NOTES AND STUDIES

A TEXTUAL COMMENTARY ON MARK I.

For something like forty years I have been interested in the problem of the textual criticism of the New Testament: and for the last seven years I have been devoting special attention to the Gospel according to St Mark, its exegesis, its relation to the other two Synoptic Gospels, and its text. As to the exegesis I am contributing the section on St Mark to a brief commentary on the whole Bible which may, I hope, appear before the end of 1927. But that commentary is confined to the English version, and, as regards any questions of the text, can only deal with them indirectly and incompletely. I am therefore venturing to put before the readers of this Journal a specimen, covering only the first chapter, of what I should like to do for the text of the Gospel as a whole. The specimen is purely tentative; my object has been to comment on all readings that are important in themselves and on any readings where the text that I have constructed differs from the critical texts in use. I have cited regularly the readings of Westcott and Hort, as the edition of the Greek Testament which (in my view) at present holds the field, and frequently, but not exhaustively, the readings of Tischendorf, which are also the readings of Ruck’s Synopsis. But in order to concentrate attention on the things that seem to me really salient, and to find room for discussion and explanation of variant readings, I have had to limit myself in the list of authorities cited to those only that are the oldest and the most important. In any such selection some personal and subjective element must come into play, and the choice may here and there seem arbitrary. Naturally my ruling idea has been to give prominence to those authorities or groups of authorities in which, according to my judgement, a strain of early tradition may be looked for, especially where it may be argued that insufficient attention has been given to that evidence in the critical editions of the past.

Put in other words, this means that, in company with a good many scholars of our day, I should hold that the chief defect in Westcott and Hort’s great work lay in their comparative neglect of what is called the Western text. In so far as their purpose was to put the coping-stone to the achievement of the long and slow process of the replacing of the Received Text by a text based wholly on ‘pre-Syrian’ testimony,

1 I say ‘comparative neglect’, because it is well known that, however timidly, they did give the preference to a number of omissions, especially towards the end of St Luke, guaranteed only by D and Old Latin MSS.
I should have no quarrel with them; nor should I entirely differ from them in their estimate of the individual excellence of the codex Vaticanus, B. But I cannot resist the conclusion that convergent proof from different quarters and of different sorts does compel us to lay very much more weight than they did on the evidence of ‘Western’ authorities. And here one is naturally faced at once with the question what exactly one means by ‘Western’. For as first used in the eighteenth century the word meant just what it said: it was a symbol to represent the evidence of those MSS and writers, whether Greek or Latin, that belonged to the Western half of the Roman Empire. But in the course of the nineteenth century witnesses to a Western type of text—to a text at any rate that had as marked agreements with strictly Western authorities as with Alexandrian or Neutral authorities—began to be detected in an ever-increasing number in the East. In Syria, if the Diatessaron of Tatian derives its Western character from the fact that its Greek original was composed in Rome, the Old Syriac ‘Separate’ Gospels must have been rendered from a local Greek text. In north-eastern Asia Minor the late uncial codex Ƶ testifies to the survival in remote corners of a pre-Byzantine, more or less ‘Western’ text, some centuries after the Lucianic or Byzantine text had come into official use at Antioch and Constantinople. And Dr Streeter, following out indications given by Prof. Lake, would combine the evidence of Ƶ with the evidence of various important cursives such as the Ferrar group (13–69–124–346 etc.) and the MSS 565 and 700, and would refer this whole branch of the tradition to an original home in Caesarea and Palestine. Finally, Egypt itself, the one district which provides the whole evidence for Hort’s Neutral text, does not speak in this respect with a consentient voice. There are divergent witnesses: ‘Western’ elements can perhaps be detected in the earliest vernacular version of Egypt, the Sahidic, and more markedly in the newly discovered Freer MS of the Gospels (W) and also, as Prof. Burkitt shewed, in Clement of Alexandria.

Now if all these types of so-called Western text are united against the Alexandrian or Neutral text, it is obvious that, whether we regard its age or its wide diffusion, it makes a very strong claim for consideration, and a claim that is stronger now, owing to fresh discoveries, than it was in the days of Dr Hort. But to speak in this sense of a Western text seems to me now so entirely misleading that I prefer to revert to Griesbach’s usage, and mean by Western the authorities that are Western geographically. If the word is used in the other and wider sense, it is better to be careful to put it into inverted commas as ‘Western’: it is better still, I think, to drop ‘Western’ in this sense as far as possible, and to group these types of text, whether Western or Eastern, under the common heading ‘unrevised’. Such a heading
admittedly implies a contrast with a type of text that is revised, and I feel no doubt that the text contained in the codex Vaticanus is the fruit of a revision—a revision very carefully and very skilfully done, so that B stands out as our best witness to the text of the Gospels, but a revision for all that.

