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Harmonization to parallel passages or traditions (oral as well as written)
is well known as a cause of textual variation in biblical texts and is frequently
cited as an “explanation” of the origin of certain variant readings. This is
particularly true, for obvious reasons, with regard to the Synoptic Gospels,
where this phenomenon occurs quite often.\(^1\)

A careful analysis, however, of various discussions or explanations of har­
nemonic variants, whether in articles, commentaries, or the UBS’s Textual
Commentary, strongly suggests the conclusion that the investigation of allegedly
harmonic variants generally has been carried out in too isolated or
atomistic a manner. The most commonly observed procedure or pattern
involves the evaluation of harmonizing variants in a particular passage (or
even phrase) in light of an already established or critical text of the parallel
passages. The same procedure is followed with regard to parallels: only
variants involving the immediate passage are usually considered, and only in
light of an established text of the parallels, variants generally being ignored.

There are two problems with such a procedure—one logical and the
other methodological. The logical problem is the obvious danger of circular
reasoning; this requires no further comment. The methodological problem
involves how the set of parallel texts is handled: the textual tradition too
frequently is atomized into its smallest constituent parts, and the variants of
each part are dealt with in isolation from the variants affecting the other
parts.\(^2\) Thus, decisions are based on partial evidence, and arguments or

---

1. In the influential United Bible Societies’ Textual Commentary (Bruce M. Metzger, ed., A
   Societies, 1971]), for example, harmonization or the influence of parallel passages is mentioned
   in the discussion of thirteen of the first twenty variants in the Gospel of Mark.

2. H. Baltensweiler’s treatment of Mark 10:12 (in Die Ehe im Neuen Testament [Zurich/
   Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1967] 66) is a particularly telling illustration of this “atomistic” tendency. He
   separates the variation between \(\mu\nu\sigma\tau\iota\) and \(\gamma\nu\nu\iota\) from the rest of the verse, decides that \(\mu\nu\sigma\tau\iota\) is
   original, and then prefixes it to three different forms of the rest of the verse. He thereby creates
two “phantom” forms of the verse that do not exist in any known manuscript. He apparently does
reasons are offered that appear convincing in isolation but look quite different in light of the rest of the tradition. The results of such a methodologically flawed approach, it may be argued, are erroneous judgments regarding the original text of the passage(s) in question.

A preferable approach would evaluate the entire set of parallels and all their variants simultaneously as a unit or cluster, rather than individually and in isolation. To be sure, this is not a particularly revolutionary proposal, and it is certainly not without precedent, at least in terms of scattered examples. But it does touch on an important point, one that runs against an observable tendency within the discipline to break everything down into its smallest constituent parts. This tendency obscures matters at least as often as it clarifies them. The forest is sometimes more obvious if one looks at the trees as a group rather than individually.

Let me now attempt to illustrate this point—that we should look at all the evidence, including in this instance parallel passages, in as comprehensive a manner as possible—by turning to a discussion of two sets of parallel texts, first Matt 26:73 and Mark 14:70, and then, as the major example, the Matthean divorce passages.

I. Matthew 26:73 and Mark 14:70

Matt 26:73:

... οἱ ἐστῶτες εἶπον τῷ Πέτρῳ ἀληθῶς καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ. καὶ γὰρ ἡ λαλία σου δῆλον σε ποιεῖ. 74 τότε ἤρξατο ...

