

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]

I conclude by an extract from a letter Dom Connolly wrote to me while this paper was being prepared. He says:

'As to the antiquity of the Homily there is a point worth noting, which I have just indicated at the end of my Introduction (p. xli. note 4): "The mere fact that A [Homily xvii, discussed in this paper] treats only of the *missa fidelium* strikes me as a note of antiquity". What I meant was (though this only occurred to me at the last moment) that the Homilies A, B, C, are really *catechetical instructions* like those of Cyril of Jerusalem—and indeed all three of them seem to shew acquaintance with Cyril's Catecheses (see p. 28, note 4; p. 38, note 1; p. 51, note 2).

'In A (Hom. xvii) the author is, I believe, addressing those who have just witnessed the Mysteries for the first time. They had seen all the earlier part as catechumens often before, and so he has nothing to say about it, but begins with the dismissal of the unbaptized and non-communicants. Later people, like "George of Arbel" (cf. also George of the Arab Tribes, and Bar Kepha), go through the whole from beginning to end, but the Catechists don't. They only deal first with baptism and then with the "Mysteries" or central part of the Mass. Such instructions were absolutely necessary, as nothing could be said about the "Mysteries" during the time of catechumenate. Hence all such—Cyril's, Ambrose's, the *De Sacramentis*—have this limitation of scope.'

The conclusion is, that our Homily was composed while the Catechumenate was still a living institution.

F. C. BURKITT.

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

(continued).

IX. *Lexical notes on (1) some ἀπαξ λεγόμενα: words used once in Mark, and nowhere else in the Gospels: (2) some words or phrases of common occurrence in Mark but rare in Matthew or Luke.*¹

(1)

ἀποστερεῖν.

MARK x 19 μὴ ἀποστερήσης. The word occurs among the list of the Commandments, and is clearly intended to be one of them: but because it does not in terms correspond to the Old Testament lists, it is dropped by both Matthew and Luke. It is quite certainly genuine,

¹ The notes that follow are rather miscellaneous in character, but I hope that they may be found to present not a few points of interest.

and is indeed presumably the source of the inclusion of 'fraud' among irremissible sins in the penitential discipline of the early Western Church. If *μη πορνείας* (after *μη μοιχείας*) at the beginning of the Marcan list is, as I suspect, genuine, then just as the Seventh Commandment is extended to include fornication, so here we may suppose the Eighth is extended to include fraud as well as literal theft.

For the use of *ἀποστερεῖν* in non-Christian writers I need do no more than refer to Field's admirable note *ad loc.* (*Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* p. 33): its technical meaning is that of holding back 'money or goods deposited with another for safe keeping'. But it is, I think, worth while to add some references from Christian writers, or in one case from a non-Christian writer in relation to Christian ethics; and with that object I begin by shewing that the earliest Latin rendering of *ἀποστερεῖν* is *abnegare*.

Mark x 19 'ne abnegaueris' *κ*, 'non abnegabis' *a c.* Hermas *Mand.* iii 2 *ἀποστερηταί τοῦ Κυρίου*, lat. 'abnegant Dominum': *Mand.* viii 5 *ἀποστέρησις*, lat. 'ab abnegantia'. We can therefore confidently assume that where we find 'abnegare' in an appropriate context, it corresponds to *ἀποστερεῖν*.

Pliny *ep. ad Traianum* 96 (Lightfoot *S. Ignatius* i 50-53: the well-known letter about the Christians) 'seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent'.

Herms *Mand.* iii 2 οἱ οὖν ψευδόμενοι ἀθετοῦσι τὸν Κύριον, καὶ γίνονται ἀποστερηταί τοῦ Κυρίου, μὴ παραδίδοντες αὐτῷ τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἣν ἔλαβον. ἔλαβον γὰρ πνεῦμα ἄψευστον· τοῦτο ἐὰν ψευδὲς ἀποδώσωσιν, ἐμίαναν τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἐγένοντο ἀποστερηταί.

Id. *Mand.* viii 5 καὶ γε πολλά, φησίν, ἔστιν ἀφ' ὧν δεῖ τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγκρατεῦσθαι· κλέμμα, ψεῦσμα, ἀποστέρησις, ψευδομαρτυρία, πλεονεξία κτλ.

Id. *Sim.* vi 5. 5 ὁ ὀξύχολος . . . καὶ ὁ μοιχὸς καὶ ὁ μέθυσος καὶ ὁ κατάλαλος καὶ ὁ ψεύστης καὶ ὁ πλεονέκτης καὶ ὁ ἀποστερητῆς καὶ ὁ τούτοις τὰ ὅμοια ποιῶν κτλ.

Cyprian *ep.* lii 1 (Hartel 617. 1) 'Nicostratum quoque diaconio sanctae administrationis amisso, ecclesiasticis pecuniis sacrilega fraude subtractis et uiduarum ac pupillorum depositis denegatis . . .'

κεφαλῖώ.

Mark xii 4 καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον· κάκεινον ἐκεφαλῖωσαν καὶ ἠτίμασαν.

