῦ . . . οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες—probably a proverbial phrase, and for that reason also more difficult of change.

3. ii 19 ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ' αὐτῶν, cf. xiv 7 πάντοτε τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μετ' ἑαυτῶν. In ii 19 both Matthew and Luke omit the phrase, primarily no doubt because it is redundant after ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστίν. But the use with εἶναι is the use satisfactory to Luke, cf. I, 5, 9, 13.

4. ii 25 χρεῖαν ἔσχεν. Omitted by Matthew and Luke, and characteristically Marcan: but quite classical with a genitive following, ii 17, xi 3, xiv 63, and retained on each occasion by both Matthew and Luke.

5. iii 1, 3 ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα (see above, at the top of the page), τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ξηράν: on the first of the two occasions Luke vi 6 substitutes ἡ χεῖρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιὰ ἦν ξηρά, cf. I, 3. See the next note.

6. iii 10 ὅσοι εἶχον μᾶστιγας, cf. iii 22 Βεζεβούλ ἔχει, iii 30 πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει, v 15 τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγιῶνα, vii 25 εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον

αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, ix 17 ἔχοντα πνεῦμα ἄλαλον. Of these six cases of ἔχειν neither Matthew nor Luke (where they have parallels at all) retain any one. Luke paraphrases with οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι ὑπὸ . . . ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν (but in viii 27 he writes ἔχων δαιμόνια), Matthew with κακῶς ἔχοντες, κακῶς δαιμονίζεται, κακῶς πάσχει. Mark's use would seem to be a sort of colloquial idiom, somewhat resembling our own 'a man with an unclean spirit' and the like.

7. iii 29 οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν. Both Matthew and Luke substitute the cognate verb ἀφίεσθαι. Mark's use is very un-Greek—'to have forgiveness' instead of 'to be forgiven'—and no better example of his exaggerated use of ἔχειν could be found.

8. iv 5, 5, 6, 17 οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν, οὐκ ἔχουσιν ῥίζαν. There is nothing wrong in these phrases, but they do illustrate the limitations of Mark's vocabulary and his fondness for an elementary verb like ἔχειν. Precisely similar is his repeated usage, for instance, of ἔρχεσθαι.

9. iv 40 οὐπω ἔχετε πίστιν; cf. xi 22 ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ. Again nothing absolutely incorrect, and Matthew has the construction three times, the Epistle of James twice. But common as πίστις is in St Paul's Epistles, ἔχειν πίστιν only occurs three times. Luke viii 25 changes to ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;

10. v 3 τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν. Again Luke changes noun with ἔχειν to verb ἔμενεν, viii 27.

11. v 23 ἐσχάτως ἔχει. A colloquial phrase, unique in N. T., and condemned by purists as not found in Attic writers: see Rutherford *The New Phryniachus* p. 481. Both Matthew and Luke alter it.

12. vi 34 ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα, 'as sheep without a shepherd', see on 6 above. The phrase is adopted by Matthew in another context, Matt. ix 36. The idea is frequent in O. T., but the LXX (cf. Luke's usage, see on 3 above) always renders οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμὴν (Swete).

13. vi 38, viii 5 πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; Matthew on both occasions has the same construction as Mark: Luke here (no parallel to viii 5) changes once more to the construction with εἶναι, see on 3, οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ . . . But in viii 16, 17 ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε (no Lucan parallel), Matthew substitutes ἐλάβομεν, ἐλάβετε.

14. ix 50 ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλα. No parallel: but perhaps Matthew's ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ τὸ ἄλας τῆς γῆς (Matt. v 13) represents the Q form of the same Saying.

15. x 21 ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον, 22 ἦν γὰρ ἔχων χρήματα πολλά, 23 οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες. It is curious that Luke retains the first and third of these contiguous phrases, and changes the second to ἦν γὰρ πλοῦσιος σφόδρα, while Matthew retains in substance the second (with κτήματα

for *χρήματα*) but changes the first to *πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα* and the third to *πλούσιος*. Obviously the common instinct of both was to modify at some point or another Mark's superabundant use of *ἔχειν* in this context.

16. xi 13 *συκῆν . . . ἔχουσαν φύλλα*, 'a fig-tree in leaf' 'with leaves'. Luke omits the whole episode because of its difficulty, Matthew omits *ἔχουσαν φύλλα*, perhaps simply because the phrase immediately following 'nothing but leaves' sufficiently implies that there were leaves.

