Judaism. The Apocalypse, by its omission of all reference to the Incarnation, and by its use of the Jewish Wisdom-Logos theme, may have been regarded by the orthodox as lending support to this heresy. It is not to be wondered at, that this part of the Church questioned and rejected for so long this Book.

But time passed, and with it the peculiarly Jewish elements which remained in the doctrines of the Christian Church. We have learnt to read the Apocalypse anew in the light of the rest of the New Testament teaching. The Jewish elements in it have been sublimated as to their original meaning; but they remain to indicate the essential unity in the revelation that God, who spake in times past by the prophets through His Spirit concerning His Son, gave at last in that Son, His Word Incarnate. The seer read that revelation aright when he declared, 'The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy'.

G. H. Dix.

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

II.

Φέρευ in St Mark

Φέρευ is one of the words specially characteristic of the Second Gospel, and Sir John Hawkins rightly includes it in his list *Horae Synopticae* p. 13. If we make abstraction of the technical usage of φέρευ 'to bear fruit', the figures for the four Gospels are Mark 14, Matthew 4, Luke 4, John 8. Sir John Hawkins leaves the matter there: but examination of the passages concerned reveals the secret of the disproportionate occurrence of the word in Mark. The other three Evangelists, in fact, limit the meaning of φέρευ, speaking generally, to the sense of 'carry': Mark, on the other hand, uses it also, and more frequently, in the sense of 'bring'. The difference is therefore a lexical one. It is well illustrated in the treatment of Mark 2 (ii 3) by Luke, and of Mark 7 (xi 2, 7) by both Matthew and Luke.

1. Mark i 32 ἐφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας. Here ἐφερον, as in the parallel cases 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, means certainly 'brought', not 'carried': and therefore Matthew substitutes προσήνεγκαν and Luke ἤγαγον.

2. ii 3 καὶ ἔχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικῶν αἰρόμενον ἐπὶ τεσσάρων. So far is Mark from implying the sense of 'carry' in φέροντες that he finds it necessary to add αἰρόμενον to convey the further
idea: ‘they bring to him a paralytic, carried by four men’. Matthew again substitutes προσφέρει: Luke transfers φέροντες to take the place of αλφόμενον ‘men (come) carrying on a bed a man who was paralysed’.

3 a. vi 27 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀποστείλας ὁ βασιλεὺς σπευκολάτωρα ἐπέταξεν ἐνέγκαι τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

b. vi 28 καὶ ἤνεγκεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακα.

Here the natural rendering in verse 27 would be ‘bring’, but in verse 28 we could no doubt say either ‘he brought his head on a dish’ or ‘he bore his head on a dish’. The episode is absent from Luke: Matthew’s abbreviated narrative dispenses with the ἐνέγκαι of verse 27, but retains the ἤνεγκεν of verse 28 in the passive form ἤνέχθη ‘his head was borne on a dish’.

4. vii 32 καὶ φέροντες αὐτῷ κοφὼν καὶ μουγλάλον. Obviously they ‘bring’ the man, not ‘carry’ him. So Matthew (Luke again has no parallel) paraphrases with προσῆλθον . . . ἔχοντες μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν, once more refusing Mark’s usage of φέρειν.

5. viii 22 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν. καὶ φέροντον αὐτῷ τυφλόν. Neither Matthew nor Luke retains the episode: if they had retained it, we may presume that they would have done as they regularly do elsewhere and have avoided the word φέρειν.

6 a. ix 17 διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν νιῶν μου πρὸς σέ.

b. 19 φέρετε αὐτὸν πρὸς με.

c. 20 καὶ ἤνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν.

Luke reduces the triple use of the word to a single occasion, and there substitutes προσάγαγε. Matthew inserts προσῆλθε γα καὶ φέροντα at one point, drops the ἤνεγκα, ἤνεγκα, of verses 17 and 20, but retains the φέρετε of verse 19. Here (Matt. xvii 17) we have the solitary instance in which Mark’s φέρειν = ‘bring’ retains its place in either of the other Synoptists. Probably the use was felt to be more tolerable in the imperative: possibly it is eased by Matthew’s addition of ὀδὸν. So Matt. xiv 18 of the loaves and fishes φέρετε μοι ὀδὸν αὐτοῦ.

