

The Journal  
of  
Theological Studies

OCTOBER, 1927

NOTES AND STUDIES

WESTERN READINGS IN THE SECOND HALF OF  
ST MARK'S GOSPEL.

THE reason for dealing here with the second half of the Gospel only is simply that this is the part of the Gospel for which we have the evidence of  $\bar{k}$ : in other words, the Western evidence for the text is here at its best and strongest. The textual theory of the Gospels which I propounded in the January number of *J. T. S.* (pp. 145-149) involves, if it is justified, the modification of our critical editions by the acceptance of at least a certain number of readings on Western authority only: and in chapter i as there printed purely Western readings were in fact adopted in the text on three occasions and into the margin twice.

The object of the present paper being to reinforce the plea for further consideration of Western readings in St Mark by examining a number of them in succession, it is natural to begin at the point where Western evidence can be presented in the most favourable light. And of  $\bar{k}$  we know this, that it gives us the Gospel text which Cyprian used in Africa in the middle of the third century.

But before proceeding to the details of the enquiry it may serve the reader's convenience to have before him a conspectus of the lacunae in our principal authorities.

$\bar{k}$  is extant for St Mark from viii 8 onwards, save for two small gaps, viii 11-14, 16-19.

From viii 8 to the end of the Gospel  $\Theta$  and syr-sin are complete.

D is complete as far as xvi 6 Lat., xvi 15 Gr. In other words, that possessor of the MS who wanted to separate from the rest the portion containing the Catholic Epistles as a whole was obliged to take out a leaf containing on the *recto* the Latin of xvi 6-15, and on the *verso* the Greek of xvi 15-20, because the *verso* in question contained also the commencement of the Greek text of the Catholic Epistles.

W is complete, save for the ante-penultimate leaf containing xv 12-38.

*e* has nothing in this half of Mark but four isolated columns of text (apparently the inner halves of two, probably conjugate, leaves), containing xii 37-40, xiii 2, 3; xiii 24-27, 33-36.

*a* has lost from xv 15 onwards.

*b* has lost everything from xiv 61, and nearly everything from xiii 10, onwards.

*ff* has lost parts of ix 17-33, xvi 15-20.

*i* has lost x 2-33, xiv 36-xv 33, xv 40-end.

I. viii 26 Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθης (I put in each case Westcott and Hort's text first). In *J. T. S.* xxvi p. 18 (Oct. A.D. 1924) I discussed this reading, and shewed that the process of analysis could be carried a stage further back than Hort had carried it: for 'Marcan usage', εἰς for ἐν, points to Μηδὲ (or Μηδενί) εἴπης εἰς τὴν κώμην as the original reading. No Greek authority gives that and nothing more, though D has in fact Μηδενί εἴπης εἰς τὴν κώμην as part of its reading: but *k* has 'nemini dixeris in castello' and *c* is even nearer to the true Greek with 'ne cui diceret in castellum'. Read therefore Μηδενί εἴπης εἰς τὴν κώμην.

2. viii 38 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν ἐπαισχυθῆί με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, and so Luke ix 26 (with *án* for *éán*). Now in Luke the best 'Western' authorities there extant omit λόγους: so D *a e l* syr-sin.<sup>1</sup> But it has been (so far as I know) a factor hitherto unnoticed that the same omission is attested for St Mark by two of our oldest and best Westerns, *k* W. What are we to say? Is λόγους right in both Gospels? or is omission right in both? or, what is *a priori* perhaps the most probable view, is omission right in one Gospel, insertion in the other? But if we adopt this third view, we must certainly attribute the shorter reading to Mark, the longer to Luke: it would surely be incredible that Luke should have omitted λόγους if he had found it in the text of Mark.

Anyhow it is not our business to settle the text of Luke: it is enough to say that if τοὺς ἐμοὺς (without λόγους) is right in Luke, that is in itself strong testimony to the same reading being right in Mark. But let us suppose that τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους is right in Luke: whence in that case did D *a e l* syr-sin derive the shorter reading but ultimately from Mark, even though the existing text of Mark in all of them (but *e* is not extant for Mark) gives λόγους?

Next what has 'intrinsic probability' got to tell us as between the two readings in St Mark? There is, on the one hand, very little about our Lord's sayings, as such, in Mark: apart from this passage the only two occasions on which the phrase οἱ λόγοι is found are x 24 and xiii 31, while in Luke it occurs at least half a dozen times. On the other

<sup>1</sup> Origen *Exhortatio ad Martyrium* 34, 37 quotes the Lucan passage both with and without the word λόγους.

hand, St. Mark's Gospel does I think definitely distinguish itself from the others by its special expression of the thought that the Lord and the disciples form a single group: compare, for instance, the 'follows not us' of Mark ix 38 with the 'follows not with us' of Luke ix 49, and see generally Mark ix 37, 41, 42, x 39. The reading *ἐπαισχυνθῆ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμούς* is naturally strange to us at first: but I venture to think that it corresponds more closely than the alternative to the conceptions that are dominant in this part of St Mark's Gospel.