Our authorities vary between *ἐκεφαλῖωσαν* (N B L Ψ) and *ἐκεφαλαίωσαν* (A C D Θ etc.): *κεφαλῖώ* is not given in Liddell and Scott, *κεφαλαίω*

only—apart from this passage in Mark—in the sense ‘to sum up’. The earliest Latin rendering is ‘decollauerunt’ *k*: but the injury implied must be something between the *ἔδειραν* of verse 3 and the *ἀπέκτειναν* of verse 5, and it must be on the same plane with *ἠτίμασαν*: in other words, it must be some sort of treatment which would degrade a man, or at any rate make him look ridiculous. I do not see that to ‘knock on the head’, even if we could get that sense out of the Greek word, which is all but impossible, satisfies this condition: and I see no alternative but conjectural emendation. Burkitt proposes *ἐκολάφισαν*: but how is ‘slapped’ a worse form of punishment than ‘thrashed’? and why should a fairly familiar word have suffered so gross a corruption? Very tentatively I suggest, that a metathesis of the syllables *κε* and *φα* has taken place, such as might occur with an unfamiliar word, and that we should read *ἐφακελίωσαν* (or *ἐφακέλωσαν*), ‘trussed him up in a bundle’. *φάκελος* is a classical word, and the verbal form *φακελόω* is quoted in L. S. from the Byzantine writer Nicetas. I notice too in Thumb that *φακιάλι* is modern Greek for a turban. If this were the true reading, the procedure indicated would be preparatory to some degrading process expressed by *ἠτίμασαν*.

προδοῦναι.

Mark xiv 10 *ἵνα αὐτὸν προδοῖ* (or *προδοῖ αὐτὸν*) *αὐτοῖς* is the reading of *D ci k* vulg (*proderet*), where the other texts have the verb elsewhere always used in the Gospels, *παραδοῖ* (*traderet*). In the next verse *πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαίρως παραδοῖ* stands without variant. I suspect that the Western reading in verse 10 is correct. The contrast between *προδοῖ* and *παραδοῖ* is very much to the point, *προδοῦναι* meaning ‘to betray’, *παραδοῦναι* properly to ‘hand over’, ‘deliver up’ to the chief priests. And it seems much more likely that the normal *παραδοῦναι* should be introduced by scribes and editors in place of the unusual word, than that the unusual word should have been, on this one occasion, introduced at all.

On the assumption then that *προδοῖ* is genuine, it will be, with Luke vi 16 *Ἰουδαν Ἰσκαριῶθ ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης*, the only New Testament source of any usage of *προδοῦναι προδότης*, *prodere proditor*, in early Greek and Latin Christian literature. But while *proditor* is good Latin enough, there is no noun *παραδότης* in Greek, and therefore *προδότης* was inevitable (as well as *προδοσία*), but for the verb *παραδοῦναι tradere* is so all but universal in the Gospels in connexion with Judas that any evidence for the use of the alternative word in Christian antiquity seems worth collecting.

Martyrium Polycarpi vi 1, 2 ὁ εἰρήναρχος ὁ κεκληρωμένος τὸ αὐτὸ ὄνομα, Ἡρώδης ἐπιλεγόμενος, ἔσπευδεν εἰς τὸ στάδιον αὐτὸν εἰσαγαγεῖν· ἵνα ἐκεῖνος μὲν τὸν ἴδιον κλῆρον ἀπαρτίσῃ Χριστοῦ κοινῶς γενόμενος, οἱ δὲ προδόντες αὐτὸν τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰούδα ὑπόσχοιεν τιμωρίαν.

But this single example of προδοῦναι¹ refers primarily to the betrayal of Polycarp by a domestic rather than to the betrayal of Christ by Judas. One cannot therefore, on the evidence so far available, establish any influence of the solitary instance of προδοῦναι in St Mark, even if it is genuine, on Greek Christian usage.

The case for *prodere* in Latin is more respectable. It is of course clear that προδοῖ in Mark xiv 10, whether or no it is original, was the word rendered by the earliest Latin version: and the two writers now to be cited may or may not have derived their use of *prodere* from its use in this one instance in their Latin Gospels.

Cyprian *de eccl. unit.* 22 (Hartel, 229. 23) 'nam et Iudam inter apostolos Dominus elegit, et tamen Dominum Iudas postmodum prodidit [prodidit R M* prodit G tradidit WM²]. non tamen idcirco apostolorum firmitas et fides cecidit quia proditor Iudas ab eorum societate defecit'.

Id. ep. lix 2 (668. 2) 'cum uideamus ipsum Dominum . . . ab eo quem inter apostolos ipse delegerat proditum'.

Ps.-Cyp. *ad Nouatianum* 14 (Hartel, iii 64. 20) 'Iudas ille inter apostolos electus . . . ipse postmodum deum prodidit'.