καὶ σὺ] omit D Θ f1 pc (it) sy sams
γὰρ] add Γαλλιαῖος εἰ καὶ C* Σ pc syh**
δῆλον σε ποιεῖ] ομοιώζει D it sy s

Mark 14:70:

... οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον τῷ Πέτρῳ ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἰ. καὶ γὰρ Γαλλιαῖος εἰ, καὶ ἡ λαλία σου ὀμοιώζει. 71 δὲ ἤρξατο ...

text A Θ f13 28 (33) 892.1006.1071. 1506 m q syh bpt] omit καὶ η

not realize— or at least give the reader any clue—that ἄνωθεν virtually never occurs in a manuscript that does not also read απολύσασα. In fact, the two words should be treated as a single unit of variation, since they virtually always occur together. (Only two exceptions, in which απολύσασα is found with γωνία, are known to me. They involve singular readings in 1424 [see the apparatus for Mark 10:12 below] and 179 [see n. 16 below], but these are quite problematic on other grounds and are scarcely credible witnesses on this point.)
Both H. Greeven and K. Aland in their respective synopses, together with NA²⁶ and UBSGNT₃, print for the text of Mark 14:70 the reading of Ν Β et al., which lacks the phrase καὶ η ἡ λαλία σου ομοιάζει.⁴ In so doing they are almost certainly in error, as the following discussion will attempt to demonstrate.

With regard to the Marcan variants, in their respective synopses Greeven and Aland both explicitly attribute the longer reading of the Majority text (and others) to the influence of the Matthean parallel. The UBSGNT³ does not even list this variant; nor is it discussed in the Textual Commentary, and so it is not possible to ascertain the editorial committee’s line of thought in this instance. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that the committee headed by Aland reasoned along similar lines in choosing to follow the Alexandrian reading. Most of the commentators who mention this variant likewise reject the longer Marcan reading on the basis of the Matthean parallel.⁵

As for the Matthean variants, both Aland and NA²⁶ attribute the omission of καὶ σὺ to the influence of the parallel text, but say nothing about the origin of the two other variants.⁶ Greeven labels the first two as harmonistic, but unfortunately does not give the third variant.⁷ The commentaries essentially pass over them in silence.

Note carefully the conclusion to which the synopses (as well as the commentaries, if and when they notice any variants) lead with regard to the rejected readings. It is being claimed that the rejected Matthean variants are due to the influence of Mark, and that the rejected Marcan variants are due to the influence of Matthew. In this respect this example is quite typical of

---

⁵ See, e.g., J. Gnilka (Das Evangelium nach Markus [EKK 2/2; Zurich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979] 2. 293); cf. C. S. Mann (Mark [AB 27; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1986] 631–32). R. Pesch does notice the major Matthean variant, but nonetheless finds the Matthean parallel decisive against the originality of the longer Marcan variant (Das Markusevangelium [HTKNT 2/2; Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1977], 2. 447).
⁶ Synopsis Quattuor, 467.
⁷ Synopsis, 254. This is somewhat surprising in view of his stated aim to include all harmonistic variants in his apparatus (Synopsis, vi).
much current discussion and use of harmonization as an "explanation" of what are viewed as secondary readings.

At this point, however, it is necessary to back up and look at things a bit more closely. If the longer Majority reading in Mark were the result of harmonization to Matthew, one would expect it to read καὶ η λαλοῦν σου δηλοῦν σε ποιεῖ, which is the generally accepted text of Matthew. But it does not; it reads ομοιαζεῖ, a variant found only in D it syg, which is, in the opinion of Aland and Greeven, a secondary reading.

Consider what is being implied here regarding the interaction between these two texts. By choosing to follow the shorter, Alexandrian text in Mark, one is more or less forced to postulate—in light of (1) the impressive uniformity of the Marcan mss reading the longer text in question, and (2) ομοιαζεῖ apparently is the reading of the Diatessaron—that at an early stage in the transmission process a narrowly attested Matthean variant has influenced a very broad stream of Marcan witnesses. Although this is certainly theoretically possible, realistically it is very improbable, especially in light of the observation that a Bezan reading in Matthew earlier in the same verse—the omission of καὶ συ—gives evidence of having been harmonized to Mark 14:70. If one also views this as a harmonistic variant, as both Greeven and Aland do, then one is forced to multiply the levels of interaction between the various forms of Matthew and Mark beyond any reasonable probability.