7 a. xi 2 εὑρίσκετε πῶλον διδημένον . . . λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ φέρετε.

b. 7 καὶ φέροντον τὸν πῶλον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

Both Matthew and Luke substitute ἀγάγετε in a, ἥγαγον in b. Luke therewith makes his regular alteration: Matthew for once deserts προσφέρω for ἁγμα, presumably because ‘leading’ is a natural word to employ of an animal.

8 a. xii 15 φέρετε μοι δηνάριον να ἵδω.

b. 16 οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν.

Matthew ἐπιδείκατε μοι . . . οἱ δὲ προσῆλθεγκαν. Luke δείκατε, omitting the addition that a δηνάριον was then brought. Neither would talk of

1 See for the imperative also Luke xv 23 (quoted in the next note), and Jo. xx 27 φέρε τὸν δάκτυλον.
φέρειν in connexion with a coin: but Luke's normal substitution of ἄγειν was inappropriate here, and he had to find another word. That he and Matthew should have found the same substitute for φέρειν in δείξατε (ἐπιδείξατε) naturally challenges our attention. But coincidences will happen: they have no significance unless they bear an undue proportion to the total number of cases in which they could happen. And if the chances were—as presumably they were—that one or other of the group of Pharisees and Herodians had a denarius on his person, then 'shew me one' was an even more natural phrase than 'bring me one'.

9. xv 22 (ἀγαρείωναν ... Ξίμωνα ... ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ) καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Γολοθύαν τόπον ... (καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτῶν).

Mark uses αἴρω, as in ii 3, for 'carrying' the cross: Luke, as there, substitutes φέρειν. Mark's φέρειν for 'bring' him to Golgotha is of course rejected by both Matthew and Luke, who agree in simplifying the sentence into the form 'on their arrival (ἐλθόντες, ὁτε ἀπήλθον) at Golgotha ... they crucified him'. Again a coincidence, but surely a very obvious one, once it is postulated that the word φέρειν had somehow to be got rid of, and that the four verbs connected by καὶ in Mark xv 22–24 offered an irresistible temptation to revision.

In the result, out of fourteen instances of φέρειν in Mark, the word is never retained by Luke, once only by Matthew; though Luke twice (v 18, xxiii 26) transfers it to the immediate context, displacing Mark's αἴρειν to make room for it. For φέρειν Luke's favourite alternative is ἄγειν (three times) or προσάγειν (once). Mark only once has ἄγειν in the ordinary transitive use: Matthew, save in the episode of the 'bringing' of the colt to Jesus, shares Mark's avoidance of ἄγειν, and replaces φέρειν by προσφέρειν (four times), a word which he employs nearly twice as often as the other three Evangelists put together.

III.

els and ἐν in St Mark


1 Yet compare Luke xv 23 φέρεις τῶν μοίχων τῶν στεντῶν (again however in the imperative, as Matt. xiv 18, xvii 17, see above under 6 δ), Acts v 16 φέρουσις ἀθεωσις.
The following list of passages is intended to justify the conclusion that in Mark's usage εἰς is frequently used in the place of εν, εν perhaps occasionally where we should rather expect εἰς (see 2, 10): that the other two Synoptists, and Matthew more consistently than Luke, dislike the confusion of the two prepositions and generally alter Mark's phraseology: and that the volume of evidence for εἰς = εν as a favourite usage of Mark is sufficient to turn the scale where the witnesses happen to be divided, some giving an εἰς = εν reading and others either having εν in place of εἰς (6, 15) or more often introducing into the text a verb of motion (3, 4, 14).

1. i 9 ἑβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην. It is quite impossible, in my judgement, to suppose that by this phrase Mark means anything at all different from i 5 ἑβαπτίζοντο εν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ: the phrases were to him synonymous. Matthew retains ἑβαπτίζοντο εν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ of the multitudes, and for the baptism of Jesus alters the construction to παραγίνεται εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην . . . τοῦ ἑβαπτισθῆναι. Luke omits both εν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ and εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην.

