

NOTES AND STUDIES

W AND Θ: STUDIES IN THE WESTERN TEXT OF
ST MARK (*continued*).*Hosanna.*

THE problems raised by the *voces populi* at the Entry of our Lord into Jerusalem very well illustrate the inter-relation of the textual, literary, and historical problems of the Gospels. The present article is a continuation of a study of W and Θ, the two comparatively newly discovered texts, but in view of the intrinsic interest of the problems which cluster about the cry of *Hosanna* I shall not confine myself merely to questions of various readings.

There can be little doubt as to the true text of

(11)¹ Mk. xi 9^b, 10.

Ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένοι οὗ ἐρχόμενοι ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου·
εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ·
ὡσαννά ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.

This is the text of **NB** and a good many other authorities, including the Latin and Syriac Vulgates, and also of all modern critical editions. There are three variants of importance:—

(i) after *βασιλεία, ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου* is added by ζ (A N al^{pl}), but no Versions earlier than ϱ goth syr.hl. There can be no doubt, from the mere weight of authority, that the addition is out of place: it may have come by accident from the preceding line into the archetype of *K*, and as it seemed edifying it was allowed to remain. Except for this addition *K* agrees with *H* (i. e. **NB** & c).

(ii) ὡσαννά (1^o)] om. D W *bffr* . . . + ἐν ὑψίστοις 299 *ci* . . . + ἐν ὑψίστω 28 *a* . . . + τῶ ὑψίστῳ Θ 13 & c 565 700 *k* arm (*sic*).²

A very curious cross-grouping of interesting authorities!

(iii) ὡσαννά (2^o) ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις] εἰρήνη ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις W 28 700 syr.S Orig^{Mt} . . . εἰρήνη ἐν οὐρανῶ καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θ arm . . . + εἰρ. ἐν οὐρ. καὶ δ. ἐν ὑψ. 1 & c . . . pr. εἰρ. ἐν οὐρ. καὶ δ. ἐν ὑψ. 251 syr.hl*.

A good deal of this mass of variation is clearly secondary. The readings ἐν ὑψίστοις and ἐν ὑψίστῳ in (ii) are very weakly supported in Greek and are to be regarded as mere corruptions of τῶ ὑψίστῳ. The

¹ The number refers to the continuous numeration of the texts considered in these articles.

² The Armenian is *bardsreloyn*: cf. Acts vii 48.

readings in (iii) must be considered in connexion with Lk. xix 38, where 'peace in heaven and glory *ἐν ὑψίστοις*' is substituted for Mark's *ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις*. Lk. xix 38 is thus the ultimate source of the *εἰρήνη* found in W 28 700 syr.S Orig^{Mt}. That *εἰρήνη* is not original is practically proved by the occurrence of *ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις* in Matt. xxi 9, where also the former *ὡσαννά* occurs in the form 'Hosanna to the Son of David'.

We may thus distinguish here two distinct tendencies in Christian documents. On the one hand there was a tendency to get rid of *Hosanna* altogether as a 'barbarous' word: this is seen in the paraphrase given by Luke, and also in W. On the other hand the texts that retain *Hosanna* tend to add an object in the dative.

This brings us to consider what the meaning of *Hosanna* was. Here again there are two traditions, the one *grammatical*, the other *ritual*. It is as if we were asking the meaning of the German cry *Hoch!*, and one should say it meant 'high' and another that it meant 'hurrah!' The ultimate derivation of *hosanna* is, no doubt, הושיעה נא, i. e. 'save-oh!'. No doubt, also, the original use of the word as an exclamation is to be seen in 2 Sam. xiv 4, 2 Kings vi 26, where הושיעה is used as the call of a suppliant to the King, like *Haro! à mon aide!* But the general import of a ritual exclamation is not necessarily exhausted by its grammatical derivation: when we shout 'God save the King!' we do not think of the King as in particular need of rescue or salvation.