But since B may be said, since the publication of Westcott and Hort’s edition in 1881, to hold the field, some brief summary must be given in limine of the sort of reasons which seem to me to qualify its sureness as a guide, and to reduce it to a lower pedestal than that on which Hort placed it. If B is, as I think it is, a product of the highest kind of Alexandrine scholarship, we have to begin by asking ourselves on what lines Alexandrine criticism was accustomed to treat classical authors. And among classical authors Homer is for our purpose supreme, because Homer presents the nearest parallel, in the temper of veneration with which his writings were approached, to the Bible of Christians. This temper almost inevitably led to ‘recension’, to the omission for instance of anything that seemed ἀπετεῖς or ἀπειθανον. Do we not see just the same temper at work in Mc. i 41 when ἄργυρείς is replaced by ὀπλαγχυσθείς, in Mc. xv 34, where ἄνείδως has made way for ἔγκατελιπτες, or again, to cite a case where Β stand alone save for a small handful of cursive, in vii 4, the emendation of βαπτίσονται—as being consecrated in Christian usage to the sacrament of Baptism—into βαπτίζονται. Once more, Alexandrian scribes or editors, with a great inheritance of Greek culture to live up to, were under a strong temptation to correct even an evangelist (to them it would seem the corrupted text of an evangelist) into accord with Greek grammar and literary usage: in viii 2 ἡμέρας τρεῖς προσμένουσιν μοι is emended into ἡμέρας τριάν, in viii 3 ἡκαίρων is turned into ἑκάρων, in ix 8 οὐδένα εἰδον ἀλλὰ becomes (with Matthew) οὐδένα εἰδον εἰ μή, while the preposition εἰς, which Mark frequently uses for εἰ, is regularized by the insertion of εἰσελθεῖν or the like, as in Mc. i 21, viii 26. Less common, but still worthy of notice, are the indications that alternative readings with an introductory ἦ had been jotted down by some scholar in the margin of some early Alexandrian ancestor of B (and other MSS), and in the next copy incorporated in the text, e.g. Lc. x 41 ὀδηγῶν δὲ ἐστιν χρεία ἦ ἐνός, Lc. xii 47 καὶ μή ἐτοιμάσας ἦ τούτος. And finally the tradition represented by B is unfortunately not quite exempt from the temptation to supplement one Gospel from another, or to assimilate it to another even by a process of omission. Mark is perhaps the Gospel which has suffered most in this way: compare the additions in i 34 χριστὸν εἶναι (from Lc. iv 41), or in iii 14 ὃς καὶ ἀποστόλους ἐνόμισε (from Lc. vi 13), and the omission in x 19 of μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς (in accord with Mt. xix 18, Lc xviii 20).
As to the date and place of origin of B, Dr Ropes in his new edition of the Acts (The Beginnings of Christianity, Part III) has drawn out very persuasively, following Rahlfs, the arguments which bring it into relation with St Athanasius: and as it is quite certain that so sumptuous a MS can only have been written for a great person or a great church, I am disposed to regard with favour the conjecture which identifies it with a copy prepared under Athanasius about A.D. 340 for the emperor Constans.

Similar considerations convince me that codex N, a no less sumptuous MS, must also have been written with some similar purpose: and I want to ventilate the hypothesis—I do not propound it as more than a hypothesis—that its origin should be brought into connexion with the known activity (twice mentioned by Jerome) of the bishops Acacius and Euzoius of Caesarea, about the middle of the fourth century, in causing the worn out papyri of the famous library of their church to be copied on the more durable material of vellum. If it is objected that the text of N is of an Alexandrian type rather than of the type which Dr Streeter has adduced reasons for calling Caesarean, I should meet the point by asking further whether N may not have been, in part or in whole, transcribed from the papyrus rolls which Origen, rather more than a century earlier, may be presumed to have brought with him when he left Egypt to settle in Palestine. I cannot pretend to have made more examination of the available material than covers the first twenty-four verses of Mc. i: but in these verses there are seven significant readings where Origen in Jo. sides with N against B, and the first of them is the highly important omission of νιῶθ ϑεοῦ in Mc. i 1, where N Origen stand nearly alone. There is here at least, I am sure, a case for inquiry. And I cannot think it open to question that Jerome had had access to N before he published his edition of the Vulgate Gospels.

But something must also be said, however briefly, in support of the stress which it seems to me should be laid on the evidence of D and of the best of the Old Latin MSS. When D stands alone, it cannot indeed be safely trusted as a guide: but the case is different when it has the support of any one of the three leading Old Latins, cod. Bobiensis (k), cod. Palatinus (e), or cod. Vercellensis (a). I will not attempt on this occasion to do more than enumerate three objective tests which, as I think, combine to recommend these authorities to our close attention.