3. ix 5 *καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς*. So, save for the inversion of *σκηνὰς τρεῖς*<sup>1</sup>, Luke ix 33: Matt. xvii 4 has, on the other hand, *εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω*<sup>2</sup> ὡδε *τρεῖς σκηνάς*, and how are we to account for *εἰ θέλεις*? Now D @ *fam* 13 565 *b ff i* have in Mark not *καὶ ποιήσωμεν* but *θέλεις ποιήσωμεν* (*ποιήσω D b ff i*), and if that is right the text of Mark stands midway between the texts of Matthew and Luke, and accounts for both. It is true that *k* gives *donum est nobis hic est | set faciamus*, which probably stands for *hic esse et, i. e. the ordinary reading: W καὶ θέλεις ποιήσω δέ, a too esse \*\* si uis f\*\*\*\*mus*, though their texts are mixed, recognize *θέλεις*. With *k* and syr-sin supporting *NB*, the results are not as clear as one would wish: but D W @ *fam* 13 565 *a b ff i* are a strong group, and to my mind the balance is in favour of *θέλεις ποιήσωμεν* as (i) giving a good Marcan construction, cf x 36, 51, xiv 12, xv 9, 12, (ii) improving the sense, (iii) accounting for the form given to the sentence by Matthew.

4. ix 18 *ὅπου ἐὰν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ ῥήσσει αὐτόν*. The verb *ῥήσσω* is a collateral form of *ῥήγνυμι*: but it cannot be said that 'breaks' or 'tears' gives a tolerable sense, and L.S. quotes no authority for the sense we want here save this passage only. Obviously the meaning must be 'dashes to the ground' (Euthymius *ἀντὶ τοῦ καταβάλλει εἰς γῆν*, quoted by Swete), and we are thrown back on the Western reading *ῥάσσει*: so D 565 with *collidit k, allidit b i, elidit* (ut uid) *ff*, and presumably syr-sin 'casteth him down'. *ῥάσσω* is a collateral form of *ἀράσσω*: it is found some eight times in LXX, and Thackeray *Grammar of the O.T. in Greek* i p. 76 (I owe the reference to Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary* s.v. *ῥήγνυμι*) points out that it is 'the LXX form of *ἀράσσω* . . . not an alternative for *ῥήσσω ῥήγνυμι*': generally in a metaphorical sense, but in Dan. viii 10 LXX gives *ἐρράχθη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν* where Theodotion has *ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*. The Concordance shews that the word was either unfamiliar or suspect as colloquial, for on two or three occasions it is in some authorities omitted or altered: even the classical

<sup>1</sup> The Western text has *τρεῖς σκηνάς*, but that may perhaps be an assimilation to Matthew and Mark.

<sup>2</sup> Again the Western text (with the mass of authorities) has *ποιήσωμεν*, but once more we may be in presence of an assimilation to Mark and Luke.

form ἀράσσω is hardly ever found in prose writers, though 'it was certainly employed in everyday life' (Rutherford *The New Phrynichus* p. 6). Hermas *Mand.* xi 3 εἶ τινα δυνήσεται ῥάξαι τῶν δικαίων offers an instructive parallel to the passage in Mark—the more instructive that Hermas, like Mark, wrote in Rome and wrote the Greek of everyday life—for the editors print ῥήξαι, as indeed Clement's text has it, *Strom.* i 17. 85 (Stählin ii p. 55), though the Athos MS has ῥάξαι and the Latin versions respectively *deiciet* and *adlidat*. I have therefore no hesitation in accepting the testimony of the Western authorities in Mark and replacing ῥάσσει in the text.

5. ix 19 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς . . . But καί for ὁ δέ in D W ⊕ *fam* 1 *fam* 13 28 565 O.L.: and the ἀποκριθεὶς δέ of Matthew and Luke is more likely to have arisen out of the Western reading, since the substitution of δέ for καί is a regular feature of their re-handling of Mark, while ὁ δέ of Mark is left standing fifteen times by Matthew, eleven times by Luke. I do not think I have noticed any instance where both change ὁ δέ of Mark.