It is obvious, of course, that the cry of *Hosanna*, followed as it is by *Benedictus qui uenit in nomine Domini*, has something to do with Ps. cxviii (cxvii) 25 f, where הושיעה נא actually occurs in the Hebrew. But what do the words mean in the Psalm? And why should that Psalm, or phrases from it, be shouted by a crowd? At the risk of being tedious, let me put down in words one feature in which an investigation such as this differs from those of older expositors, up to fifty years ago. Till quite recent times the religion of Jews was regarded almost exclusively as synonymous with the Old Testament, with a greater or less admixture of Oral Tradition. 'The Law' meant to European scholars the Pentateuch itself rather than the religious system enacted in the Pentateuch. And similarly the mere fact that such-and-such words occurred in a Psalm seemed sufficient reason for their use by Jews, almost on any occasion. Psalm cxviii forms part of the 'Hallel', a collection of Psalms sung at certain times, and this was thought in itself a sufficient explanation of why the crowd should say *Benedictus qui uenit*.

The religion of Jews has probably never been so much of a book-religion as Christians have imagined, but it is quite certain that

in Gospel times, in Palestine, while the Temple was still standing and the sacrifices still being offered, the Jewish Religion was far more a system of ritual than a book-religion: the average Jew, as distinct from the professed Scribe, knew how to perform his religious duties better than he knew what was written about them. If certain acts were accompanied by certain cries, he knew the cries themselves better than he knew where they were written in the Bible. If the crowd really shouted *Hosanna!* on this occasion it was not because the word occurred in Psalm cxviii, but because the occasion itself was somehow similar to that presupposed in Ps. cxviii.

What was the occasion for which Psalm cxviii was composed? An extremely probable guess is that it was composed for the Dedication of the Temple by Judas Maccabaeus in December 165 B. C.¹ The words of the Psalm will then have been chosen with reference to the actual usages at the Feast. And how was the new Dedication Feast (*Hanukka*) celebrated? The answer is given in 2 Macc. x 6, which tells us that they celebrated it something like the old Feast of Tabernacles, *θήρσουσ καὶ κλάδουσ ὠραίουσ ἔτι δὲ καὶ φοίνικασ ἔχοντες*, i. e. with green boughs and branches, such as they could get in December. These green boughs are what is common to Tabernacles and the ceremonies that accompanied Dedication.

And what was the popular Aramaic name for a *thyrsus*? Let us hear Haman instructing King Ahasuerus about the wicked customs of the Jews: 'On the 15th of Tishri they make booths on the roofs of their houses, and they go out into our gardens and pull off our palm-branches² and pick our oranges³ and tear away our greenery and devastate our gardens, and they pull up their own hedges and spare them not and they make for themselves *Hosannas* . . . and, they rejoice and go round with the *Hosannas* and jump about and spring like kids, and we do not know whether they are blessing us or cursing us, and they call it the Feast of Tabernacles' (Targum II to Esther iii 8). So far as outward appearances are concerned, there must have been a certain resemblance between the behaviour of the Galilean crowd at the Entry and the scene so maliciously described by Haman.

Why should green boughs plucked from the hedges be called 'Hosannas', except because *Hosanna* was shouted when they were used? And so we find in Psalm cxviii 25 the Hosanna-cry is actually introduced: 'Ah! LORD, *hoshi'a-na!* Ah! LORD, make all go well!'

¹ The whole tone of the Psalm speaks of a recent deliverance from the Gentiles (v. 10) after chastisement (v. 18). Is it possible that *אסרו חג בעבתים* (v. 27^b) means 'Institute a Feast of obligation, to be celebrated with *thyrsi*'? 'Hallel', including Ps. cxviii, is still sung at *Hanukka*.

² *Lulab*.

³ Or rather, 'citrons', *Ethrog*.

When the Jews sing the Hallel now, they repeat this twice. When they came to *hoshi'a-na* they waved their palm-branch (*lulab*): most of them in Talmudic days waved their branch also at 'make all go well', but Rabbi Gamaliel and Rabbi Joshua waved only at *hoshi'a-na*! (T. B. *Succa* 37 b).

The conclusions to which these ritual facts seem to point are these:—

(i) 'Hosanna' had come to be a cry for good luck to God at the Feast of Tabernacles, from quite ancient times, before the minor details of the Feast were finally stereotyped.¹

(ii) The fact that the name for the thyrsi is *Hosanna*, not *Hosianna* (הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא), suggests that the Gospels are correct in giving this shortened form as a popular exclamation.

(iii) Psalm cxviii, composed for the Dedication of the Temple by Judas Maccabaeus, gives us a hint of the ritual procession to the Temple then made; it confirms 2 Macc. x 6 in representing this procession as modelled upon the ancient procession at the Feast of Tabernacles.