(i) The use of Nomina Sacra. Of Greek MSS D comes next to B in its sparing use of any but the four universal abbreviations of θεός, κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός. Of Latin MSS k stands alone in never abbreviating the word which was first added to these four, namely πνεύμα = spiritus: one hand of B is the only parallel to this
feature in $k$ among Greek MSS. There is a presumption that MSS which distinguish themselves in respect of limiting the *Nomina Sacra* that are subject to abbreviation, represent the earliest types of text.

(ii) The supposed agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in those parts of their Gospels which are taken from Mark: by 'agreements' in this sense is meant of course agreements in changes which do not look as though Mt. and Lc. would have bit on them independently. In comparison with Tischendorf's edition, Westcott and Hort by help of B had already removed a certain number of these, e.g. Mc. ii 9 ἄρον τῶν κράσπεδων σου καὶ ὑπαγε Tischendorf, where Mt. and Lc. for ὑπαγε have περπάτει, and W-H read περπάτει ... ἔναρξιν πληρώματα. But affi [neither e nor $k$ is here extant] have 'reliquias fragmentorum', with $33$ τὰ περπατεῖματα. Read ἔραν [περπατεῖματα] κλασμάτων and all is clear: a line was lost in a very early copy, not so early however but that the archetype of the oldest Latin version had escaped the loss. (2) In ix 19 Mc. has Ὅ γενεᾶς ἁπάστος, the parallels in Mt. and Lc. are printed as Ὅ γενεᾶς ἁπάστος καὶ διατραμμένη, and it would be in the highest degree unlikely that Mt. and Lc. had independently added the second adjective from Deut. xxxii 5. But then we find that in Lc. it is omitted by Marcion (on the testimony of both Tertullian and Epiphanius), by $a$ and by $e$. Once more Western witnesses solve the difficulty for us. (3) In Mc. xii 5 ἀπεκτείνων καὶ ἐξέβαλον, the heir is murdered in the vineyard and the body thrown outside: in our texts of Mt. and Lc. the two verbs are inverted, and the heir is first ejected and then killed. But in Mt. xxv 39 we ought to replace ἀπεκτείνων καὶ ἐξέβαλον on the testimony of DΘaβεfff h Iren. Lucif. (4) For Mc. xiv 72 ἐπιβαλὼν ἐκλαιείν the other Synoptists are edited as giving ἐξέλθων ἔξω ἐκλαιαίνειν πιερόν. But the phrase in Lc. (xxii 62) is omitted by $a$ beff$^2$ and is bracketed by W-H. Omit it as an interpolation from Mt., and once more all is plain sailing.

(iii) The third test is that of Marcan usage: I will confine myself to the citation of three instances of absence of particles (καὶ, ναὶ, ὅν), and one of plural for singular in describing the movements of our Lord and the disciples. i 22 ὡς ἐξοσίων ἔχων, ὅχι ὃς οἱ γραμματεῖς DΘbce: the rest καὶ ὅν with Mt. vii 28 Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κονάρια κτλ DΘWfam. 13 565 beff$^2$ syr-sin.: the rest ναὶ, Κύριε with Mt. x 9 δο θεός σωιζειων Dk: δ ὅν ὅ θεὸς the rest with Mt. xi 11 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ λευκόν ὦ ἰδ.: the rest εἰσῆλθεν with Mt. and Lc.

These preliminary remarks are adequate, I hope, to bespeak a patient hearing for the deference paid from time to time in the following pages to Western evidence, even where a reading is only guaranteed by one or two authorities. I do not claim more than to have made out a case for consideration. Least of all must I be supposed to be supporting indiscriminately the majority of Western readings against the majority of the readings of B: I have only tried to consider each case on its merits.
TEXT OF MARK 1.

1. ἈΡΧΗ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ 2 (καθὼς γέγραπται εν τῷ Ἡσαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ
1. ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μοῦ πρὸ προσώπον σου ὡς κατασκευάζει τὸν οἶκον σου.

2. φωνῆ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
3. Ἑσομάσατε τὸν ὄλον Κυρίον, εὐθείας ποιῆτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ ἄντογον)
4. ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων βαπτισμάτα μετανοίας εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτίων. 5 καὶ ἐξετορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χῶρα καὶ οἱ

1-4. Ἀρχὴ ... ἀμαρτίων: to be constructed, with Origen, Basil, and Victor of Antioch, as a single sentence, verses 2 and 3 being parenthetical. See J. T. S., Jan., 1925 (xxvi 146).

