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The construction of ὥς at Mk. xiv. 72 has evidently been a matter of difficulty from very early days. Luke (xxii. 61) maintained the word, 'though slightly modifying the construction by the addition of τοῦ κυρίου after τοῦ λόγου (v.l. τοῦ ἔχοματος); but 'Matthew' (xxvi. 75) substituted the participial phrase Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος. Both connect the accusative τὸ ἔχομα to a genitive. The manuscript tradition of Mark provides further demonstration of the perplexity which the construction caused: ὥς is read by B ψ 33 L 892 579 Δ372 1342 230 etc. 1047 A 1346 280 al.; these are manuscripts mainly of 'Neutral' or 'weak Caesarean' affiliation, to the former of which a high appraisal may still be accorded as a trustworthy witness to the original text. Their attestation of the 'lectio difficilior' at this point leaves little room for doubt that is the original reading. Family I attests an accommodation to the Matthaean adaptation τοῦ ἔχοματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰπόντος; M 69 and several others read τοῦ ἔχοματος ὅδε in which the Textus Receptus follows them; this is evidently a correction of the variant attested by the majority of witnesses, namely δ l. ὥς which treats the conjunction as if it is or should be a plain relative.

The commentators strike a like note to synoptists and scribes by their failure to give an adequate exposition of the grammar and idiom of the passage. Dr. Vincent TAYLOR, ad. loc., simply says that 'the phrase ὥς εἶπεν αὐτῶ δ Ἰησοῦς is awkward' and notes its removal in the various MSS and versions and in 'Matthew'. Most other commentators leave it unreferred to, nor is the point dealt with in any of the standard grammars of the Greek New Testament, nor in Bauer's Wörterbuch. But since Luke left it uncorrected, it may seem a little too harsh to judge it without further consideration as simply a Marcan awkwardness. Indeed it has recently been argued that the very awkwardnesses of Mark—down to the last unrepentant γὰρ—can be of considerable significance.

I venture to suggest that the use of ὥς at this point by Mark
is no awkwardness but a subtle idiom, rare but not unattested in earlier Greek, that its retention in the 'Neutral' text and in whatever text lies behind the 'weak Caesarean' manuscripts, and in Luke, is due to recognition of an idiom with which editors and authors were not unfamiliar, and that the Lucan account of this incident is either a corroboration or an exposition of Mark's implication. This is put forward tentatively, in the hope that even if it do not convince it may at least stimulate discussion and elucidation of this apparently neglected minor crux.

The Byzantine variant δ l. ὧς suggests that a preliminary description of Mark's ὧς in this passage might be "ὁς apparently used as a relative pronoun". It is with interest, then, that in R. KÜHNER (Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache: 2* Teil. Satzlehre. Dritte Auflage, neubearbeitete von Bernhard Gerth 1898), we find in the index the modest note "ὁς scheinbar statt ὧς". The reference is to paragraph 581 section 8 (Band 2, S. 445) where it is stated that "occasionally an adverbial clause of comparison appears to take the place of an adjectival clause: only on closer examination is it seen that such clauses do not contain a simple attributive statement but rather express the fashion or manner in which the fact referred to in the main clause was carried out." He gives four examples, two of which we must briefly consider:

Iliad 11 44, 45. (we quote 44-47)

δειδω μη δη μοι τελεση ἕπος ὥριμος Ἰκτωρ
ὁς ποτ' ἐπηπάλησεν ἐν Τροιες' ἀγορεύων
μη πριν παρ νηόν προτι Ἰλιον ἀπονέεσθαι
πριν πυρι νήας ἐνυπρήσας κτέναι δε και αὐτοὺς

He comments that in these lines (where incidentally the ὧς has been emended to ὅς in several MSS. and by Aristophanes of Byzantium) we do not simply have a statement "Hector will bring to pass the word which he once threatened ... that ... he would burn with fire ..." but rather "Hector will effect his word against me ... even as he threatened (it)" scil. the demeanour and stern intent of Hector on that notable occasion of counsel, being in Agamemnon's mind. It is thus implied that ὧς is linked with ἐπος as relative with antecedent, but that its use rather than the normal relative pronoun is determined by the nuance required which demands not only indication of the mere words, but emphasis upon their inner psychological urgency and power. (I have been