2. i 16 ἀμφιβάλλοντας εν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. Matthew more correctly βάλλοντας ἀμφιβληστρῶν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν: Luke has no parallel. Most MSS of Mark insert a noun (some ἀμφιβληστρῶν from Matthew, others, possibly rightly, τὰ δίκτυα) to give ἀμφιβάλλοντας an object: but the insertion only makes the use of εν odder still.

3. i 21 ἐδοθακὲν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν. So so C L Δ 28 33 Ferrar group syri: εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδοθακὲν A B D W Θ latt. The latter group is in itself the stronger, and I cannot regard Ν Origen as more than a single witness. But Westcott-Hort give the shorter reading a place in their margin, and the close parallels of 4 and 14 suggest that the scholar who produced the B text, whenever he found εἰς without any idea of motion expressed, systematically put matters right from a grammatical point of view by the insertion of the verb ἔρχομαι (εἰσέρχομαι). Still in view of the Latin evidence, and of the Greek support for the same reading, the decision is perhaps less easy than in any other instance of reading on our list. Neither of the other Synoptists has a parallel text here.

4. 5. i 39 καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. So A C D W Δ latt syri: ἦλθεν Ν Β Λ Θ. With regard to the prepositions, Matthew changes εἰς both times into εν, εν ὅλη τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων εν ταῖς συναγωγάς αὐτῶν: Luke retains εἰς on the first occasion, but by combining the two phrases into εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Γαλιλαίας [Ἰονδαίας] avoids the second. With regard to the verb, Matthew changes to περιήγησεν 'went about', Luke has ἦν. It is much
more likely that Luke repeated ἃν κηρύσσων εἰς from Mark than that he altered ἃλθεν εἰς into ἃν εἰς. It is further much more likely that scribes or editors of Mark should have substituted ἃλθεν εἰς for ἃν εἰς than vice versa. I cannot doubt that Ν B represent here an intentional correction of a non-literary usage of St Mark.

6. ii 1 ἡκούσθη δὴ εἰς οἰκόν ἐστιν. So A C Δ and the margin of Westcott-Hort: ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστιν Ν B D W Θ 33. Versions hardly count; but authority, it is clear, is preponderant for ἐν οἰκῷ: it is only the consideration that the temptation to alter εἰς οἰκόν to ἐν οἰκῷ was infinitely greater than the converse which makes it likely that the inferior witnesses are right. There is no parallel in either Matthew or Luke.

7a. iv 7 ἔπεσεν εἰς τάς ἀκάνθας.

b. 18 οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπείρομενοι.

Both Matthew and Luke alter Mark on the first occasion, the former to ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας, the latter to ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν: both, on the other hand, retain Mark's εἰς on the second occasion. There is indeed some authority for ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας both times in Mark, C D 33 in verse 7, Ν C Δ in verse 18: the former is doubtless borrowed from the parallel in Matthew. And the parallel in Jeremiah iv 3 must not be overlooked, νεώσατε ἑαυτοῖς νεώματα, καὶ μὴ σπείρητε ἐπὶ ἀκάνθασιν.

8. iv 8 ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν.

cf. verse 20 οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες.

Here Matthew changes εἰς to ἐπὶ in verse 8,1 thus giving ἐπὶ in both places. Luke, more tolerant than Matthew of the Marcan use of εἰς, retains it in Mark's verse 8, while he changes ἐπὶ τὴν to ἐν τῇ in Mark's verse 20.

9. iv 8 εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ εἰς εξήκοντα καὶ εἰς ἑκατόν (with variant εν).

cf. verse 20 εν τριάκοντα καὶ εν εξήκοντα καὶ εν ἑκατόν.

By a curious freak of the Greek language εἰς εν can mean, according as breathing and accent differ, either the two correlated prepositions εἰς ἐν, or the masculine and neuter of the cardinal number one, εἰς ἐν. And since breathings and accents were not part of the usage of MSS at the time when our Gospels were written, we are thrown back on internal evidence to decide between possible interpretations. Matthew on each occasion substitutes ὅ μὲν . . . ὅ δὲ . . . ὅ δὲ: he would therefore seem to

---

1 εἰς tends to take the place of ἐπὶ (πρὸς) as well as of ἐν in Mark. i 10 καταβαίνων εἰς αὐτῶν is changed by both Matthew and Luke to ἐπὶ: xiii 3 καθημένου αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαίων, Matthew writes ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους (see no. 19 below); and the very odd καθῆκαν εἰς τὴν βαλάσσῃ of iv 1, where Matthew omits εἰς τῇ βαλάσσῃ (Luke again gives no parallel), would at least be less odd if Mark had written ἐπὶ τῆς βαλάσσης. But εἰς τὸ πέραν (iv 35, v 1, 21, vi 45, viii 13) and εἰς τῶν ὄφρων (vi 41, vii 34) are freely reproduced by Matthew and Luke, and have precedent in classical usage.