17. xii 6 *ἔτι ἓνα εἶχεν υἷον ἀγαπητόν*. Both Matthew and Luke reconstruct the phrase, perhaps just in order to get rid of *ἔχω* in this connexion. A Greek would naturally have written *not εἶχεν υἷον*, but *ἦν αὐτῷ υἷός*.

18. xiv 8 *ὃ ἔσχεν ἐποίησεν*, 'what she could she did'. Luke omits the episode, because he has already given a similar story in vii 37 ff: Matthew omits this sentence, it may be only to get rid of the collocation *ἐμὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε ὃ ἔσχεν . . .* But the parallels which Swete quotes from Luke to this use of *ἔχω* (Luke vii 42, xii 4, xiv 14, Acts iv 14) are not strictly in point, for in each of them a negative precedes, and that makes a real difference.

Nothing was said above of i 38 *τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις*, because this use of the participle of the middle voice is not *in pari materia* with the rest of the passages enumerated, and moreover it is quite good Greek.

APPENDIX

εἶδέναι, γινώσκειν, ἐπιγινώσκειν, substantially identical in sense in Mark.

We are all familiar with the distinction in classical Greek between *εἶδέναι* 'to know by intuition' and *γινώσκω* 'to know by experience or learning', or in other words between 'knowing' and 'learning'. But does this distinction exist for St Mark? Does not the process of degeneration of the language of which we have been accumulating evidence extend to these two similar verbs as well?

I. iv 13 *οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην; καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;* (no parallel in Matthew or Luke).

Both A.V. and R.V. translate both words 'know': but Swete *ad loc.* would draw the ordinary distinction between 'knowledge which comes from intuition or insight' and 'that which is gained by experience or acquaintance'. Our versions are right, if only for the reason that there is no future of *εἶδέναι* in N. T.: *εἰδήσω* is only once found (Heb. viii 11), and that in a quotation from the LXX. But if *γνώσομαι* is used as the future of *εἶδέναι*—as it certainly appears to be in this passage—a presumption is already created that in Mark at any rate the two verbs are

not really distinguishable. That presumption appears to be borne out in the passages which follow.

2. v 29, 33 ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἵαται ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος . . . εἰδνῖα δὲ γέγονεν αὐτῇ.

Our versions make the distinction of 'felt' and 'knowing': but I do not think there is any justification for this, beyond perhaps the consideration that γνώσκω may tend to be used where the sphere of knowledge, σώματι or πνεύματι, is expressed.

3. xiii 28, 29; 33, 35 γινώσκεται ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν . . . γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις . . . οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρὸς [ἐστίν] . . . οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται.

Here it is not easy to give any other rendering throughout than 'know'. All that can be said is that it is practically a rule with the negative to use οἴδατε rather than γινώσκετε: cf. iv 27, ix 6, x 38, xi 33, xii 24, xiii 32, xiv 40.

4. xii 12 ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν, and xv 10 ἐγίνωσκεν γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτόν (where Matthew at any rate thought that ἦδει was the proper word to use) contrasted with ii 10 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας and xi 32 ἅπαντες γὰρ ἠδειςαν τὸν Ἰωάννην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν. Here I read ἠδειςαν confidently with D W @ 565 700 and O. L. including *k*: for (i) the alternative reading εἶχον is easily explained as introduced from Matthew, (ii) ἠδειςαν suits better than εἶχον with the word ὄντως—you can 'know of a surety', but how can you 'regard of a surety'?

Does Mark mean to distinguish in these two sets of passages between two sorts of knowledge as predicated on these different occasions of Scribes and Pharisees, of Pilate, and of the crowd? I think the words are synonymous.

5. ii 8, v 30, viii 17, xii 15: the participles γνοὺς, ἐπιγνοὺς, εἰδῶς, as used of our Lord.

ii 8 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται . . . For this and the next case see on 2 above.

v 30 καὶ εὐθὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελεθόσαν . . .

viii 17 καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε;

xii 15 ὁ δὲ εἰδῶς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς τί με πειράζετε; So B C L A Δ Ψ a *k* Vulg. Syriac and Egyptian versions against ἰδῶν of the rest: and in spite of xii 34 (and xii 28?) the preponderance of authority for εἰδῶς here seems decisive.¹

¹ Even if εἰδῶς is not the correct reading in this passage, the participle reappears in v 33 (quoted above) and vi 20 of Herod ἐφοβείτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδῶς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον. So for the other two verbs cf. vi 54 εὐθὺς ἐπιγρόντες αὐτόν and xv 45 γνοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυρίωνος.