6. ix 38 εἶδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια, καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν. So Luke ix 49 (save that for the two words last quoted he has ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν), and so in Mark (apart from the two words in question) ⊕ B C L Δ ⊕ syr-sin. We are concerned on this occasion only with the order of the clauses; not with the tenses of ἐκωλύομεν and ἠκολούθει, and not with the variation ἡμῖν, μεθ' ἡμῶν, of which ἡμῖν is certainly right in Mark, μεθ' ἡμῶν in Luke. But the Western text of Mark omits the ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει clause at the end of the verse, and inserts it, with ὅς for ὅτι, after ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια in the first half of the verse: so D W *fam* 1 *fam* 13 28 565 a b c ff i k vg arm. Both readings are combined in the Syrian text ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια ὅς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν. Quite clearly this last reading is conflate, and we have to choose between the other two, one of which is practically identical with Luke. For myself I feel no doubt at all that the Western reading is original in Mark, that Luke transferred the clause ὅς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ to what seemed a more logical place for it at the end of the verse as the reason why the disciples 'forbade him', and that the Alexandrian reading represents an assimilation of the text of Mark to the more logical arrangement of the clauses in Luke. Read therefore in Mark εἶδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια ὅς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν.

7. x i συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν. The word ὄχλος is found thirty-seven times in Mark, and this is the only occasion on which the plural occurs. When writing in the JOURNAL for April 1925 (xxvi 237, 'Notes on Marcan usage: § V The movements of Jesus and

his disciples and the crowd') I tried to account for the exceptional use of the plural as perhaps emphasizing 'the numbers who collected from different directions on the journey through Peraea': but in fact there is no exception to account for. *συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος* is the reading of D © 565, *συνπορεύεται ὁ ὄχλος* of W, *conuenit turba* (with or without *rursus* or *iterum*) of *b c ff i k*,<sup>1</sup> 'there went again unto him a multitude' of syr-sin. Of the two verbs *συνέρχομαι* is found in two other places in St Mark (iii 20, xiv 53), *συνπορεύομαι* nowhere else in N.T. save in St Luke. The plural *ὄχλοι* is amply accounted for as an intrusion from the parallel in Matt. xix 2 *ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί*: and once more we follow the Westerns and Marcan usage with *συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς αὐτόν*.

8. x 2 καὶ [προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι] ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν. The words which W-H here enclose in brackets have again come in from Matt. xix 3 καὶ προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ Φαρισαῖοι: they are omitted by D a b k syr-sin, while *ff* has only *quidam*, and *i* is defective. See, for further discussion of the reading, my *Study of the New Testament: 1883 and 1920*, p. 60.

9. x 9 ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. So in identical words Matt. xix 6. But D k in Mark omit *οὖν*, and are borne out by Marcan usage. As I have shewn at length in a recent number of *J. T. S.* (xxviii 20, October 1926) *οὖν* is common in Matthew, extraordinarily rare in Mark. I have no doubt that it has been transferred from the passage of Matthew into the text of most authorities of the passage of Mark, and that we shall be right in following the two authorities which omit and in reading *ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν . . .*

10. x 19 Μὴ φονεύῃς, μὴ μοιχεύῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς. This order of the Commandments is the order of Matt. xix 18 and of the texts, Greek and Hebrew, of O.T., and is suspect for that very reason. Both the parallel text of Luke (xviii 20) and the catalogue in Mark vii 21 diverge, Luke only by inverting the Sixth and Seventh Commandments, Mark vii 21 by adding *πορνεία* to *μοιχεία*. When then we find that D k Iren. (for Iren. see *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei*, 1923, p. 251) agree in omitting *μὴ φονεύῃς* and in adding *μὴ πορνεύῃς*, the very unexpectedness of the reading gives it a claim for hearing. Mark's list is independent of the ordinary tradition—the presence of *μὴ ἀποστερήῃς* further on is proof enough of that: the Vaticanus represents a forcible assimilation to Matthew or O.T., witness its ejection of the certainly genuine *μὴ ἀποστερήῃς*. We shall therefore once more, if more tentatively than on other occasions, still award the preference to the reading of three good Western authorities *μὴ μοιχεύῃς, μὴ πορνεύῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The text of *a* at this point cannot now be deciphered with certainty: but Bianchini read *turba ad illum* in the singular.

<sup>2</sup> For further discussion I may perhaps be allowed to refer to my Commentary on Mark *ad loc.* in the forthcoming S.P.C.K. Bible Commentary.

11. x 22 ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά with Matt. xix 22. But *χρήματα* is given for *κτήματα* in Mark by D a b ff k<sup>1</sup> syr-sin Clem. Al. *Quis dñues saluetur* 4 § 7 (b k Clem. Al. add καὶ ἀγρούς, but I am not concerned with that addition at the moment): and it is rendered, I think, practically certain by v. 23, where the phrase is taken up again with οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες (so too Luke xviii 24). The ordinary texts have again been corrupted from Matthew: Mark used the same word *χρήματα* in both verses 22 and 23.

