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Mark 1.40

NA28

καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρός παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν ἕκαστον γονυπετῶν καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ
(var) καὶ γονυπετῶν Ν
(var) καὶ Δ W Γ it
(var) καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν καὶ A C K Δ 0130 f13 28. 33. 700. 1424. l 2211 กำไร (q)
(var) p - B samss
(var) txt Ν2 L Θ f1 565. 579. 892. 1241. 2542 (lat)

UBS5

40 {C} καὶ γονυπετῶν Ν L Θ f1 205 565 579 892 1241 1243 1424 l 890 l 1074 it e, f, l, q vg (syr, p) arm eth geo slav Augustine
// καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτῶν A C Δ 0130 0233 f13 28 33 157 180 597 700 1006 (1010 1071 l 253 l 384 l 751 αὐτῶν)
1292 1342 1505 Byz [Ε F Σ] Lect synh, pal geo2 Basil EU
// omit B D G W l 211 l 514 l 524 l 547 l 1627 it a, aur, b, c, d, ff2, r1 vg ms cop samss

CNTTS

[καὶ ἔρχεται γονυπετῶν] καὶ (3) S0. Ν5 Θ 1 2e5 118 565 579 1562 f1 SBL f e >>
καὶ γονυπετῶν καὶ - 1 Θ 2e5 >>
καὶ γονυπετῶν καὶ = 1 Θ L0t9 >>
καὶ γονυπετῶν καὶ, 2 A C E07 F09 K017 M021 Σ Υ Ω Δ Π 2 28 33 157 180 597 700 1005 1424 2358 2372 f13 MT TR q >>
ΟΜ Μ 3 B a b c f2 >>
καὶ A 4 D05 G011 W96124 >>
καὶ γονυπετῶν M 50 Ν* >>
καὶ γονυπετῶν καὶ, 51 Χ 69 >>
καὶ γονυπετῶν καὶ, A 52 1071 >>
λατινα 99 d5 g5 p58 p58 Η013 Ν Π024 Q Ψ 13 ik >>

Tyndale House GNT (Note: No text critical marks in the text; only in the apparatus)
καὶ γονυπετῶν Ν L Θ; add αὐτὸν A C K Δ 69 1424; omit B D W

SBLGNT

Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρός παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν λέγων
40 γονυπετῶν WH J + καὶ NA28; αὐτὸν καὶ Treg RP
Comprehensive NT
Alx{kneeling down}, Byz[adds to him (ASV, KJV, NAS, NAU, NKJ, NLT, REB, TLB)]. Minor[omits]


1:40  καὶ γονυπετῶν  

On the one hand, the combination of B D W al in support of the shorter text is extremely strong. On the other hand, if καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτόν were the original reading, homoeoteleuton could account for its accidental omission. On the whole, since in the parallel passages Matthew’s use of προσεκύνει (Mt 8:2) and, still more, Luke’s πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (Lk 5:12) seem to support the originality of the idea of kneeling in Mark’s account, the Committee decided to retain καὶ γονυπετῶν with א L Θ f 565 al but to enclose the expression within square brackets.

Omanson, Roger L. and Bruce Manning Metzger, A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament: An Adaptation of Bruce M. Metzger’s Textual Commentary for the Needs of Translators

1:40  καὶ γονυπετῶν  

The combination of manuscripts that supports the shorter reading without the words καὶ γονυπετῶν is very strong. But, on the other hand, the parallel passages in Matt 8:2 and Luke 5:12 say that the leper knelt (although in different words from Mark). This seems to support the idea of kneeling in Mark’s account (on the assumption that both Matthew and Luke used Mark in writing their own gospels). If the reading καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτόν (and kneeling before him) is original, the shorter reading may have been created when a copyist’s eye jumped from αὐτόν (following the participle παρακαλῶν) to αὐτόν following γονυπετῶν. To indicate doubt about the original reading, the words καὶ γονυπετῶν have been put in brackets.


Mark 1:40

A significant combination of manuscripts (B D W) omits καὶ γονυπετῶν (“and kneeling down”) from the text. It is possible that other scribes, influenced by the descriptions in Matt 8:2 (where the leper is said to “worship” Jesus) and Luke 5:12 (where he is said to “fall on his face” before Jesus), added “and kneeling” to give color to Mark’s account. It is unlikely that the words were dropped due to homoeoteleuton because the word αὐτόν, following παρακαλῶν, would have also been dropped.