It does not seem possible to distinguish any difference of meaning between the three verbs as used of our Lord's knowledge in these four passages. What distinction there is is perhaps one of tense—*εἰδώς* being the present, *γνούς* and *ἐπιγνούς* the aorist: *γινώσκων*, *ἐπιγινώσκων*, are not found in Mark. In other words, when Mark wanted to write a present participle, he used that of *οἶδα*: when he was writing an aorist, he turned to *γινώσκω* or *ἐπιγινώσκω*. Just as with *οἶδατε* and *γνώσεσθε*, so with *εἰδώς* and *γνούς*, we construct the complete paradigm only by the help of the two verbs.

The practical identity of *γινώσκω* and *ἐπιγινώσκω* seems to be borne out by a comparison of vi 33 *καὶ ἔγνωσαν πολλοί* (if we read *ἔγνωσαν* with B D and *fam.* 1) *καὶ περὶ ἧ . . . συνέδραμον* and vi 54 *εὐθὺς ἐπιγινόντες αὐτὸν περιέδραμον . . .*

C. H. TURNER.

ἌΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ

A year ago Prof. Souter published in the JOURNAL (Oct. 1926, xxviii 59) a passage of Plutarch illustrating the sense of *ἀγαπητός* for which I have pleaded in reference to the Gospels. Shortly before the appearance of Prof. Souter's note my friend the late Prof. A. H. Cruickshank, of the University of Durham, had communicated to me another passage from Plutarch where *ἀγαπητός* is conjoined with *μόνος* in the same sense: *de genio Socratis* 27¹ (Charon talking of his son) *οὔτος (ἔπεν) ὁ ἄνδρες ἐμὸς μόνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀγαπητός, ὡς ἴσται.*

C. H. TURNER.

THE 'SHORTER TEXT' OF ST LUKE XXII 15-20.

IN one of the Additional Notes to *Can we then Believe?* Dr Gore deals with the problem of the 'shorter text' of St Luke's account of the Institution of the Eucharist. In this note the writer, with characteristic candour, records his abandonment of 'a preference for the longer text, as it is found in the A.V. and R.V.', and admits the force of the textual argument against that longer text, as presented by Dr Hort and Dr Sanday. But he still finds the problem of this passage insoluble. The shorter text appears to hold the field, yet 'on the other hand, it is difficult to suppose that St Luke should have been content to give an account of the Institution which ends so abruptly, and leaves it to be supposed that our Lord dealt with the cup before

¹ In the Teubner edition of the *Moralia*, iii 539.

the bread, and should have omitted in connexion with the cup any reference to its sacramental meaning¹.

Dr Gore is surely justified, alike in abandoning the 'longer text', and in feeling that the 'shorter text', as commonly presented, is extremely hard to accept and to understand. It is the purpose of this note to give reasons for thinking that a different 'shorter text' can be reconstructed, on the basis of the textual evidence, and that such a text is both likely to be what St Luke actually wrote, and also offers none of the difficulties which are involved in the acceptance of the reading found in *Codex Bezae*.¹

Before passing on to consider the textual evidence, I would call attention to a question which is more important than some scholars have appeared to realize. The Marcan narrative provided St Luke with the words οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. Since Luke was purposing to add at a later point a reference to eating and drinking at the table of the Lord in His kingdom, he wrote down Mark xiv 25 in a shortened form—οὐ μὴ πῖω . . . ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ; but he also deliberately duplicated the whole utterance—ἐπιθυμία ἐπιθύμησα φαγεῖν . . . λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῆ ἔν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. What was the point of this duplication? This will appear more clearly later on; but it is to be noted that the effect of the duplication is to open the story of the Last Supper with a solemn and mysterious reference to (1) eating and (2) drinking. In the *Textus Receptus* this double reference is then repeated, in full liturgical form; whereas in the text of D the reference to drinking is followed only by a curiously abrupt account of the eucharistic breaking of the bread. Thus it is misleading to speak of that text as though it merely inverted the normal liturgical order, and placed the cup before the bread; it does not do so²; it merely adds a reference to bread and eating after