Ἰδοὺ Θεοῦ: omitted by N* Θ, two cursives and some patristic quotations. But these quotations are in all cases directed to the comparison of the different openings of the four Gospels, in particular to their appropriateness to the respective evangelic symbols: and with this view they tend to omit as much intervening matter as possible. Thus Irenaeus, to whom Mark is the eagle of the four, finds the point of appropriateness in the prophetic afflatus from on high, and hurries on to the prophetic reference: Victorinus, making Mark the lion, omits not only 'Son of God' but also the quotation from Malachi, in order to put the 'vox clamantis in deserto' as near the forefront as possible: the words νῦν θεοῦ, not conferring anything to the purpose of either father, are simply dropped. To conclude that the words did not stand in their copies of the Gospel would not be warranted: Irenaeus in fact twice gives the words in other citations. Origen indeed stands in another category, for as he omits the words five times it must be presumed that they were absent from his text: but in view of his close relation to N we have in N Origen really not two witnesses to deal with but only one. And it is (against Tischendorf and W-H text) infinitely more probable that in two early authorities ΤΤ Θ had dropped out after ΤΤ ΧΤ than that the majority of good texts (including B D) are wrong in retaining words which correspond so entirely to the contents of the Gospel (cf. i 11, iii 11, viii 38, ix 7, xii 6, xiv 61, xv 39).

2. ἀποστέλλω (without ἐγὼ) B D Θ 28 latt. Iren. W-H: praem. ἐγὼ Ν W most Greek MSS Orig. ἐγὼ is an assimilation to Mt. iii 10 and Mal. iii 1 (Ν A Q T).

3. αὐτῷ: τοῦ θεοῦ ήμῶν D Old Latins and apparently Iren. This may be, and perhaps is, an assimilation to Isa. xl 3, but the alternative that αὐτῷ is an assimilation to the parallels in Mt. Lc. cannot be quite excluded.

4. Ἰωάννης: here and in verses 6, 9, B only; see below on verse 29 (B D). ὁ βαπτιστής ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων B 33 W-H: praem. καὶ ἀπε κηρύσσων Tisch. with the other MSS. A good example of the excellence of B: scribes did not realize that in Mark's usage (vi 14, 24) ὁ βαπτιστής meant 'the Baptist', for they were only familiar with ὁ βαπτιστής. So they regarded βαπτιστής and κηρύσσων as two participles in the same construction 'John who was baptizing and preaching', and connected them with καὶ. They forgot that, strictly speaking, it was the preaching that was done 'in the wilderness'; the baptizing was 'in the river Jordan', verse 5.
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6. δέρρης D (δέρρη) a (pellem) τρίχας (Tisch. W-H) the rest (def. 9 to i 20). It is so difficult to account for δέρρης—a rare word, meaning 'skin' of an animal—that the agreement of D (not d) with a claims for it more than a place in the margin. Assimilation to Mt. ἀπὸ τρίχων καμηλοῦ would account for supersession of a rare, probably vulgar, word by the more familiar word of the more familiar Gospel. Moulton and Milligan Vocabulary s.v. δέρρης assert that in the 'Western text' here δέρρης 'has been transferred from Zech. xiii 4' ἐνδύσοιται δέρρην τρίχηνν ἄνθρωπόν—which is surely very improbable—and quote Hesychius δέρρης: τὸ παχύ όψαμα, ὡς εἰς παραπίστασα [= a hanging] ἔχρωτο. It is a not unlikely word for Mark, and I suspect that it is genuine. καμηλοῦ D a b d f f t: add. καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφῆν αὐτῶ. 6. τρίχας τοι καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφῆν αὐτῶ.

9. δέρρης Tisch. W-H: I have given δ 'Ισοσ (D Θ etc.) a place in the margin, just as we have in verse 6 δ Ιωάνης, so it seems natural to expect the article here. And δ 'Ισοσ seems to be Mark's usage: cf. i 14, i 17, i 25, ii 17, ii 19, etc. 11. φωνή, without verb (W-H margin Tisch.) Ν* d f f t: φωνή . . . ἡμείοις 28 is evidence on the same side, as also Mt.'s φωνή . . . λέγουσα: add. ἐγένετο Ν* A B L W sah etc. W-H text, but the verb has probably come from Luke ii 23 φωνὴν ἐς ὀφρανοῦ γενέσθαι. In the corresponding episode at the Transfiguration the textual phenomena are much the same: Mt. as here φωνή . . . λέγουσα, Luke apparently φωνή ἐγένετο . . . λέγουσα, Mark (ix 7) ἐγένετο φωνή Ν B C L Δ, ἡλθεν φωνῆς A D Θ and most Old Latins with syr-sin, φωνή alone W farn. i and b: the rival verbs in Mark, with
the omission of verb in Mt., seem to me to point to omission (evidenced by three good authorities) as right in Mark.