2 If D here, Luke viii 8, has ἐπὶ, αἰτὶ 'super', the variant is probably due to a simple assimilation to Matthew.
have read eis, and certainly to have understood Mark to mean ‘one... another... another’. Luke, with the dislike of an educated Greek for the Jewish use of symbolic numbers, omits the details on both occasions.

eis in verse 8 would be ungrammatical after alla, and if we translate with Matthew ‘one... another... another’ we must read the neuter en throughout, against the testimony of NBC*LΔ. The Latins followed Matthew’s interpretation, and rendered unum: and so among moderns Blass op. cit. § 46. 2 p. 142. But in view of the Semitic idiom, which uses the preposition ‘in’ to mean ‘at the rate of’, I suspect that Mark had in his mind here the preposition and not the numeral. Further, if the mass of evidence adduced in these notes convinces us that the evangelist used the two prepositions en and eis almost interchangeably, it becomes simple enough to suppose that he had the same idiom in his mind whether he expressed it by en, as certainly in verse 20, or by eis, as perhaps in verse 8. Nay, it becomes even possible that cod. B is right in interchanging the two in a single verse: in verse 8 if B’s eis πρακόντα καὶ en ἔχικοντα καὶ ἔκατον is the true text, we can the better understand why N should have eis... eis... eis and AD en... en... en.

[10. iv 36 παραλαμβάνων αὐτὸν ὡς ἢν ἔν τῷ πλοῖῳ. As in [2] above, this is an instance not of eis where we expect en, but of en where we expect eis. Luke omits the detail: Matthew restores the more correct use, ἐμβάντες αὐτῷ eis πλοῖον.]

II. v 14 ἀνήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ eis τοὺς ἀγροῦς. An instance on the border-line, where eis might just be rendered ‘announced it to the city’, though it is hardly doubtful that the real meaning is ‘in the city and in the country’. So, while Luke retains the Marcan phrase unaltered, Matthew, with his more rigid canon of exactness in respect of this preposition, inserts ἀπελθόντες before eis τὴν πόλιν ἀνήγγειλαν.

12. v 34 ὑπαγε eis εἰρήνην. Once more Matthew omits the phrase, and Luke, with the change of ὑπαγε into πορεύου, retains it. While μετ’ εἰρήνης and en εἰρήνη are common in the LXX, eis εἰρήνη is the characteristic use, following the Semitic idiom, with πορεύον and βάδιζε. Mark’s phrase is therefore not destitute of precedent, though it is more likely that Luke consciously sheltered himself under this than that Mark did.

13. vi 8 ἦν μιθην αἰφωσίν eis ὁδὸν... μὴ πήραν, μὴ eis τὴν ζώνην χαλκῶν. Here the usual conditions are reversed, and it is Luke who omits, Matthew who retains, eis τὴν ζώνην. It is of course just possible

1 It was suggested at our Seminar that en τῷ πλοῖῳ might be taken not with παραλαμβάνων but with ὡς ἢν, ‘just as he was, i.e. in the boat’. But Matthew obviously took the phrase with παραλαμβάνων.
to say ‘take no money for your purse’, though the more natural phrase is undoubtedly ‘in your purse’.