Proditor occurs also in Iren. lat. I xxviii 9 [xxxii 1] and II xxxii 3 [xx 5], but in the latter passage *traditor* two lines farther on: and in ps.-Tert. *adv. omn. haer.* 2. But as with προδότης this does not perhaps take us very far; though in Latin *traditor* was a possible (and presumably the usual) equivalent for 'the traitor'.

πυγμῆ.

vii 3 οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῆ νύψωνται τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν. Beyond question πυγμῆ stands rightly in the text: so all Greek MSS except \aleph W: but the word was unfamiliar, as the varieties in rendering shew—the Sinai Syriac omits, while of the Latins *a* has momento, *b* subinde, *d* primo, *c* *ffi* (more correctly) pugillo—and \aleph (followed, as so often, by Jerome in the Vulgate) W emend to πυκνά, crebro. But no one would have thought of altering a known word giving apparently (though not really) a suitable sense to anything as obscure as πυγμῆ. Now πυγμῆ means 'fist'; but it was also used as a measure of length 'from the fist to the elbow', and the Greek commentators Euthymius and Theophylact in fact interpret it here to mean

¹ I owe it to the kindness of Dr Darwell Stone, editor of the *Lexicon of Patristic Greek*.

thrusting the arm into the water up to the elbow (Swete). More than twenty years ago I called attention in this JOURNAL (vi 353), when reviewing Dom Butler's edition of the *Lausiatic History* of Palladius, to the phrase in chapter lv, p. 148, l. 21, *νύσασθαι τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας πυγμῇ ὕδατι ψυχροτάτῳ*. A certain young deacon Jovinus was a member of a party travelling from Jerusalem to Egypt, and one very hot day on arriving at their destination he got a washing-tub and plunged hands and feet *πυγμῇ* into ice-cold water. Whereupon an elderly lady of the party rebuked him for self-indulgence in so pampering himself in his youth: she herself, though in the sixtieth year of her age, never washed anything *ἐκτὸς τῶν ἄκρων τῶν χειρῶν*. Since *χείρ* in Greek means properly the forearm, *τὰ ἄκρα τῶν χειρῶν* may mean 'the fingers', or even as much as 'the hands' in the modern sense of the word, but not more: and in contrast with this, Jovinus' washing must clearly have been 'up to the elbow'. That gives excellent sense also to the passage in Mark, and justifies the exegesis of Euthymius and Theophylact. We learn once more the value of the Greek Fathers, even the latest of them, as interpreters of the New Testament.

(2)

ἀλλά (*Mark* 46 times, *Matthew* 37 times, *Luke* 36 times).

Obviously from these numbers the particle is a special favourite of Mark's: but obviously also there will be many instances where its use is normal, and offered no temptation to change. There are however some ten instances where Matthew does, apparently with intention, substitute another word, generally *δέ*: though as it happens in only three of these (3, 8, 9) have we a real parallel in Luke.

1. ix 8 *οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον*: so A C L W Δ ⊕ 565 sah. arm. Matt. xvii 8 *οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον*. In Mark **N B D** have introduced *εἰ μὴ* from Matthew, but the Latins should not be quoted on this side, for they could hardly help rendering *ἀλλά* in this context by 'neminem nisi'—I suspect indeed that the *εἰ μὴ* of D may be due to assimilation to the 'nisi' of its Latin column. It is in the last degree unlikely that any scribe should have altered *εἰ μὴ* to the ungrammatical *ἀλλά*, while the converse change, supported by the parallel in Matthew, would be easy enough. Mark's usage is probably influenced by Aramaic, but Moulton-Milligan in their *Vocabulary of N.T.* cite from the papyri a close parallel *μὴ ἐξέστω Φιλίσκω γυναῖκα ἀλλῃ ἐπαγαγέσθαι ἀλλὰ Ἀπωλλωνίαν*.

2. ix 13 *ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν*. Matt. xvii 12 *λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν*.

3. xi 32 *ἀλλὰ εἵπωμεν Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων*; Matt. xxi 26, Luke xx 6, *ἐὰν δὲ εἵπωμεν Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων . . .*

4. xiii 20 οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς . . .
Matt. xxiv 22 διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς . . .

5. xiii 24 ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην . . .
Matt. xxiv 29 εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων . . .

6. xiv 28 ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προᾶξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
Matt. xxvi 32 μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με . . .

7. xiv 29 εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ. Matt.
xxvi 33 omits the ἀλλά, and writes εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί,
ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι.

8. xiv 36 παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· ἀλλ' οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω,
ἀλλὰ τί σύ. Matt. xxvi 39, Luke xxii 42, agree in substituting πλὴν for
ἀλλά 1^o, possibly to avoid the double ἀλλά of Mark.

9. xiv 49 ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί. The sentence is of course
incomplete: Matt. xxvi 56 completes it by dropping ἀλλά and sub-
stituting τοῦτο δὲ δλον γέγονεν. Luke xxii 53 on the other hand retains
ἀλλά but gives it a full construction, ἀλλ' αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα . . .

10. xvi 7 ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ . . . Matthew once
more drops ἀλλά, xxviii 7 καὶ ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι εἴπατε . . .