NET Bible – no comment

Student’s Guide

TEXT: "and kneeling said to him"
EVIDENCE: S L Theta f1 565 892 1241 four lat vg syr(p,s) cop (north)
TRANSLATIONS: RSV NIV TEV
RANK: D
NOTES: "and said to him"
EVIDENCE: B D W some Lect most lat cop(south)
TRANSLATIONS: ASV
NOTES: "and kneeling to him said to him"
EVIDENCE: A C K Delta Pi 090 f13 28 33 700 1010 Byz most Lect syr(h,pal)
TRANSLATIONS: KJV ASV NASV NEB
COMMENTS: Since in the Greek the word for "and" is found both before and after "kneeling," it is possible that the omission of "kneeling" or "kneeling to him" happened accidently when copyists' eyes jumped from "and" to "and."
10. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπτῶς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν [καὶ γονυπητῶν] καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐὰν θέλης δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι.

BYZ Mark 1:40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπτῶς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπητῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐὰν θέλης δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι.

T&T #23

γονυπητέω "kneel"

καὶ γονυπητῶν αὐτὸν καὶ

A, C, Δ, 0130, f13, 69§, 33, 372, 700, 1342, 1424, 2737, Maj, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, geo², goth, [Trg]

καὶ γονυπητῶν αὐτὸν

69*, Weiss

καὶ γονυπητῶν καὶ

01, L, Θ, f1, 517, 565, 579, 892, 954, 1241, 1675, 2542, 2766, 2786, pc²,
Lat(f, l, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, arm, geo¹

καὶ γονυπητῶν

01*, NA², WH, Gre, Bois, Tis, Bal, WH², Gre, SBL

[WH have καὶ γονυπητῶν in brackets]

καὶ

omit:

D, G, W, Γ, 124 (= f13), pc², it, vg²

B, sa²

B: no umlaut, but colon sign! (p. 1279 A, line 13)

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:2 καὶ ἵδο γε προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων:

NA28 Luke 5:12 ἵδον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδείη αὐτοῦ λέγων· κύrie, εὰν θέλης δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 8:5-6 Ἐσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ προσήλθεν αὐτῷ ἐκατονταρχός παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν εἰς καὶ λέγων κύριε, ὅ παῖς μοι βέβληται ἐν τῇ οίκῳ παραλυτικός, δεινὸς βασανιζόμενος.
NA28 Matthew 17:14 Καὶ ἔλθοντος πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον προσήλθεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος ἑνοπτικῶν αὐτῶν καὶ λέγων:
NA28 Mark 10:17 Καὶ ἐκπορευόμενοι αὐτῷ εἰς ὄδον προσδοκάμων εἰς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτῶν ἐπηρέατα αὐτῶν.

Compare Egerton 2, line 35-36:
καὶ ἰδοὺ λεπός προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λεγει:

The variety of readings is strange.
A secondary addition as harmonization to Mt/Lk is improbable. The wording is completely different.
The omission of καὶ γονυπετῶν might be due to h.t. (either KAI - KAI for txt or AUTON KAI - AUTON KAI for Byz, so Weiss).
The omission of B is not clear. E. Güting (TC Mark, 2005, p. 116) suggests that the exemplar of B had a line length of 10-12 letters (from Clark, 1914) and that B simply omitted one line (= καὶ γονυπετῶν), giving the reading of O1*. Güting considers this reading the original.

If καὶ γονυπετῶν is not original it might have been inspired by either Mt 17:14 or Mk 10:17. Probably καὶ γονυπετῶν is original and only the αὐτὸν is a harmonization to those parallels or immediate context. Weiss (Textkritik, p. 147) suggested that scribes took the γονυπετῶν intransitive and therefore omitted the αὐτὸν.

Both Mt and Lk have different words here but both have basically the same meaning, thus it is probable that both read something like it in Mk (this explanation is based on a source theory, here Markan priority).
C.H. Turner suggests that the change of καὶ γονυπετῶν by both Mt and Lk was "due either to the desire to avoid so violent a word".