A reconstruction of the interaction between the Matthean and Marcan parallels along the lines implied by Greeven and Aland would have to look something like this: (1) the original text of Matthew, δηλοῦν σε ποιεῖ, (2) is modified to ομοιαζεῖ, which (3) influenced the text of Mark early enough to affect uniformly a broad stream of Marcan manuscripts, and (4) in turn was affected by the Marcan text (omit καὶ συ). While this chain of events is possible, it is difficult to find it either very plausible or persuasive.

A much neater alternative is offered by Eberhard Nestle, who argues that the Bezan form of Matthew 26:73 represents the original text of Matthew. The Marcan mss are now easily explained: the ΝΒ text of 14:70 is original, and the Majority text is the result of harmonization to Matthew. As for the Matthean variants, he concludes that the ΝΒ reading in Matthew, δηλοῦν σε ποιεῖ, "is the voice of the διορθωτής." ¹⁰

⁸ Compare this to the obvious diversity among the few Marcan mss (N Σ 579 33) which have been harmonized to the ΝΒ text of Matthew.

⁹ At least in its Arabic form (see n. 3 above). This passage is not preserved among the Syriac fragments of Ephrem's commentary on the Diatessaron (L. Leloir, Saint Ephrem: Commentaire de l'Evangile concordant text syriaque [Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709], édité et traduit [Chester Beatty Monograph 8; Dublin: Hodges Figgis, 1963]). The Armenian version was unavailable to me (L. Leloir, Saint Ephrem: Commentaire de l'Evangile concordant, version arménienne [CSCO 137; Louvain: Durbécq, 1953; Latin translation, CSCO 145; Louvain: Durbécq, 1954]).

Nestle does not mention (what on his view would be the *addition* of) \( \chi \varepsilon \alpha \zeta \vartheta \), but in light of the very similar manuscript support (especially D it sys) for it as for the other variant (\( \omega \mu \omega \alpha \zeta \varepsilon \iota \)), it is unreasonable not to view this reading also as having come into existence at the same time as the other. That is, in view of the similar external attestation, the two variants ought to be dealt with as a unit.\(^{11}\) To do so, however, raises two problems with Nestle's proposal.

First, the changes that Nestle attributes to the \( \delta \iota \rho \theta \omega \tau \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \) are, as both Donald Senior and Robert Gundry have shown, very characteristic of the author of the first Gospel.\(^{12}\) It is hard to avoid the temptation to wield Occam's razor at this point: why postulate a later \( \delta \iota \rho \theta \omega \tau \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \) who changed the text in ways exactly congruent with the author's style and approach when the author himself is available?

The second point involves the external evidence supporting \( \delta \eta \lambda \nu \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \) \( \zeta \sigma \nu \tau \sigma \varsigma \sigma \). This reading has impressive support from all strands of the manuscript tradition which is difficult to ignore in this instance. Although the "Western" text alone does on occasion preserve the original reading, in this case it is difficult to think it has done so, especially since the Bezan reading looks so suspiciously like a harmonization to the Byzantine text of Mark, and it is well known that one of the leading characteristics of Bezae is a strong predilection to harmonize. For these reasons Nestle's proposal is unconvincing.

The simplest and most satisfactory way to account for *all* the variants in both passages is to accept as original the \( \text{NB} \) text in Matthew 26:73 and the Byzantine reading in Mark 14:70.\(^{13}\) On this analysis, all the Matthean variants are easily and fully explained as harmonizations to Mark.

As for the variants in Mark, note with respect to the major variation unit\(^{14}\) that although so far only two variants have been discussed, there are actually three: the long Byzantine form, the shorter Alexandrian/"Western" form, and the short form found in \( \text{Wpc} \). I suggest that both shorter forms are the result of haplography due to homoioteleuton\(^{15}\) arising from the three-fold repetition of \( \varepsilon \iota : \varepsilon \iota \ldots \varepsilon \iota \ldots \delta \mu \omega \iota \alpha \zeta \iota \) (in continuous capitals, as in the

---

\(^{11}\) Cf. the similar situation in Matt 5:11, on which see M. W. Holmes, "The Text of Matthew 5:11," *NTS* 32 (1986) 283–86.


