

Some Notes on Marcan Usage

G. D. Kilpatrick

(These notes were prepared as background study material for the members of the Greek/English Diglot Committee who are now preparing a version of the New Testament in English for translators. It is hoped that the Gospel of St. Mark will be ready for publication in a few months' time.)

Λόγος¹

Λόγος occurs in the printed text of Mark at the following places: 1 : 45; 2 : 2; 4 : 14, 15 (*bis*), 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 33; 5 : 36; 7 : 13, 29; 8 : 32, 38; 9 : 10; 10 : 22, 24; 11 : 29; 12 : 13; 13 : 31; 14 : 39. At 8 : 38 λόγους is interpolated (cf. *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxix. 2, xlii. 184ff.) and at 14 : 39 τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν is an harmonising addition from Matthew 26 : 44. In both places the text with λόγος conflicts with Marcan idiom. If we omit these two occurrences and 16 : 20 in the Longer Ending, the word occurs in Mark twenty-one times.

How is it used? In Mark 4 and at 2 : 2 it means 'the Message', whether of Jesus or the Christian Church, and is a technical term similar to εὐαγγέλιον. In keeping with this, it is always used absolutely without an attributive adjective or a dependent phrase and always has the article.

A second meaning occurs at 5 : 36, ἀκούσας τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον. Here λόγος refers to a particular utterance occurring just before the statement to Jairus about his daughter. This use of λόγος for a saying or utterance in the context accounts for several passages in Mark, 7 : 29; 9 : 10; 10 : 22. ῥῆμα is used similarly twice in Mark, 9 : 32; 14 : 72. Probably in 7 : 13, ἀκροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, we should understand the phrase in this way: the particular utterance or pronouncement of God just mentioned, namely "thou shalt honour thy father and thy mother". We may at first sight be inclined to take ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ here in the sense of 'Holy Scripture' but this significance does not occur in the New Testament. At 11 : 29; 12 : 13 the utterance is still to come, λόγος in the first passage referring to a question which is about to be put, and in the second either to a question with which the Pharisees and Herodians would entrap Jesus or to a dangerous utterance which he might be lured into making. The use of λόγος in the plural at 10 : 24; 13 : 31 to mean a body of utterances or sayings is similar to that of the singular for an utterance.

If we consider these passages as a whole, we find that as far as Mark 4 λόγος means 'Message', but in 5-13 'utterance'. This difference is suggestive and has a bearing on our interpretation of the two outstanding passages, 1 : 45 and 8 : 32.

Though 1 : 45 immediately follows an utterance of Jesus, no one has suggested that λόγος here refers to this utterance and there is no reason why the healed leper should proclaim Jesus' command to him

¹ Earlier discussions occur in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xl. 389f., xlii. 67f.

to shew himself to the priest and make the accustomed offering. With this possibility rejected, we have either to understand *λόγος* of the Message which would agree with its use elsewhere up to Mark 4 inclusive, or else go outside the range of Mark's use of the word.

Let us consider the former use of the word in its context. First, to whom does *λόγος* refer? It has been suggested, for example by Klostermann, that it refers to Jesus, but Marcan usage is against this. The nominative article with *δέ* in Mark always indicates a change of subject. So *ὁ δέ* must be the leper. At first it seems odd that we should have to consider the suggestion that this man "going out preached much and proclaimed the Message": we expect him to proclaim the fact that he has been healed by Jesus. This, however, may be due to our less theological approach to the matter. What the man may be thought of as saying is 'God has visited and redeemed his people in Jesus and by him has healed me of my leprosy'. On this exegesis the man proclaimed his healing not as an isolated piece of good luck but as an expression of God's deliverance in the Messiah, as integral to the Message. If this interpretation is accepted, there is no need to go outside the demonstrable meanings of *λόγος* elsewhere in Mark and in particular to treat it as the equivalent of *τὸ γενόμενον*, the 'event', or as signifying 'narration' or 'story', usages for which it would be hard to find parallels in the Gospels.