(iv) Psalm cxviii 25 is not the ultimate source of the cry *Hosanna*, but *Hosanna* finds a place in the Psalm because the ancient cry of *Hosanna* was used at that Dedication.

(v) It is a fair deduction to suppose that the behaviour of the Galilean crowd at our Lord's Entry into Jerusalem was based on what was appropriate for *Hanukka*, for the Feast of the Dedication, rather than by what was appropriate for Tabernacles.

I venture to suggest that if (v) be accepted as valid many of the essential difficulties of the traditional narrative disappear. The essential thing is to get a rational cause for the general action of the crowd and for the most peculiar and unexpected feature of it, viz. the cry of *Hosanna*! All the rest is accessory, and a question of literary method on the part of the Evangelists. But so long as *Hosanna* merely suggests to us a scene imitated from the Vintage-feast of Tabernacles the whole account is puzzling. The difficulty has always been slurred over in English Commentaries, even in C. G. Montefiore's, but I feel there is great force in the ingenuous Note of the Christian Rabbinic scholar A. Wünsche, who says in his *Neue Beiträge* (1878), p. 241, note: 'Our passage [i. e. Matt. xxi 8 f] either contains a confusion of Passover with Tabernacles, or the narrator has intentionally transferred a ceremony of the Feast of Tabernacles to Passover'. Such a treatment of the Gospel narrative is only one step removed from the thoroughgoing scepticism of those who say the story of the Entry is so improbable that it cannot really have taken place.

¹ In the same way *pax* was an ejaculation, before the *pax-brede* or *osculatorium* came into use.

But when once we connect the sentiments of the followers of Jesus with the Feast of the Dedication, many other things become clear besides the reason for *Hosanna*. Much has been written about the significance which our Lord may be supposed to have attached to His public Entry into Jerusalem: what that significance was must, strictly speaking, remain conjectural, for He is not recorded ever to have referred to it. But on the other hand we do know what directly followed the Entry. It led up to the most public action of His whole career, the Cleansing of the Temple. It is true that according to Mark it did not take place till the next day, a postponement which is so little in accordance with romantic effect that we cannot fail to accept it as sober fact. But notwithstanding the delay, the Cleansing takes place. It must have been a remarkable scene; no wonder the authorities sought some way of bringing the Galilean Prophet to grief. And it is difficult to believe that the personal ascendancy of a single stranger would have compelled instant obedience with such summary commands, if unsupported by a large body of those who already sympathized—more than sympathized, expected something striking and astonishing. Mk. xi 18^b, in fact, tells us that the action of Jesus was supported by the crowd. We need not even suppose that *πᾶσ ὁ ὄχλος* xi 18 means the crowd who had shouted *Hosanna* yesterday, but if those who had shouted *Hosanna* told others that their Prophet was coming as the messenger of the covenant to purify the sons of Levi just before the great and terrible Day of the LORD, that Passover-multitude would be far more ready to let Him do what He would, for a time. A new Dedication—that is the connecting link between the Entry and the Cleansing. On the next day begins the tragedy: Jesus still has the shout of *Hosanna* in mind; but things go on as usual. The end has not come, and He thinks of Himself as the stone which the builders have rejected. Before the end of the day the hot-heads among the Galileans will have learned that their Prophet is willing after all to pay tribute to Caesar.

One further point must be noticed. The Fourth Gospel puts the Cleansing of the Temple at the beginning of the public Ministry. I regard this as a deliberate alteration, an alteration of the same nature as the omission of the Baptism of Jesus by John and the omission of the words about the Bread and Wine at the Last Supper. But in the case of these events the Fourth Evangelist has been careful to insert elsewhere important sections which give the teaching connected with the Baptism and the Last Supper. So also here. What is the text in St John that most of all corresponds to 'By what authority doest Thou these things?' Is it not John x 24? 'How long dost Thou hold us in suspense? If Thou be the Christ, tell us openly.' This is said

to have taken place in Jerusalem, at the Feast of the Dedication. It is practically impossible to take this literally, i. e. to place Jesus in Jerusalem in December, if the narrative of Mark be at all historical. I cannot help thinking that this mention of τὰ Ἐγκαίνια may have originated in a sort of consciousness that one visit of Jesus to Jerusalem had something to do with a Dedication of the Temple, a Dedication which was also, in the words of 2 Macc. x 5, the καθαρισμὸς τοῦ ναοῦ.

