Textual Criticism: Text, Apparatus, and Commentaries Compared

NA28 from BibleWorks10
UBS5 from BibleWorks10
Center for NT Textual Studies (CNTTS) from BibleWorks10
Tyndale House GNT from Accordance 12
Society of Biblical Literature (SBLGNT) from Logos 7
Comprehensive NT Notes (Clontz) from Accordance 12
Metzger's *Textual Commentary* from Logos 7
Omanson and Metzger's *Textual Guide* from Logos 7
Comfort's *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary* from Logos 7
NET Bible notes from Accordance 12
A Student's Guide to New Testament Textual Variants at http://bible.ovc.edu/tc/
An Online Textual Commentary on the Greek Gospels by Wieland Willker at http://www.willker.de/wie/TCG/

Mark 1.40

NA28

Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν ⸀[καὶ γονυπετῶν] καὶ⸃ λέγων αὐτῷ

(var) και γονυπετων   ℵ*
(var) και   D W Γ it
(var) και γονυπετων αυτον και   A C K Δ 0130 *f*13 28. 33. 700. 1424. *l* 2211 𝔐 (q)
(var) *p) -*   B samss
(var) *txt*   ℵ² L Θ *f*1 565. 579. 892. 1241. 2542 (lat)

UBS5

40 {C} καὶ γονυπετῶν ℵ L Θ *f*¹ 205 565 579 892 1241 1243 1424 *l* 890 *l* 1074 it[e, f, l, q] vg (syr[s, p]) arm eth geo¹ slav Augustine
// καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτόν A C Δ 0130 0233 *f*¹³ 28 33 157 180 597 700 1006 (1010 1071 *l* 253 *l* 384 *l* 751 αὐτῷ) 1292 1342 1505 *Byz* [E F Σ] *Lect* syr[h, 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

Tyndale House GNT (Note: No text critical marks in the text; only in the apparatus)

καὶ γονυπετῶν ℵ L Θ; *add* αυτον A C K Δ 69 1424; *omit* B D W

SBLGNT

Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ ⸀γονυπετῶν λέγων
40 γονυπετῶν WH] + 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]

Metzger, Bruce Manning. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition a Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (4th Rev. Ed.)*. London; New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.
1:40   [καὶ γονυπετῶν] {C}
    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] ([and kneeling]) {C}
    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) τὸ αὐτόν following γονυπετῶν. To indicate doubt about the original reading, the words καὶ γονυπετῶν have been put in brackets.

Comfort, Philip W. *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary: Commentary on the Variant Readings of the Ancient New Testament Manuscripts and How They Relate to the Major English Translations*
Mark 1:40
    A significant combination of manuscripts (B D W) omits και γονυπετων ("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 αυτον, following παρακαλων, would have also been dropped.

NET Bible – no comment

Student's Guide
        TEXT: "and kneeling said to him"
        EVIDENCE: S L Theta *f*1 565 892 1241 four lat vg syr(s,p) cop (north)
        TRANSLATIONS: RSV NIV TEV
        RANK: D
        NOTES: "and said to him"
        EVIDENCE: B D W some Lect most lat cop(south)
        TRANSLATIONS: ASVn
        NOTES: "and kneeling to him said to him"
        EVIDENCE: A C K Delta Pi 090 *f*13 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."

TVU 24

10.   **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

NA28 Mark 1:40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν [καὶ γονυπετῶν]   καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι.

BYZ Mark 1:40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι

T&T #23

γονυπετέω "kneel"

καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν καὶ	A, C, Δ, 0130, f13, 69ᶜ, 33, 372, 700, 1342, 1424, 2737, Maj, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, geo², goth, [Trg]
καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν	69*, Weiss
καὶ γονυπετῶν καὶ	01ᶜ², L, Θ, f1, 517, 565, 579, 892, 954, 1241, 1675, 2542, 2766, 2786, pc⁹⁰, Lat(f, l, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, arm, geo¹
καὶ γονυπετῶν	01*, NA²⁸, WH, Gre, Bois, Tis, Bal, WHᵐᵍ, Gre, SBL
	[WH have καὶ γονυπετῶν in brackets]
καὶ	D, G, W, Γ, 124(=f13ᵇ), pc⁶⁰, it, vgᵐˢ
omit:	B, saᵐˢˢ

B: no umlaut, but colon sign! (p. 1279 A, line 18)

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:2 καὶ ἰδοὺ λεπρὸς προσελθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων·
NA28 Luke 5:12 ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ λέγων· κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι.

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 8:5-6 Εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἑκατόνταρχος <u>παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν 6 καὶ λέγων</u>· κύριε, ὁ παῖς μου βέβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παραλυτικός, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος.