At 8 : 32, *τὸν λόγον* is either 'the saying' or 'the Message'. The evangelist's practice elsewhere in the latter part of the Gospel is in favour of 'saying' and there is a particular saying in the context to which *λόγος* can refer, Jesus' statement about his Passion and Resurrection. On the other hand, 'Message' does not fit into the passage so easily. If Jesus merely spoke the Message, why did Peter rebuke him? Thus, 'saying' or 'utterance' seems to suit the situation better. If this conclusion is right, then Jesus spoke about his Passion *παροησία* and whatever *παροησία* means here, it is hard to maintain that it implies secrecy or concealment.

To sum up our enquiry we find that *λόγος* in Mark is apparently used in two senses. First it means 'saying' or 'utterance', a meaning which occurs at 5 : 36 and nine subsequent passages, among them 7 : 13; 8 : 32, where it has not always been understood. Secondly it means 'the Word' or 'the Message' eleven times, eight of them in the explanation of the parable of the Sower. Only at 1 : 45 has this meaning not been apprehended. This consistency in the use of the word is in keeping with Mark's style as a whole. We may compare his treatment of *ὄχλος* and *πορεύεσθαι*. The most significant feature about Mark's use of *λόγος* is not that the twenty-one instances of the word can be brought under two heads, but that they are two and not one. Does this indicate a twofold source for the Evangelist's vocabulary, one usage coming from current Greek and the other, the use of the word as 'Message', from the peculiar terminology of early Christianity?

Ἐνθός

There are probably forty-seven instances of *ἐνθός* in Mark: 1 : 10, 12, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 30, 31, 42, 43; 2 : 2, 8, 12; 3 : 6; 4 : 5, 15, 16, 17, 29;

5 : 2, 13, 29, 30, 36, 42 (2); 6 : 25, 27, 45, 50, 54; 7 : 25, 35; 8 : 10; 9 : 8, 15, 20, 24; 10 : 52; 11 : 2, 3; 14 : 43, 45, 72; 15 : 1. Of these 1 : 31; 2 : 2; 5 : 13, 36 do not appear in the present edition of the B.F.B.S. Greek Testament, but they will appear in the third edition. 9 : 8 will not appear in any edition.

Of these forty-seven, twenty-nine instances and two variant readings appear in the phrase *καὶ εὐθὺς* at the beginning of their clause. We have one example of *ἀλλ' εὐθὺς* in the same position at 7 : 25. Where there is a preceding subordinate clause or a participle equivalent to a clause, *εὐθὺς* begins the main clause at 1 : 43; 4 : 15, 16, 17, 29; 5 : 2; 6 : 54; 9 : 20, 24; 14 : 45, in all ten instances. There remain five exceptions to the initial position, 1 : 28; 5 : 13, 36, 42; 6 : 25; 7 : 25 and the two variant readings at 1 : 31; 3 : 6. 5 : 36 is hardly an exception. The subject is put first out of order and the rest of the sentence is quite regular. 1 : 28 and the variant reading at 3 : 6 give us this arrangement: *καὶ*, verb, subject, *εὐθὺς*, rest of predicate. At 5 : 42; 6 : 25 we have *καὶ*, verb, *εὐθὺς*, rest of predicate, and at 5 : 13 *καὶ*, verb, *εὐθὺς*, subject, and at 1 : 31 *καὶ*, verb, subject, *εὐθὺς*. In these analyses pronoun objects, direct or indirect, which follow their verbs are not taken into account.

This analysis of the position of *εὐθὺς* clearly indicates the evangelist's dominant practice. *Εὐθὺς* normally comes at the beginning of its clause. The exceptions are few and indicate no uniform alternative, nor is there any reason for thinking that difference in position indicates any difference in meaning. The evidence suggests that we are dealing not with an adverb of time but with a connecting particle. *Εὐθὺς* or *εὐθέως* occurs in Matthew eighteen times, Luke seven, John six, Acts ten. There may be traces of the use of the word as a particle in Matthew and Acts.