Two other features in the *voces populi* at the Entry call for remark. 'Our father David' is, so far as I can gather, unparalleled elsewhere. 'Our father Abraham', or 'our father Jacob' (John iv 12), is natural enough in the mouth of an Israelite, but David is never called the Father of his people. The expression occurs in the line εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαβίδ—surely a very unlikely transcription of the shouts of a crowd, if taken *verbatim*. If we try to reconstruct for ourselves what such a crowd as our Galileans may be supposed to have actually uttered, we must remember not only that, like other crowds, they would use much shorter cries than this, but also that they would certainly avoid any direct Name of God. At the most they might say 'in the Name of Heaven' for ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, but it is likely that they did not actually say anything corresponding to ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου at all, and only shouted 'Bārūch hab-bā'.¹ Now the Messianic Kingdom might be called the Kingdom of David or the Kingdom of God, and for the latter you may say βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in Greek without offence; it was only in Hebrew and Aramaic that Jews avoided naming God's Name. But you might say 'Kingdom of our Father', meaning the Kingdom of God, as in Matt. xiii 43. I cannot help thinking that the crowd only shouted 'Kingdom of our Father! Kingdom of David!' and that the double cry has been made into one by the Evangelist.

Still more doubtful is what really corresponded to ὡσανὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις. The simplest explanation is that of the *Acta Pilati* i 3, 4, which makes ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις a vocative, as if it were ὁ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις. It would thus be equivalent to Solomon's 'then hear Thou in heaven their prayer and maintain their cause' (1 Kings viii 45). This is not, however, a good linguistic parallel, as the Hebrew in Kings has יְשִׁמְךָ only and the Greek ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. As the phrase is unparalleled elsewhere it seems to me possible that it is based altogether upon a misunderstanding, and that it represents לְעִלָּא הוֹשַׁנָּא lit. 'Hosanna upwards', i. e. 'Up with your wands!' It was at the moment when they waved their Hosanna-boughs (or palm-branches, if they had them) that the actual cry of *Hosanna!* was made.²

¹ Compare Lagarde *Onomastica Sacra* 160²⁸, 201⁵⁶.

² See above, p. 4.

The Fourth Gospel, recognizing the near resemblance of the scene at the Entry to the procession at Tabernacles, speaks of the crowd taking Palm-branches (*τὰ βῆτα*, i. e. the *Lulab*). Whether this be strictly historical or not—the Mount of *Olives* was nearer than Jericho and the season was March or April—we may accept it for the moment, on the ground that a ‘Palm-branch’ does have associations with us of processional use, whereas ‘olive-branch’ and ‘green bough’ have altogether alien connotations in English. We may then, I venture to suggest, reconstruct the cries of the crowd at the Entry somewhat thus:—they escorted the ass and its Rider with shouts of ‘Hosanna!’ ‘Blest be He who comes!’—‘Our Father’s Kingdom!’—‘The Kingdom of David!’—‘Up with your palms!’

And if the general argument here followed is sound, the best English equivalent for *Hosanna*, when it does not mean the green boughs, will be ‘God save Israel!’, used more or less as we are told they use ‘God save Ireland!’ over the water. I mean, that *Hosanna* is a festal shout, but a festal shout in the form of a prayer to God to give a good turn to the affairs of the nation. It is not accurate to say with Suidas that *Hosanna* means *εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα*, but when Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* i 5) says that *φῶσ καὶ δόξα καὶ αἶνος μεθ’ ἱκετηρίας τῷ Κυρίῳ* is the interpretation of *ᾠσαννά* in Greek, he gives a fair account of the actual use of the word.¹

From this long excursus into historical criticism we can now come back to the variants to Mk. xi 9, 10, both in the MSS and in the other Synoptic Gospels. We have already considered the paraphrase of *Hosanna* in Luke: as usual, his Hellenized phraseology is not far off the general sense, but the local colour is gone. In Luke, the crowd praise God with loud voices in thankfulness, but the *ἱκετηρία*, the supplication, is absent. In Matt. xxi 9 *ᾠσαννά* is retained, but *τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ* is added, both at the Entry and in the story, peculiar to Matthew, of the boys shouting ‘Hosanna to the Son of David’ in the Temple. This phrase presents grave difficulties. I have ventured to give as a paraphrase of *Hosanna*, ‘God save Israel!’; Mr Weymouth gives ‘God save the Son of David’ as a paraphrase of *ᾠσαννά τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ*, but the two expressions are not really analogous. Just as the address to God is understood though not expressed in the ritual shout of *Hosanna*, so also the object, *viz.* ‘us’, ‘Israel’, ‘Thy holy People’ is also inevitable. The Jews only shouted ‘Hosanna’ to God and they did not shout it *for* anybody in particular. Furthermore, ‘Son of David’ is one of the favourite catch-words of Matthew, representing an