12. x 29 ἡ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα . . . So B C W Δ ⊕ 565 syr-sin: and in the inverse order ἡ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα Ν A with Matt. xix 29: ἡ μητέρα alone D a ff k (*def. i*). It seems to me all but certain that the latter reading is right. But it may be best to open the discussion by reducing the alternatives to two, and setting aside the reading ἡ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα: if this had been original no one would have altered it, while its appearance in some MSS of Mark is amply accounted for either as the restitution of the common order 'father or mother', or as a direct transference from the parallel passage in Matt. xix 29. The issue lies really between the other two readings: and the considerations that seem to me decisive in favour of the Western reading are the following: (i) in all other points v. 30 is modelled on, and exactly reproduces, v. 29, 'home or brethren or sisters or mother [or father] or children or lands', 'homes and brethren and sisters and mothers and children and lands'—in v. 30 the evidence for 'and fathers' is wholly negligible: (ii) the order 'mother or father' seems unique in the Greek Bible, Old and New Testament alike: (iii) the omission of 'father' is no doubt at first sight odd, but may it not be that our Lord begins with His own case, which He transfers naturally enough to His followers—He had left 'home and brethren and sisters and mother': (iv) if 'mother' alone was original, and 'or father' was at a very early point added over the line, it would be an open chance whether the adventitious words were incorporated in the next copy before or after the 'or mother' of the evangelist's text. Read therefore ἡ μητέρα alone.

13. xi 31 Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ . . . So the critical texts with Matthew and Luke: but the Westerns D a b c ff i k, supported by the Easterns ⊕ Φ *fam* 13 28 565 700, prefix Τί εἴπωμεν; and that seems so entirely to correspond to the style of the Gospel that it is difficult not to believe it genuine. The other Synoptists may have independently suppressed the question as superfluous; or one or other of them may already have found it absent from his text of Mark. A line of nine letters Τί εἴπωμεν; might easily have dropped out if the scribe's eye wandered on to the next line ending with εἴπωμεν also.

<sup>1</sup> In spite of Tischendorf's note *ad loc.* it seems to me certain that *diuitias* of k represents *χρήματα*, not *κτήματα*: *diuitias* recurs in v. 23, where the Greek has *χρήματα* without variant. And he wrongly cites Clem. Al. for *κτήματα*.

14. xi 32 ἅπαντες γὰρ εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάννην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν. Matt. xxi 26 πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην, cf. xiv 5 ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον, xxi 46 εἰς [v. l. ὡς] προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον. Mark nowhere else uses ἔχω (fond as he is of the verb) in this sense: Matthew, as just quoted, does so twice. Thus there is proof that it is Matthaean use, none that it is Marcan: moreover Matthew's construction ἔχειν ὡς (or εἰς) προφήτην, 'reckon him for a prophet', is natural enough; not so Mark's ἔχειν ὄντως. But εἰδέναι ὄντως, 'to know of a truth', is as natural as ἔχειν ὄντως is the opposite: and D W @ 565 a b c ff i k arm have ἤδεισαν τὸν Ἰωάννην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν. That seems to me right: the rest, as so often, have borrowed from Matthew. I think too that Luke's πεπεισμένος ἐστίν (xx 6) is rather a paraphrase of ἤδεισαν ὄντως than of εἶχον ὄντως.

15. xii 6 ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτοὺς with  $\aleph$  B C L  $\Delta$  @ *jam* 13 33: πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔσχατον A W vg etc.: ἔσχατον (without πρὸς αὐτοὺς) D 1071 a ff i k. Now if we look at the context we shall find that in v. 2 Mark has πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς followed by Matthew and Luke: in v. 4 he has πρὸς αὐτοὺς, where both Matthew and Luke omit: in v. 5 (omitted by Matthew) Mark and Luke have nothing, and in v. 6 (the verse under discussion) Luke again has nothing. In other words Luke has πρὸς (αὐτοὺς) on the first occasion, but not again: Matthew has it on the first occasion, but not again till the last. Those are, from a literary point of view, both obvious and natural arrangements. Though there is less in Mark of conscious literary writing, I should like to give him the credit of the simple straightforwardness of ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον, which quite disappears if we prefer to read αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτοὺς. Add the considerations that πρὸς αὐτοὺς can be validly explained as a borrowing from Matthew, and that it is inserted in different places by different authorities, and I think the presumption in favour of the Westerns attains considerable proportions.