Πάλιν

Like *εὐθὺς*, *πάλιν* occurs frequently in Mark. There is, however, one feature which prevents us from treating it like *εὐθὺς* as a connecting particle and that is its place in the sentence. *Εὐθὺς* is usually placed at the beginning of its clause or phrase but this is not true of *πάλιν*. Of twenty-nine instances, only eight occur at the beginning of this clause. On the other hand, the commonest position for *πάλιν* is immediately before or after its verb. We have the order *πάλιν*, verb, rest of sentence, at 4 : 1; 7 : 31; 8 : 25; 10 : 1; 12 : 4; 14 : 39, 40; seven examples. In addition there is the order, subject, *πάλιν*, verb, rest of sentence at 10 : 24; 14 : 70 (2); 15 : 4, 12, 13; six instances. Verb, *πάλιν*, rest of sentence, occurs at 2 : 1, 13; 3 : 1, 20; 7 : 14; 8 : 13; 10 : 1, 32; 11 : 27; 14 : 69; ten times. This leaves six exceptions out of twenty-nine appearances, 5 : 21; 8 : 1; 10 : 10; 11 : 3; 12 : 5; 14 : 61. The fact that for nearly four fifths of its occurrences *πάλιν* is placed next to its verb is very much in favour of its being an adverb as distinct from a connecting particle.

This is in contrast to the use of *πάλιν* in a writer of *Koine* like Hero of Alexandria. He uses the word very frequently where the Atticists employed *αὖ* and *αὐθις*. In his writings it usually occurs at the beginning of the sentence, often in the place of an enclitic and may fairly be regarded as a connecting particle, cf. Reinhardt, *De Heronis Alexandrini Dictione Quaestiones Selectae*, (1930), 126, 132.

The evidence about the position of *πάλιν* enables us to decide a question of text. At 5 : 21 manuscripts which read *πάλιν* have before *συνήχθη* either *πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν* or *εἰς τὸ πέραν πάλιν*. The second reading brings *πάλιν* next to a verb and so conforms to Mark's dominant order.

This use of *πάλιν* was unwelcome to the scribes. It is absent from our printed texts at 12 : 5. Scribes have tried to get rid of it at 7 : 14; 8 : 1; 11 : 3; 12 : 5; 14 : 40. The word is frequent in John, and some manuscripts eliminate it at 9 : 20; 10 : 31; 11 : 7.

Οἶκος and *οἰκία*

In Attic Greek *οἰκία* is commoner than *οἶκος* and although both words occur in the New Testament the Attic preference is maintained at any rate in Mark. There seems, however, to be no trace of the Attic legal distinction between *οἶκος* 'property, estate' and *οἰκία* 'dwelling house'.

Οἶκος is used in Mark at 2 : 1, 11, 26; 3 : 20; 5 : 19, 38; 7 : 17, 30; 8 : 3, 25; 9 : 28; 11 : 17; twelve times in all. It occurs only in the accusative singular with *εἰς*, except in the quotation at 11 : 17.

At 2 : 11, 26; 5 : 19, 38; 7 : 30; 8 : 3, 26 (*v.l.*) it has the article and a dependent genitive, except at 8 : 3, where it is used generically, and the article is absent. Only at 5 : 38 is Jesus described as entering the house of the ruler of the synagogue and in none of these passages is the house described as being that of Jesus. In view of the fact that *οἶκος* is in all of them someone's house, the nearest English equivalent seems to be 'home'. Only at 2 : 26 *τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ* and the quotation at 11 : 17, does 'home' sound unnatural in English, perhaps because we are used to the phrase 'house of God' as a description of the Tabernacle or Temple. *Ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ* seems to be the conventional phrase, and *ἡ οἰκία τοῦ θεοῦ* does not occur.

Οἶκος is employed absolutely without the article at 2 : 1; 3 : 20; 7 : 17; 9 : 28, in all four passages with reference to Jesus, though at 3 : 20 *ἔρχονται* (so we should read) includes the disciples. At 2 : 1 the translation 'a house' would be wrong. The crowd could gather only at a known house. Here too the rendering 'home' would be in place. It is heard that Jesus is at his home, and all interested know where to go. The translation 'home' will suit the other three passages admirably and there is nothing against the inference that in all four places Jesus' 'home' in Capernaum is meant. The context of 3 : 20 favours this. At 3 : 7 Jesus is by the sea, at 3 : 13 He ascends the mountain and at 4 : 1 He is by the sea again. The same is true for 7 : 17. At 6 : 53 Jesus lands at Gennesaret and at 7 : 24 He leaves for the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon. At 9 : 28 He has come down from the mountain of transfiguration and at 9 : 30 sets out through Galilee.