¹ What does Clement mean by *φῶσ*? Is it merely a mistake for *φωναί*, or did his informant ultimately connect the cry with the Feast of the Dedication, a popular name for which, according to Josephus, was the *τὰ φῶτα*?

aspect of the Christ that he is always anxious to bring forward ; where 'Son of David' occurs in Matthew and is absent from the parallels in other Gospels, it is always more likely to be an unhistorical addition than an independent survival of tradition. And finally, the point of the quotation of Psalm viii 2 in Matt. xxi 16 depends on the Greek LXX rendering (*αἶνον*) and is lost in any Semitic language.

For these reasons I regard the appending of τῷ υἱῷ Δαυεὶδ to ὠσαννά as a later addition, made in Greek, and not based on any tradition which goes back to the original Aramaic-speaking community. This conclusion has often been reached before, but it is important to see what is involved by it. In the first place, if the cry ὠσαννά τῷ υἱῷ Δαυεὶδ be not historical, but merely literary, it affords yet another proof of the close connexion between the sources used by Hegesippus (Eus. *HE* ii 23) and our Gospel according to Matthew.¹ But another deduction has to be made. 'Ωσαννά is retained in Matthew's narrative without explanation, and even an addition (in Greek) is made to it : we must infer that among these Greek-speaking Christians, for whom Matthew wrote, *Hosanna* had already become a ritual cry, like ἀλληλουαῖα. It is, I suppose, a safe inference that wherever we find a Hebrew or Aramaic phrase occurring in the New Testament, without an interpretation added, it must have been used in worship : *Rabbi* is the only exception. But if *Hosanna* was used in worship by some Christians earlier than the writing down of the Gospel of Matthew, we should expect some traces of it to survive, independent of the literary influence of that Gospel.

This is actually the case. When Bryennius first edited the *Didache* he found 'Hosanna to the God of David!' in the MS and thought it a mere scribal blunder. But in later times it is a most improbable blunder for a Christian scribe to make, to whom 'Hosanna to the Son of David' is so familiar from worship even more than from Scripture. And a parallel to the MS reading from Jewish liturgical sources can now be given, for in the archaic Palestinian recension of the 'Eighteen Benedictions' the 14th runs 'Blessed art Thou, O LORD, God of David, Builder of Jerusalem', where the ordinary recension omits 'God of David'.² ὠσαννά τῷ θεῷ Δαυεὶδ is therefore no mistake, but an ancient Christian exclamation.

¹ Many no doubt would say simply, that Hegesippus based the diction of his account of the martyrdom of James the Just on our Matthew. I have preferred the more cautious expression in the text, to leave open the possibility that the similarities between Matthew and Hegesippus are derived from the same source, viz. the Greek-speaking community of Christians established in Jerusalem (not yet *Aelia*), after the Destruction in A. D. 70.

² This recension of the 18 Benedictions is given from Schechter's text in Dalman's *Worte Jesu*, p. 300.

The same may in all likelihood be said of *ὡσαννὰ τῷ Ὑψίστῳ*, found as a variant in Mark. At any rate this reading is not formed by harmonization to the text of Matthew. It is attested by © 13&c 565 700 *k* and the Armenian: when it is noticed that D W 28 *abcffir* all differ in various ways from the accepted text, it will be seen that a variant is here attested by all the Western phalanx except syr.S.

Readers of the former article on W and © will not expect me to draw the conclusion that St Mark wrote *ὡσαννὰ τῷ Ὑψίστῳ*, but it does seem to me to have been far the most widely spread text of Mark i. the second century. The addition was certainly absent from the text of Mark used by Matthew and by Luke, but its presence in *k*, combined with the other Latin evidence, shews that it was already in the text when the first Latin translation was made. It would be interesting to know in what part of the Christian world they once used to say 'Hosanna to the Most High!' 'The Most High' as a current Name for God is specially characteristic of 4 Ezra and the Apocalypse of Baruch, but as these books are of Jewish origin the coincidence may not have significance.