(πρὸς) ἑαυτοῦς.

(*Mark has πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς seven times, πρὸς ἀλλήλους four times: Luke
πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς twice, πρὸς ἀλλήλους eight times: John πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς twice,
πρὸς ἀλλήλους four times: Matthew never uses either phrase.*)

There is of course no doubt about the meaning of πρὸς ἀλλήλους
(Mark iv 41, viii 16, ix 34, xv 31): the problem to be resolved is the
meaning of πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς.

1. i 27 ὥστε συνζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς λέγοντας . . . I read πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς
with A C D Θ W (αὐτοῦς 565) and Marcan usage, cf. 3 below: syr-sin
'to one another': αὐτοῦς B Tisch. W-H. I do not doubt that
Alexandrian scholars disliked the phrase πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς if it was used—
as συνζητεῖν shews it was here used—to mean 'with one another'.
Luke's συνελάουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους shews that he had πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς, not
αὐτοῦς, before him in Mark. There is no parallel in Matthew.

2. ix 10 καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς συνζητοῦντες τί ἐστὶν . . .
The parallel of 1 suggests that, in spite of the unusual order of the
words, πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς must be taken with συνζητοῦντες, 'discussing with
one another': for the absolute use of τὸν λόγον κρατεῖν 'keep in mind',
cf. vii 3, 4, 8, 'observe the tradition'. There is no parallel in either
Matthew or Luke.

3. x 26 οἱ δὲ περισσωσ ἐξεπλήσσαντο λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς . . . Once
more the Alexandrians avoided πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς, substituting πρὸς αὐτόν: so

ⲚBCΔΨ and the Egyptian versions with W-H, against A D W latt. syr-sin and all other authorities with Tisch. But Mark's usage is quite decisive, for λέγειν πρὸς αὐτόν is never found in his Gospel, but always λέγειν αὐτῷ. Both Matthew and Luke have simply λέγοντες (εἶπαν).

4. xi 31 καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες . . . Here Matthew alters to παρ' ἑαυτοῖς 'among themselves', and Luke, while retaining πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς, alters the verb to συνελογίσαντο, Luc. xx 5, compare xxii 23 συνζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς.

5. xii 7 ἐκείνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν ὅτι . . . Again Matthew alters to εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς . . ., Luke to διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες . . . Luke, as in I, clearly understood Mark to mean 'said to one another'.

6. xiv 4 ἦσαν δὲ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς . . . Textual complications abound in this passage, and the usual conditions are reversed, for the Alexandrians and the mass of authorities with W syr-sin give πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς, while D © 565 cff *i k* omit πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς with Matthew (there is no parallel in Luke): but again Marcan usage must be the decisive factor.

7. xvi 3 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς Τίς ἀποκλιῖσει . . . Neither Matthew nor Luke has anything parallel here.

πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς 'with one another' is thus a Marcan usage, which Luke generally modifies, Matthew absolutely rejects. But Luke, wherever he is parallel to Mark, always retains the sense: it is a more difficult question whether Matthew, when he substitutes παρ' ἑαυτοῖς (4 above), or ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (5 above, and similarly for πρὸς ἀλλήλους of Mark viii 16), means the same thing as Mark or no, since ἐν ἑαυτοῖς might mean, what ἐν ἑαυτῷ must mean (Matt. ix 21, Mark v 30, Luke vii 39, xii 17, xvi 3, xviii 4), 'in their own hearts'.

ἐκ, ἀπό.

(Mark has ἐκ half as often again as ἀπό; Matthew and Luke have ἀπό rather more frequently than ἐκ; John has ἐκ more than three times as often as ἀπό. The actual numbers for ἐκ are roughly Mark 66, Matthew 82, Luke 87.)

On many occasions of course the other Synoptists take no offence at Mark's use of ἐκ: but some phrases they omit, and further in something over a dozen cases ἐκ of Mark is changed to ἀπό in one or both of them. Since ἐκ has given way to ἀπό in modern Greek, it does not seem likely that we can appeal to the κοινή to explain the preponderant use of ἐκ in Mark and John: and we seem thrown back on the Semitic atmosphere of the two Gospels.

1. i 10 ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος. Matthew ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος: no parallel in Luke.

2, 3. i 25, 26 ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ [ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] . . . ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Luke ἔξελθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ . . . ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. The whole episode is absent from Matthew: but compare 9 below.

4. i 29 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελλόντες. Luke ἀναστὰς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς: no parallel in Matthew.

5. v 8 ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ Ἐξελθε . . . ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Luke παρήγγελλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Matthew abbreviates at this point and omits the whole verse.

6. vi 14 ἔλεγον οὐτὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν. Luke retains ἐκ, doubtless because in the phrase 'rose again from the dead' ἐκ νεκρῶν was almost universal (so Luke, John, Acts, Pauline epistles, Hebrews, 1 Peter): Matthew is the only N.T. writer who even here prefers ἀπὸ, ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν xiv 2, cf. xxvii 64, xxviii 7 (xvii 9 b is the only exception).