If *οἶκος* in Mark is 'home', *οἰκία* seems to be 'house'. It occurs nineteen times in the Gospel and everywhere 'house' is an acceptable translation. At 3 : 25; 13 : 35; for example, 'home' is impossible. However, just as in English, there are passages where 'house' and 'home' are interchangeable, so in Mark it is sometimes possible to render *οἰκία* by 'home'. Thus it is probable that in 2 : 15 *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ* refers to the same

place as is described in 2 : 1 as *εἰς οἶκον*. We too would find no difficulty in English in referring to the same dwelling place sometimes as 'house' and sometimes as 'home'. Further, we must remember that while *οἶκος* is restricted in Mark to one kind of phrase, *οἰκία* occurs in the plural as well as in all cases of the singular.

Ἐπιτιμᾶν

At first sight this verb seems to be used in two senses in Mark, 'to rebuke' and 'to charge strictly', as a verb of censure and as one of command. It is less common for words to be used in a variety of senses in this Gospel than in the others and an examination of the occurrences of our word suggests that its meaning is more coherent. The verb in Classical Greek can mean 'to inflict a *τιμὴ*, a fine or penalty upon someone'. Next it comes to mean 'to censure'. One form of censure is to tell someone that they ought not to have done something. It differs little from this to tell someone that they ought not to do it. This again is very close to a straight prohibition not to do something.

These last senses seem to be characteristic of the verb in Mark. It is used in this Gospel in three ways. First, it is used twice absolutely. At 10 : 13 they were bringing their children to Jesus and the disciples told them not to, *ἐπιτίμησαν*. At 8 : 32 Jesus had been foretelling His Passion and Peter *ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ*, 'told him not to', 'told him to desist'. Next we have three examples with *ἵνα*, 3 : 12, *ἵνα μή*, 8 : 30, *ἵνα μηδένι*, and 10 : 48 *ἵνα σιωπήσῃ*. Two of these are prohibitions and the third which means 'stop his shouting' is very near to one.

In the four remaining instances of the word, it is followed by a verb of saying and direct speech. At 1 : 25 *φιμώθητι* and 4 : 39 *σιώπα* are tantamount to prohibitions. 8 : 33 *ἔπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ*, is also an order to desist. 9 : 25 *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφόν, ἐγὼ ἐπιτάσσω σοι, ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ μηκέτι εἰσέλθῃς εἰς αὐτόν*. Here we have two commands, one an incontrovertible prohibition and the other implies one, 'beset him no longer'. It is noteworthy that the commands in this verse are reinforced by *ἐπιτάσσω*, a verb of positive meaning.

From this examination it appears that the meaning of *ἐπιτιμᾶν* is much more unified than appeared at first sight. Everywhere it means or is near to meaning 'desist from an action being performed' whether it is shouting or bringing children to Jesus, or speaking a prophecy or dissuading.

Ἀκολουθεῖν

The verb occurs at Mark 1 : 18; 2 : 14 (2), 15; 5 : 24; 6 : 1; 8 : 34 (2?); 9 : 38 (2?); 10 : 21, 28, 32, 52; 11 : 9; 14 : 13, 54; 15 : 41. It is also in the printed texts at 3 : 7, but C. H. Turner² and Vincent Taylor have given good reasons for following the manuscripts which omit it here.

It is used in the literal sense of physical following, as at 11 : 9; 14 : 54, and also in the derived sense of being a disciple, for example at 8 : 34. When the word has the derived sense the literal sense is not always absent. Thus at 1 : 18 *ἠκολούθουν* (so read with B) implies discipleship,

² cf. *Journal of Theological Studies* xxvi, 238-240.

but at 1 : 20 ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ is used with the same suggestion. To this extent there is agreement among interpreters.

It is when we consider the subjects of the verb in its various senses that agreement fails, and yet the conclusion we reach about Mark's usage at this point is important for our interpretation of passages like 2 : 15. The idea of discipleship, with or without the sense of physical following as well, is present at 1 : 18 (subject, Peter and Andrew), 2 : 14 (Levi), 8 : 34 (general), 9 : 38 (general), 10 : 21 (the rich man), 10 : 28 (Peter and the disciples), 15 : 41 (women from Galilee). From this it appears that the subject of ἀκολουθεῖν with the meaning of discipleship may be any who can or do become disciples. This does not agree with Turner's third conclusion about the use of the word: "that, with one possible exception in the earlier half of the Gospel, it is not used in narrative of or to the apostles, who did not 'follow' but rather accompanied their Master". (*Journal of Theological Studies* xxvi, 238f.).