γονυπετέω appears only 4 times (and only in Mt and Mk) in the Greek Bible, here at Mk 1:40 and:

NA28 Matthew 17:14 προσήλθεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος γονυπετῶν αὐτῶν
omit αὐτῶν: 28, 579, e, f, ff1, l, r1, Sy-S, Sy-P, mas-1+2

NA28 Matthew 27:29 καὶ γονυπετήσατε ἐξπροσδεχεῖ αὐτῶν

NA28 Mark 10:17 προσδοκαμένοι εἰς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτῶν

omit αὐτῶν: W, pc, c, ff2, q, Cl

Rating: - (indecisive)

brackets ok, slight tendency to omit the brackets
Mark 1:41

NA28
καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθεις ἐκτείνας (var) οργισθεὶς D α ff2 r1

UBS5
41 {B} σπλαγχνίσθεις Κ Α Β Ζ Λ Θ 0130 0233 f1 f13 28 33 157 180 205 365 579 597 700 892 1006 101 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 157 180 56 579 700 892 1006 1010 1071

Tyndale GNT
σπλαγχνίσθεις Κ Α Β Ζ Λ W Δ Θ 69 1424; οργισθεὶς D

SBLGNT
καὶ ὄργισθεὶς ἐκτείνας οργισθεὶς Holmes WH[mark] σπλαγχνίσθεις WH Treg NA28 RP

Comprehensive NT
Alx/Byz[compassion], Minor[anger (REB)]

Metzger
1:41 σπλαγχνίσθεις {B}

It is difficult to come to a firm decision concerning the original text. On the one hand, it is easy to see why ὄργισθείς (“being angry”) would have prompted over-scrupulous copyists to alter it to σπλαγχνίσθεις (“being filled with compassion”), but not easy to account for the opposite change. On the other hand, a majority of the Committee was impressed by the following considerations. (1) The character of the external evidence in support of ὄργισθείς is less impressive than the diversity and character of evidence that supports σπλαγχνίσθεις. (2) At least two other passages in Mark, which represent Jesus as angry (3:5) or indignant (10:14), have not prompted over-scrupulous copyists to make corrections. (3) It is possible that the reading ὄργισθείς either (a) was suggested by ἐμβριμησάμενος of ver. 43, or (b) arose from confusion between similar words in Aramaic (compare Syriac ethraḥam, “he had pity,” with ethraʿem, “he was enraged”).

Omanson
1:41 σπλαγχνίσθεις (moved with pity) {B}

Instead of the participle σπλαγχνίσθεις, a few manuscripts read the participle ὄργισθείς (being angry). Some interpreters consider this variant reading original since it is the more difficult reading. Among modern translations, REB follows this variant reading: “Jesus was moved to anger.” Scholars who follow the variant reading have suggested numerous reasons why Jesus was angry (see Guelich, Mark 1:1–8:26, p. 74) or why the variant reading is more likely original (see Marcus, Mark 1–8, p. 206). For a recent defense of the variant reading, see Ehrman, “A Leper in the Hands of an Angry Jesus,” pp. 77–98.

However, the quality and diversity of the manuscripts that support the reading of the text are impressive. In addition, in two other passages in Mark (3:5 and 10:14), where Mark says that Jesus was angry, copyists did not attempt to correct the text, so it seems unlikely that copyists changed ὄργισθείς to σπλαγχνίσθεις here. (France [The Gospel of Mark, p. 115], however, notes that in 3:5 and 10:14 there are obvious causes for anger.) Perhaps the presence of the word ἐμβριμησάμενος (sternly charging) in v. 43 led a抄ist to change “moved with pity” to “being angry.” It is also possible that the similar Aramaic words for “to have pity” (ethraḥam) and “to be enraged” (ethraʿem) may have been confused during translation into Greek.
Most scholars believe this to be a significant textual dilemma because the variant is such an obviously difficult reading, while TR WH NU have such exceedingly strong documentation. The argument runs as thus: If σπλαγχνισθείς (“being compassionate”) had originally been in the text, why would any scribe want to change it to ὀργισθείς (“being angry?”)? Thus, ὀργισθείς must have been original, which was then changed to σπλαγχνισθείς. But we must remember that the scribe who wrote ὀργισθείς was the scribe of D. This scribe (or a predecessor) was a literary editor who had a propensity for making significant changes in the text. At this point, he may have decided to make Jesus angry with the leper for wanting a miracle—in keeping with the tone of voice Jesus used in 1:43 when he sternly warned the leper. But this was not a warning about seeking a miracle; it was a warning about keeping the miracle a secret so as to protect Jesus’ identity.