¹ The whole passage Luke xxii 14-23 was the subject of a very interesting study by Dr H. E. D. Blakiston which appeared in this JOURNAL in 1903 (vol. iv, pp. 548-555). Dr Blakiston, who was definitely inclined to prefer the 'longer text' to that of W-H, propounded the hypothesis that the whole section was 'not the Synoptic tradition with additional details perhaps affected by St Paul's version, but a deliberate, though intentionally incomplete, conflation of two distinct, independent, and perhaps equally original narratives of the Institution'. The acute arguments by which this hypothesis was supported do not concern me here; but it is interesting to find that the narrative which Dr Blakiston assigned to the Lucan source is exactly identical with the Lucan text towards which, as I believe, the textual evidence really points.

² The view here rejected is maintained by Loisy (*Évangiles Synoptiques* ii 528): 'le récit de Luc a toujours embarrassé les commentateurs, la bénédiction de la coupe précédant celle du pain, sauf à revenir une seconde fois après le souper.' Loisy holds the common view that the Lucan account and order, as given in D &c., is to

the twofold utterance about eating and drinking which is found in *vv.* 15-18. This 'shorter text', then, ought not to be thought of as narrating a complete eucharistic Institution in an abnormal order. Its difficulty is not one of order but of redundancy; for if it be accepted we have to explain why one half of the Institution-narrative is appended to a passage in which the twofold elements of the eucharistic action are already represented, enigmatically indeed, but in their normal sequence.

The textual evidence is reduced by Dr Zahn in his Commentary (pp. 671 ff) to four main types of reading, namely:—

I. an early Syriac-Latin form, in which *vv.* 17-18 are placed after *σῶμά μου*, and take the place of 19^b-20 as the conclusion of the narrative;

II. the text of the great uncials, &c.;

III. that of the Peshitto, which omits 17-18 altogether, but includes 19-20 as they are found in II;

IV. the reading of D a ff² &c., which inserts *καὶ λαβὼν . . . σῶμά μου* only, after *v.* 18.

This classification is rather a rough one, as a closer glance at the Syriac evidence would shew, but it is adequate, perhaps, for our present purpose. Of the types thus distinguished, III may clearly be disregarded; and in spite of Professor A. C. Clark's rehabilitation of II (*Primitive Text of the Gospels* pp. 77 ff) I will take leave to assume that the weight of evidence is definitely unfavourable to II, and that II is a deliberate and non-Lucan assimilation of a difficult passage to more familiar texts and usages. But it must not be forgotten that the evidence for II, or something very like it, is extremely early. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i 66), harmonistic though his reference to the Eucharist may be, clearly thought of the words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου* as Gospel words, and when he wrote *καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως* it is to be presumed that the Lucan *ὡσαύτως* was in his mind. Marcion also—though the evidence for his reading at this point is incomplete—appears to have had in his text the words *διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου*. Therefore, if II is the product of a process of assimilation, that process must have begun very early indeed.

This being admitted and borne in mind, we have next to ask whether any of our extant Gospel-texts is so pure as to preserve the

be illustrated from the *Didache*; it reproduces the normal Jewish order of the benedictions, which was not the order in which the distribution took place. The order bread-wine was due, he thinks, to St Paul, 'qui a vu surtout dans l'eucharistie le symbole et la continuation du sacrifice de la croix . . . De ce point de vue théologien, la fraction du pain, symbole de la mort, s'offrait la première à l'esprit, et permettrait de comprendre sans difficulté le symbolisme du vin'.

original text from which the process of assimilation and amplification took its beginning; and since the reading of D &c. has been accepted as the standard type of 'shorter text', we have to ask whether D preserves what St Luke wrote, or whether even this text has undergone any amplification.