7. ix 9 α καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους. So I read with B D 33 (and 'de monte' of latt. perhaps suggests ἐκ rather than ἀπὸ) W-H: if with the rest we read ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους the explanation of the preposition may be that ἐκ νεκρῶν follows immediately after. Luke κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους: in Matt. xvii 9 a \aleph B C D W Θ and others agree with the ἐκ of Mark, and it is possible that the Lucan parallel is responsible for the intrusion of ἀπὸ into the majority of MSS of both Matthew and Mark. Of course ἀπὸ is the natural preposition to use with καταβαίνειν: so Matt. viii 1, xiv 29, xxvii 40, 42, Mark iii 22, xv 30, 32, Luke ix 54, x 30, Acts viii 26, xxv 7, 1 Thess. iv 6. The Gospel of John and the Apocalypse are alone in writing regularly καταβαίνειν ἐκ.

8. ix 17 εἰς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου. Matthew ἄνθρωπος: Luke ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου.

9. ix 25 ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Matthew ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ: no parallel in Luke. Conversely the same phrase in 2, 3, 5, is altered to ἀπὸ in Luke, while there is no parallel in Matthew.

10. xi 8 στιβάδας κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν δένδρων. Matthew ἔκοπτον κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων. Luke omits the clause.

11. xiii 1 καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. Matthew ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ: the whole clause is dropped by Luke.

12. xiv 25 οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου. So in effect Matthew: but Luke ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου.

13. xvi 3 τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου. Luke εἶρον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου. No parallel in Matthew.

πάλιν (*Mark 27 times, Matthew 16 times, Luke thrice, John 43 times*).

The mere enumeration of these numbers creates at once the suspicion that the preponderant use of the word in Mark and John, coupled with its practical absence from Luke, must be due *either* to the Aramaic background of the thought of the second and fourth evangelists, *or* to some characteristic of the *Κουή* instinctively repugnant to the other two and especially to Luke. I do not propose here to choose between these two alternatives (they are not indeed mutually exclusive), but I confine myself to the investigation of the meaning or meanings of the word in Mark and of the procedure of the other two Synoptists when they found the word before them. But the caution must be given *in limine* that since Mark most commonly uses *πάλιν* in cases of transition—as we should put it, at the beginning of a paragraph—and since it is just these introductory phrases which Matthew and Luke habitually drop in copying Mark, the proportion of cases where there is no actual parallelism between the three is much smaller than the numbers at first sight suggest. In fact out of the twenty-seven instances in Mark, there are only nineteen where Matthew is strictly parallel, and for Luke only nine. Even so, the results are startling enough: Matthew retains *πάλιν* five times—twice with some modification—Luke retains it once.

Before giving the catalogue of the instances of *πάλιν* in Mark, it may be well to deal with, and dismiss, those cases where the textual evidence is divided for or against *πάλιν*. They are not many, and for the most part they reflect simply the same tendency, on the part of ancient scribes or editors, to dislike the word and therefore to remove it, which influenced Matthew and to a still greater degree Luke. But the textual problem is rather more complicated when it is a question of the place of *πάλιν* in the sentence, though it is probably a good general rule for Mark that in case of doubt the earlier place is the more likely to be genuine.

The most definite result that emerges is the bad record of the *Textus Receptus*: in vii 14 it substitutes *πάντα τὸν ὄχλον* for *πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον*, in viii 1 *παμπολλοῦ ὄχλου* for *πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου*; in xi 3 it omits *πάλιν* entirely, and, as represented by cod. A, also in x 24; while in viii 13 and xiv 40 it moves *πάλιν* to a later position in the sentence. But again the record of the Western text is not wholly satisfactory, though it must of course not be forgotten, so far as the Latin witnesses are concerned, that either omission or transposition of *πάλιν* so apparently unimportant a word may take place in the process of rendering into

the vernacular, whatever was the form of the Greek before the translator: for omission compare ii 13 (D^{gr}, *fam* 13?), viii 13 (*bc*), x 1 (*W fam* 13 *bcff*), xi 3 (*W* 565 syr. sin. latt.), xiv 40 (*D Wa cffk*), for transposition iv 1 ἤρξατο πάλιν and v 21 εἰς τὸ πέραν πάλιν (*D* 565 O.L., with the support on the second occasion of **N** and on the first of **W**). On the other hand in ii 1 πάλιν εἰσῆλθεν of latt. (*W*) is a transposition in the right direction, and in xiv 69 πάλιν ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἢ παιδίσκη of *D* 565 *c k* syr. sin. I believe to be right against the rest. The solitary instance of a serious discrepancy in text is xiv 40, where πάλιν ἐλθὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς of **N B L** (so syr-sin, but with πάλιν after αὐτοῖς, and *D* and O.L., but without πάλιν) must unquestionably be right against the ὑποστρέψας of *W* 565 vulg. and the mass of Greek authorities, since ὑποστρέφω, while common in Luke and Acts, is never found (apart from this passage) in Matthew, Mark, or John: it is just an attempt to vary the construction of xiv 40 from that of xiv 39.