The physical sense may be uppermost at 5 : 24 (subject, the crowd), 6 : 1 (the disciples), 10 : 32 (the twelve), 10 : 52 (Bartimaeus), 11 : 9 (the crowd), 14 : 13 (two disciples), 14 : 54 (Peter). Here too the variety of subjects excludes any limitation of the word in this sense to one class. We may note that at 14 : 13 Jesus is not even the object. Probably the evangelist used the word for any who accompanied Jesus in this way. Nor does there seem to be any reason why scribes and Pharisees should not follow Him on occasion in the physical sense. As a class they were certainly not His disciples and for part of the ministry at least were opposed to Him, but they are found in close contact with Him for example at 2 : 6, 24; 3 : 22f.; 7 : 1. Sometimes they are discussing with Him in the same room, sometimes out in the open. If there is no objection in principle to the Pharisees following Jesus in the literal sense, then the one argument against punctuating at 2 : 15f. πολλοί. Καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων collapses, namely the argument that the Pharisees did not follow Jesus. We, of course, need not suppose that in following they were doing more than holding a watching brief.

We may notice that, except at 8 : 34; 11 : 9 and the spurious 3 : 7, ἀκολουθεῖν is followed by a dative. At 8 : 34 ὀπίσω μου serves instead of the dative and in this passage we should probably read ἐλθεῖν instead of ἀκολουθεῖν. Thus it follows that 11 : 9 is the only passage in Mark where ἀκολουθεῖν is not followed for certain by a dative.

Πολλά

Unlike οὕτως which precedes the verb in Mark except at 4 : 41, adverbial πολλά regularly follows it (1 : 45; 4 : 2; 5 : 10, 23, 38, 43; 6 : 23, 34; 15 : 3). There is a clear and incontrovertible exception at 3 : 12 πολλά ἐπεῖμα αὐτοῖς and three instances of πολλά παθεῖν, 5 : 26; 8 : 31; 9 : 12. These are the only examples of πάσχειν in Mark and we seem to have here a stereotyped phrase. This is supported by the fact that where in the Gospels the aorist παθεῖν is accompanied by an accusative or an adverb, the verb comes in the second place: Matthew

* 16 : 21 (= Mark 8 : 31); * 27 : 19; Luke * 9 : 22 (= Mark 8 : 31); * 13 : 2; 17 : 25; 24 : 26, 46. πολλά occurs in the instances marked with an asterisk. At Matthew 17 : 15 we may have the present, κακῶς πάσχει.

Mark's practice bears on the interpretation of two passages. At Mark 6 : 20 it is said of Herod ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλά ἠπόρει (v.l. ἐποίησεν). Mark's order is definitely in favour of taking πολλά with ἀκούσας. This, however, enables us to decide in favour of ἠπόρει against ἐποίησεν, because, while ἠπόρει makes sense standing alone, ἐποίησεν alone does not, whatever πολλά ἐποίησεν might have been taken to mean.

At Mark 9 : 26 we have two readings, κράξας καὶ πολλά σπαράξας and in far fewer manuscripts κράξας πολλά καὶ σπαράξας (A Θ Ψ fl 565 pc). The second reading is in keeping with Mark's placing of πολλά and is probably original.

Scribes did not like πολλά as an adverb and tried to get rid of it at 1 : 45; 3 : 12; 4 : 2; 5 : 10, 23, 38, 43; 6 : 23; 9 : 25. It is not in the printed texts at 6 : 23 and Dr. Vincent Taylor has rightly restored it.

Periphrastic εἶναι and Participle

In addition to the discussions in the grammars, there are two studies: C. H. Turner, *Marcan Usage* viii, *Journal of Theological Studies* xxviii, 349-351, and G. Björck, *HN ΔΙΔΑΣΚΩΝ*, Uppsala, 1940. Björck takes account only of εἶναι with the present and aorist participles and Turner of the present and perfect passive participles. Chantraine, *Histoire du Parfait Grec*, chapitre ix, has some important remarks on the use of the perfect passive participle in periphrastic tenses in the New Testament.