Therefore, it would have to be said that, though it is possible Mark wrote ὀργισθείς, nearly all the documents line up against this. This is not to say that Jesus never got angry or exasperated with people; he did (see Mark 7:34; 9:19; John 11:33, 38). It simply seems unwise to take the testimony of D in this instance when good arguments can be made against it, according to both external and internal criteria.

NET Bible
tc The reading found in almost the entire NT ms tradition is σπλαγχνισθείς (splanchnistheis, “moved with compassion”). Codex Bezae (D), [1358], and a few Latin MSS (a ff² r¹) here read ὀργισθείς (ojrgistheis, “moved with anger”). It is more difficult to account for a change from “moved with compassion” to “moved with anger” than it is for a copyist to soften “moved with anger” to “moved with compassion,” making the decision quite difficult. B. M. Metzger (TCGNT 65) suggests that “moved with anger” could have been prompted by 1:43, “Jesus sent the man away with a very strong warning.” It also could have been prompted by the man’s seeming doubt about Jesus’ desire to heal him (v. 40). As well, it is difficult to explain why scribes would be prone to soften the text here but not in Mark 3:5 or 10:14 (where Jesus is also said to be angry or indignant). Thus, in light of diverse MSS supporting “moved with compassion,” and at least a plausible explanation for ὀργισθείς as arising from the other reading, it is perhaps best to adopt σπλαγχνισθείς as the original reading. Nevertheless, a decision in this case is not easy. For the best arguments for ὀργισθείς, however, see M. A. Proctor, “The ‘Western’ Text of Mark 1:41: A Case for the Angry Jesus” (Ph.D. diss., Baylor University, 1999).

Student’s Guide
TEXT: "And moved with pity, he stretched out [his] hand"
EVIDENCE: S A B C K L W Delta Theta Pi 090 f1 f13 28 33 565 700 892 1010 1241 Byz Lect most lat vg syr cop
TRANSLATIONS: KJV ASV RSV NASV NIV NEBn TEV
RANK: D
NOTES: "And being angry, he stretched out [his] hand"
EVIDENCE: D four lat
TRANSLATIONS: NEB TEVn
NOTES: "And he stretched out [his] hand"
EVIDENCE: one lat
TRANSLATIONS: NEBn
COMMENTS: It is easier to see why copyists might have changed "being angry" to "moved with pity" than to see why they would have changed "moved with pity" to "being angry." However, the evidence for "moved with pity" is so much stronger that it is retained in the text.

Wieland Willker

12. Difficult variant:
Minority variant:
NA28 Mark 1:41 Καὶ ὁργίσθηκεν ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἢψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: θέλω, καθαρίσθηι.

T&T #24

καὶ ὁργίσθηκεν D, a, d, ff², r², Diatessaron, Bois, SBL
καὶ pc⁴, b, g₁
pc = 169, 505, 508, L866

‘O ὑς Θεοῦ ἐκτείνας 169, 505, 508, 1358, L866

‘O ὑς Θεοῦ ὁργίσθηκεν A, c, k, π, (L'), W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 783, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, Co²

txt καὶ ὁργίσθηκεν 01, B, 892, e, Co²

Et iratus a, d, ff², r²
Iesus autem misertus aur, c, f, l, (q), (r²), vg
Et misericordia actus e (k lac.)

1358: This is noted for ὅργισθηκεν in T&T, but in error! It omits the word. Jeff Cate checked the film (textualcriticism list message #6521, July 2011).

783: Jeff Cate also writes: "The data for minuscule 783 in TUT is misleading. 783* omits an entire "line" (SPLAGXNISQEIS EKTEINAS THN XEIRA AUTOU), not simply the participle, and the line is then added in the margin by what seems to be the original hand." There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, click here.

Diatessaron, in his Diatessarion commentary writes (McCarthy): "Therefore our Lord showed him two things in response to his double [attitude]: reproof through his anger, and mercy through his healing. For, in response to if you are willing, he was angry, and in response to you can, he was healed."
The Arabic Diatessaron (Ciasca, ch. 22) has misertus.