1. ii 1 καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ . . . 'Again', with reference back to i 39 καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὄλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Matthew omits πάλιν: Luke is not parallel.

2. ii 13 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. 'And he left Capernaum again for the lake-side', with reference to ii 1. Πάλιν omitted by Luke: Matthew not parallel.

3. iii 1 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς συναγωγὴν. Πάλιν omitted by both the others: in Mark are we to interpret 'again', 'once more', with possibly a reference to i 21, 39? or if that is too distant, are we forced to render πάλιν by something like 'next'?

4. iii 20 καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν [ὁ] ὄχλος. 'And again a [the] crowd collects': we can quite easily refer back, if need be, to iii 9 διὰ τὸν ὄχλον. No parallels in the other Synoptists.

5. iv 1 καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. The lake-side had been mentioned in iii 7, and teaching by the lake-side in ii 13. But with each recurrence of πάλιν the impression seems to become clearer that Mark has not really got these elaborate cross-references in his mind, the more so that πάλιν, as the story proceeds, comes more frequently at the beginning of the sentence, and so corresponds more closely to our English use of 'Again' in the same position. Omitted by Matthew: no parallel in Luke.

6. v 21 καὶ διαπεράσαντος . . . πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν. Here the idiomatic rendering would certainly be 'back to the other side': and viii 13, x 10, x 32, xi 3, xi 27, xiv 39, 40, are also cases, where with verbs of motion, the same word 'back' may not be the right one. It appears to be the only meaning of πάλιν in Homer. Luke omits: no parallel in Matthew.

7. vii 14 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον. 'And summoning the

crowd again.' The right rule for securing the equivalent sense in English seems to be to put 'again' into the most inconspicuous place. 'Once more' is certainly reading too much into Mark. Matthew omits: Luke is deficient as far as **11** inclusive.

8. vii 31 *καὶ πάλιν ἐξεληθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὀρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν.* Omitted by Matthew. Conceivably we should render 'and on the return, leaving the district of Tyre, he came'.

9. viii 1 *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος.* It is here more attractive to see a definite intention to hark back to the other miracle of feeding, vi 34 *εἶδεν πολλὸν ὄχλον,* and if so we must render 'there was again a great crowd', in the sense of 'once more'. Matthew has just mentioned 'crowds' twice over as present, and so omits the whole verse.

10. viii 13 *καὶ ἀφείς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.* Here again, comparing verse 10 *ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον,* we must apparently render 'embarked again and went away to the other side'. Matthew again omits the word.

11. viii 25 *εἶτα πάλιν [ἐπ]έθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ.* Πάλιν obviously here refers back to the first imposition of hands in verse 23, 'again' in the sense of a second time, cf. xiv 39, 40, 69, 70. The whole story is absent from Matthew.

12, 13. x 1 *συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος* (for the reading see on [συν]-*πορεύεσθαι* below) *πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.* It is worth noting that the combination of 'crowd' and 'teaching' does occur before in vi 34; but the interval is so great that we can hardly suppose a direct reference, and must fall back on the indefinite 'again'. In neither clause does *πάλιν* reappear in Matthew: there is no parallel in Luke.

14. x 10 *καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν.* It is very tempting to render 'and when they were back in the house his disciples asked him about it': see **6** above. Again no parallel in Luke: omission of the whole verse in Matthew.

15. x 24 *ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει.* Here the reference to verse 23 seems clear, 'but Jesus repeated' his statement', 'said once more'. Luke omits the verse, no doubt because it is a repetition: Matthew, to avoid any break in our Lord's words, ingeniously alters to *πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν.*

16. x 32 *καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα,* 'taking the twelve back into company with him', because He had been walking on alone in front. See again **6** above.

17. xi 3 *καὶ εὐθὺς ἀποστέλλει αὐτὸν πάλιν ὄδε.* If (as I think) these words are part of the message the two disciples were to deliver, we could render 'The Lord needs the colt, and will send back again here

(i. e. to the place from which it was taken) as soon as ever he has done with him'. The clause is omitted by Luke, the word by Matthew.

18. xi 27 *καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα*. Comparing verse 19 'they left the city', I should once more render 'they come back to Jerusalem'. Both the other evangelists omit the whole sentence.

19. xii 4 *καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον*. The reference is to the first sending of a servant in verse 2, 'and again he sent them a second servant'. Matthew retains *πάλιν*, Luke retains the idea but avoids the word by *προσέθετο πέμψαι*.