I have printed these words without comma after pov (against Swete), and in quotation type (against W-H), because I believe that they are an echo of Gen. xxii 2,12,16, οὐκ ἐφεσθεν τῷ οὖν τὸν ἀγαπητόν δὲ ἐμέ, and that the meaning of ἀγαπητόν in connexion with νόος is the same here as there, namely not 'beloved' but 'only'.

St Paul also gave a Christian application to the passage in Genesis, and also interpreted ἀγαπητόν as 'his own son', Rom. viii 32 τὸν ἵλιον τοῦ οὖν ἐφεσθης where the verb seems decisive of the reference to Gen. xxii 12,16. See the discussion of the phrase in J. T. S. xxvii (Jan. 1926), especially the passages of Ath. Or. c. Ar. iv 24, 29, loc. cit. p. 126, where the equivalence of τοῦ μονογενῆς and τὸ ἀγαπητὸν is emphasized: the idiom was unfamiliar in Athanasius's day, but he appeals to pagan scholars Ἠλληνες ἴσασιν οἱ δεινοὶ περὶ τῶν λόγων.

14. Μετὰ δὲ ΝΑΛ ΔῊ W, most O.L. MSS and vg, Tisch. : Καὶ μετά B D (not d) a syr-sin W-H—so good a combination that one relegates it to the margin with difficulty. As we know, St Mark's normal way of commencing a new paragraph is with καὶ, while the other Synoptists, Luke especially, prefer δὲ: what are we to say when the authorities in Mark are divided? Let us look at the other instances where a paragraph begins with δὲ. They are (if we except xv 16, where I am sure a smaller division than a paragraph should be made) only three in number in W-H, vii 24, x 32, xiv 1, and they are each significant of a great break in the story. At vii 24 our Lord passes for the first time outside the confines of Palestine: at x 32 Jerusalem is for the first time mentioned as the objective of our Lord's movements: at xiv 1 the Ministry is over, and the Passion story commences. Is there any similar emphasis at i 14? W-H imply that there is not, for they print the first words of verse 9 in capitals, and make no break beyond an ordinary paragraph at verse 14. If καὶ is right, their arrangement may be right, though in that case καὶ must be wrong (and B right to omit it) in verse 9. But I cannot think that this absence of break at verse 14 corresponds with the intention of the Evangelist: I think the commencement of the Ministry must have been marked by him as a crucial moment, while on the other hand the previous verses belong to the Preparation. John the Baptist was but a precursor: he pointed to one who was to follow, and his baptism of the Christ was the culmination of his work, after which he passes out of the story. So though there is a break between verses 8 and 9, there is also still a connexion between John and Jesus: and the greater break comes when the Preparation is complete, and the Ministry of John is succeeded by the Ministry of Christ. Moreover this is the commencement of Peter's continuous story as an eye-witness. On internal grounds then I prefer δὲ in verse 14.
16 καὶ παράγων παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶθεν Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σίμωνος ἀμφιβαλλόντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ (ἥταν γὰρ ἂλεεις). 

καὶ ἐπέν ἄτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς Δεῦτε ὁπίσω μοῦ καὶ ποῦρα ὑμᾶς γενόθαι ἂλεεις ἄνθρωποι. 

καὶ τῇ ἐνόθῃ ἄφεντες τὰ δίκτυα ἄκολουθησαν ἄτης. 

καὶ προβίων ὀλίγου εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄτους ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα; 

καὶ ἐνθὺς ἐκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἠφεντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ἄρτεδαιον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν ἄπτηθον ὁπίσω αὐτοῦ. 

καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναοῦ. 

καὶ ἐνθὺς τοὺς σάββασιν ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν. 

18. [ἐνδιώκαμεν] 

βασιλείας Α Δ W Γ Θ ν: οἷοι N B L θ 1 28 33 b ff ταυρ-σίν sah Orig. Tisch. W-H. 

External evidence is no doubt stronger for omission; internal evidence tells the other way, for τὸ ἐνδιώκαμεν is a favourite phrase of Mark's, and as a rule absolutely 'the good news'. 

In i i τοῦ ἐνθ. ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ means 'the good news of', i.e. about, 'Jesus Christ': he is in fact the good news. You could therefore say 'the good news of the kingdom', i.e. the establishment by Jesus Christ of the Kingdom of God upon earth: but it is difficult to see that 'the good news about God' is a natural phrase. 

On the whole I think it probable that a line τῆς βασιλείας—

11 or 12 letters are the size of a line in a papyrus roll of the primitive Gospel type—dropped out of a very early copy. We should then have in the Evangelist's summary the two phrases which he immediately repeats in our Lord's own words, the 'kingdom of God' and the 'good news', i.e. of the coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth: but it is difficult to see that 'the good news about God' is a natural phrase. 