\(^{14}\) For the minor variations in \( \text{N} \Sigma 33 579 \), see n. 8 above.

\(^{15}\) Pesch's objection—namely, that there is no explanation for the shorter text (*Das Markus­evangelium* 2. 447)—overlooks this probability.
earlier manuscripts: -ΩΝΕΙ . . . -ΟΣΕΙ . . . -ΑΖΕΙ). In this variation unit, it turns out, harmonization is not a factor. In short, by looking at the entire tradition simultaneously and as a whole, one comes to a different and, it may be suggested, more convincing and probable evaluation of the data which, if accepted, would require a change in the text of Mark 14:70 in the next editions of our “standard texts.”

II. The Matthean Divorce Passages

Matt 5:32:

εγώ δε λέγω ύμιν ὅτι τ'πας ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ δός ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχάται.

The preceding apparatus presents the manuscript and versional evidence in the style of the admirably compact and efficient Nestle-Aland format. To fully appreciate, however, the information contained therein, it is often helpful to reorganize and reformat the evidence. Arranged somewhat differently, the key variants and the evidence supporting them look like this:

(a) πας o απολυων . . . και o σα απολελυμενη γαμηση μοιχαται
(b) πας o απολυων . . . και o απολελυμενη γαμησας μοιχαται
(c) o αν απολυση . . . και o απολελυμενη γαμηση μοιχαται
(d) o αν απολυση . . . — — — — —

(a) Ν Κ (L) Ζ (Θ) Π ἦ1.13 33. 157. (565) (700) 892. 1342 sa? mae; NA88
(b) B pc sa?
(c) E 0250. 28. 346. 579. 1006. 1010 (1506) sa? mae bo
(d) D pc it

It would be even easier for an accidental omission such as this to occur if the exemplar being copied was written in short sense lines (as is Codex Bezae) or in narrow columns, as are Ν and B; in fact, in both of them the second ε in Mark 14:70 is almost directly under the first, the amount of offset being the space of one letter or less.

It may also be noted that this analysis accounts very nicely for the reading found in the Diatessaron, a point that would seem to clinch the matter.
Matt 19:9:

λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι δς ἄν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεῖα καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχάται; ἵνα ὁ ἀπολελυμένης γαμήσας μοιχάται.

Again, it will be helpful to reorganize the information:

(a) μη ἐπὶ πορνεῖα καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχάται
(b) μη ἐπὶ πορνεῖα καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι
(c) παρεκτὸς λογοῦ πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι
(d) παρεκτὸς λογοῦ πορνείας καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχάται

(a) A C K L (W) Δ Θ Π 078. 28. 69. 157. 209. 565. 700. 892. 1006. 1010. 1071. 1241 (1342) 1424. 1506 m l vg sy s.p.h. NA26 Greeven
(b) C* (N) pc (N lacks καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην]
(c) B 0233 f1 bo
(d) D f13 33 pc it (syce) sa mae

(e) — καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένης γαμήσας μοιχάται.
(f) — καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένης γαμῶν μοιχάται.
(g) ὡσαυτὸς καὶ ὁ γαμῶν ἀπολελυμένην μοιχάται.
(h) — — — — — — — —

(e) B K 0233. 28. 157. 700. 892. 1006. 1071. 1342. 1506 m; Greeven
(f) C* W Δ Θ Π 078 f113 33. 565. 1010. 1424. al lat sy s.p.h bo
(g) p25 mae
(h) A C K L 69. 209* 1241 pc it syse sa; NA26

Mark 10:11–12:

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ὅτι ἄν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχάται ἐπὶ αὐτὴν 12 καὶ ἐὰν αὐτῇ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχάται.
Verse 11:

ος αν απολυση| ean aplan. ανηρ Θ 565 (a)(sy5); ean ανηρ απολ. (W 1) f13
28 (205. 209) pc
γαμηση αλλην| αλλην γαμηση D it
eπ’ αυτην| omit (W) Θ (1) 28. 565 (205) pc (sy5)

Verse 12:

(a) ean αυτη απολυσασα τον ανδρα αυτης γαμηση αλλον
(b) ean αυτη απολυσασα τον ανδρα αυτης γαμηση αλλοκ
(c) ean απολυσασα γυνη τον ανδρα γαμηση αλλον
(d) ean γυνη απολυση τον ανδρα αυτης και γαμηση αλλον
(e) ean γυνη απολυση τον ανδρα αυτης και γαμηση αλλον
(f) ean απολυση γυνη τον ανδρα αυτης και γαμηση αλλον
(g) γυνη ean εξελθη απο ανδρος και αλλον γαμηση

(a) Ν Β (C) L (Δ Ψ) 892 (1342) 2427 pc co; NA26
(b) 57918
(c) 1424
(d) A 118. 157. 1006. 1071. 1506 m f l vg syρ. h
(e) Greeven19
(f) (W 1. 205. 209 pc sy5)
(g) (D) Θ f13 (28 + του) 543. 565. 700 it [D ean γυνη and + του]

ος αν . . . μοιχαται] ean απολυση γυνη τον ανδρα αυτης και γαμηση αλλον μοιχαται και ean ανηρ απολυση την γυναικα μοιχαται W (1. 205. 209 pc sy5)

18 An examination of the microfilm of this manuscript reveals that both Greeven (Synopsis 177) and S. C. E. Legg (Novum Testamentum Graece: Evangelium secundum Marcum [Oxford: Clarendon, 1935]) correctly report that 579 reads απολυσασα . . . γαμηση αλλοκ. Aland's Synopsis records it as απολυση . . . και γαμηση αλλοκ; the slip likely is due to the way the apparatus is laid out: what is presented as one variation unit actually includes two variants, απολυσασα απολυση . . . και and γαμηση] γαμηση. 579 does agree with the second variant; this apparently resulted in its being erroneously recorded as though it supported both.

19 At first glance, there seems to be in Greeven's apparatus considerable support for his text. But to the extent that it has been possible to decipher the apparatus and its various group indicators and symbols, it appears that the apparatus actually includes only one manuscript that allegedly supports the text he prints for Mark 10:12, MS 179, a member of the von Soden group. But even this is misleading, inasmuch as 179 (as determined by an examination of the microfilm) actually reads, quite ungrammatically, και ean γυνη απολυσασα τον ανδρα αυτης και γαμηση αλλον μοιχαται.
Three of these four sayings present an extraordinarily complex situation.

Only the text of Luke 16:18 is relatively firm. Moreover, and rather surprisingly, it apparently has had very little if any impact on the text of the other passages—or they on it, for that matter. For the present discussion it may be set aside.

The variants in the Marcan passage are extremely complex and interesting, but also largely peripheral to a discussion of harmonistic variants. This judgment is based on three observations: (1) the contents of v. 12 are unique to Mark; (2) it does not appear to have affected any of the other three passages; and (3) the variants in vv. 11–12, with the possible exception of the omission of επ' αυτην in a few witnesses, do not reflect any apparent harmonizing tendencies. This last point is quite remarkable; I find it amazing that the “Matthean exception,” for example, is not known to occur in any Marcian manuscript.

We may conclude, therefore, that the question of the original text of Mark 10:11–12 is an intra-Marcan affair whose resolution is independent of the resolution of the variants in the two Matthean passages. To these we may now turn for another example of the need to (1) work comprehensively rather than atomistically, and (2) consider the appeal to harmonization more rigorously than is customary.

There are in Matt 5:32 four basic text-forms. Three of them—(b), (c), and (d), represented by B, 0250, and D, respectively—reflect varying degrees of harmonization to Matt 19:9. It is interesting to note, however, that the “exception clause,” παρεκτος λογου παρεναις, is without variation. The text found in Ν W Θ 33 et al., which is accepted by both NA and Greeven, is almost certainly the original text here. We will return to the other variants in a moment.