One special point remains to be noticed. Origen in his Commentary on St John (*tom.* x; Brooke i 207 f) quotes the story of the Entry in full from Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The quotation was evidently intended to be exact, for where Origen means to skip (as in the case of the story of the Fig-tree) he says: *ἐξεληθόντων ἀπὸ Βηθανίας ἐπειήασεν. εἶτα μετὰ τὴν τῆς ξηρανομένης συκῆς οἰκονομίαν. Ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.* As a matter of fact, the quotation is very accurate, and Mk. xi 9, 10, which we are now considering, agrees exactly with Westcott and Hort. The text of Origen on St John rests upon the Munich Codex of the thirteenth century; it is usually a faithful witness, and there does not seem any evidence that the long occasional quotations have at any time suffered assimilation by copyists to the current texts of the Gospels. In writing the Commentary on St John, therefore, Origen used a text of Mark agreeing here with *SB* and modern critical editors against D and W and © and other Western evidence.

The passage is again noticed by Origen on Matt. xxi 6 ff (*tom.* xvi; Delarue iii 744), a later work. Here the passages are not cited in full, only the beginnings and ends. Mk. xi 4-9 is thus given: *ὁ δὲ Μάρκος οὕτω κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐξέθετο καὶ ἀπελθόντες εὗρον πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς τὴν θύραν ἕξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφοδου, καὶ λύουσιν αὐτόν, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς ἕως τοῦ εὐλογημένης ἢ ἐρχομένης βασιλείας τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαβὶδ, εἰρήνην ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.* Here are two variants at least, the important one (*εἰρήνην* for *ὡσαννὰ*) agreeing with W.

It might be held that the abridged citation in the Commentary on Matthew was simply inaccurate; but in the same context, on Matt. xxi 1

(Delarue iii 737 and 743), Origen states that Matthew says 'Bethphage', Mark 'Bethany', Luke 'Bethphage and Bethany'. This is true of the Western texts D lat. vt-vg, but not of any others, the double name being found in W, in Θ , and in syr. S, as well as in all Greek texts except D, including Origen *in Ioan.* (Brooke, p. 208). We must therefore accept these two important variants, viz. the omission of Bethphage in Mk. xi 1 and the substitution of *εἰρήνη* for the second *Hosanna* in xi 10, as really characteristic of the text from which Origen was citing in his Commentary on Matthew.

A comparison of Mk. xi 1 with Matt. xxi 1 and Lk. xix 28, 29, will make it pretty clear that, whatever the subsequent history of the text may have been, the original text of Mk. xi 1 agreed with $\aleph B$ and the 'Textus Receptus': i.e. Origen *in Ioan.* has the true text and Origen *in Matt.* the corrupted text. The ordinary text of Mk. xi 1 really invites change. 'And when they draw near to Jerusalem to Bethphage and Bethany by the Mount of Olives'—no doubt this indicates that they were not far from their journey's end in Jerusalem, close to villages at the foot of the Mount of Olives called Bethphage and Bethany, but it is very awkwardly expressed. Accordingly the sentence is expanded by Luke into two; he says Jesus 'went on, going up to Jerusalem. And when He drew near to Bethphage and Bethany by the Mount of Olives . . .' (Lk. xix 28, 29). Matthew eases the sentence by omitting the mention of Bethany, and also by the insertion of a fresh verb: 'When they drew near to Jerusalem and came to Bethphage by the Mount of Olives' (Matt. xxi 1). It is the profusion of place-names in the sentence of Mark that causes the other evangelists to rewrite it. Moreover there is no hint that in the story of the tied ass either Matthew or Luke is using any source beyond Mark. As then they agree in mentioning Bethphage, a village otherwise unnamed in the gospel, it is reasonable to suppose that Bethphage was in the text of Mark used by Matthew and Luke, and therefore that those texts which now omit it have suffered corruption.

The same may be said of the variant in Mk. xi 10: *ὡσαννά* is there more primitive than *εἰρήνη*.

Our problem is therefore this: How does it come about that Origen's citation in his Commentary on St John has a more correct text than in his Commentary on St Matthew, written some years later?

This is really a very troublesome question, much as the textual student would like to have an authoritative answer for it. It is not likely that the text underwent progressive corruption of this kind in the days of Origen. Nor is it very likely that the one text is Egyptian and the later one Palestinian, for we must suppose that a professed scholar like Origen would carry his books with him, *μάλιστα τὰς μεμβράνας*.