20, 21. xiv 39, 40 (*καὶ προελθὼν μικρὸν . . . καὶ ἔρχεται . . .*) *καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν . . . καὶ πάλιν ἐλθὼν . . .* It seems impossible here not to translate 'he went forward [v. 35] . . . and he came and found them asleep [v. 37] . . . and a second time he went away [v. 39] . . . and a second time he came and found them asleep [v. 40] . . . [Mark leaves us to understand the third departure, which Matthew supplies, xxvi 44 *καὶ ἀφείς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀπελθὼν*] . . . and he came the third time and said unto them'. *πάλιν . . . τὸ τρίτον* correspond, that is, to one another: Matthew makes this still clearer by writing *πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου . . . ἐκ τρίτου*. But Mark is content with the less emphatic *πάλιν*: it is only when the second time is important as such that he writes in xiv 72 *εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν*. Luke has no parallel: Matthew to the double use of *πάλιν* in Mark adds a third of his own.

22. xiv 61 *καὶ πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν*: referring to a previous *ἐπηρώτησεν* of v. 60, cf. 26. Matthew omits: Luke is not parallel.

23, 24, 25. xiv 69, 70 [*ἔρχεται μία τῶν παιδικῶν . . . καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον . . . λέγει . . . ὁ δὲ ἡρνήσατο λέγων . . .*] *πάλιν ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἢ παιδίσκη ἤρξατο λέγειν . . . ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἡρνεῖτο. καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον . . .* Here we have, as in 21, 22, *πάλιν* for the second assertion and the second denial, but, in contrast to that passage, also of the third assertion. Of the three cases of *πάλιν* Luke retains none, Matthew only the second.

26. xv 4 ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος *πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν*, referring to v. 2 *καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν ὁ Πειλᾶτος*. 'Questioned him again', exactly as in 22. No parallel in Luke: Matthew substitutes his favourite *τότε*.

27. xv 12 ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος *πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*, referring back (as in 22 and 26) to a previous contact of the same interlocutors, v. 9 ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος *ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων*.

28. xv 13 οἱ δὲ *πάλιν ἔκραξαν Σταύρωσον αὐτόν*. A difficulty is raised (see Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v.) by Souter, on the ground presumably that the crowd had not been said to have made the cry before. But it must be remembered that in the case of the high priest, and both times in the case of Pilate—22, 26, 27—Mark's *πάλιν* does not imply that the same question or statement was repeated, but only

that 'he questioned him again' or 'he made answer to them again'. And we may well suppose that possibly *v.* 8 and more certainly *v.* 11 implies a previous *ἔκραξαν* on the part of the crowd. Luke at least so interpreted the words of *v.* 11 *ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς*, for he writes in xxiii 18 *ἀνέκραγον δὲ πανπληθεὶ λέγοντες· Αἶρε τοῦτον, ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν τὸν Βαραββᾶν.*

What are the general results of this perhaps over long and over detailed enquiry? Primarily, I think, that *πάλιν* is in Mark a very light and unemphatic particle: and secondly that the original sense of 'back' seems clear in certain connexions, e. g. 6, 17, and possible in 8, 14, 16, 18. The vehement dislike of Luke for the word I should suppose to be due exactly to his Hellenic sense of the importance of definiteness and precision in the use of particles. In the first five instances of the list just given *πάλιν* is really almost otiose as used by Mark.

ὑπάγω and *πορεύεσθαι* (with its compounds).

A. *ὑπάγω.*

(*Mark* 15 times, *Matthew* 19 times, *Luke* 5 times, *John* 32 times, *Apocalypse* 6 times: not in *Acts*, *Paul*, or *Hebrews*.)

The first distinction that needs drawing about *ὑπάγω* is between its use in the imperative and its use in other moods: for while Matthew (17 times out of 19) and Mark (12 times out of 15) use it almost exclusively in the imperative, this was exactly what Luke most disliked. The imperative is found only twice in Luke, four times in John, and twice in the Apocalypse.

Imperative.

1. i 44 *ὑπαγε σεαυτὸν δείξον τῷ ἱερεῖ.* So Matthew: Luke *ἀπελθὼν δείξον . . .*

[ii 9 *καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὑπαγε* \aleph L Δ Tisch (and with the addition *εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου* D 33 *aff* arm.: this is perhaps the earlier form of the corruption) is certainly wrong, and has come in from *v.* 11. *περιπάτει* must be read with A B C W \odot 565 *bce* vulg. sah.: and so Matthew and Luke.]

2. ii 11 *καὶ ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.* So Matthew: Luke *πορεύου . . .*

3. v 19 *Ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.* Absent from Matthew: Luke *ὑπόστρεφε . . .*

4. v 34 *Ὑπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην.* Again no parallel in Matthew: *πορεύου* Luke.

5. vi 38 *Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε ἴδετε.* Matthew drops the verse: Luke recasts, using *πορευθέντες.*

6. vii 29 *Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὑπαγε.* Matthew recasts: Luke is defective.

7. viii 33 *Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ.* So Matthew: Luke omits the episode.

8. x 21 Ὑπαγε ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον. Matthew retains ὕπαγε, Luke omits it.

9. x 52 Ὑπαγε, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. Luke changes ὕπαγε to ἀνάβλεψον, Matthew omits the whole clause.