On the whole I think it probable that a line τῆς βασιλείας—

11 or 12 letters are the size of a line in a papyrus roll of the primitive Gospel type—dropped out of a very early copy. We should then have in the Evangelist's summary the two phrases which he immediately repeats in our Lord's own words, the 'kingdom of God' and the 'good news', i.e. of the coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth: but it is difficult to see that 'the good news about God' is a natural phrase. 

On the whole I think it probable that a line τῆς βασιλείας—

11 or 12 letters are the size of a line in a papyrus roll of the primitive Gospel type—dropped out of a very early copy. We should then have in the Evangelist's summary the two phrases which he immediately repeats in our Lord's own words, the 'kingdom of God' and the 'good news', i.e. of the coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth: but it is difficult to see that 'the good news about God' is a natural phrase. 


Omission can appeal to evidence in i 25 Ν* Α*, i 27 ε, ii 12 B W b: but the more or less pleonastic ὁτι is thoroughly characteristic of Mark's style, and is always preceded by a verb like λέγων (see J. T. S., Oct. 1926, xxviii 9–15). The real question is the genuineness of καὶ. There is a parallel in i 40 παρακαδών αὐτῶν καὶ γνωστῶν, [καὶ] λέγων: and in both cases it is perhaps easier to understand the insertion of καὶ than its omission. 

18. εἰσδίδωσι. On this occasion the evidence for ἐνδιώκαμεν (against ἐνδιώκω) drops to its lowest: N L 33 (add here θ) are the only constant quantities. The critical texts assume, probably with justice, that ἐνδιώκαμεν is Marcan usage, and should be read even in doubtful cases. ἐνδιώκω is the regular Κοινή word, and is largely preponderant over εἰσδίδωσι in the texts of Matthew and Luke as given by modern editors: in Mark it is given throughout by A D, and BC Δ only rally to ἐνδιώκαμεν after some hesitation on the earlier occasions of its use. Why Mark should have preferred ἐνδιώκαμεν we cannot tell. Perhaps we should refer both the frequency and the form of the word to a mannerism of St Peter in his oral Gospel teaching. 

21. ἐνδιώκαμεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν. So Ν C L Α ταυρ-σίν Orig. Tisch. W-H mg. If it were not for Mc.'s habitual use of εἰς for ἐν, the authority for this reading would be inadequate, and we should prefer to follow A B D W O L. and add εἰσδίδωσι with W-H text. But this is a good case of the coincidence of the more difficult reading with well-established Marcan usage (see J. T. S., Oct. 1924, xxvi 15), and I have little doubt that εἰσδίδωσι was put in to ease the construction, as in viii 26 (εἰσάδεσθαι for εἰσῆλθος, i 39 (ἀλεθῶς for ἀλεθῶς). 

οἰχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς D θ b c e (def. a): the rest with the editors prefix καὶ, but the asyndeton before οἰχ is in Mc.'s jerky style
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The text is a page from a journal article discussing linguistic and textual analysis of ancient Greek text. It includes Greek script and references to earlier works and language usage. The article delves into the intricacies of the text, the influence of various witnesses, and the agreements between different manuscripts and versions.