---


11 In the case of (b), harmonization to the first clause of the verse is also an obvious possibility. In either instance, see further below on the text of Vaticanus.
In 19:9 one finds not only more forms of the text but a more difficult decision as to which is the original. The manuscript evidence attests to at least nine (and just possibly ten) different forms of this verse:

(1) a + h  ₋ C3 L 69. 209. 1241 pc sy; NA
(2) a + e  K 28. 157. 700. 892. 1006. 1071. 1342. 1506 m Greeven Orchard
(3) a + f  W Δ Θ Π 078. 565. 1010. 1424 vg sy p h
(4) b + f  C*
(5) c + e  B 0233
(6) c + f  f1 bo
(7) d + h  D it sy c sa
(8) d + f  f13 33
(9) d + g  mae
(10) ? + g  p25 [? probably = b or d]

The patristic testimony is, according to H. Crouzel, virtually unanimous in support of c + e, the text-form found in Vaticanus, and he has argued that this was in fact the original form of this text. Although the onesidedness of the patristic evidence is striking, it is, as J. Duplacy has rightly observed, an insufficient basis for either describing the history of the text or deciding on its original form. For the latter, which is the present interest, the manuscript and versional evidence is in this instance decisive, and to that we may now turn. In analyzing the evidence it appears that each half of the verse was liable to alteration independently of the other, and so each half will, as a matter of clarity and convenience, be examined separately.

In the first half of 19:9, variant (a) is to be preferred, since (b), (d) all betray distinctive traces of the influence of 5:32. This is certainly the case with (c) and (d); if either of these were judged to be original, then the genesis of the alternative form of the “exception clause,” μη επι τορνευ, is inexplicable. As for (b), it is possible, no doubt, to accept it as original and view (a) as the result of assimilation to Mark 10:11. If this were the case, one would reasonably expect to find some trace, at least, of either of the two distinctive elements of the Marcan form of this saying, namely, the absence

---

23 The fragment reads . . . ] μοιχεύθηκαι οὐκατως και. . . .
26 For a detailed discussion of the often problematic versional evidence, see Duplacy, “Note," 390–406.
27 So also Duplacy, “Note,” 396, 405, 408.
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of the “exception clause” and the presence of ετεροτριή. There is, however, no trace of either of these features among the witnesses supporting (a), which therefore seems unlikely to be the result of assimilation to Mark 10:11.28 In short, (a) best accounts for the existence of the other three readings and therefore may be judged to be original.

The options in the second half of 19:9 may be reduced to a choice between (h) and (e), since both (f) and (g) appear to be variations of (e).29 In favor of the short form, (h), which NA26 and the UBSGNT read, the Textual Commentary gives the following:

Although it might be argued that homoeoteleuton (μοιχᾶται . . . μοιχᾶται) accounts for its [i.e., the long reading (e)] accidental omission from 8 D L 1241 αι, the fact that B C* pal read μοιχᾶται only once (at the conclusion of the combined clauses) makes it more probable that the text was expanded by copyists who accommodated the saying to the prevailing text of 5.32.10

The committee is not alone in arguing that the longer text is a harmonization to 5:32; M.-J. Lagrange, T. Zahn, and a number of other commentators take a similar view.31

There are, however, a number of difficulties here. First, the phrase in question (variant [e]) does not match the “prevailing text of 5.32”; it reads . . . χαμησας rather than the expected ος εαν . . . χαμηση. Nor is Luke 16:18 the source; the complete absence of any trace of απο αυδρος χαμων μοιχωει is decisive.32 Second, the appeal to the reading of B C* et al.—variants (b) and (c) above, in which the first clause ends with μοιχευθηναι rather than μοιχαται—is baffling. This point would carry weight only if the reading of B C* were thought to be original, but clearly it is not. Not only is this a minimally attested variant, but the committee itself prints a text of the first clause that ends in μοιχαται, and thus in a sense invalidates its own point. Furthermore, the really key factor facilitating homoioteleuton is not the repetition of the entire word but only of the last syllable, the αι, which is present in both μοιχαται and μοιχευθηναι.