10. xi 2 Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν. Here the usual conditions are reversed, for Matthew changes to πορεύεσθε, Luke on this one occasion retains ὑπάγετε.

11. xiv 13 Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν. So Matthew: Luke εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς . . .

12. xvi 7 ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε, εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. Matthew substitutes πορευθεῖσαι εἶπατε, Luke omits the charge to deliver a message, probably because of the reference to Galilee.

Other moods (participle and indicative).

13. vi 31 ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοί. Not in Matthew or Luke.

14. vi 33 καὶ εἶδαν αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας. Again not in either Matthew or Luke.

15. xiv 21 ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει. So Matthew: Luke πορεύεται. On the whole then Matthew retains Mark's imperatives 5/7, but substitutes πορεύεσθε (πορευθεῖσαι) 2/7: in the other moods he retains ὑπάγειν only once, xiv 21 = Matt. xxvi 24. Luke never retains any form of the verb where he finds it in Mark, save only xi 2 = Luke xix 30: four times he substitutes πορεύεσθαι, once ὑποστρέφειν, and twice uses the participles ἀπελθών, εἰσελθόντων. It seems not unusual with Luke to deal more drastically than in the rest of his Gospel with a word which he finds often, and dislikes, in Mark.

ὑπάγειν must have been a κοινή use, and appears to survive in modern Greek (Blass *Grammatik des N.T. Griechisch* § 24 s.v.). The use probably had its origin in the want of a word to express 'go' as contrasted with 'come' (Mark vi 31 οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες is exactly our 'coming and going'), and for this purpose it is more expressive than the alternative πορεύεσθαι. Further it seems not unlikely that the colloquial imperative ὕπαγε 'go' is an echo of the similar, quite classical, ἄγε 'come': though it is not clear why the particular compound ὕπαγε was employed for the purpose.

B. πορεύεσθαι and its compounds.

πορεύεσθαι (Matthew 28 times, Luke 50 times: never in Mark).

[Mc. ix 30 κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες ἐπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας B D c W-H text. παραπορεύοντο the rest, and Marcan usage—see below on παραπορεύεσθαι—is decisive in favour of this reading. 'Iter faciebant' of a should not be cited (as by Tischendorf) on the side of the simple verb: it would be an excellent rendering of παραπορεύεσθαι.]

In Luke *πορεύεσθαι* is three times substituted for *ἀπελθεῖν* of Mark, four times for *ὑπάγειν* of Mark.

διαπορεύεσθαι (Luke thrice : not Matthew or Mark at all).

[Mc. ii 23 *καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν διαπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων* B C D W-H text : *πορεύεσθαι* W : *παραιορεύεσθαι* the rest, according to Marcan usage. *διαπορεύεσθαι* has clearly come in from Luke.]

ἐκπορεύεσθαι (Mark eleven times, Matthew four times [Mt. xvii 21 is not genuine], Luke three times).

Matthew twice substitutes the simple verb, twice *ἐξέρχεσθαι*, once *ἐκβάλλεσθαι*. Luke generally omits. Note that Mark three times uses the word in the genitive absolute of the present participle, *ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ*, of our Lord's movements : x 17, x 46, xiii 1.

παραιορεύεσθαι (Mark four times, Matthew once, copying Mc. xv 29, Luke never).

Apparently the compound verb *παραιορεύεσθαι* must have been unfamiliar or unpalatable, for, as we have seen, B D agree in altering it on two of the four occasions (ii 23, ix 30) when Mark uses it. *παράγειν* too is never used by Luke.

προσπορεύεσθαι (not in Matthew or Luke).

Mc. x 35 *καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης*.

This compound is found in the LXX, but nowhere else in N.T.

συνπορεύεσθαι (Luke three times : not in Matthew).

[Mc. x 1 *καὶ συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν* B and the mass of Greek MSS, followed by Tischendorf and W-H. Marcan usage shews conclusively that *ὄχλος* is right against *ὄχλοι*, and I have no doubt that *συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος* should be read with D 565 syr. sin. *a b c ff i k (conuenit turba)*. The other reading has come in from Luke xiv 25 *συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί*.]

The investigation leads to queer results as between the Gospels. The simple verb is common in Matthew, very common in Luke, but never occurs in Mark. Of the compounds Mark uses *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* rather often, and is not averse to *παραιορεύεσθαι* : but both are rarely or never found in the other two Synoptists. Luke on the other hand uses two compounds, *διαπορεύεσθαι* and *συνπορεύεσθαι*, which are never found in Matthew or Mark. Perhaps more curious still is the effort which scribes of Mark, and especially we may say the Alexandrian editor whose work is represented in B, have made to get rid of *παραιορεύεσθαι* and to introduce the forms preferred by Luke (in ii 23 *διαπορεύεσθαι*, in ix 30 *πορεύεσθαι*, cf. x 1 *συνπορεύεσθαι*) : some similar instinct of Hellenic taste must, it would seem, have prompted both the evangelist and the Alexandrian scholar.

C. H. TURNER.