16. xii 14 ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον . . .; and similarly (without variant) in Matt. xxii 17. But in Mark ἐπικεφάλαιον (*capitularium*) is given in place of κῆνσον in D @ 124 (one of the best representatives of *jam* 13) 565 1071 k: W has neither word in the text, but κῆνσον is written over Καίσαρι by perhaps the original scribe: a b ff i have *tributum*, but as b and ff render κῆνσον by *censum* in Matt. xxii 17, it seems likely that they did not read κῆνσον in Mark.<sup>1</sup> Decision is very difficult: for our natural instinct would be to treat the Latin word κῆνσος as one of Mark's many Latinisms, and moreover, though the Jews did pay a poll-tax to Caesar after A.D. 70, it does not seem that they did so at an earlier date: the taxes, whether direct or indirect, did not, apparently,

<sup>1</sup> It is true that Vulg. has *censum* in Matt., *tributum* in Mark, but St Jerome has probably just followed his Old Latin model.

include a poll-tax. I am not sure that I should feel justified in putting *ἐπικεφάλαιον* into the text, though I am quite sure that *capitularium* was the earliest Latin rendering of whatever word stood then in the Greek text of Mark used in Rome.

17. xii 23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή; So both Matthew and Luke: and in Mark  $\aleph$  B C D L W  $\Delta$  28 33 and *c k*: a very strong combination, about the strongest combination anywhere in the Gospels in favour of a reading quite certainly wrong. But after ἀναστάσει the words ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν are added in A  $\Theta$  *fam* 1 *fam* 13 565 and the mass of Greek MSS, *a b f f i* and Vulg. in Latin, syr-sin and arm. The presence of A and the mass of MSS on this side only means, of course, that the Syrian reviser found the words in one of his authorities, and so elected to retain them according to his regular preference—a preference no doubt usually wrong—for the longer reading. Apart from the Syrian text, however, we have one branch of the Western text, and the best authorities for the Eastern text, as against the Alexandrian text and D *k* of the Westerns: but we have also, what is decisive, the whole weight of Marcan usage. Cf. in xiii 19 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἦν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεός, xiii 20 διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο, and note that in both these cases Matthew (there are no strict parallels here in Luke) omits the second half of the phrase. We could have predicted with confidence that if Mark wrote ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν, the other Synoptists would have pruned away the redundancy, as they have in other cases too many to recapitulate. Further ground for admitting ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν into the text of Mark in *v.* 23 is supplied by the echo of the phrase in *v.* 25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν, where Matthew and Luke, having both suppressed ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν above, both substitute the noun ἀνάστασις. That scribes invented the words in *v.* 23 is a far less reasonable proposition than that scribes omitted them under the influence of Matthew and Luke. And we are therefore face to face with the unwelcome conclusion that the agreement of the Alexandrians with the best Westerns is not necessarily right: see also no. 22 below.

18. xiii 2 οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῆ. So both the Alexandrian and the Eastern texts, and so with but small variation Matthew and Luke. But the whole Western group, D W *a b c e f f i k* Cyprian, add καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἀνευ χειρῶν. These words, whether genuine or no, are clearly not independent of xiv 58 ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω or (as the Westerns have it) ἀναστήσω. It is true that xiv 58 was the evidence of 'false witnesses', but it is clear from the evidence of the Gospels (cf. Acts vi 14) that our Lord *had* prophesied the destruc-



tion of the Temple; it is clear that the Jews believed that He had also spoken of its being raised or built again after an interval of 'three days', Mark xv 29; and it is clear that Christians too believed that He had used in connexion with His Death and Resurrection the phraseology 'after three days' or 'at an interval of three days' or 'on the third day'. Had He not only done this but brought both predictions, the destruction of the Temple and His own Resurrection, into juxtaposition with one another? It is not impossible, perhaps not even improbable: but it is another question whether St Mark had recorded such a double prediction at this point. If he had recorded it, it is not easy to see why both Matthew and Luke should have omitted it. That is the reason which inclines me on the whole to reject the words as an addition, though of course an early addition, to the text of Mark.

19. xiii 15 ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω τι ἄραι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ. So **NBLΨ** and the Sahidic; both Western and Eastern texts insert after καταβάτω the words εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, and the insertion was adopted by the Syrian revision, the authorities in support being **ADW** etc *affi syr-sin*. Tischendorf wrongly cites *k* on the side of omission: it reads *et qui in tecto est non descendat auferre aliquit de domo*, and therefore omits not only εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν but μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω, obviously by *homoeoteleuton* whether in its ultimate Greek or in its proximate Latin ancestor (*descendat . . . introeat*), and there is so far nothing to shew whether it would have read εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν or no: it must, as far as that issue is concerned, be simply put aside. But the supposition that the words are genuine explains the phenomena much better than the converse: (i) the reduplication εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν . . . ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας is thoroughly Marcan, see on no. 17; (ii) it would again be in accord with Matthew's usage to omit one of the two synonymous οἰκία phrases—he gives only μὴ καταβάτω ἄραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ; (iii) omission of εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν may have been due either to partial assimilation to Matthew, or to the accidental omission of a line; (iv) μὴ καταβάτω as an independent sentence is really nonsense, for the man on the house-top is bound to 'come down', whether or no he goes into the house. On all grounds, then, read μὴ καταβάτω εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω ἄραι τι (or τι ἄραι) ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ.