NA28 Matthew 17:14 Καὶ ἐλθόντων πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος <u>γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων</u>·

NA28 Mark 10:17 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν προσδραμὼν εἷς <u>καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν</u> ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν·

Compare Egerton 2, line 35-36:
και ἰδοὺ λεπρὸς προσελθων αυτῷ 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 01*. 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 προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος <u>γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν</u>
                    omit αὐτὸν: 28, 579, e, f, ff¹, l, r¹, Sy-S, Sy-P, mae-1+2

NA28 Matthew 27:29 καὶ <u>γονυπετήσαντες ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ</u>

NA28 Mark 10:17 προσδραμὼν εἷς καὶ <u>γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν</u>

                    omit αὐτὸν: W, pc, c, ff², q, Cl

Rating: - (indecisive)
        brackets ok, slight tendency to omit the brackets

Mark 1.41

NA28

⌜καὶ ⌜σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας
 (var) οργισθεις   D a ff2 r1*

UBS5

41 {B} σπλαγχνισθείς ℵ A B C L W Δ Θ 0130 0233 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 28 33 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 *Byz* [E F G Σ] *Lect* it^(aur, c, e, f, l, q) vg syr^(s, p, h, pal) cop^(sa, bo) arm eth geo slav Basil; Ambrose^(vid)
    // ὀργισθείς D it^(a, d, ff2, r1) (Diatessaron) REB BJ
    // *omit* (*see* Mt 8.3; Lk 5.13) *l* 866 it^b

Tyndale GNT

σπλαγχνισθεὶς ℵ A B C K L W Δ Θ 69 1424; οργισθεις D

SBLGNT

⌜καὶ ⌜ὀργισθεὶς ἐκτείνας
ὀργισθεὶς Holmes WH^(marg)] σπλαγχνισθεὶς WH Treg NA28 RP

Comprehensive NT

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

Metzger

1:41   σπλαγχνισθείς {B}
    It is difficult to come to a firm decision concerning the original text. On the one hand, it is easy to see why ὀργισθείς ("being angry") would have prompted over-scrupulous copyists to alter it to σπλαγχνισθείς ("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 ὀργισθείς is less impressive than the diversity and character of evidence that supports σπλαγχνισθείς. (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 ὀργισθείς 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 σπλαγχνισθείς (moved with pity) {B}
    Instead of the participle σπλαγχνισθείς, a few manuscripts read the participle ὀργισθείς (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 ὀργισθείς to σπλαγχνισθείς 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 copyist 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.

Comfort

TR WH NU	σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο
	"being compassionate he stretched out his hand and touched [the man]"
	ℵ A B C L W f¹, 33 565 700 syr cop Diatessaron
	KJV NKJV RSV NRSV ESV NASB NIV TNIVmg NEBmg REBmg NJB NAB NLT HCSB NET
variant	οργισθεις εκτεινας την χειρα αυτου ηψατο
	"being angry he stretched out his hand and touched [the man]"
	D it
	NRSVmg TNIV NEB REB NLTmg NETmg

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 σπλαγχνισθεις ("being compassionate") had originally been in the text, why would any scribe want to change it to οργισθεις ("being angry")? Thus, οργισθεις must have been original, which was then changed to σπλαγχνισθεις. But we must remember that the scribe who wrote οργισθεις 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 οργισθεις, 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 ƒ1 ƒ13 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 σπλαγχνισθεὶς** ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι·

T&T #24

καὶ ὀργισθεὶς	D, a, d, ff², r¹*, Diatess^Ephrem, Bois, SBL
καὶ	pc⁴ ᴮʸ², b, g¹
	pc = 169, 505, 508, L866

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐκτείνας	169, 505, 508, 1358, L866

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς σπλαγχνισθείς	A, C, K, Π, (L'), W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 579, 700, 783, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, Co^pt
txt καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς	01, B, 892, e, Co^pt

Et iratus	a, d, ff², r¹*
Iesus autem misertus	aur, c, f, l, (q), (r¹ᶜ), vg
Et misericordia actus	e (k lac.)

1358: This is noted for ὀργισθεὶς 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.

Ephrem, in his Diatessaron 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 (...γχνισθεὶς)
B: no umlaut

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

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 8:3 καὶ _____ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι·
NA28 Luke 5:13 καὶ ___ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι·

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:43 καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν
                        ἐμβριμάομαι   speak harshly to; criticize harshly
                        W omits the verse!

NA28 Mark 3:5 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετʼ ὀργῆς,
                                        safe!