In order to answer this question we must look more closely into the texts roughly grouped by Zahn under the heading I. Within this group Syr-sin seems to stand over against Syr-cu and *b e* as representing a more advanced stage of textual evolution, while *b e*, again, are more primitive than Syr-cu. A *conspectus* will make this clear:—

<i>Syr-sin</i>	<i>e (Syr-cu, δ)</i>
επιθυμια επεθυμησα το πασχα φαγειν μεθ' υμων προ του με παθειν λεγω γαρ υμιν (οτι) ουκετι ου μη φαγω αυτο εως οτου πληρωθη εν τη βασιλεια του θεου και λαβων αρτον	concupiscentiam concupi hoc pascha manducare uobiscum priusquam patiar dico enim uobis quia iam non manducabo illud doneque adimplear (impleatur δ) in regno dei et accepit panem et (et accepto pane δ)
ευχαριστησας εκλασεν και εδωκεν αυτοις λεγων τουτο εστιν το σωμα μου το υπερ υμων διδομενον ουτως ποιειτε εις την εμην αναμνησιν και μετα το δειπνησαι λαβων το ποτηριον	gratias egit (+ επ' αυτω <i>cu</i>) et fregit et dedit eis (illis δ) dicens hoc est corpus meum (+ το υπερ υμων ουτως ποιειτε εις την εμην αναμνησιν <i>cu</i> : om δ <i>e</i>) et accepit calicem et (accepto calice δ) gratias egit (+ επ αυτω <i>cu</i>) et dixit accipite (+ hoc et δ + τουτο <i>cu</i>) uiuite (diuidite δ) inter uos
ευχαριστησας επ αυτω ειπεν λαβετε τουτο	— —
διαμερισατε εις εαυτους τουτο εστι το αιμα μου η καινη διαθηκη λεγω γαρ υμιν οτι ου μη πιω απο του νυν απο του γεννηματος τουτου	dico enim uobis quod non uiuam (bibam δ) amodo de potione uitis (de generatione uitis huius δ: απο του γεννηματος τουτου της αμπελου <i>cu</i>) quoadusque (donec δ) regnum dei ueniat.
εως οτου η βασιλεια του θεου ελθη	

The Greek text underlying the Sinaitic Syriac, with its additions of τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον ('which I give for you'), οὕτως ποιείτε κτλ., μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, and τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμα μου ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη, is clearly later, at this point, than that represented in the Curetonian, while the Curetonian is in its turn later than the Latin authorities grouped with it; and we may conveniently take *e*, therefore, as representing Zahn's group I in its earliest extant form.

What, then, is the difference between the text of I (*e*) and that of IV (D *a ff*², &c.)? Neglecting minor details, it amounts simply to this, that IV has the words καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον . . . τὸ σῶμά μου after the clause ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ, whereas I has the same words appended to the clause ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. Dr Sanday (in H. D. B. ii 636 f) regarded the reading of *e* as an attempt to improve upon that found in D. 'The omission of *vv.* 19^b-20 (D *a ff*² *i l*) belongs to the oldest form of the Western text. The next step was to transpose the order of *vv.* 17-18 and 19^a, so as to make the sequence of the Bread and Cup correspond to that in the other authorities.' Yet, with all due deference to so high an authority, it is permissible to doubt the correctness of this reconstruction of the textual development, and to suggest an alternative.

Since *k* is not extant at this point, *e* is our only available representative, though by no means a consistent representative, of the African Latin; and it is not impossible that *e* should be regarded here as parallel to D rather than derivative from D. In fact, I would suggest, these two manuscripts represent two extremely early and almost identical attempts to emend a difficult passage, or rather they represent one and the same attempt, marred in one case and not in the other by a mischance.

Is there not a presumption, where a piece of 'over-matter' is found, in two different but kindred authorities, at two different points in a paragraph, that it is in both cases an interpolation? If that is so, the present case is surely one in which that presumption is of exceptional strength. We have here a little section, very strangely placed in D and less strangely in *e*, but occurring in both cases after the words βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. Is it not probable, at least, that the clause is a very early interpolation, intended from the first to be inserted where *e* has it, but added by mischance, in an ancestor of D, after the wrong βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ? Professor Turner, to whom I made this suggestion, amplifies and illuminates it thus: 'one might suppose that the first change was that a very early annotator put in the καὶ λαβὼν . . . σῶμά μου clause between two columns of his papyrus roll, and that *e*'s ancestor copied it into his copy in the left-hand column of the text, D's ancestor into the column to the right, that is, at a later point.'