The text is too complex for a full transcription, but it appears to be discussing the textual variants and their implications for understanding the original intent of the author. The article references other scholarly works and uses Greek script extensively, indicating a detailed analysis of the text's history and development.
of them at least (but never all of them) being interrogative. The central clause is
generally the briefest, as ii 7 \( \text{βλασφημε} \), and one would like with W-H to punctuate
after \( \text{κατά} \); but verse 22 connects \( \text{κατά} \) with \( \text{αὐτάν} \), and I punctuate accord-
ingly. 28. \( \text{ἐνθαλώσθησαν} \) a redundant expression quite in Mark's style, but because redundant altered by Luke to
\( \text{ἐνθάδησαν} \), and by most authorities in Mark by the omission of
\( \text{ἐνθαλώσθησαν} \). Luke's \( \text{ἐνθάδησαν} \) shews that he read
\( \text{ἐνθαλώσθησαν} \) in Mark with \( \text{ἐνθάδησαν} \). 32. \( \text{ἀναχώρευ} \) BD W-H :
\( \text{ἀναχώρευ} \) the rest and Origen and most of the Latins bear witness to a past tense, so that the same aorist
form may be genuine there as well. 34. \( \text{ἀναχώρευ} \) the rest with Tisch. W-H.
if \( \text{ἀναχώρευ} \) etc., the
Latins, syr-sin, Victor's catena, Tisch. : + \( \text{Χριστοῦ} \) (or \( \text{τῶν Χρ.} \) \( \text{ἐναπ} \) \( \text{Β} \) \( \text{Β} \) \( \text{C} \) \( \text{L} \) \( \text{W} \) \( \text{fam. 13 b c} \). 35. \( \text{ἐξῆλθαν καὶ ἀπῆλθαν} \) ('he left Capernaum and went away to a desert place') :
\( \text{ἐξῆλθαν} \) only B 25 565, \( \text{ἀπῆλθαν} \) only W 6 6 66. The double phrase is very Marcan,
and either accidental omission of a line or a conscious intention to prune away the
apparent redundancy will account for the reading of B : versions hardly count, for
an early Latin translator e. g. might easily have contented himself with a single verb.
But a syr-sin have two verbs. \( \text{καὶ ἔλει} \) \( \text{Β} \) \( \text{Β} \) \( \text{C} \) \( \text{L} \) \( \text{Δ} \) \( \text{Θ} \), and so in verse 38 N D L,
xiv 15 N D 565 : \( \text{καὶ ἔλει} \) the rest, but in xiv 15 many authorities have \( \text{ἔλει} \) without
\( \text{kai} \). I incline to think that Mark may have been the more likely, scribes of Mark...
the less likely, to prefer the contracted form. 36. κατεδώσαν αὐτῶν "Σίμων" καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτῶν, 27 καὶ εὗρον αὐτῶν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὅτι Πάντες ἠττούσιν σε. 38 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Ἀγωμεν ἄλλαξον εἰς τὸς ἔχομενας κωμοπόλεις, ὡς "κάκει παρείσθεν εἰς τούτῳ γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐξῆλθαν. 39 καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλατίαν, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλον. 40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτῶν λεπτὸς παρακάλων αὐτῶν καὶ γονυπετῶν,

36. "ο τε Σίμων τοις σαλώμαθες καὶ τοῖς γονατιστοῖς καὶ τοῖς καταλήψεσιν καὶ τοῖς ἐβραίοις· 37. καὶ κατεδώσαν τοις ἀετοῖς καὶ λέγοντες τοῖς ΝΒΛΕ· καὶ τοις ἐκείνοις οἱ πρὸς τὸν μεταφραστικόν ἀρχιτέκτονα, ὡς εἷς τοῦ ἀρχιτεκτονικοῦ τοῦ καθορισμοῦ τῆς ἑκάτερας καὶ τοῦ συνολοῦ. 38. ἀλλαξὼς εἰς τὰς ἔχομενας κωμοπόλεις ΝΒΔΛ ΕΑΤΚΘ καὶ τοῖς ἑκατοντάδες τοῖς λέγοντες εἰς τὸν συναγωγόν τούτον. 39. καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλατίαν, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλον. 40. Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτῶν λεπτὸς παρακάλων αὐτῶν καὶ γονυπετῶν,
NOTES AND STUDIES

λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔδω θέλης, 'δόγη' με καθαρίσω. 41 καὶ ὁμοθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ ἤπατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Θέλω καθαρίσωσθεν. 42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπήλθεν ἄπ' αὐτοῦ ἥ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθερίσθη. 43 καὶ ἐμβρυμησάμενος αὐτῷ