20. xiii 22 ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφήται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα. So Matthew with the addition of μεγάλα after σημεῖα. But in Mark ψευδόχριστοι καὶ is omitted by **D 124** (i.e. *fam 13?*) *i k*, and ποιήσουσιν is read for δώσουσιν by **D** *fam 13 28 565 a*. About the latter variation it needs only to be said that ποιεῖν σημεῖον is so common a collocation that it is more likely to have been substituted for δόσιν σημεῖον than *vice versa*. As to ψευδόχριστοι καὶ it is obvious that

24. xv 34 *a* Ἐλωί ἐλωί λαμὰ σαβαχθανεῖ; But it is very difficult to think that this can represent the words used by our Lord, for how could the form Ἐλωί possibly have been confused with anything like Ἡλείας? Ἡλί (Ἡλεί), that is to say, the Hebrew form not the Aramaic, must certainly be original, and it is in itself much more likely that our Lord in His dying cry from the Psalm would have used the sacred language rather than any Aramaic rendering. Now the Hebrew form is actually given here by D @ 131 (that is *fam* 1) 565 *c i k n* arm and Eusebius (*demonstratio evangelica* x 8, citing Mark by name), and I cannot hesitate for a moment in restoring to Mark the words Ἡλεί Ἡλεί λαμὰ ζαφθανεῖ; With our larger knowledge of the Synoptic problem it is, if one of the two Gospels gave a Hebrew and one an Aramaic wording, much the more probable that it was Mark who gave the original, Matthew the altered and more generally intelligible, form.

25. xv 34 *b* εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με; So all authorities, save one Greek and three Latin MSS. But D has ὠνειδισάς με, *k* has *maledixisti me*,<sup>1</sup> *i* has *me in opprobrium dedisti*, *c* has *exprobrasti me*: it is quite impossible that any scribe should have invented this reading, while the ordinary text is amply accounted for by the combined influence of the LXX of Ps. xxi (xxii) 1 and Matt. xxvii 46. Read therefore εἰς τί ὠνειδισάς με;

26. xv 39 ἰδὼν δὲ . . . ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν. A very complicated case: and presumably Matthew and Luke either found some difficulty in the text of Mark, or else regarded it as mere reduplication of v. 37 ἀφείς φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν, for the former has ἰδόντες . . . τὰ γινόμενα, the latter ἰδὼν . . . τὸ γερόμενον. οὕτως, though omitted by W @ 565 syr-sin arm, is given by both the Alexandrian and the Western texts, **N A B C D L c ff i k n**, and must surely be genuine. But for the ἐξέπνευσεν of **N B L**, ἔκραξεν alone is represented by *k*, κράξας ἐξέπνευσεν by A C (D) W @ 565 syr-sin arm and all Old Latins but *k*. The latter reading looks like a combination of the other two, and I am not sure that οὕτως ἔκραξεν (*sic exclamavit*<sup>2</sup>) of *k* does not best explain the genesis of the alternatives. In the first place κράζω has very strong

<sup>1</sup> We owe to Prof. Burkitt the detection of the original reading of *k*. It may be noted here that *maledicere* is used in the *Actus Petri cum Simone*, ed. Lipsius 61. 14, 71. 18 (and probably 55. 23, where the MS gives *malo dixit*), with the meaning 'bitterly reproach' rather than 'curse', and the Greek verb of the original was very likely ὠνειδίσειν.

<sup>2</sup> It did occur to me to wonder whether *exclamavit* could be a rendering of the simple verb ἔκραξεν, and whether, in the ancestor of *k*, *clamans* could have been added by a correcting hand over *expiravit*, and that the scribe of the copy took the addition as a substitution and so produced *exclamavit*. But in fact κράζω is represented in *k* by *exclamo* (Mark ix 24, Matt. xv 22) and by *adclamo* (Mark xv 13, 14) as well as by *clamo* (Mark ix 26, x 47, 48, xi 9, Matt. viii 29, ix 27, xv 23); and so far as there are shades of difference between the three alternatives, *exclamare* is here (in Mark xv 39) the most appropriate.

support—all authorities in fact except **NBL**: in the second place it was in all probability from Mark xv 39 that Matthew derived *κράξας* in xxvii 50 *κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*: in the third place *κράζω* is not used of our Lord anywhere else in the Synoptic Gospels (though three times in the Fourth Gospel), and it is exactly the sort of indication of violent emotion that Alexandrian critics would have liked to modify. I conclude that it belongs to the genuine text of Mark, and we have to choose between *οὕτως ἔκραξεν* and *οὕτως κράξας ἐξέπνευσεν*. I should like to add a further argument, though to some readers it will perhaps seem an over subtle one. What was it that moved the centurion to the particular conclusion that He who had so cried out at the moment of death was ‘a son of God’? It is (is it not?) a question that calls imperatively for answer: and I cannot help thinking that St Luke gives the key to the solution. Mark’s informant heard the cry, for it was loud, but was too far off to hear what the words of the cry were: Luke tells us that it was ‘Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit’. If the centurion had asked of some one near him what the (Hebrew) words meant, and learnt that Jesus died with the confident appeal to God as Father on His lips, then the conclusion that this was in truth ‘a son of God’ becomes at last intelligible.