28 Similarly Duplacy, “Note,” 408.
29 The change from the aorist participle χαμησας to the present χαμων probably is due to the influence of the present tense μοιχαται (so H. Greeven, “Ehe nach dem Neuen Testament,” NTS 15 [1968–69] 383 n. 3). The influence of Luke 16:18 is also a possible, but much less likely, cause of the variation.
32 Cf. Greeven, “Ehe,” 383 n. 3.
Finally, there is still the matter of explaining the reading of Vaticanus, ο...γαμήσας, at 5:32. The Textual Commentary suggests that the ο...γαμήσας of Vaticanus was "substituted for the reading of the other uncials (δς ἔαν...γαμήσῃ) in order to make the construction parallel to the preceding participial clause (ὁ ἀπολύων)."\(^{33}\) Remembering that the Textual Commentary also attributed the long form of 19:9b (which agrees with the wording of Vaticanus regarding this point) to accommodation to the prevailing text of 5:32 (which does not agree with the text of the long form regarding this point), one is forced to reconstruct the history of the text implicit in these explanations in one of two ways. Either (1) the text of Vaticanus (or its ancestor) was changed as the committee suggested, and the long form of 19:9b, which according to the committee was taken over from the unaltered form of 5:32, was independently and coincidentally altered in exactly the same way, or, if the similarity is not due to this unlikely coincidence, and there is, as the committee suggests, a link between the two passages, then (2) the text of 5:32 was at some point altered to produce the reading now found in Vaticanus, this altered reading of 5:32 became the basis for the interpolated (long) — and, among the extant witnesses, most widely attested — text of 19:9b, and this interpolated text of 19:9b—but not its twin in 5:32—became the text of the Byzantine tradition. Although possible, neither scenario seems very probable or convincing.

A much more straightforward and compelling way to explain not only the rise of the other variants in 19:9b but also the reading of Vaticanus in 5:32 is to accept the Vaticanus/Byzantine reading, variant (e), as original in 19:9b. Then variants (f) and (g) are easily explained as alterations to (e), while (h), the short text preferred by NA\(^26\), is probably due to homoioteleuton from μοιχᾶται to μοιχᾶται, a possibility which the Textual Commentary itself acknowledges.\(^{34}\) Finally, harmonization to 19:9b would easily and satisfactorily account for the variant reading in Vaticanus at 5:32.\(^{35}\)

\(^{33}\) Metzger, Textual Commentary, 13-14.

\(^{34}\) Metzger, Textual Commentary, 48. In D, which is written in sense lines (and which reads a short text at both 5:32 and 19:9), μοιχεύθηκα ends the line at 5:32 and μοιχᾶται does likewise at 19:9; in Ν, which is written in narrow columns, both μοιχεύθηκα and μοιχᾶται end lines at 5:32, and μοιχᾶται ends the line at 19:9 (where Ν reads the short text). In both D and Ν the last word of Mark 10:12, μοιχᾶται, falls at the end of a line. This illustrates nicely, on the basis of two different ways of laying out the text on a page, how easy it would be for homoeoteleuton to occur when transcribing an early uncial manuscript.