40. 'δόγη'1

avoid so violent a word (note that both Mt. and Lc. have changed it here, just as they drop it in the passages parallel to Mc. x 17) or, perhaps more probably, by the accidental omission of a line in a very early copy of Mc.: the words καὶ γονυπετῶν do in fact occupy just a line in N and θ. (2) Of the authorities that preserve καὶ γονυπετῶν, A C Δ and others (versions hardly count here) add αὐτῶν, and this is the normal construction, Mc. x 17, cf. Mt. xvii 14. But even Mc. might shrink from αὐτῶν ... αὐτῶ ... αὐτῶ in the limit of seven words, and we may suppose that the preceding αὐτῶν is governed by both παρακαλῶν and γονυπετῶν. (3) καὶ before λέγων is omitted only by Ν B 69* sah, but λέγων is not really parallel to the two preceding participles, and I suspect omission is right. (4) αὐτῷ is omitted only by D W, the Latins other than e, and sah: there are numerous cases up and down the Gospel, where after λέγει (λέγων) some good authority, even sometimes B, omits αὐτῷ (αὐτοῦ). It is often no doubt pleonastic, but that is no reason against it in Mc. [Compare for instance in the next verse λέγει αὐτῷ, where Ν W fam. 1 eff omit αὐτῷ, with Mt. and Lc., as redundant, against A B C D θ and the best Latins. Inadequate as the omitting authorities are—clear as Marcan usage is—Tisch. follows them.] Note then that the 'African' Latin, represented by e, is the only text that in all four points gives what seems to be the right reading. δόγη B: δόγασα the rest, with the parallel passages in Mt. (vii 2) and Lc. (v 12), and so too Mt. v 36, Lc. vi 42, Jo. xiii 36. Apart from Lc. xvi 2, the only books of N.T. where δόγη is found are Mc. (ix 22, 23), Apoc. (ix 2), and also Hermas: see Blass Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch [1896, p. 48], § 23. 2. Clearly therefore it was the more vulgar or colloquial form, and likely to be used by Mc.; and as B is re-inforced in ix 22, 23 by Ν Δ fam. 1 28, I feel little hesitation in following it here, even W-H desert it. 41. ὁργασθέαι D eff: b omits: σκληρυνθέαι the rest. The considerations that here dictate decision are: (1) If σκληρυνθέαι were original, it is hardly conceivable that any scribe should have substituted ὁργασθέαι: (2) Mt. and Lc. have nothing corresponding to either word; they had a strong motive for omitting ὁργασθέαι, just as they both omit ἐμβρυμησάμενος of verse 43, and μετ' ὁργῆς of iii 5, but there was none for omitting σκληρυνθέαι. (3) ἐμβρυμησάμενος of verse 43 shews that there was, in the working of this miracle, for whatever reason, indignation on our Lord's part against the man, perhaps because of his doubt of the will to heal, ἔδω θέλης. ἐκτείνας τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ ἤπατο Ν B L: ἐκτείνας τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ ἤπατο D: ἐκτείνας τὴν χείρα ἤπατο αὐτοῦ the rest, with Mt. and Lc. Versions could hardly avoid the natural rendering 'stretched out his hand and touched him', and D, the only authority which gives a Greek that corresponds to this, has presumably Latinized here. But our other Greek witnesses, though they are divided into two camps over the position of αὐτοῦ, mean all of them to connect αὐτοῦ with ἤπατο. τὴν χείρα is the Greek for our 'his hand' (so Mc. iii 5, where W-H, wrongly I think, desert B to read τὴν χείρα σου, v 23, vi 5, vii 3, vii 32, viii 23, 25, ix 43 τὰς δύο χειρῶς 'your two hands', x 16, xiv 46): would not τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ be the other man's hand? As between αὐτοῦ ἤπατο and ἤπατο αὐτοῦ, Ν B L are shewn to be right by Marcan usage, see iii 10, (v 30), v 31, vii 22, x 13 (vi 56 would be an exception, but a b f i omit αὐτοῦ): Mt. and Lc. habitually put αὐτοῦ after ἐκτείνας. αὐτῷ: see on verse 40. 42. ἐκαθερίσθη A B* C L Δ Ι (cf. πεσσεμάκων in i 13, where also
the second hand of B substitutes the more correct form): a solecism for ἐκαθαρίσῃ, perhaps genuine only in Mc.

44. μηδειν μηδειν εἰπης B C Θ and the mass of Greek MSS: μηδειν εἰπης N A D L W Δ 33 (fam. 13) Latins sah, with Mt. and Lc. On the one side we have Mc.'s tendency to pleonasm: on the other side the parallels in Mc. vii 36, viii 26 (where the true text has μηδειν εἰπης εἰς τὴν κόμην), viii 30; I think the longer reading is right. 45. αὐτῶν δύνασαι εἰς πόλιν φανερῶς: the order of these words varies in a puzzling way in the MSS, but

(i) αὐτῶν is omitted by D W, and, if omission is right, we can understand why Ν inserts αὐτῶν after δύνασαι and the rest before δύνασαι: (ii) the order εἰς πόλιν φανερῶς ought to be correct, for the emphasis is rather on εἰς πόλιν than on φανερῶς; but desire on the part of scribes to avoid the hiatus δύνασαι εἰς may perhaps account for the change in A B W Δ Θ etc. to δύνασαι φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν. ἐν ἑρμοίς τόπους Ἕβ Λ W Δ (fam. 13) 28: ἔνι is changed to ἐν by the other MSS and by Lc. The more unusual preposition is doubtless right: but ἐν c. dat. in a local sense meaning neither 'on' nor 'at' is unusual, and I know of no exact parallel in N.T. Moulton and Milligan Vocabulary s.v. cite however from a papyrus (140 B.C.) ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ καὶ ἔνι χάρα. ἦν καὶ ἤρχοντο: ἐοι ὁμιν ἦν καί, and it is possible to translate their reading 'they came to him outside the city in the open country from all sides': B omits ἦν retaining καί, which seems untranslateable, though W-H give B's reading a place in the margin.

Variations of the text above printed from the text or margin of Westcott and Hort.
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