Lac: 33 (...χεῖρισθῆκεν)
B: no umlaut

σπλαγχνίζομαι "be moved with pity or compassion"
ὀργίζομαι "be angry, be furious"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:3 καὶ ἑκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἤψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:43 καὶ ἐμβριμοσύνενος αὐτῷ εὕθες ἐζεβαλεν αὐτὸν ἐμβριμόμοιαν· speak harshly to; criticize harshly
W omits the verse!
NA28 Mark 3:5 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ’ ὀργῆς.
safe!

NA28 Mark 10:14 ἵδων δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἤγγικται καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ἀγανακτεῖν· be indignant or angry
add ἐπιτιμήσας: W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 1342, 2542, pc, Sy-S, Sy-H", arm, geo

NA28 Matthew 9:30 καὶ ἐπεφημίζη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων·
NA28 Matthew 9:36 ἵδων δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἔπλαγγυνόθη περὶ αὐτῶν,
NA28 Matthew 14:14 εἴδεν πολίν ὄχλον καὶ ἔπλαγγυνόθη ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς
NA28 Matthew 15:32 Ἰησοῦς ... ἔλεγεν· σπλαγγυνύσωμαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,
NA28 Matthew 20:34 σπλαγγυνύσωμεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς

NA28 Mark 6:34 εἴδεν πολίν ὄχλον καὶ ἔπλαγγυνόθη ἐπὶ αὐτούς,
NA28 Mark 8:2 σπλαγγυνύσωμαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,
NA28 Mark 9:22 βοήθησον ἡμῖν σπλαγγυνύσωμεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς.
NA28 Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς·

Ἀμὴν ἐν ὀργῇ D, Θ, Λ, f1, f13, 22, 157, 1071, al² :: Mk 3:5

NA28 Luke 7:13 καὶ ἵδων αὐτὴν ὁ κύριος ἔπλαγγυνόθη
NA28 Luke 10:33 Ἀμαρίτης ... καὶ ἵδων ἔπλαγγυνόθη
NA28 Luke 15:20 εἴδεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔπλαγγυνόθη

NA28 John 11:38 Ἰησοῦς οὖν πολίν ἐμβριμοσύνεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.
NA28 John 11:33 Ἰησοῦς οὖν ἐπεφημίσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἔταραξεν ἑαυτὸν.
Compare also: "The Parable of the Unforgiving Servant" (In this parable we have both words very close to each other.)

NA28 Matthew 18:27 σπλαγχνισθείς δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἔκεινον ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ δάνειον ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ.
NA28 Matthew 18:34 καὶ ὁργισθείς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ παρεδώκεν αὐτὸν τοῖς βασιλισσαῖς ἐξε τοῦ ἀποδῷ πάν τὸ ὀφειλόμενον.

BDAG notes: the constr. is in doubt; τοῦ δούλου should prob. rather be taken w. ὁ κύριος)

Note also "Secret Mark":
καὶ ὁργισθεὶς ὁ Ιησοῦς ἀπῆλθεν μετ' αὐτῆς εἰς τὸν κήπον ὅπου ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον

σπλαγχνίζομαι:
Swete (comm. Mk): In the N.T. σπλαγχνίζεσθαι is limited to the Synoptists: in the LXX, Prov. 17:5 ὁ δὲ ἐπισπλαγχνιζόμενος (א, σπλ.) ἐλεηθήσεται (where the Gk. is the converse of the Heb.) seems to be the only instance of its use in a metaphorical sense; for the literal sense of the verb and its derivatives, see 2.Macc. 6:7,8,21, 7:42, 9:5,6. It is remarkable that, while σπλάγχνα was used in classical Gk. for the seat of the affections, the verb appears first in Biblical Greek: see Lightfoot on Phil 1:8, "perhaps a coinage of the Jewish dispersion."

Thayer: properly, to be moved as to one's bowels, hence, to be moved with compassion, have compassion (for the bowels were thought to be the seat of love and pity).

The support for ὁργισθείς is very slim. On the other hand it is possible that scribes changed the hard word, ὁργισθείς fits good to the verse 43 ("After sternly warning him...") and it is possible that σπλαγχνισθείς had been changed to remove a possible discrepancy between verse 41 and verse 43 (so Weiss).