Nor again, for the reasons given above, need we suppose that the text as given in our MS of the Commentary on St John does not represent what Origen wrote.

The only explanation I can give is that the citation in the Commentary on St John was really copied from a good MS, while the citation in the Commentary on St Matthew was given by Origen from the current text, or at least not from the specially good MS that he used for the extract from Mark in his Commentary on St John. The broad fact, apart from single instances to the contrary, is that Origen is both the first Christian scholar to occupy himself with questions of text and variant readings, and also the earliest generally consistent patristic witness to the text preferred by critical editors. Before his time the evidence, such as it is, is predominantly Western. The easiest explanation of this state of things is that Origen is himself somehow responsible for the emergence of this good, non-Western text, and as it is highly unlikely that he invented it by conjecture he must have gathered it from the discovery of better MSS—in this case, probably of some old MS which had escaped certain widespread corruptions.

But if this be the case, it implies that the text of the Gospels known to Origen before he embarked upon critical studies was a more or less corrupted text. It implies, moreover, that the texts commonly used by his contemporaries in worship and reading were corrupted texts, and naturally these remained in use until Origen's own works, and the reputation they won, set the better readings in circulation.¹ And further, if the texts used by Origen's contemporaries were inferior, it is likely that Origen, when quoting by memory, or when not verifying his quotations by the special MSS or transcripts which he had collected, would quote in accordance with the corrupted texts. We must remember that he wrote no commentary on Mark: he made no special study of that gospel, so far as we know, and he may have been simply unaware of the extent of the variations between the actually existing MSS.

In any case the fact remains that in nine cases out of ten, as for instance in the readings discussed in the present article, the readings of the type called by Hort 'Neutral', by von Soden 'H', the readings in fact of Codices N and B, whether supported by Origen or not, whether supported by the 'Textus Receptus' or not, do continually approve themselves to critical editors. There is, indeed, a remaining tenth of which a different tale is told, about which I shall hope to say something later on: I am speaking now of the nine-tenths majority.

¹ No doubt this was done through the agency of Pamphilus, rather than by Origen himself.

It was one of the great surprises of von Soden's Greek Testament that the text accepted is so like Hort's. Theories of Greek Testament textual criticism change, in fact, more than the text accepted by critical editors as original. Hort's theories and von Soden's about the grouping of authorities, of the relative value of the groups, of the causes of corruptions and of the method of reconstructing the true text differ very widely: the odd thing is that they come to much the same result. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.* It is very surprising, and the simplest explanation I can give is that something that Origen did brought in an otherwise untraced element of very great value. And further, it seems to me that when Origen trusted to the ordinary texts round him or to his own memory, his quotations are as full of bad Western readings as other people's quotations are.

Additional Note upon the readings in Origen in Ioan. (Brooke i 207-209).

In Origen's Commentary on St John, as mentioned above, the texts of Matt. xxi 1-9, Mk. xi 1-12, Lk. xix 29-40, are quoted in full. I have made a collation of these passages with Westcott and Hort (text) and the 'Received Text' (5). Most of the variants naturally are small points, about which mere tabulated statement gives the fairest impression. The results are:—

Matt. xxi 1-9.	
Origen agrees with W.-H.	8 times
" " " 5	6 "
" differs from both	6 "
	—
Total	20 variants.
Mk. xi 1-12.	
Origen agrees with W.-H.	16 times
" " " 5	3 "
" differs from both	3 "
	—
Total	22 variants.
Lk. xix 29-40.	
Origen agrees with W.-H.	9 times
" " " 5	4 "
" differs from both	6 "
	—
Total	19 variants.

It is noteworthy how very much higher the proportion of agreement with Westcott and Hort (i.e. with \aleph B) is in St Mark than in the other Gospels.

Three of these readings call for special remark. In Matt. xxi 5

πῶλον υἰὸν ὑποζυγίου Origen omits υἰὸν with **N^aLZe** and some codd. of lat. vg. This might have been put down to mere carelessness or to an accidental omission in Origen's MS, but in the Commentary on Matthew (Delarue iii 738), where he assumes for Matthew the full reading πῶλον υἰὸν ὑποζυγίου, in comparing it with the text of Zechariah he says ἡ ὥσ ἐν τισι· πῶλον ὑποζυγίου. The omission of υἰὸν here is therefore accurate, so far as the text of Origen's commentary in John goes; he is copying here from the text which he calls in his Matthew that of 'some copies'. Whether the omission of υἰὸν is ultimately to be preferred is of course quite another matter.