27. xv 43 *ἤτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. But *Dk* have *πτῶμα* (*cadaver*); just as in xv 45 **NBDL** 565 have *ἐδωρήσατο τὸ πτῶμα τῷ Ἰωσήφ*, the rest *σῶμα* (with *k corpus*). I cannot suppose that Mark meant to distinguish more respectful language of Joseph from more contemptuous language of Pilate: he is too artless a writer for such refinements. He used, I think, in both cases *πτῶμα* of the Lord’s dead body, but we cannot wonder that Matthew and Luke in their parallels to *v.* 43 (both omit in *v.* 45) have substituted *σῶμα*, or that most MSS of Mark have followed them: *D* is in fact the only witness that gives *πτῶμα* in both cases, but I believe it to be right, and would read here *ἤτήσατο τὸ πτῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*.

28. xvi 1 *καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου ἡ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμῃ ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα . . .* The names here are omitted by *Dkn*, that is (since *n* is equivalent to *a*) by our three best Western authorities; *a bi* are defective. And omission appears to be right; if the ordinary text had lain before Matthew and Luke, why does neither of them make any mention of Salome in the Resurrection narrative? Moreover the text of Mark becomes more intelligible if we read xv 47, xvi 1 continuously with only one mention of names, *ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσήτος ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται· καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου [πορευθεῖσαι<sup>1</sup>] ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἀλείψωσι*

<sup>1</sup> It is true that *πορεύομαι* is not a Marcan word, though *παρπορεύομαι* (ii 23, ix 30, xi 20, xv 29) is fairly common. But *ἐλθοῦσαι* of the critical texts is suspect,

αὐτόν. What then was the genesis of the ordinary text? As so often, it is due to the influence of the text of Matthew: Matthew mentions the women at three points, xxvii 56 repeated from Mark xv 40, xxvii 61 repeated from Mark xv 47, and, *because he has here interpolated the story of the sealing of the tomb*, the names of xxvii 61 are repeated in xxviii 1. Because Matthew had the names three times, Mark must have them three times also, though in Mark there is no interval. And the interpolators, with the fondness of interpolators for fullness, make, as it happens, the insertion not of the two names of Matt. xxviii 1 but of the three of Matt. xxvii 56 = Mark xv 40.

Here then are twenty-eight Western readings from the second half of the Gospel, selected more or less by chance, though it is hoped that a good many of the most important variants between the Alexandrian and the Western texts are included. In something like two-thirds of them I should myself judge the Western variation to represent more or less certainly what the evangelist wrote: in nos. 2, 3, 5, 10, 20, 21, 26, 28 I should not put it higher than that the Western reading has the better claim of the two: in 16 and 18 the issue is doubtful—the balance may even incline the other way. But if these conclusions are anywhere near the mark, it is abundantly clear that the accepted results of the textual criticism of the Gospels need to be re-opened and re-examined. And, with that aim in view, some further precision both as to the causes which account for the depravation of the Marcan original in the Alexandrian tradition (reproduced in our critical texts), and also as to what seems *prima facie* to be the relative value in the cases before us of the different authorities or groups of authorities on the 'Western' side, will not be out of place.

(i) *Causes of the errors of the Alexandrian tradition in all or most of the readings discussed.*

a. By far the most common cause of error is assimilation to the text of one or both of the other two Synoptists. All authorities or groups of authorities for St Mark's Gospel succumb in varying degrees and on different occasions to this temptation. The Alexandrian text of Mark would seem to shew examples of this, by assimilation to Matthew, in 7, 8, 9, (10), 11, (12), 14, 15, (19), 20, 21, 24, 25, (28); by assimilation to Luke, in 2, 3, 6, 22<sup>1</sup>; by assimilation to both, in 13, 17, 27; altogether

for often as Mark employs *ἐρχομαι*, this is the one passage (if we except v 26 *εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα*, 'went from bad to worse', and that is not literal but metaphorical) where we must translate not 'come' but 'go'. In any case the reading *πορευθεῖσαι* is not necessarily bound up with the omission of the names: Ⓞ 565 have the names and yet have *πορευθεῖσαι* as well as *ἐλθοῦσαι*.