The majority of commentators opts for ὁργισθείς now (see list in Greeven, TC Mark, 2005, p. 120-21), but the editions all give σπλαγχνισθείς (except Boismard's Synopsis).

Zahn noted the interesting fact that in Aramaic the words are almost identical: "ethraham" = "he had pity" and "ethra'em" = "he was enraged".

So, too, JR Harris, but suggesting Syriac (Codex Bezae, p. 186). He suggests a "much more simpler" explanation though: "it arose out of a misunderstanding of the African Latin motus, which was ambiguous in its meaning. If the reader will refer to the Acts of Perpetua he will find two instances of the use of the word. In c. 3 we have motus = ταραχθείς ["trouble, disturb, upset"], in c. 13 moti =
σπλαγχνισθέντες ["be moved with pity"]. The word might be used both of passion and compassion."

It is also possible that the Latin iratus is a misreading of misertus. This is perhaps supported by r*, which has been corrected from iratus to the Vulgate text. The Greek ὄργισθείς then is a back-translation (suggested by Pete Williams, blog 12/2005). This approach appears elsewhere in D. On the other hand this is not fully convincing, since the reading is not simply a variation between iratus and misertus, but between Et iratus and Iesus autem misertus.

Note also that ὄργισθείς was in the Syriac Diatessaron of Ephraem, which means the origin of this variant is very early. If one maintains that the variant originated in Latin, it means either that the back-translation into Greek occurred extremely early, or, that Tatian worked from Latin sources.

It is possible, as Jeff Cate has pointed out to me, that Mark wrote σπλαγχνισθέντες, but intended it as anger (not compassion). Cate notes that σπλαγχνίζομαι (in pre-Christian times) was used for impulsive emotions such as anger and lust (Liddell and Scott). He writes: "If Mark intended σπλαγχνισθέντες as anger (even though the verb normally didn't mean that), it could possibly explain why the Old Latin tradition ends up split between anger (iratus) and compassion (miseratus)."

K. Lake suggests a different punctuation:
And there came to him a leper beseeching him and kneeling and saying to him: "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." And he (the leper) put out his hand in a passion of rage and touched him. And he (Jesus) said: "I will, be thou clean." Lake writes: "It is obvious that in any case the change of reference in the 'he' and the 'him' is obscure, but it is also clear that the change of subject has to be made somewhere in this long and inartistic sentence. To make the sense plain, the latest manuscripts insert the name of Jesus before σπλαγχνισθέντες, but this is undoubtedly an emendation of late date."

όργισθείς also seems to be a harmonization to the immediate context. In verse 41 Jesus is compassionate and in verse 43 he is scolding the man for no apparent reason. οργισθείς seems to be a conformation to ἐμβρυμοσύνενος.

Both Mt and Lk omit the word but retaining the wording of the rest. A significant Minor Agreement. This has been taken as an argument that they read οργισθείς and omitted the word as inappropriate.
Note that also 4 Byzantine manuscripts omitted the term in Mk (probably a harmonization to Mt).

Arguments in favor of σπλαγχνισθείς:
1. In Mk 3:5 μετ’ ὀργῇς is safel Mk 10:14 is safel
2. In Lk 6:10 a lot of witnesses (including δ!l) add μετ’ ὀργῇς. Note also the addition of ἐπιτιμήσας in Mk 10:14.
3. Very limited Western support for ὀργισθείς.
4. ὀργισθείς could be a conformation to ἐμβριμησάμενος verse 43.
5. Other appearances of Jesus’ anger have not been changed.
6. Incoherent support.

Arguments in favor of ὀργισθείς:
1. The appearance of ὀργισθείς in Ephrem's Diatessaron commentary.
2. It’s the harder reading.
3. Both Mt and Lk omit the word.

Compare:
- K. Lake "ἔμβριμησάμενος and ὀργισθείς, Mk 1:40-43" HTR 16 (1923) 197-198
- E. Beyan "Note on Mk 1:41 and Jo 11: 31, 38" JTS 33 (1932) 186-8
- P.J. Williams "An Examination of Ehrman’s Case for ὀργισθείς in Mark 1:41" NovT 54 (2012) 1-12

Rating: - (indecisive)