14. viii 26 μηδὲ[ν] εἰς τὴν κόμην εἴπης. There are no parallels from the other Synoptists: but the instance is a most significant one, and the case for the reading adopted above is in my judgement unanswerable. Westcott and Hort Introduction § 140 cite this verse with good cause as a typical ‘conflate’ reading of the received text: it is demonstrable that behind the form μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κόμην εἰσέλθης μηδὲ εἴπης τοιῷ ἐν τῇ κόμῃ lie two earlier readings, (1) μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κόμην εἰσέλθης, and (2) μηδὲ εἴπης τοιῷ ἐν τῇ κόμῃ, which the Antiochenese text has combined. Westcott-Hort treat the two briefer readings as rivals, and decide for the former, which is given by Ν Β Λ Ζ Ἱ συρίσιν. But what if we repeat the process of analysis, and ask whether both (1) and (2) cannot be explained as developments of a reading that lay further back than either of them? If we bear in mind (a) the accumulation of evidence in favour of the Marcan use of εἰς for ἐν: (β) the tendency of codex B to get rid of this unclassical idiom, on the more startling occasions of its employment, by the introduction of ἐφρομαί or εἰφρομαί—see 3, 4 above: (γ) the actual presence of the phrase μηδὲν εἴπης εἰς τὴν κόμην as part of the reading in D, and of ‘νε κεὶ δικεῖν in castellum’ as the whole reading in the Old Latin MS c: (δ) the ease with which the other early readings can be explained if we postulate μηδὲν[ν] εἰς τὴν κόμην εἴπης as the original source of the different developments: then I do not think it too much to say that the problem has solved itself.¹

15. χ 10 καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ περὶ τοῦτον ἐπηρώτων αὐτῶν. Luke is no longer parallel to Mark: Matthew drops the whole phrase. But the reading is that of Ν Β Δ ΔΑ Ψ, and it must not be assumed that because the Latins give the ablative they found ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ in their Greek exemplars. It cannot be too often repeated that a large element in our critical apparatus is vitiated because it is forgotten that the earliest translators translated by the sense and not by the letter, and followed the idiom of their own language. It is only the late pedantry of the Greek O.T. of Aquila, or the Harclean Syriac, or the English Revised Version of N.T., which so translates as to enable one to reconstruct the exact phraseology and order of their original.² So we are free to follow the reading of our best Greek MSS without reference on this occasion to the versions. The temptation to scribes to substitute ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ in so palpable a case of εἰς = ἐν was obvious: it is rather

¹ When I first published my Inaugural Lecture, The Study of the New Testament: 1889 and 1920 (1920), I had not grasped the evidence for St Mark’s usage of ἐν, and thought that the original text must have run μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κόμην, without any verb: but my friend the Rev. H. N. Bate had already divined the true reading, as I have there recorded (p. 59 ad fin.).

² The Vulgate was saved from this pitfall of revision because Jerome was not only a good Greek scholar, but a great Latin stylist.
matter for wonder that the few MSS escaped it than that the many fell
victims to it.

16. xi 8 πολλοὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἐστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὀδόν. The verb ‘to
strew’ might be conceived of as implying motion, ‘strewed their
garments on to the road’: and if Mark never used εἰς for ἐν, some such
explanation would be feasible. But in view of the evidence here
accumulated, it is by far the simpler view that he meant ‘on the road’.
So certainly Matthew and Luke understood it, since both substitute ἐν
τῇ ὀδῷ. This is the first occasion on which we find them agreeing on
ἐν for εἰς; but see also below, no. 20.

[17. xiii 3 καθημένου αὐτοῦ ἐις τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἔλαιων, ‘as he was sitting
on the Mount of Olives’. In English we can only render by ‘on’. But
that does not mean that the proper Greek word was necessarily ἐν:
Matthew’s ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους (Luke omits the whole detail) is doubtless more
idiomatic. It remains, however, that it is a real example of the encroach­
ments in vulgar use of εἰς upon other prepositions.]