<sup>1</sup> And conceivably also 23: if the *ἐσταύρωσαν* of all save the Western texts needs

in twenty-one cases out of twenty-eight, just three-fourths of the total number, though in one or two cases there may be alternative or contributory causes.

*β.* Another *vera causa* of Alexandrian corruption of the text of Mark is the desire to remove the imperfections or non-literary elements of Mark's Greek. This accounts for 1, 4, and probably 5.

*γ.* A third criterion of variants in the tradition of Mark's text is evidence of Marcan usage. Mark's fondness for tautological expressions suggests that the fuller text is right in 17 and 19.

These three causes, then, account between them for twenty-four out of the twenty-eight variations discussed above. There remain only 16, 18, 23, 26. In the first two of these decision is difficult, and the Western reading is perhaps probably wrong. In 23 internal evidence and the parallel in Matthew appear to me to be decisive: in 26 I believe the Alexandrians to be wrong, but there remain two Western readings between which we have to decide.

(ii) *The relative value of different authorities supporting the Western readings.*

*a.* In more than half the readings discussed there is some evidence from Eastern witnesses—witnesses, that is, which give us the ancient text, as it seems, of Antioch or Caesarea, especially  $\Theta$  565 and the Sinai Syriac, less often *fam* 1 *fam* 13 and 28—in support of strictly Western texts: namely in 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, (11), 13, 14, (15), 16, 17, 19, (20), 22, 24, 26. But, important as their evidence is, it does not in my judgement amount to being decisive. A reading unsupported by them is not necessarily wrong. The Western and the Alexandrian texts are primary: each of them may be right against all the rest. I doubt if the Eastern texts are ever, I am sure they are not often, right against the Western and Alexandrian texts combined. Their value comes in in cases where the Western texts are divided: in 3, 17, 22 I accept readings where D and European Latins (in 22 only D *a*) are supported respectively by  $\Theta$  *fam* 13 565, by  $\Theta$  *fam* 1 *fam* 13 565, and by syr-sin, against  $\aleph$  B *k*.

*β.* Better than any other witness apart from  $\aleph$  B is *k*. It gives the Western reading in all our twenty-eight cases except 3, 17, 22.<sup>1</sup> It is in my judgement right alone in 21 and perhaps in 26: probably right with W only in 2: right with D only in 9, 27, with D Iren. in 10, with D *n* (that is, presumably *a*) in 28, with D *c i* in 25: right with *c* only in 1. But perhaps the most striking result of our enquiry is that even

any other explanation than the mis-directed intelligence of scribes, it may have arisen out of a marginal jotting due to Luke xxiii 33.

<sup>1</sup> In 19 *k* has an omission by *homoeoteleuton* which removes its ultimate evidence from consideration.

the combination **NBk** is not necessarily right: **3, 17, 22** seem to shew that the 'African'<sup>1</sup> and Alexandrian texts may, on some rare occasions, agree in error against what one may call provisionally the texts of Rome and Antioch. It is difficult to construct a history of text-development which will account satisfactorily for this phenomenon: but there it is.

γ. Of the other Latins *a* and *i* are definitely the best.

δ. Always the most puzzling problem is the text of D. Not counting the two readings, **16, 18**, where the whole Western group, D *k* included, is perhaps wrong, it gives all the readings here recommended except **1, 2, 17, 21, 26**: of these **21** and **26** are singular readings of *k*, and **2** of *k* W, and in **17** *k* is wrong as well as D. No account has, however, been taken of any singular readings of D. And we do not therefore get further than that D, however erratic on occasion, contains a very valuable text.

These results are based on too small a number of instances to be more than provisional. But I think they are important in their implications.

C. H. TURNER.

### DID CODEX VERCELLENSIS (*a*) CONTAIN THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF ST MARK?

SOME doubt must naturally hang over the problem of the earliest Western text of the ending of St Mark's Gospel: for three of our authorities, *b e* and *i*, are defective at that point, and the rest are divided, *k* having the Shorter Ending only, while D and *f* contain enough of the Longer Ending to shew that when complete they contained the whole of it. And since Irenaeus also bears witness to the Longer Ending, it may be concluded that the Church of Gaul at any rate had it in its Gospel text from the first. Thus Gaul and Africa are set against one another: but we have so far no evidence as to Italy. The object of the present note is to examine the evidence of the oldest and best of our Italian, Old Latin MSS, codex *a*, the Vercelli Gospels.

Now the St Gall fragments known as *n* are admitted to stand in very close relation textually to *a*: and they contain verses 9 to 13 of Mark xvi on the last leaf extant (*Old Latin Biblical Texts* ii p. 72). There was therefore some presumption to start with that *a* also once contained the Longer Ending.

<sup>1</sup> I have myself always supposed that the 'African' text came from Rome. I only call it 'African' because St Cyprian's evidence shews that it was the text of Carthage in A. D. 250.