In Mk. xi 7, 8 Origen omits καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτόν. καὶ πολλοὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν. This is quite unsupported: the texts of *k*, of syr. *S*, and of *W*, all omit words just about here, but not these words. The loss is made up in Origen by the addition of ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν after ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν.¹ Evidently Origen's codex was descended from an ancestor that had lost a couple of lines, or clauses, and the loss has been not quite successfully patched up. We need not imagine that even if Origen succeeded in unearthing a very ancient and valuable text that text was impeccable, or that it contained no scribal or other errors.

In Lk. xix 37^b we read that 'all the multitude of the disciples began rejoicing and praising God' (ἤρξαντο, οὐ ἤρξαντο, ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος . . . χαίροντες αἰνεῖν). For ἅπαν the newly-discovered text *W* is found to read ἀπανταν, which Prof. Sanders (p. 141) curiously calls a mistake in gender. Origen also has ἀπανταν, but quite clearly understands by it ἀπαντᾶν 'to meet', for the subsequent χαίροντες αἰνεῖν is changed into χαίροντες καὶ αἰνοῦντες, so that the whole passage runs 'a multitude of the disciples began to meet him (sc. Jesus, as He neared the Mount of Olives, v. 37^a), rejoicing and praising God'. Here we may note (i) that the variation is wrong, for it is only in the (unhistorical) presentation of the Fourth Gospel that the Hosanna-shouting crowd comes out to meet Jesus (ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ, John xii 13); (ii) Origen's text, as in the case of Mk. xi 7, 8, has been doctored a little, to make the corrupt reading make sense; (iii) Origen and *W* after all do not agree, for in Origen ἀπανταν has been formed out of ἅπαν τό, while in *W* it has been formed by a kind of reduplication from ἅπαν only: it should be added that Origen and *W* shew no other signs of noticeable agreement in this part of Luke; (iv) a certain tendency to introduce the Johannine feature of the crowd from Jerusalem meeting Jesus is to be

¹ The mention of the ἀγρῶν is highly characteristic of the **NB** text, in fact green stuff from the *fields* only appears in **NB(C)LD** sah (boh) syr.h1.mg Orig of all our critical authorities, early and late. Thus in Origen's text no garments, but only στιβάδες, are laid on the path.

found elsewhere: to Matt. xxi 9^b we find added in syr. *C* 'and many went forth to meet Him, and they were rejoicing and glorifying God for all that they saw', which agrees with an addition found in Φ (Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae): ἀπὸ πάντων δὲ αὐτῶ πολλοὶ χαίροντες καὶ δοξάζοντες τὸν θεὸν περὶ πάντων ὧν εἶδον. The Arabic Diatessaron (xxxix 31-35), it should be noted, gives a different combination. I mention these readings here, because I think the single coincidence between Origen and W in Lk. xix 37, striking as it is at first sight, is very likely nothing more than an accidental coincidence in error, and therefore of no great significance.

F. C. BURKITT.

(*To be continued.*)

TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

AN INSTANCE (Ps. xcvi 11).

THE Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible may be broadly described as a starveling Science which ekes out its existence on false pretences. Except in the Pentateuch, of which there exists a Hebrew-Samaritan recension, there are (as everybody knows) only a very few various readings of any importance or interest, which are preserved in Hebrew. But this meagre list, too thin to live by itself, has been incorporated by critics in another of imposing dimensions. 'The reading of the LXX' is a phrase in common use, and a goodly number of such 'readings' is found in almost every modern commentary upon almost any book of the Hebrew Bible. In fact the Textual Criticism of the O.T. lives chiefly by one hypothesis, viz., that a vast number of the *renderings* of the LXX can be turned back almost at sight into ancient *readings* of the Hebrew text. Renderings (readings) of other Versions are cited at the heel of the LXX, but chiefly by way of garnishing.

Critics pay lip-homage to Fact when they confess that the LXX was born in ignorance and brought up in a state of continual textual corruption. It was made in Egypt because the Egyptian Jews were fast forgetting their Hebrew, it suffered corruption because it was a popular version, which could be tried by no standard except that of popularity. It was fated both to follow the easier reading and also to fall further and further away from the Hebrew original. When we arrive at codex