Before we consider the commonest periphrases with εἶναι in Mark we must distinguish between tense periphrases and other uses of εἶναι with the participle. First we may refer to instances where εἶναι is the copula and the participle is an adjective or noun. We can distinguish in English between 'he was amusing the baby' and 'the book was amusing'. In the latter example the participle is adjectival. Likewise in Greek, ἦν ἄρχων can mean 'he was a magistrate' as distinct from 'he was ruling'. The second use to be distinguished is that of the supplementary predicate. There is an example with γίνεσθαι at Mark 1 : 4, ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων κτλ. Here ἐγένετο ... κηρύσσων is not our tense but a main verb with a supplementary participle which could be replaced by καὶ and a second main verb thus: ἐγένετο . . . καὶ ἐκήρυσσεν.

In Mark εἶναι, usually in the imperfect, and the present participle may be presumed to form a single tense, and the same is probably true for Luke at least. On the other hand, where γίνεσθαι is joined with a participle, Mark 1 : 4; 9 : 3, 7, (cf. Björck 62) no true periphrastic tense is constituted. Consequently we shall translate ἦν etc. with the present participle as an imperfect but not so γίνεσθαι and the participle.

The periphrasis for the imperfect was not popular with scribes and it has not survived in the printed text at Mark 1 : 39; 2 : 4; 5 : 40. There are variant readings which suppressed it at 3 : 1; 5 : 11; 9 : 4; 13 : 25; 14 : 4; 15 : 26. Periphrasis occurs at 1 : 6, 13, 22, 33, 39; 2 : 4, 6, 18; 3 : 1; 4 : 38; 5 : 5, 11, 40; 6 : 52; 7 : 15; 9 : 4; 10 : 22, 32 (bis); 13 : 13.

25; 14 : 4, 40, 49, 54; 15 : 7, 26, 40, 43; twenty-nine instances in all. Of these only 7 : 15; 13 : 13, 25 are not examples of the participle with the imperfect of *εἶναι*.

In English we are used to the participle following the verb 'to be' immediately in compound tenses. The fact that the two are usually separated in Mark has probably inclined translators not to treat them as forming a single tense. In Mark apart from particles like *καὶ* and relatives, the copula comes first in its clause. The exceptions are 5 : 5; 7 : 15; 13 : 25; 14 : 49; four instances out of twenty-nine. Again the subject where it is separately expressed comes between the copula and the participle as at 1 : 6, 33; 2 : 4, 6, 18; 3 : 1; 4 : 38; 5 : 11, 40; 6 : 52; 14 : 4, 40; 15 : 7, 26, 40, 43; sixteen examples against three exceptions, 7 : 15; 10 : 32; 13 : 25. The rest of the predicate is usually put between the copula and the participle or after the participle. This practice conforms with Mark's word order, verb, subject, rest of predicate, where *εἶναι* provides the verb and the participle is treated as part of the predicate. It does not, however, determine which part of the predicate the participle is, and so constitutes no obstacle to treating the verb and participle as a compound tense.

New Testament Commentaries

III. Epistles and Revelation

C. K. Barrett

(Reproduced by permission from *The Expository Times*, Volume LXV, No. 6, March 1954.)

The Pauline Epistles. (I use the traditional title without prejudice to questions of authorship.)

On the Greek text of *Romans* the only available commentary in English is that of W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam (*I.C.C.* [1st ed., 1895, several subsequent editions and reprints]). This is still valuable: careful, accurate, and full. But it is inevitably out of touch with modern Pauline study, and not altogether satisfactory. There exists, however, no substitute for it, and the information it affords can be supplemented by means of several more recent commentaries based on the English text. Of these, three in particular call for mention. C. H. Dodd's *M.N.T.C.* [1932] has proved its value over twenty years. It is frankly based upon a psychological approach to Paul and his theology, an approach which is perhaps less popular today than when the book was written; but it reveals all Professor Dodd's well-known lucidity and power and is undoubtedly the best exemplification of the method it employs. K. E. Kirk's *Romans* [1937] is one of the most thorough volumes in the *Cl. B.* The commentary itself is comparatively slight but it is supplemented by a long introductory chapter on the main ideas of the Epistle. More recently Anders Nygren's commentary on *Romans* has been translated out of Swedish and published by the S.C.M. Press [1952]. Dr. Nygren expounds Paul on the eschatological basis of his