This interpolation, if we may now venture to call it so, is not based on 1 Corinthians nor on Matthew but on Mark; *ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς* appears in Matthew as *δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς* and is absent from the Pauline text. Moreover, with its omission of *λάβετε* it is closer to the text of *k* in Mark than to that of the critical editions, although it does not go so far with *k* as to include 'et manducaverunt ex illo omnes', which Professor Turner (*Inaugural Lecture* ed. 2 p. 71) believes to be the authentic Marcan text. Both D and *e*, however, with *εὐχαριστήσας* and *gratias egit* shew a slight assimilation to the Pauline text, or to that of Luke xxii 17, whereas the Marcan reading is undoubtedly *εὐλογήσας* (beneficent *k*).

It may be asked whether after all it is not possible that the *e* text as it stands is original. The answer seems to be that in its present form it cannot be the parent of the text of D, nor does it in any way serve to explain the reading of the great uncials. On the other hand, it is, as I believe, the most primitive text that we possess; but in order to explain the other and later forms we seem forced to go back behind all extant MS authority, and to discern behind *e* a text in which there was no explicit eucharistic reference at all. Such a text must have seemed from the first to cry out for amplification¹; and such a text alone would afford a simple and adequate explanation of all the subsequent variants. That it explains the present reading of *e* is obvious; while Zahn's text-form II may either have been an independent amplification, or, conceivably, may have originated on the basis of the error now perpetuated in D and its congeners. In any case, there is a direct road from the shortest of all the possible 'short forms' to any of the longer ones.

A word must now be said about the resultant text: *καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῆ ἔν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ δεξιόμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν· λάβετε, διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος [τούτου] τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως ὅτου ἔλθῃ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντός με κτλ.* All this is deliberately substituted for the explicit eucharistic reference of Mark. The motive for the duplication *οὐ μὴ φάγω . . . οὐ μὴ πῖω*, which replaces Mark's *οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω*, at once becomes plain. The words are *φωνᾶντα συνειπίσω*; the double reference to eating and drinking, coupled with the promise uttered later of a *διαθήκη*, wherein the faithful, and they only, would eat and drink at the Lord's table in His

¹ The amplifying process is presumably older than Marcion, but the form in which his text appears to have presented it would have commended itself to him on the ground of its Pauline character.

kingdom, would be understood to veil from all but the initiated the intimacies of a familiar rite. But even so veiled a reference must touch, though allusively, upon food as well as upon drink: and the duplication of the Marcan utterance serves to clothe the allusion in a perfectly appropriate form.

I do not infer, as some recent German scholarship is inclined to do, that the story of the Last Supper was not, in St Luke's mind, linked closely with liturgical usage, that it was not *kultisch gedacht*. Contrariwise, I am tempted to think that we have here such a genuine trace of a *disciplina arcani* as reappears in the Fourth Gospel. One can quite readily conceive that St Luke's narrative was published under circumstances which made it inadvisable to disclose the inner meaning of Christian worship. Dr Blakiston, in the paper alluded to above, called attention to some of the contacts between the Third Gospel and the Fourth at this point. A recent study by von Harnack, dealing with Marcionite readings and their influence upon Catholic texts, has suggested others. Here, perhaps, we have one more; and the significance of these contacts offers a problem for which no one yet, so far as I know, has provided an adequate solution.¹

H. N. BATE.

THE THEOPHANIES OF GIDEON AND MANOAH.

IN the course of the criticism of the Old Testament it is often necessary to conclude that a particular narrative or element of a narrative is unhistorical, on the ground that it is contradicted by other evidence which appears to be more trustworthy. But the task still remains of considering the details, for in the effort to understand them we may often throw light upon beliefs and ideas of great value for the study of history in its widest sense. For example, if the opening chapters of Genesis are not regarded as an authentic account of the beginning of the world, we find in its stead a quantity of evidence which illumines the ideas and beliefs of the Hebrews, and what we seem to lose in 'objective' history we gain in a deeper knowledge of Hebrew life and thought. In the long run we acquire material which

¹ This note was written, and had left my hands, before the publication of Professor Burkitt's note on the same passage in the January number of this JOURNAL (pp. 178 ff.). Professor Burkitt holds that the 'shorter text' preserves the true Lucan reading, while the 'longer text' dates from the formation of the Church's official Canon of Four Gospels. I should prefer to say that the 'shorter' and the 'longer' texts both date from successive stages in that process, and that the earlier of these stages cannot be placed later than the first decades of the second century.