18. xiii 9 παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνεδρία καὶ εἰς συναγωγάς δαρῆσεσθε
καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε. How is the sentence to be
punctuated? Luke, omitting δαρῆσεσθε entirely, is able to construct
a simple sentence with two pairs of parallel nouns, παραδίδοντες εἰς τὰς
συναγωγάς καὶ φυλακάς, ἀπαγορεύοντος ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας. Matthew
(x 17) sacrificed the connexion of συνεδρία and συναγωγάς, constructing
the former with the verb that precedes it and the latter with the verb
that follows it, παραδώσουσιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνεδρία, καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγάις
αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς ἀχθήσεσθε.
I cannot doubt that Matthew is so far right that εἰς συναγωγάς δαρῆ­
σεσθε was intended by Mark to be taken together, and that therefore
εἰς συναγωγάς means nothing more nor less than ‘in synagogues’. But
I am also inclined to believe that Luke interprets correctly when he
joins συναγωγάς καὶ φυλακάς—i. e. συνεδρία and συναγωγάς—in one con­
struction: for it seems as odd to think that Mark meant to contrast
the usage to be experienced in sanhedrins and in synagogues respec­
tively,1 as that he should have contrasted governors and kings. If
I am right, Mark’s thought implies a comma after ὑμᾶς, and another
after δαρῆσεσθε: ‘they shall give you in charge, in sanhedrins and
synagogues shall you be beaten, and before governors and kings shall
you be made to stand’. The absolute use of παραδίδοναι is found in
i 14 μετὰ τὸ παραδοθῆμαι τὸν Ἰωάννην, and in frequent references to
Judas and the Betrayal of Christ.

1 The suggestion was made in our Seminar that συνεδρία are the courts which
pronounce the sentence, and συναγωγαί the scene of its execution. That appears
to me a rather artificial contrast: but in any case if εἰς is to be taken in two different
senses, ‘to’ and ‘in’, in the same line, the process of the suppression of ἐν in
favour of εἰς must have gone already a long way.
Anyhow a clear case is established of *eis* = *ēv*: Mark, we may be quite sure, had no thought of 'the simplest rendering "Ye shall be scourged into the synagogues"', even though it 'presents no archaeological difficulty' (Winer-Moulton p. 518).

19. xiii 10 καὶ *eis* παντα τά ἔθνη πρῶτον ἰδι ἱπτηθηναι τῷ εὐαγγέλιον. 'Preached to all nations' would be a possible rendering: but when Matthew xxiv 14 wrote *ἱπτηθησται . . . ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ* (Luke has no parallel), he must have taken Mark to be once more using *eis* for *ēv.*

20. xiii 15, 16 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δόματος μὴ καταβάτω [eis τὴν οἰκίαν] μηδὲ ἐσελθάτω τι ἄραι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ *eis* τὸν ἄγρον μὴ ἐπιστρεφάτω *eis* τὰ ὄπισω ἄραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ. Both the other Synoptists recognize the clear implication of *eis* τῶν ἄγρων 'the man in the field'; Matthew writes ὁ *ēv* τῷ ἄγρῳ, Luke ὁ *ēv* ταῖς χώραις. For the second time (see 16 above) they agree in the very obvious substitution of *ēv* for *eis.*

21. xiv 20 ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ *eis* τῷ [ἐν] τρύβλιον. As in 16, it is possible to argue that ἐμβαπτότων implies motion, so that 'dips into the dish' could stand. But Matthew at any rate (Luke omits the whole phrase) interpreted Mark's *eis* as equivalent to *ēv,* ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χείρα ἐν τῷ τρύβλῳ. I think it not unlikely that the *ēv* of B in Mark does not really mean 'the one dish' (there seems no trace in Marcan usage of τῷ *ēv* = 'the same') but is the descendant of a marginal gloss suggesting the substitution of *ēv* for *eis.*

These instances, taken together—even after allowance is made for the two, 2 and 10, where *ēv* appears instead of *eis,* and another 17, where *eis* has ousted *ἐπὶ* rather than *ēv*—do seem to establish a definite tendency in Marcan usage for *eis* to encroach on *ēv.* That encroachment is not peculiar to Mark, though among New Testament writings there is none where the encroachment is so marked as in his Gospel. The process which was commencing in the common speech of our Lord's time has ended in the complete supersession of *ēv* in modern Greek. But it was still resented by scribes and scholars, or at any rate by some of them, in the first and second centuries A.D. If Matthew regularly, and Luke frequently, are found to desert Mark's use in this respect, it is reasonable to expect that the same tendency will have influenced scribes, and not least the more skilled among them. The evidence of undoubted cases like 1, 15, 18, 20, may fairly be used to turn the scale where the evidence is divided, and justifies the conclusion that the scribe of codex B or its ancestor, admirable as is his general fidelity, did not rise superior to the temptation of altering an incorrect idiom into accordance with the traditions of literary Greek.

(To be continued)

C. H. Turner.