\(^{35}\) In Vaticanus (B), the text of 5:32 agrees, apart from the first three words (5:32 πας ο ἀπολύων) as ο εαυτόν απολύσῃ 19:9) exactly with the text of 19:9 in the same manuscript: ...την γυναικα αυτου παρεκτος λογου πορειας ποιει αυτην μοιχευθηαι, και ο απολλυμενην γαμησης μοιχαται. It appears that the two passages have been harmonized to one another to a degree unmatched, as far as I have been able to determine to date, by any other manuscript of the NT (the text of Bezae, however, does come close: for 5:32 it reads ο εαυτον απολυση την γυναικα αυτου παρεκτος λογου πορειας ποιει αυτην μοιχευθηαι, and for 19:9 it reads ο εαυτον απολυση την γυναικα αυτου παρεκτος λογου πορειας και γαμηση αλλην μοιχαται.
The Bezan readings also call for comment. The substitution of οὐ αὐτῷ ἀπολύσῃ for πας οὗ ἀπολύων in 5:32 and of παρεκτός λόγου πορνεύεις for μὴ εἶ πορνεῖα in 19:9a clearly reflects deliberate cross-harmonization between the two passages, the result being that the first nine words of the sayings are now identical in each instance.36 With regard to the major omission in each verse, what the Textual Commentary says about 5:32 applies equally well to 19:9b:

The omission . . . may be due to pedantic scribes who regarded them as superfluous, reasoning that if “everyone who divorces his wife, except on the ground of unchastity, makes her an adulteress [when she remarries],” then it would go without saying that “whoever marries a divorced woman [also] commits adultery.”37

Such an omission is a strong possibility, especially in light of other editorial omissions observable in Bezae.38 Or, if the exemplar of the editor lacked the words καί . . . μοιχαται in 19:9,39 it may be that their excision in 5:32 reflects accommodation to a short text of 19:9. This suggestion gains credence in view of the already noticed extensive harmonization of 5:32 and 19:9 to each other in this manuscript.

By way of summary we may bring together the results of the preceding examination of 19:9a and 19:9b. When one analyzes the variants in both Matt 5:32 and 19:9—two passages which clearly had a reciprocal effect on one another—the pattern of harmonization between them looks considerably different than if each is considered in isolation. In light of this new pattern, one is led to conclude that the original text of 19:9 is almost certainly that represented by the combination α + ε above, a combination which as a whole is found today almost exclusively among mss of the Byzantine40 and (to a much lesser degree) secondary Alexandrian traditions. In this instance Greeven has printed the correct text, and once again a change in the text would seem to be called for in the next editions of our “standard texts.”

III. Conclusion

To recapitulate, Mark 14:70 should read . . . οἱ παρεκτότες ἔλεγον τῷ Πέτρῳ ἀληθῶς εὖ αὐτῶν εἰ, καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαίων εἰ, καὶ ἡ λαλία σου ὁμοιάζει, and Matt 19:9 should read . . . ὅτι δὲ δὲν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μη ἐπὶ

---

36 It seems somewhat odd, therefore, that the concluding words in each sentence—ποιεῖν ὡς οὐκ ἔχωσιν (5:32) and καὶ γαμήσῃ ἀλλὴν μοιχαται (19:9)—were not also harmonized.
37 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 14.
39 Either because of accidental omission, as suggested above, or, if one follows the NA26 text, because they were originally absent from Matthew.
40 A fact which, in and of itself, is certainly no bar to the conclusion reached here, as G. Zuntz long ago pointed out in his 1946 Schweich lectures (The Text of the Epistles [London: The British Academy, 1953] 55–56, 150–151).
These conclusions will affect one's view of the author's meaning and method, of synoptic relationships, and of Matthean redactional activity. In Mark 14:76, for example, no longer is the reader of Mark left to speculate about how the bystanders were able to determine that Peter was one of Jesus' followers; the text makes clear the basis of their identification: his accent was similar. Further, the author of Matthew will now be viewed as having merely redacted a phrase found in his source, rather than having added or created this bit of explanatory detail. Similar conclusions likewise follow for Matt 19:9.

Finally, these examples have demonstrated how atomization and isolation of the evidence can lead astray, particularly when dealing with harmonistic variants in parallel passages. A more comprehensive approach that takes into account simultaneously all the variants in all the parallels results in a more satisfactory and probable decision and explanation of both the text and the subsequent corruption of the passages examined.