NA28 Mark 10:14 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠγανάκτησεν καὶ ᵀ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
                        ἀγανακτέω be indignant or angry
add ἐπιτιμήσας: W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 1342, 2542, pc, Sy-S, Sy-Hᵐᵍ, arm, geo

NA28 Matthew 9:30 καὶ ἐνεβριμήθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων·
NA28 Matthew 9:36 ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν,
NA28 Matthew 14:14 εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπʼ αὐτοῖς
NA28 Matthew 15:32 Ἰησοῦς ... εἶπεν· σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,
NA28 Matthew 20:34 σπλαγχνισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς

NA28 Mark 6:34 εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπʼ αὐτούς,
NA28 Mark 8:2 σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,
NA28 Mark 9:22 βοήθησον ἡμῖν σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐφʼ ἡμᾶς.

NA28 Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς ᵀ εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
            ᵀ μετʼ/ἐν ὀργῇ   D, X, Θ, Λ, f1, f13, 22, 157, 1071, al²¹ :: Mk 3:5

NA28 Luke 7:13 καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν ὁ κύριος ἐσπλαγχνίσθη
NA28 Luke 10:33 Σαμαρίτης ... καὶ ἰδὼν ἐσπλαγχνίσθη,
NA28 Luke 15:20 εἶδεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη

NA28 John 11:38 Ἰησοῦς οὖν πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ
NA28 John 11:33 Ἰησοῦς οὖν ... ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν 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 <u>σπλαγχνισθεὶς</u> δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ δάνειον ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ.
NA28 Matthew 18:34 καὶ <u>ὀργισθεὶς</u> ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τοῖς βασανισταῖς ἕως οὗ ἀποδῷ πᾶν τὸ ὀφειλόμενον.
> BDAG notes: the constr. is in doubt; τοῦ δούλου should prob. rather be taken w. ὁ κύριος)

Note also "Secret Mark":
καὶ <u>ὀργισθεὶς</u> ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπῆλθεν μετ᾽ αυτῆς εἰς τὸν κῆπον ὅπου ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον

<u>σπλαγχνίζομαι</u>:
Swete (comm. Mk): In the N.T. σπλαγχνίζεσθαι is limited to the Synoptists: in the LXX, Prov. 17:5 ὁ δὲ ἐπισπλαγχνιζόμενος (Α, 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 ὀργισθεὶς is very slim. On the other hand it is possible that scribes changed the hard word. ὀργισθεὶς fits good to the verse 43 ("After sternly warning him...") and it is possible that σπλαγχνισθεὶς had been changed to remove a possible discrepancy between verse 41 and verse 43 (so Weiss).

The majority of commentators opts for ὀργισθεὶς now (see list in Greeven, TC Mark, 2005, p. 120-21), but the editions all give σπλαγχνισθεὶς (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 r², which has been corrected from *iratus* to the Vulgate text. The Greek ὀργισθεὶς 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 ὀργισθεὶς 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 σπλαγχνισθεὶς, but intended it as anger (not compassion). Cate notes that σπλάγχνα (in pre-Christian times) was used for impulsive emotions such as anger and lust (Liddell and Scott). He writes: "If Mark intended σπλαγχνισθεὶς 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 σπλαγχνισθεὶς, but this is undoubtedly an emendation of late date."

ὀργισθεὶς 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. ὀργισθεὶς seems to be a conformation to ἐμβριμησάμενος.

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 ὀργισθεὶς 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 σπλαγχνισθεὶς:
1. In Mk 3:5 μετ᾽ ὀργῆς is safe! Mk 10:14 is safe!
2. In Lk 6:10 a lot of witnesses (including D!) add μετ᾽ ὀργῆς. Note also the addition of ἐπιτιμήσας in Mk 10:14.
3. Very limited Western support for ὀργισθεὶς.
4. ὀργισθεὶς 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 ὀργισθεὶς:
1. The appearance of ὀργισθεὶς in Ephrem's Diatessaron commentary.
2. It's the harder reading.
3. Both Mt and Lk omit the word.

Compare:
- K. Lake "ἐμβριμησάμενος and ὀργισθεὶς, 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
- B.D. Ehrman "A leper in the hands of an angry Jesus" in: NT Greek and Exegesis" Festschrift for G.F. Hawthorne, Eerdmans, 2003, p. 77 – 98
- P.J. Williams "An Examination of Ehrman's Case for ὀργισθεὶς in Mark 1:41" NovT 54 (2012) 1-12
- T. Baarda "Mk 1:41 ὀργισθεὶς" ZNW 103 (2012) 291-5

Rating: - (indecisive)